

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 8th December, 1971

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

QUESTIONS (37): ON NOTICE

1. CENSORSHIP *Books of Merit*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) When did the State and Commonwealth Ministers in charge of this subject last meet to discuss uniform censorship?
- (2) Has there been any decision made regarding literary censorship of a restricted classification for books of merit?
- (3) If so, would he describe or table such decision?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) 15th October, 1971.
- (2) Agreement has been reached in principle between the States and the Commonwealth to investigate the feasibility of the introduction of such a classification.
- (3) No firm decision has been made, but preliminary discussions were held in Canberra last month between officers of the various States and the Commonwealth to consider uniformity in methods of restricted distribution, advertising, and amendment of the Commonwealth/State Agreement.

2. FLOREAT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Fire Hazard

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Is he in a position to advise me—as promised by the then Minister for Education on 25th August, 1971 (*Hansard* page 1018)—on the matter of rectifying the fire hazard which exists in the Floreat primary school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The Public Works Department is at present preparing a plan and cost estimate for a new escape stairway.

3. HOSPITALS

Building Programme

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will he have the answer to question 2 on 2nd December, 1971 re-examined and indicate how the

Armada Maternity wing, the Bunbury permanent care unit, and any other hospital works which were opened before 30th June, 1971 are included under works in progress for financial year 1971-72?

- (2) Will he advise the estimated cost for each item of the hospitals building programme for this financial year?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Although the work was completed, there is a financial commitment to meet the balance of expenditure involved.
- (2) I will table the hospitals building programme.

Hospitals building programme was tabled.

4. PUBLIC RELATIONS, PROMOTION AND RESEARCH OFFICERS

Terms of Service

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

Further to question 6 on 25th November referring to public relations, promotion and research officers in Government employment, and as approximately two weeks have passed since the question was submitted, will he now give the information to the House so it can be recorded in *Hansard* before this session finishes?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The Member surely should realize that the detailed information asked for by him is not stockpiled in readiness for such questions and consequently considerable time and effort are required to obtain it. The information is still being gathered from departments and every effort will be made to make the information available to the House before the session ends.

5. TRAFFIC HAZARD

Airlie Street, Claremont

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is he aware that as a result of the siting of the Sundowner Hotel's bottle department drive-in and parking area a traffic hazard (pedestrian and car) exists in Airlie Street, Claremont just off Stirling Highway particularly when cars swing off the Highway proceeding to the parking area?
- (2) Will he have the site investigated with a view to making the area safer, possibly by creating a pedestrian refuge on the hotel side of the wide stretch of Airlie Street extending towards the hotel?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Investigations will be carried out.

6. PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE

Tabling of Plans

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Would he table the plans for the proposed public health laboratories and the proposed medical school to be built at the Perth medical centre site?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

I will table plans for which contracts have been let, i.e. southern block, public health laboratories, and the medical school buildings. Because the northern block, public health laboratories, is not proceeding at this stage there will be a redistribution of space in the southern block as between the various sections.

Plans were tabled.

7. WHEAT

Quotas

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Have any 1971-72 wheat quota certificates been issued to growers who have not been holders of certificates in previous seasons?
- (2) If so, do any of these certificates relate to farms that have not had wheat quota certificates in previous years?
- (3) If (1) and (2) are "Yes" do any of these certificates relate to farms or land that have no wheat delivery history?
- (4) If so, how many certificates are involved, and what is the total number of bushels involved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.
- (4) 37 certificates involving 100,795 bushels.

8. INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENT

Owen Anchorage Area

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) With reference to my questions of 27th July, 1971, 21st September, 1971 and 18th November, 1971 on the subject of disposal of effluent in Coogee area (Owen Anchorage), will he please advise when an official statement can be expected?
- (2) Does he propose to table the report in view of the fact that copies appear to have been made available in certain quarters as evi-

denced by the article in *Fish Co-op News*, October 1971 issue and answers to my 18th November, 1971 question?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) The Fremantle Port Authority has been attempting to negotiate with the industries discharging effluent in the Coogee area but has not been able to make any progress. Until there is agreement regarding implementation of the recommendations of the reports on a voluntary and co-operative basis, or failing such agreement, a decision by the Fremantle Port Authority to take action under its regulations, no official statement will be made.
- (2) No. The reports were commissioned by the Government following arrangements for sharing of costs with industries concerned acting through the Chamber of Manufactures. Therefore, publication of the report would be a matter for decision by all parties. Extracts of the report printed in *Fish Co-op News* were published without reference to my department and as far as can be ascertained, without authority of all the industries involved.

9.

ROAD TRANSPORT

Inquiry

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he read Phillipa Feehan's letter to the editor in the *Sunday Independent* page 19 of 5th December, 1971?
- (2) If not, will he acquaint himself of the contents?
- (3) Is it a fact that he stated to an owner-driver transport association meeting—
 - (a) that he would abolish road maintenance tax;
 - (b) that he would have a full scale inquiry into the road transport situation?
- (4) Does he now intend to have the full scale inquiry into road transport?
- (5) What does he intend to do to assist these owner-drivers?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) (a) Yes.
 - (b) I have no clear recollection of having made such a promise but do not deny that I may have done so as a number of allegations of irregularities were made at the meeting referred to.

- (4) No. The difficulties are known and an inquiry would appear to be of little value.
- (5) It is considered that the abolition of road maintenance tax and the substitution of a system of licensing are expected to improve the present situation. The Minister for Transport is prepared to consider suggestions from truckies with a view to further improving the conditions under which they are operating.

10. MITCHELL FREEWAY

Extension to Leach Highway

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the planned route for the extension of the Mitchell Freeway from Canning Bridge through to Leach Highway?
- (2) Will he advise the estimated timetable and cost of the construction programme for this extension?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Main Roads Department is still carrying out investigations to evaluate all aspects of alternative alignments. Until these investigations are complete it is not possible to give information regarding a timetable and cost of construction.
- (2) Answered by (1).

11. ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT DISTRICT MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Patients, Staff and Buildings

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many patients have now been admitted to the (old) Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital?
- (2) What number of employees are in attendance?
- (3) What alterations and additions have been completed and at what cost?
- (4) What are the future intentions for these buildings and grounds, particularly—
 - (a) total patients;
 - (b) total staff;
 - (c) additions, alterations and maintenance;
 - (d) total estimated cost of changing from the maternity hospital to present use when fully operational?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Four severely mentally and physically handicapped residents were admitted on 6th December, 1971,

and arrangements made to admit a further 8 within the next few weeks.

- (2) 28, to cover 24 hours a day 7 days per week on rostered basis.
- (3) Alterations to plumbing and overhaul of boiler. Actual costs not yet available—estimated \$1,000. No additions have been made.
- (4) (a) (i) Total number of residents—32.
 - (ii) A day activity centre (in the future) catering for 35 attenders.
 - (iii) Possible outpatient clinic (in future).
- (b) Total staff requirements not yet known. Preliminary estimate 50.
- (c) and (d) Additions—
It is proposed to build a new wing and make internal alterations estimated to cost \$115,000.
Expenditure in relation to (4) (a) (ii) and (4) (a) (iii) has not been estimated.
Maintenance—
Grounds and services will be maintained by Mental Health Services.

12. SHIPPING

International Service: Government Participation

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to enter the international shipping business?
- (2) If so, with whom and under what financial arrangements?
- (3) How many vessels will be involved, and what are the proposals for shipping operations?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) This matter has not been the subject of consideration by the Government.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

13. NARROGIN SHIRE COUNCIL

Loan: Rejection

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What is the reason for his recent refusal to allow the Narrogin Shire Council to raise a loan for the purpose of constructing electricity mains for the Narrogin Flying and Gliding Clubs—the clubs to service the loan?
- (2) Will he reconsider the request?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The project is considered to be outside of the scope of local government activities, being on private land. If the clubs were to fail the responsibility for overpayments of the loan would devolve upon the ratepayers.
- (2) No.

14. ABATTOIRS

Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Project

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

With respect to the advertisement headed "TLC-UFGA Co-operative Meat Sales" which appeared in *The West Australian* of 6th December—

- (1) Has a company been formed?
- (2) If a company has not been formed, by whom in this State have big contracts been made with Russia, Canada and the Middle East countries?
- (3) What is the extent of these contracts?
- (4) When does the Government expect to be in a position to make a decision with respect to the requested guarantee?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Only preliminary contacts have been made with possible importing countries. No contracts have been made.
- (4) The T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. will require to undertake and submit a feasibility study. When this is examined a decision will be made by the Government.

15. ABATTOIRS

Boyup Brook Flax Mill Site

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has a feasibility study been undertaken by the Government into the proposed use of the old flax mill site at Boyup Brook for use as an abattoir?
- (2) If "Yes" what were—
 - (a) the conclusions arising from the study;
 - (b) the acreage of land available for the abattoir and holding paddocks;
 - (c) the health inspector's report on the use of the site for these purposes?
- (3) What assurances can be given that the nearby Blackwood River will not become polluted by run-off, effluent disposal or by river flooding?

- (4) What are the highest and lowest points above normal river level of the proposed abattoir and holding paddocks respectively?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. This was a preliminary assessment only.
- (2) (a) Conversion of the flax mill building for meat works operations was not recommended.
- (b) 40 acres including buildings.
- (c) Plans for effective drainage and effluent disposal installations will require to be submitted to the Public Health Department before approval can be given for use of the site as an abattoir.
- (3) No assurances could be given in the absence of an efficient drainage system.
- (4) The site may be flooded in exceptional circumstances. The highest point of the holding paddocks has never been under water but the lowest parts of the paddocks have been under one to two feet of water.

16.

CHILD WELFARE

Badgingarra Property

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

- (1) Has a property in the Badgingarra area recently been purchased by his Department?
- (2) If so, at what price, and on what terms?
- (3) For what purpose is the property to be used?
- (4) If for the accommodation of children, which children, and how many?
- (5) What provision will be made for their education?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The full price, including the provision of two additional homes is \$140,000. \$100,000 has been paid over and the balance of \$40,000 will be paid on 1st July, 1972.
- (3) A home for children needing large group care and a farming property.
- (4) Twelve primary school aged wards of the Child Welfare Department.
- (5) They will be educated at either of the Education Department's primary schools at Badgingarra or Coorow.

17.

SHEEP**Brucellosis**

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has his Department any information available to the public on the incidence of brucellosis in sheep in each of the several districts in which a departmental veterinary officer is appointed?
- (2) If available, will he supply statistics relevant to this disease over the past three years?
- (3) What steps are being taken to alleviate the disease?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) No special survey of incidence has been made. Results of testing of blood samples from British breed rams during the past 2 years are as follows:

1970-71—1,253 sera—(173 reactors or 13.8%).

1969-70—1,489 sera—(25 reactors or 1.7%).

No infection in merino rams was reported. Information for individual veterinary districts is not immediately available.

- (3) A plan proposed in 1969-70 for an ovine brucellosis accreditation scheme under Government supervision was not accepted by the Australian Society of Breeders of British Sheep. No official action to control the disease has since been taken on a State basis but departmental assistance is given to control ovine brucellosis in flocks in which the disease is a problem.

18.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT**Employees: Leave**

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What will be the amount of—
 - (a) annual leave; and
 - (b) long service leave,
 due to each individual head and sub-head of the various branches of the railway department as at 31st December, 1971?
- (2) What amount of accrued leave was due on retirement to the former comptroller of accounts and audit, Mr. Downing?
- (3) What amount of accrued leave was due on retirement to the former commissioner, Mr. Wayne?
- (4) Will the Minister take steps to ensure that all leave due is cleared as soon as is practicably possible?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Annual leave is calculated to 30th June. Leave due to heads of branches, sub-heads, and officers of comparable status, and uncleared at 30th June, 1971, was as follows:

	Annual leave weeks	Long service leave weeks
Secretary for Railways branch		
Secretary for Railways	15 1/5	26
Co-ordinator of Planning	5 4/5	13
Industrial and Staff Superintendent	11 1/5	39
Commercial Branch		
Commercial Manager	11 1/5	28
Assistant Commercial Manager	6 2/5	13
Accounts and Audit Branch		
Comptroller of Accounts and Audit	22 1/5	13
Chief Audit Officer	3 3/5	Nil
Stores Branch		
Comptroller of Stores	12 4/5	13
Civil Engineering Branch		
Chief Civil Engineer	7 2/5	13
Assistant Chief Civil Engineer (new works)	9 4/5	26
Assistant Chief Civil Engineer (design)	16	13
Signal and Telecommunications Engineer	36 2/5	13
Inspecting Engineer (now Assistant Chief Civil Engineer) (maintenance)	8	26
Mechanical Engineering Branch		
Chief Mechanical Engineer	10	13
Assistant Chief Mechanical Engineer (motive power)	18 2/5	26
Works Manager	14 1/5	13
Traffic Branch		
Chief Traffic Manager	21 2/5	26
Assistant Chief Traffic Manager (operations)	20 1/5	26
Assistant Chief Traffic Manager (works and research)	17 2/5	30

- (2) Accrued leave—

Annual—22 1/5 weeks.

Long Service—13 weeks.

Pro-rata leave—

Annual—1 week.

Long Service—7 1/5 weeks.

- (3) Accrued leave—

Annual—14 weeks.

Long service—13 weeks.

Pro-rata leave—

Long service—10 3/5 weeks.

- (4) Every endeavour is made to ensure that officers clear some leave in each period of 12 months but because of developments and requirements of the service, coupled with the shortage of experienced staff, in recent years it has not been possible to clear all leave as it accumulates or to reduce the arrears.

The position is reviewed annually and every effort is made to clear the maximum amount of leave, particularly by those with the highest accumulation.

19. **ABATTOIRS***Restriction of Local Trade*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

In view of the urgency of attracting private capital and expertise to establish additional abattoir export killing capacity—especially for sheep and lambs—will the Government reconsider introducing legislation to remove restrictions on local trade if major abattoir developers are prepared to establish additional facilities within the currently restricted area?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Restrictions on access to local market were introduced many years ago and these have been maintained by successive Governments since to ensure that the utmost use is made of Government abattoirs built to provide a public service on which the sum of \$10,383,000 will have been spent in the three years ending 30th June, 1972, in improving and expanding capacity.

If restrictions were removed unconditionally, and as a result there was a great increase in capacity, there could develop a situation where the Government-owned facilities would be used only seasonally at great cost to the taxpayer. However, the Government would be prepared to give full consideration to any finite proposal from a major developer.

20. **MIDLAND TECHNICAL SCHOOL***Art Course: Accommodation*

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What alternative accommodation can be provided for the start of art classes at the Midland technical school in 1972 if the present art building is demolished?
- (2) Is he aware that the present art building (which accommodated approximately 200 students in 1971) is a temporary building only as it has been condemned by the Public Works Department?
- (3) Will he state the long term plans to provide up-to-date and adequate accommodation and facilities at the Midland technical school for art, applied art and homecraft subjects?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The condemned building must be demolished to allow the erection of new workshops for apprentice training. Investigations are pro-

ceeding as to the most suitable alternative accommodation which can be provided for art teaching.

(2) Yes.

(3) Accommodation for art classes will be included in the long term planning of the site.

21.

SEWERAGE*Cannington*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware that at present a large tract of land in the Cannington area, only 5-7 miles from Perth, and close to road, rail and other facilities, cannot be developed because of lack of deep sewerage?
- (2) Is he also aware that for several years landowners have been told that plans existed to extend the sewerage from the Lynwood direction to serve this area, but nothing has happened; in the meantime, areas much further from Perth on sands that would permit septic systems, are being serviced?
- (3) When is the Cannington area likely to receive deep sewerage?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Cannington will be served by a system of main sewers flowing via Bibra Lake pumping station to the Woodman Point treatment works. Work is now virtually complete from the treatment works back to Bateman from which point the proposed Cannington branch sewer will originate. Construction of this branch is expected to commence early in 1972 and will proceed as funds become available. The sand areas mentioned in the question are being served by a system which was largely financed by developers.
- (3) The completion of the main sewer system to Cannington will depend upon availability of funds but in any case is unlikely before the middle of 1974. As much of the area to be sewered is subject to re-development proposals, details of these proposals will be necessary before reticulation design can be undertaken. I might add that the area in question is represented by three influential members of the Government in this House who make consistent representations to the Metropolitan Water Board for the extension of these sewers.

Mr. O'Neil: Without much effect.

22.

PARLIAMENT*Autumn Sitting*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Would he please give the approximate starting time and anticipated duration of the autumn sitting of Parliament?
- (2) Would he state whether the autumn sitting will be the continuation of the present session or will it be the beginning of a new session of Parliament?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) The first part of the Third Session of the present Parliament will commence on 14th March, 1972 and will continue for approximately five or six weeks.
- (2) It will be the beginning of the Third Session of the 27th Parliament.

23.

MINING*New Legislation: Introduction*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Mines:

As he already indicated that the drafting of the new Mining Act is in a fairly advanced stage, would he consider introducing the Bill during the present sitting so that Members may have an opportunity to give the Bill the considerate and lengthy study that it demands and deserves?

Mr. MAY replied:

The drafting of the new Mining Act is at present being carried out by the Parliamentary Counsel but will not be completed in time for introduction as a Bill during the present sitting of Parliament.

I might add it is my intention to introduce the Bill early in the New Year. Ample time will be given for a study of it.

24.

**YUNDURUP CANALS
DEVELOPMENT***Dredging: Consultation with Harbour
and Light Department*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Respecting the Yundurup canal scheme, has the Harbour and Light Department ever been consulted regarding dredging and other conditions?
- (2) If so, what is its recommendation?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No. Dredging and other conditions were evolved by a departmental committee on which the Harbours and Rivers Branch of the Public Works Department was

represented. The Harbours and Rivers Branch is the Government body controlling dredging and related operations.

- (2) Answered by (1).

25.

VERMIN*Control Boards and Schemes*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to the answers given to my question, Thursday, 2nd December, would he please elaborate on the position in each of the main pastoral areas where vermin control boards and schemes operate and in particular—

- (a) the general financial arrangements and position with the funds in each of the areas;
- (b) the economic and climatic conditions in each of these areas;
- (c) the outlook beyond 30th June, 1972 in each area and the prospect of a revision of the present arrangements including the prospect of additional Government financial assistance for vermin control to overcome the economic and climatic problems in each of the areas;
- (d) the outlook for efficient and effective control under the arrangements planned?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

For the purposes of replying to this question, I have considered the main pastoral areas to be the Kimberley, Pilbara, North West and Murchison, and Eastern Goldfields.

- (a) Kimberley: Vermin board funds are buoyant. Vermin boards contribute to Agriculture Protection Board group dogging schemes. There is no financial restriction on vermin control work in this area at present.

Pilbara: A scheme jointly financed by local vermin boards and the Government has run into financial difficulties because pastoralists are unable to meet their commitment to the scheme. Already the number of doggers has been reduced in this area. The Agriculture Protection Board commitment to the area has been maintained at its previous level.

North-West and Murchison: A programme similar to the Pilbara scheme was planned for this area, but lapsed when

vermin boards were unable to raise their contributions to the scheme. Vermin boards have entered into group dogging arrangements with the Agriculture Protection Board, but already three of these have closed down due to lack of finance from the vermin boards. The Agriculture Protection Board commitment to the area has been maintained at its previous level.

Eastern Goldfields: There are no special vermin control schemes operating in this area. All vermin control is financed by the Agriculture Protection Board and this commitment has been maintained at its previous level. A request for assistance from the Sandstone Vermin Board has been rejected because of lack of finance.

(b) Economic:

Kimberley—extremely good. Pilbara, North-west and Murchison, Eastern Goldfields: Reduced station incomes due to low wool prices have severely affected the viability of properties only running sheep, particularly where less than 8,000 to 10,000 are carried. Pastoralists running cattle are well situated financially.

Climatic:

Kimberley, Pilbara, North-west and Murchison—Very favourable.

Eastern Goldfields—A serious drought situation still exists. Stock losses have been severe.

(c) Kimberley—Vermin control arrangements are not expected to alter after June, 1972.

Pilbara—Under the present arrangements, it is difficult to see the Pilbara scheme continuing after June, 1972.

North-west and Murchison—Under the present arrangements many of the current group dogging schemes may have to close down after June, 1972 as vermin boards will probably be unable to meet their commitments.

Eastern Goldfields—As all dogging operations are financed by the Agriculture Protection Board, it is not expected that any changes will occur in the level of control.

(d) Under the present financial arrangements it is expected that control will continue at

its current level and efficiency in both the Kimberley and Eastern Goldfields areas. In other areas the reduced capacity of vermin boards to meet the cost of their joint control operations will result in some reduction in staff and consequently in less effective control of wild dogs.

26.

YUNDURUP CANALS DEVELOPMENT

Dredging: Restrictions on Time

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

Referring to the Yundurup canal scheme, can he state on whose advice and/or for what reason the dredging restrictions in time were changed allowing dredging from 1st March instead of 1st May?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The amended dredging period was recommended by a committee comprising representatives of the Departments of Town Planning, Public Works, Lands and Surveys, and Crown Law.

The Committee had regard to the developer's representations that the May-October period was inadequate to complete dredging operations in one season. It was considered that this compromise would encourage the acceptance of dredging limitations.

27.

YUNDURUP CANALS DEVELOPMENT

Dredging: Lease Terminology

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

(1) Referring to draft of dredging lease offer tabled with his reply to question 29 on 30th November, 1971, could he explain the meaning of the passage in paragraph 9 on page 3, viz: "the area between these bunds and the foreshore channel to be levelled"?

(2) Does this mean levelling approximately 12 inches under low water level as it originally was?

(3) Does it mean filling and levelling above water level thereby reclaiming this area from the Peel Inlet?

(4) If (3) is "Yes" will this reclaimed area be given and/or used by the canal developers?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) During preparatory operations, earth banks or bunds were constructed in shallow water outside the developer's land.

(2) The intention of the clause is that the levels are to be restored to those existing prior to the commencement of the work.

(3) No.

(4) Answered by (3).

28. GERMAN SHEPHERD DOGS*Registrations and Prohibition of Breeding*

Mr. HARMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many German shepherd dogs are registered in Western Australia with the Department of Agriculture?
- (2) Is Western Australia the only State in Australia to prohibit the breeding of such dogs?
- (3) When was such legislation passed by this Parliament?
- (4) Is he aware that the German shepherd dog is bred to tend sheep and that such dogs are used for this purpose in this State?
- (5) Has he received a proposal to amend the legislation so that controlled breeding in Western Australia could be allowed?
- (6) If so, was this proposal accepted or rejected, and if the latter, for what reason?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 1,090 dogs are currently registered.
- (2) No. Prohibition on the breeding of Alsations is in force in parts of Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia and the Northern Territory. Western Australia is the only State where a State-wide prohibition applies.
- (3) The original legislation was passed in 1929, but this was superseded by an Act of 1962 which strengthened the administration of the prohibition on unsterilised dogs.
- (4) Yes. A very small percentage of the total number registered in Western Australia may be used for this purpose.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The proposal was rejected because it was considered that it would prove extremely difficult to administer in view of the general requirements of the Act.

29. INDUSTRY (ADVANCES) ACT*Government Guarantees: Office Blocks*

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) How many office blocks and similar building or land development projects (other than Yundurup canals) have been financially assisted or guaranteed by the State Government since 3rd March, 1971?
- (2) If any such financial assistance or guarantees have been given, to which parties have they been given, on what conditions and for what amounts?

- (3) Which projects of this kind are under consideration?

- (4) (a) Has an application been received from the A.L.P., T.L.C. or organisations associated with A.L.P. or T.L.C. for financial assistance in respect of funds or guarantees for new office accommodation;
- (b) if so, has a decision been made and what assistance is involved;
- (c) if no decision has been made, when can a decision be expected, and what form of assistance and/or guarantee is under consideration?
- (5) (a) Is it correct that the Government is prepared to give assistance through guarantees or guaranteed rentals to developers who are prepared to commence early construction of major building projects;
- (b) if "Yes" what criteria will be applied in considering applicants?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) None.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) None.
- (4) (a), (b) and (c) No such application has been received.
- (5) (a) No.
- (b) Answered by (a).

Mr. COURT: That is slightly different from the report on the radio the other night. Apparently you did not hear the 11 o'clock news.

30.

HOSPITAL*Rockingham-Kwinana*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the land been leased on which the new Rockingham-Kwinana hospital is to be built?
- (2) If so, what are the terms and conditions of the lease including—
 - (a) area;
 - (b) lessee;
 - (c) rent;
 - (d) term?
- (3) Will the letting of this land inhibit the provision of the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital in any way?
- (4) If (3) is "No" will he show how?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) and (2) (a) Yes. The land is owned by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. It is part of a grazing lease of 1,964 acres, of which 45 acres will be excised for the proposed hospital.

- (2) (b) R. C. and B. F. Houghton.
P. E. and A. Male.
- (c) The Metropolitan Region
Planning Authority is not pre-
pared to reveal rental, which
relates to the total area.
- (d) Annual tenancy.
- (3) No.
- (4) Possession of the land can be
obtained at six months' notice.

31. HEALTH

Meat Inspections: 1960 to 1971

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Health:

What were the number of slaught-
ered cattle, calves, sheep, lambs
and pigs, inspected by Public
Health meat inspectors in West-
ern Australia for the years 1960-
61 to 1970-71 inclusive in—

- (a) the metropolitan area;
- (b) country areas?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The answer to this question is
statistical in nature and, with your
permission, Mr. Speaker, I will
table it.

The answer was tabled.

32. ABATTOIRS

Stock Slaughtered: 1960 to 1971

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for
Agriculture:

- (1) What number of stock were
slaughtered at metropolitan abat-
toirs for the years 1960-61 to
1970-71 inclusive—

- (a) cattle;
- (b) sheep;
- (c) lambs;
- (d) pigs?

- (2) What number of cattle, sheep,
lambs and pigs were slaughtered
for the years 1960-61 to 1970-71 in
each of the following areas—

Albany, Boyup Brook, Bunbury,
Busselton, Capel, Collie, Dar-
danup, Denmark, Donnybrook,
Drakesbrook, Kalgoorlie, Esper-
ance, Harvey, Mandurah, Katan-
ning, Manjimup, Mount Barker,
Narrogin, Northam, Plantagenet,
Upper Blackwood and Waroona?

- (3) Are present abattoir facilities in
Western Australia adequate for
the killing of cattle and pigs?
- (4) By whom is the feasibility study
being carried out for the T.L.C.
and U.F.G.A. abattoir project at
Boyup Brook?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) I will table information relating
to Midland and Robb Jetty Abat-
toirs.

It is regretted that this informa-
tion cannot be provided in respect
of privately operated abattoirs
since it would disclose details of
the activities of the companies
concerned.

- (2) This information is not available
from statistical sources.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) By a company which has been in-
volved in constructing abattoirs
elsewhere in Australia.

The paper was tabled.

33. STAMP DUTY ON RECEIPTS

Refunds: Cost of Advertising

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

What is the estimated cost to the
Government of the advertising in
the newspapers for the proposed
return of receipts duties by the
State Taxation Department?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:
\$2,000.

34. SCHOOL GROUND IMPROVEMENTS

Public Works Department Policy

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for
Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Public Works
Department will not allow the
parents and citizens' associations
to carry out all or part of the
school ground and reticulation de-
velopment schemes?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Public Works
Department is insisting on the
work being carried out by con-
tract?
- (3) Is he aware this policy is in some
cases trebling the cost to the as-
sociations?
- (4) Now that the parents and citizens'
associations are being denied the
right to make their traditional
valuable contribution by personal
physical contribution will the Gov-
ernment now take over this re-
maining item and provide the full
finance?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No, it depends on the merits of
each individual project as to
whether the Public Works Depart-
ment approves of the association
carrying out the work.
- (2) Answered by (1), but it is to be
recognised that the use of the
contract system assures the most
competitive price with the great-
est protection to the parents and
citizens' associations.
- (3) No.

- (4) Parents and citizens' associations are not being denied the right to make personal physical contributions. In certain types of work, the Public Works Department can place a valuation on materials and supervised voluntary labour when assessing costs for subsidy. An increase in subsidies is not contemplated at the present time.

35. SAND PITS *Safety Rules*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Mines Department considered formulating safety rules for sand pits?
- (2) If so, would he indicate the type of safeguards recommended?
- (3) How does the Mines Department intend publicising the new safety requirements?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Recommended safeguards include—
 - (a) Fencing of area prior to mining.
 - (b) Danger notices at 100 yard intervals along boundary fence.
 - (c) Restricting face heights to no greater than 30 feet.
 - (d) Excavating by series of benches in sandpits deeper than 30 feet or deeper than the vertical reach of the excavating equipment used in the pit.
 - (e) All pit faces and walls to be sloped on completion of each day's work, to prevent any further slump of sand.
 - (f) Safeguarding of machinery tools, etc., against interference from children.
- (3) The proposed set of safety rules will be conveyed to the Local Government Department so that it may advise shire councils of the safety requirements.

36. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE *Service to Darwin: Lost Markets*

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

- (1) Following the Government's decision to continue the State Shipping Service to Darwin, have the contracts already held by Western Australia for the supply of pigmeats, groceries and agricultural products been already cancelled?
- (2) Will it be possible to fully regain these markets?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) (a) Watsons—pigmeats—Contracts with Department of Health and armed services have not yet been cancelled.
- (b) Anchor products—groceries—Have various contracts, none of which have been cancelled.
- (c) Peerless roller flour mill—Have lost all contracts into Darwin. Company feels that flour trade could be regained if service was continued on a full time basis because of regular weekly frequency of State Shipping call.
- (d) Wesfeeds Pty Ltd—agricultural produce—Trade lost because of freight increase in July, 1971, plus uncertainty and the company concerned has since established a plant at Darwin for manufacture of feed from local sorghum and meatmeal.

37. POLICE

Lionel Brockman: Cost of Search

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

- (1) In *The Sunday Times* of 28th November, 1971, it was reported that the search for Lionel Brockman was estimated to cost the Western Australian Government \$50,000—
 - (a) is this figure correct;
 - (b) if not, what is the correct figure?
- (2) As bail is never granted to a gaol escapee, is it not an extraordinary action in granting bail to him?
- (3) Will he explain the reasons why he agreed to accept a deputation comprising the State Chairman of the A.L.P., the Hon. C. J. Jamieson, M.L.A., Minister for Public Works and Water Supplies, and the State Secretary of the A.L.P., Mr. F. E. Chamberlain?
- (4) Was it the result of this deputation that influenced Cabinet to instruct the Minister for Police to order the plaintiff, Inspector C. E. Standen, not to oppose bail?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) No.
- (b) \$31,131.00.
- (2) In the very special circumstances obtaining the Government's action was justified.
- (3) I agreed to receive the deputation referred to because I considered I should do so.
- (4) No.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE**1. STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION***Land at Turkey Point: Traffic Control*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) As a result of our inspection last Sunday of the areas of State Electricity Commission land through which the public require access to Turkey Point and the "Cut" at Bunbury, would he make available to myself or the Bunbury Town Council a written authority for the Bunbury Town Council traffic inspectors to patrol the necessary roads to assist in overcoming a problem that has apparently developed?
- (2) If the above is not possible, for what reasons, and as an alternative, would consideration be given to fencing in the mined areas which require time to stabilise and regenerate growth?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) and (2) A verbal offer has been made by the Bunbury Town Council to make their traffic inspectors available to patrol roads towards the "Cut" and to prevent vehicles entering onto land being rehabilitated by surface stabilising techniques.
- Such offer has been accepted by the commission.

2. ABATTOIRS*Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Project*

Mr. T. D. EVANS (Attorney-General): Yesterday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question in three parts relating to a document which was purported to have been issued by the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia and the United Farmers and Graziers Association. To the first part of the question I replied in the affirmative; and I indicated to the House that I would have parts (2) and (3) examined, and would report later thereon.

I now advise that in my view the document does not come within the provisions of the Companies Act. By this I mean it does not purport to be a prospectus within the meaning of the Companies Act, and therefore the third part of the question is not applicable.

Mr. Court: You are opening the field wide up.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY*Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 7th December, on the following motion by Mr. Moiler:—

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

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

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [5.00 p.m.]: I thank the House for the opportunity to speak in the debate on the Address-in-Reply. I want to address my remarks to travel concessions for country pensioners. When one talks of concessions for pensioners one invariably thinks of the concessions that are already available in the metropolitan area, and not the concessions that are available in the country.

To start off my contribution to the debate I will read the following report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 10th June, 1971:—

Government Gives Free Travel to More. The State Government's scheme to provide free public transport in the metropolitan area for needy people has been extended to include deserted wives, unmarried mothers and women whose husbands are in gaol.

Further on in the report the following appears:—

In addition, the scheme would include free travel for social service pensioners who qualified under the Commonwealth Social Service Act for pensioner medical benefits or who were identifiable, on an income basis with that class of pensioner.

People who would qualify for free travel on Government buses, ferries or trains in the metropolitan area would include:

Age and invalid pensioners and dependant wives.

Age war service pensioners and dependant wives.

Ex-servicemen permanently unfit for work and dependant wives.

TB pensioners.

Widowed mothers of dead ex-servicemen.

War widows over 60.

It was stated that the concession would be extended to other country towns including Albany, Bunbury, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder when negotiations with private

operators had been completed. I understand that to date negotiations have been completed in these country towns, and free bus service for pensioners is provided.

An interesting aspect is that it will cost the Government \$1,500,000 during the coming year for these purposes; and this is an increase of slightly more than \$500,000 on last year. The point I wish to make is that I do not for one moment decry the free travel concession that has been granted in the metropolitan area. I think this is generous treatment by the Government, but by its action the Government has actually discriminated against country pensioners.

Whilst I realise the Government could point out that it was not possible to allow unrestricted free rail travel to be granted to country pensioners, I make this point: Where a pensioner requires specialist medical treatment, irrespective of where he resides, provided he qualifies within the meaning of the aged persons assistance legislation he should be granted free transport.

At present we find that generally the hospital facilities in the country are fairly adequate, but I might add that the hospital facilities at Busselton leave much to be desired. I understand the Minister for Health has given some undertaking to upgrade the facilities at Busselton. By and large the hospital facilities in the country are adequate to cope with the day-to-day needs. However, there are times when specialist medical treatment is required. If a pensioner residing in the country needs such treatment he is required to attend a regional hospital and pay for it; or alternatively to go to a public hospital in Perth where the treatment is provided free of charge.

Travelling assistance from the Child Welfare Department is available to some pensioners, but to obtain this assistance they are required to fill in certain forms before travel warrants are issued. This is in direct contrast with what the Premier said in reply to a question I asked on the 27th July last. My question was—

Will the Government allow pensioners living in country areas requiring specialist medical treatment free return rail travel to the metropolitan area?

The Premier replied—

Yes. This has been the practice for many years and it will continue.

I am afraid this is typical of some questions which members ask, the reply to which is not entirely correct. What the Premier said in his answer was certainly not a fact. I would point this out to the House: Answers which in essence are not strictly correct should not be given to questions asked by members.

Following the answer given by the Premier in relation to the provision of free rail transport, I referred this matter to the Child Welfare Department, which referred me to section 8 (b) of the Welfare and Assistance Act of 1961; it states—

The Minister may for the purpose of rendering and affording financial assistance—

(b) for the transport of indigent persons

make advances at his discretion to persons who apply for such assistance and satisfy the Minister that in the circumstances of the case such assistance should be given.

Certainly that was not the information I was given in reply to my question.

On this issue I do believe the Government has discriminated against country pensioners in respect of free rail travel, because if the Minister decides that from his point of view a particular pensioner does not qualify for assistance then a warrant is not issued.

When one takes into consideration the amount of money that has already been allocated for this financial year—an excess of \$500,000—one will see that metropolitan pensioners are already advantaged by their proximity to public hospitals. I for one do not decry the privileges which have been granted to them. However, I wish to bring up a few points. Firstly, the metropolitan pensioner does not have to go through the embarrassing process of filling in an indigent person's assistance form. I would like any member of the House, in whose electorate pensioners are required to apply for this assistance, to look into the matter I have raised. It is quite embarrassing for these pensioners to have to fill in such forms.

In the first place, the metropolitan pensioner does not have to go through this embarrassment; and in the second place, there is no means qualification to determine who does and who does not qualify. If one is a pensioner living in the metropolitan area one can get the full concession, irrespective of whether or not one is sick; but if one is a pensioner living in the country one will be placed in an invidious position, because if one is required to obtain specialist medical treatment, and the Minister in his discretion decides that one does not qualify, then one will not get the free travel concession. I believe a precedent was established when the Government extended free travel concessions to all metropolitan pensioners and increased the allocation by \$500,000 in this financial year.

The final point I wish to make on this matter relates once again to the application form for assistance. In the country it is necessary to obtain this form from either the clerk of courts, or if one lives in an area where there is no clerk of courts

the form has to be obtained from the police station. If a pensioner lives 30 to 40 miles from the local police station he must travel to the police station to obtain the form and fill it in. Even if a pensioner does this he may still be told by the Minister or his agent that he is not eligible for assistance.

Mr. Fletcher: A pensioner could write in to obtain a form.

Mr. BLAIE: The pensioners in the metropolitan area merely have to get on a bus to obtain medical treatment, but pensioners in the country have to write in to obtain the forms for free rail transport. Why is there discrimination?

Mr. Fletcher: Could the pensioners not write in?

Mr. BLAIE: I appreciate the concern of the member for Fremantle. If a pensioner was sick and lived in a country area, he would go to his local doctor who might say, "I expect you to go into hospital. Catch the next bus to Perth." In those circumstances how could the pensioner write in? He could write to the nearest police station but it would take some time for a reply. The pensioners in the country do not have the advantage of expeditious treatment. I hope the Minister for Health will take notice of what I have said, because there is a very real problem.

Mr. Fletcher: His departmental officers will read your comment and pass it on to the Minister. Country doctors could be issued with forms and make them available to their patients.

Mr. BLAIE: I appreciate the assistance which the member for Fremantle desires to render. If his proposal is placed before the Minister I hope he will act on it. I have said that the actual collection and the filling in of the form is an embarrassment which country pensioners should not be obliged to suffer when they seek assistance.

I now refer to a letter from the Minister for Child Welfare, addressed to me and dated the 19th November, 1971. In my letter to the Minister I asked whether it would be possible for the personnel of the Railways Department to issue travel warrants, provided that when a pensioner produced his card he would also be required to submit documentary evidence that he had to travel to the metropolitan area for specialist treatment. In his letter the Minister said—

I regret to advise that it will not be possible to authorise Railway personnel to issue Railway Ticket Orders.

I refer once again to the report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 10th June last. The final paragraph states—

To qualify for the free travel pensioners would only have to present their existing fare concession certifi-

cate, issued by the Commonwealth Social Services, to the conductor or driver of a bus, ferry or train.

Country pensioners have been discriminated against in the matter of travel for medical reasons, and I ask the Government to take heed of my remarks and do everything in its power to rectify the situation.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [5.15 p.m.]: I wish to express my regrets at the passing of the previous Speaker (Mr. Toms) and to say that I always found him to be an extremely decent and honest member of Parliament and Speaker. His passing certainly is a loss to this House and I wish to pass my respects on to his widow and family. At the same time I welcome the new member for Ascot and wish him well during his stay in this Chamber.

When speaking on the previous Address-in-Reply debate I expressed concern at what I considered were the unsavoury actions of the Government in certain departments and its interference which affects the efficiency and overall operations of those departments. In Australia generally, but in Western Australia in particular, there is a fairly unruly element which endeavours to operate whenever possible. This element has been involved in various demonstrations such as the one which occurred outside the Parmelia Hotel when Captain Bain was here and there was a demonstration against the Springboks. The same people were also involved in the moratorium marches and other demonstrations in the metropolitan area.

Unfortunately this type of element is organised in Western Australia to a greater degree than most people realise. Several people have been detained by the police and subsequently convicted, and this is very good. I know that in certain circumstances it is extremely hard for convictions to be upheld because these people work as a mob. If the police go near any of them they heckle the police and do everything possible to interfere with them in the course of their duty. If a policeman tries to arrest one of the mob he is likely to be hit, and so on. When an individual is taken into custody his friends in the mob state that the police dealt with him indecently and harshly. Unfortunately this type of behaviour makes the policeman's task a very difficult one.

I say that the crowd is organised because mostly the same people have been involved in each of the demonstrations I have mentioned. If something is not done to assist the police in this field, the efficiency of the force will eventually be reduced. The Police Force in Western Australia is as good as the force anywhere else in Australia. It carries out its duties in a decent manner, and on a percentage basis the number of criminals it has convicted is probably as high as anywhere else in Australia or in other parts of the world.

Photographs have been taken of demonstrators at the various gatherings. I do not know, but I presume they were taken in order that the demonstrators might be identified, so the police could subsequently keep an eye on them. Consequently I was extremely disappointed to learn that these photographs had been destroyed. In an unprecedented incident a member of the Minister's office personally attended to ensure that the photographs were destroyed. This is quite an unusual action and is quite wrong. The Government should have sent someone from the commissioner's office to ensure that the photographs were not destroyed, but kept and used effectively in the work of the department.

When this type of action is taken it gives rise to the belief that the department is being interfered with and not being permitted to carry out its duties in a proper manner.

I would now like to deal with the issue of Lionel Brockman. This man, who was serving time, escaped from prison. He was the subject of one of the longest and most expensive manhunts by the police in this State. If I remember correctly the figure involved was something in excess of \$30,000, and his recapture involved many weeks of work by members of the Police Force who spent night after night chasing Brockman in the bush until he was recaptured. Since his recapture, he has been charged with something like 54 offences. I was amazed—as I am sure others were—to read recently in *The West Australian* of the 4th December a headline, "Cabinet sought bail for Brockman."

This man led the police a merry dance. He was charged with 54 offences, and once he gets into the bush it is very difficult to recapture him, but Cabinet sought bail for him.

Mr. May: Do you feel that what we did was wrong?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Yes, very wrong.

Mr. Hartrey: Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The member for Boulder-Dundas can make a speech later. I am distressed at the action of Cabinet in this regard and the interference of the Government in the normal operations of the Police Department and other departments in this State.

Mr. Hartrey: The police do not normally take four months to catch an escapee.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This indicates the difficulty. He is an extremely good bushman, and if he is out in the bush it is hard to catch him. He also proved he is very capable of eluding the police.

Mr. Hutchinson: Why allow the search to go on?

Mr. Hartrey: He was like Paddy's horse, very hard to catch and no damned good when you have caught him!

Mr. O'CONNOR: It was not very hard for him to get out. I want to express my concern about the actions of Cabinet in this regard. The newspaper report reads—

The Government asked the Police Department not to oppose bail on Lionel Brockman.

People are inclined to forget what happened while Brockman was free. Many places were broken into and this action affected the future lives of the parties concerned. While he was free one particular individual had his premises broken into three times.

The SPEAKER: I would warn the honourable member that a case is pending before the court this month.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I did not say that he did it.

The SPEAKER: Certain items are *sub judice*.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I said that while Brockman was out certain things happened.

Mr. Hartrey: They should not have been mentioned. This insinuation should be ruled out of order. It is a reflection on a matter which is *sub judice*.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The person whose premises were broken into could go bankrupt and so he has no future; but he is forgotten. No-one is concerned about him.

Mr. McPharlin: Also Brockman was terrifying the wives of farmers and others in the localities in which he was operating.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Although the police had a very difficult job in recapturing Brockman, they were open to a lot of criticism. I am quite sure that when he was recaptured the police were relieved and tired, but extremely satisfied that they had brought him to hand without any injury to himself or any member of the Police Force. But, after all this hard work, what happens? Cabinet says, "Bad luck, fellows. We are going to let him out again, and if he happens to shoot through, you will have to go through all that you went through before, or let him go." I believe this attitude is wrong and that it is undermining the morale of the Police Force in this State.

Mr. H. D. Evans: When he walked out of Wooroloo, what sentence was he serving?

Mr. O'CONNOR: He had only a few weeks to go.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But what was the sentence?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not know.

Mr. H. D. Evans: One month.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Does the Minister think he was right in walking out of Wooroloo? I do not think so. If a person—whether it be Brockman or anyone else—breaks the law, he should be punished. We make the laws. If they are wrong, let us alter them. If the Minister feels the laws are wrong in this regard, fair enough; but he should bring some amendments to us.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Why did he walk out of Wooroloo?

Mr. Hutchinson: Is that an excuse?

Mr. H. D. Evans: There is such a thing as mitigation.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This is what I am talking about.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Find out what you are talking about first and we will listen.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We are encouraging people to break the law.

Mr. Hutchinson: Call the law off the people if you feel that way, and save all the trouble.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Brockman was granted bail on 37 charges on a \$100 bond on each charge; that is, \$3,700. Most people in the State would find difficulty in paying such a bond and it amazes me that Brockman was able to pay it. However, as far as Brockman is concerned, the issue has only just commenced. Demonstrations will be held and every case will be fought all the way through, involving further harassment to the police.

As I said earlier, the police in this State have, in the past, ardently carried out their duties and they have done so extremely well. I am concerned that their morale is being undermined by certain actions, and I hope the Government will, in future, be more loyal to the department and the police, and try to ensure that when they are carrying out the duties Parliament has bestowed upon them, it stands behind them to some degree.

Is it any wonder that the Minister for Police cast aside his Premier and Cabinet colleagues in connection with the ombudsman issue? I can understand his attitude because he obviously realises how badly the department is being undermined. An honourable member on the other side is laughing, but quite honestly I believe the Minister for Police is one person who has carried out his duties properly in this regard. He has shown some concern for his department, and I hope the Minister for Agriculture will show even half as much concern for his department.

Mr. Bertram: He does.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Not for the Police Department.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Nor you either, for that matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am standing behind the police, which is more than the Minister for Agriculture is prepared to do. If the

Minister for Agriculture believes that this law or any other is unsatisfactory, he should have it amended. We make the laws and we instruct the police to enforce them and capture any lawbreakers. Surely we should not encourage lawbreaking, but should stand behind the laws we make and behind those we entrust with the duties in this regard.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'CONNOR: If we are to undermine the morale of the Police Force in this way we will have it turning its back on crime rather than trying to capture the lawbreakers. The situation in this State is rather difficult because of the number of people who desire to behave contrary to the law and against the police. Mob rule is creeping in to a small degree. People endeavour to push the police around. Recent reports have appeared in the Press concerning policemen who have been kicked, punched, knocked to the ground, and then kicked while they were on the ground. Those concerned have been apprehended and then fined only \$40 to \$100. I say that such a fine is insufficient and I hope the Government will introduce some amendments to increase the penalties under the Police Act, and particularly those dealing with interference to a policeman while engaged in his duties. I believe that when people harass the police to the extent which occurs today, a more severe penalty should be imposed than is imposed by the courts in this State.

I now come to the Transport Department. For some weeks I have been trying to obtain information from various Ministers in connection with the operations of the Transport Department. In the field of transport, again laws are being broken. The Government is condoning lawbreakers in this field.

I have asked questions about individuals and for files to be tabled in the House. The Ministers concerned have not been prepared to table the files but have told me I may see them on a confidential basis. This certainly does nothing to unearth the growing number of people who are breaking the law so far as the Government is concerned. There are people in this State with 60, 70, or 80 charges against them for breaking the laws which obtain to the Transport Department but the Government will not permit the department to go ahead and issue warrants for their arrest. I think this is a poor effort, particularly since the Government is protecting some of its friends to the disadvantage of decent people in the State who obey the law and pay their taxes.

I have pointed to instances of the Government's interference with the Police Department's normal operations. I believe this can be said in connection with the burning of photographs which should have been kept.

Mr. Hartrey: They should not have been taken in the first place.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It has also applied in connection with the Brockman issue. As I have said, the Government has protected some of its friends in the field of transport and, to mention something else, I believe the Government is wrong in some of the guarantees it has given recently.

I ask the Government to be more careful in future and to be more considerate towards members of the Police Force and the Transport Department so that these officers are given assistance to do their work instead of being hampered in their operations.

I believe the Government's action can only bring about inefficiency in the force and the department, and over a period of time will probably lead to an increase in the number of crimes committed in the State.

Officers in the Transport Department now do not know what they will do for a living. The Premier has indicated that if the Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) is not acceptable to the Parliament he will, nonetheless, proclaim the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Repeal Bill. We will not have money to spend on roads and 46 men in the Transport Department will be unemployed.

Although I have not seen the statement I believe that prior to the elections the Premier wrote to members of the Transport Department—or to one of the unions—advising that he would ensure that officers in the Transport Department were looked after if they lost their jobs as a result of the abolition of road maintenance tax. Is that correct?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I cannot recall it but I will not deny it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I heard this from officers of the department. I wonder whether the Premier could possibly make some effort to try to place some of them in other departments as quickly as possible if the legislation in question is thrown out of the window. Those involved are good and conscientious men who have been a credit to the department. They are extremely capable and it would be a pity to see them lost to the service.

Those are the only points I wanted to make when speaking to this debate. I sincerely hope in future the Government will encourage officers in the Transport Department, the Police Department, and other departments to carry out their duties manfully and properly, and certainly without political interference.

MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [5.33 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on the Address-in-Reply and I assure the Government I will not be quite as brief as the Governor

was when he opened this session of Parliament, although I do not intend to take any more time than I need.

The Minister for Housing is not in the House at the moment but my comments can be passed on to him. In any event I have mentioned the matter to him and we have discussed it on one or two occasions. The matter of the cost of gas hot water systems to people in the new State Housing area of Withers Park in Bunbury is one that I brought up earlier this year. At that time most of the people concerned had received their first accounts for gas. I asked the then Minister for Housing whether he would contact the State Electricity Commission Home Advisory Service to arrange for people to visit the area for the purpose of instructing the residents how to use gas economically. This was done and in some cases it was successful, but not to any extent.

I have been through the area since this time after I received complaints from people who had received gas accounts for the quarter ending in September. I checked with people to ascertain the total of the accounts. I shall give a quick resume of some of them without mentioning any names. I went to the trouble of asking most residents how many people, including children, were in the family and what the gross or net income was.

Case number one shows a gas account of \$24.25 for the quarter ending June; the gas account for the quarter ending September was \$25.26. The people concerned have one child and the net income is slightly in excess of \$70 a week. I have given this example to illustrate that apparently the Home Advisory Service of the State Electricity Commission, as good as it may be, did not produce results in this case. I do not say this has applied in every instance. I shall mention some instances later where apparently the Home Advisory Service had success. However, people have to go to extremes to be successful.

I shall mention another case of people I know personally and have known for some time. The couple have five children and members will notice that as the number of children increases the gas account also increases. The man is on an income of \$52 a week gross and his gas account was \$56.59 for the quarter. His wife told me she had to fall back on her child endowment to pay the account. One or two of their children are teenagers and, therefore, half-yearly child endowment would be sufficient to pay one quarter's gas. This means that after the first two quarters someone will go short—either the State Housing Commission or the S.E.C.—for the account.

In another case a couple have four children, one of whom is a teenager. At the time I spoke to them the husband was

unemployed but since then I understand he has obtained a job paying approximately \$50 a week. The June account for electricity and gas was \$59.94, of which approximately \$20 would be for electricity. The September account, for gas alone, is \$31.32.

Mr. Bickerton: The member for Bunbury say \$21?

Mr. WILLIAMS: The gas account for the quarter ending September was \$31.32. In another case the September account, which represented the family's first full quarter, was \$39.41 for gas. Another example is of a man on \$64 gross a week. The couple have two children and their gas account was approximately \$40. I say "approximately" because they gave me an estimate of the electricity account. On this basis the gas account was approximately \$40 for the quarter.

Another couple whom I know personally, and have known for a number of years, are extremely cautious in their habits because the man is an unskilled worker and they have had to watch their cents. He is in receipt of a gross income of \$49 a week and the couple have two children. He has to pay a gas account of \$51.54 a quarter. Of course it is completely beyond his capacity. A number of people are asking the commission to transfer them from this area to another area of the town where the houses do not have gas hot water systems. We cannot blame them for this. Many people are not accustomed to using gas appliances and, as I have said previously in the House, a number of salesmen of gas appliances often ask a couple what their income is. They maintain that if \$100 a week comes into the home it is all right to go ahead and take a chance with a gas hot water system but, if the income is less than that, gas can be too expensive. Again, it depends on how gas is used.

Recently a woman came to me on another matter. I sent her case on to the parliamentary liaison officer in the Housing Commission. The lady is a widow on a widow's pension and she has three children who are aged 11, 10, and 4½, respectively. Of course she is on a rebated rent but her gas account is \$34.36 a quarter. This is about as low as she estimates she can get it. Needless to say the expense is driving her up the wall.

A general principle has been followed by the Housing Commission—and I do not blame the commission for this—in that the commission does not consider transferring a person from one State Housing Commission home to another, particularly in the same town, until that person has been in the first accommodation for a period of two years. I do not disagree with this policy.

Mr. Bickerton: Would her gas consumption be for everything except lighting?

Mr. WILLIAMS: In the homes themselves the stove is a gas unit as are the room heaters and the hot water systems. The people themselves maintain the stove is as economical as a wood stove. At least that is the general opinion of people to whom I spoke and I approached 30 or 40 on this matter. The cases I have given are random samples only. I do not think the people concerned would want to do without their gas stoves; perhaps they would scream if the commission took them out and put in wood stoves. They do not mind room heaters because many of the people to whom I spoke have bought kerosene heaters. Besides, room heaters are not used for many months in the year in the climate we have in Western Australia, particularly in Bunbury. At the most a room heater would be used for three or four months in a year. However, a hot water system is used for 365 days a year.

I shall now mention some of the examples I promised the Minister of the extremes some people go to in order to keep their gas accounts down. I know of two families with young children. In both cases the children are extremely young. These families have kept their gas accounts to \$10 and \$9 respectively for the quarter. As I have said, they have gone to extremes to achieve this. Each time after they use their hot water system they turn the pilot flame off. I am not an expert on gas, but I did think the pilot flame in many of the gas hot water units was extremely high. I thought the pilot flame was perhaps burning gas unnecessarily, but the S.E.C. men have been through and considered it to be all right.

The couples of whom I am speaking relit the pilot flame when they wanted to use the hot water system. They washed their children in lukewarm water each night and gave them a bath every second day. They do all their washing in cold water.

Mr. Bickerton: Cold power.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This may be all right for companies that advertise certain types of washing powders as being suitable for cold water, but the people concerned are not really happy about it. I have given these extreme cases to illustrate that people can, I suppose, reduce their gas accounts if they really put themselves out to do so. I think this is going to the extreme.

I know the Minister for Housing is new to his portfolio and for this reason it is fair for me to tell him the story as I know it. Doubtless he will reply later in the debate or by letter at a later date. I am expressing my own opinion and I may be wrong—although I think I am fairly right—when I say that the reason for installing gas hot water units was that the commission felt it would be more economic from the overall point of view. Perhaps

the commission had in mind the replacement angle. In the old section of Withers, if I can put it that way—I am referring to the area north of Hudson Road which has been established for seven or eight years and is now completely built out—solid fuel hot water systems were installed when the houses were built. Some of these systems burnt out within 18 months or two years.

It was at this particular time that the State Housing Commission gave consideration to the types of hot water services to be installed in the Withers Park area.

I myself had a water system installed at about the same time as these units in the old area of Withers. My unit burnt out within 12 months. I believe this was the same type of unit and a fault was inherent in it. Subsequently my unit was replaced, and although the new unit split a seam and was repaired it is still working. I know of many people in the Withers area still using the original system after six or seven years.

The Housing Commission made the decision to put gas hot water units into the area of Withers Park on the supposition that the water in that area would corrode the inside of the tank of a storage system. It was considered that the gas hot water systems would last longer under these conditions. Probably the water in that area was a little worse than most of the Bunbury water but it has improved since that time. The Bunbury Water Board now has sand filters and aeration. There is not much difference now between this water and water in other sections of the town. The other houses run solid fuel hot water systems similar to my own.

I believe the State Housing Commission made a mistake somewhere along the line. Possibly the commission sent a plumber to look at the hot water services in Withers and the plumber reported back, "The hot water services have had it; the water is no good." I have a fair suspicion that the commission did not check the report out—it took the word of a plumber. This would suit the plumber if he did not want to repair old units and felt it was easier to put in new ones.

As I said earlier, the tenants are quite happy with the functioning of the units but find they are very expensive. The State Housing Commission should be aware when it builds houses for low-income groups that the tenants would find difficulty in meeting gas bills to the order of \$30, \$40, or \$50, a quarter. These tenants just cannot manage to pay bills of this amount and somebody will eventually suffer for it. The Housing Commission may miss out on the rent due or the S.E.C. will miss out on its payments. The S.E.C. issues a summons very quickly if an account is overdue. It may be the tradespeople who miss out or the children of

the tenants themselves. In many cases the tenants become so fed up with the whole business that they do not give a damn anyway.

I visited two streets during my tour—Wilkerson Street and Stallard Street. I asked the tenants the question, "If the commission is prepared to swap your gas hot water system for a solid fuel system would you agree?" I consider it is the duty of the State Housing Commission to swap the systems over without payment from the tenant. It is a different situation when tenants are purchasing the property, but people paying rent would lose money if they were required to pay for the system. I also asked the question, "If the commission required you to pay a portion towards the replacement of the hot water system, would you be prepared to put forward half the cost?" I estimated the new system would cost about \$120 to \$140, which may be a little low but I do not think it would be too high. Most of the tenants said they would be happy to pay half the cost which would be about \$60 or \$70. They reasoned that as they were receiving high accounts for gas this would be cheaper in the long run. Of course, the gas accounts would include gas used for cooking and other appliances but the major item in the account is the hot water system.

If the commission asked the tenants to make an application on a 50-50 or even a 75-25 basis, I am sure many of them would apply. It would then be up to the tenant to decide whether or not to keep the old hot water system.

Mr. Bickerton: What about a later tenant coming into the premises who might require a gas hot water service?

Mr. WILLIAMS: This could be a problem. However, I cannot see a future tenant wanting to install a gas hot water system if he knew the whole story. The commission would be very wise to refuse such a request unless the cost of gas was reduced considerably. Even then the commission should refuse such an application unless a strong reason were put forward.

Mr. Bickerton: Just before you leave that point, rather than endeavour to reply to you at this stage, for the purpose of accuracy I would prefer to obtain a pull of your speech and give a full reply.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I thank the Minister. I will be only too happy to answer any queries he may raise in the future. I have no doubt this matter will be looked into.

The next matter I wish to talk about is something which has concerned me for some years in a general way. However, this is not the first specific case which has been brought to my attention. I have spoken about unionism from time to time but tonight I intend to speak about a particular person. This man has told me

I can use his name and address but I prefer not to do so because of the possible consequences to him and his family. Perhaps some members will know of whom I am talking but I do not intend to mention his name in the House. If a member makes a genuine request for the facts I will inform that member if I think it necessary, but I would prefer not to do so in the interests of this man's safety.

This man was employed by John Thompsons (Australia) Pty. Ltd., at the Alcoa alumina site at Pinjarra. John Thompsons are the contractors for the installation of the boiler and associated equipment for the power station at the Pinjarra plant. The employee commenced work in September, 1971, as a rigger. He was filling in for a short period before a vacancy occurred for a crane driver. This gentleman from my electorate and one other man were the two crane drivers on the project. They were both members of the Federated Engine Drivers' & Firemen's Union.

On Thursday, the 11th November, 1971, members of the Boilermakers & Blacksmiths Society of Australia and the Amalgamated Engineering Union, who were also employed by John Thompsons, clocked on at 7.30 a.m. and then went out on strike because of a situation at the plant. Four people had been laid off—two boilermakers and two trades assistants. It does not concern us why these people were laid off, but they were given one week's notice or one week's pay in lieu of notice. At that time Alcoa made the announcement about cutting down the expansion of the plant. This subsequently rubbed off onto the contractors and retrenchments were necessary.

At 9.00 a.m. on Thursday, the 11th November, 1971, the representatives of the two unions, the boilermakers union and the A.E.U. told—not asked—the two crane drivers to go on strike with the members of their two unions. These men said they wanted to check with the Perth office first. They rang the F.E.D. & F.U. and were told by the officer that they were not to join in the strike. The men asked for confirmation of this by telegram and the direction from the union was received the next day. The union directed them not to join in the strike as it did not concern them, but to continue to work and carry out the wishes of their employer. This telegram was signed by a Mr. Jack Bainbridge, and it is apparently still in the possession of one of these two men.

On Friday, the 12th November, the members of the two unions, the boilermakers union and the A.E.U., again told the F.E.D. & F.U. men to come out on strike. The two crane drivers informed the union men of the telegram advising them not to join the strike. There was then talk by the boilermakers union and the A.E.U. of blacklisting these two unionists. The

strikers told the crane drivers to start making other arrangements because no-one would work with them in the future.

We have all heard stories such as this before and some of us have known particular cases. However, this story goes a little further and becomes more serious. On Tuesday, the 16th November, members of the boilermakers union and the A.E.U. again met and the management informed them that no more retrenchments would be made until after Christmas. This was the whole object of the strike. However, the strike continued and on Friday, the 19th November, the boilermakers union and the A.E.U. issued an ultimatum to the two crane drivers that they had a choice of donating half their week's pay to a charity nominated by the two unions concerned or of being blacklisted on the site. This is the part of the story which concerns me most. The head office of the F.E.D. & F.U. informed its two unionists they were not to join in the strike, but members of two other unions intimidated them. The men's last week's pay was \$95, so they were being asked to pay \$47.50 to a charity named by the boilermakers union and the A.E.U.

The two crane drivers would not agree to this so they were blacklisted. They were told that their safety on the site could not be guaranteed. Of course, the intimidation is carried out without witnesses—the men were singled out and told individually by one man. The man from my electorate was also told on more than one occasion that he should watch out or he would get a bottle in his face.

He was assured that it would not be a full bottle and that it would be broken before it was pushed in his face. This was the threat made to him; that is, that before the job was finished this would happen. On Monday the 22nd November an ultimatum was again issued to the two men to donate half a week's pay. If they did this everything would be O.K. and everyone would work with them. So apparently the payment of \$47.50 would be sufficient to wipe out their apparent misdeeds and this amount would be paid to a charity nominated by the two unions.

The man from my electorate told them he would not agree to this, but the other chap yielded under pressure and paid up half his week's pay. However, this fellow from my electorate did not pay and he was then informed that no-one would work with him. The management was informed by the two unions that nobody would work with these two men and this is when the other chap promised he would pay the \$47.50, which I gather he paid some time later, but the man from my electorate said, "No dice."

It was then intimated that no-one on the site would work with him. So rather than have it on his conscience that he

was to be singled out and made to appear that he was the cause of the strike over the whole of the site, when in actual fact he was only doing what he was instructed to do and obeying all the rules and regulations, he said, "I will resign." This was on the Monday morning. The employer paid him all moneys due to him, a week's pay in lieu, and also paid him for half the shift of that Monday morning, and the man went on his merry way.

At this stage his "merry way" happens to be that he is unemployed. He has several children. He was in the Navy for seven years, from 1956 to 1963. Under the Naval Emergency Reserve—this is the name that is now given to what used to be known as the Naval Volunteer Reserve—he is required to do three weeks' training every year. This period of training was not due until after Christmas. However, the Navy has been co-operative and has said, "We will bring your training period forward before Christmas to enable you to have some cash in your pocket for the Christmas period."

At present he is serving two weeks' training with the reserve. This is a dreadful case, but it is not the only one that has come to my knowledge. However, it is the only case in regard to which I have been instructed by the person concerned to use his name. I do not intend to do this, because of what I have seen happen. Members on the other side of the House may say that these cases do not happen, but I know that they do. The member for Darling Range can cite a case similar to this one.

I know of several similar cases, but people are a little fearful to talk about them because of the repercussions that will follow. I would like to see the Government take some action in regard to these instances and introduce some amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act. I would like to see the Government bring forward something similar to a Bill of Rights for the individual unions.

Mr. Cook: You have presented this man's story. What else have you done to establish the facts in regard to the other side of the story?

Mr. WILLIAMS: It is a little hard to do that because no-one is willing to speak to me. I have all the facts I can get. I have checked with the employer to ascertain if what I have been told is true and he advised me that it was. If the member for Albany would like to check out the facts I have in my possession, he is at liberty to do so. Being a Liberal Party member it is difficult for me to ascertain the facts relating to the other side of the story; the member for Albany should not be so facetious or so silly.

Mr. Cook: Did the two men who saw you know that you were a Liberal? Have you telephoned the two unions concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I have always adopted the attitude that if the unions want to telephone me about this case, they can. I would like the member for Albany to check my story, because he knows that I will not get much assistance.

Mr. Cook: I know that there are two sides to the story.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I know there are two sides to the story, too. I have put up one side, so let the member for Albany put up the other side. However, I am certain he would not get to first base with it. Nevertheless, now that I have outlined one side of the story let the unions come out and outline the other side and try to establish that what I have said is not correct, because the gentleman concerned is quite prepared to argue his case. What I am so stirred up about is that this man can lose his job but cannot lay his finger on the person or persons to lodge a common law charge.

Mr. Rushton: Intimidation and blackmail!

Mr. WILLIAMS: That is for sure! I believe that amendments made to the Industrial Arbitration Act, along the lines of a Bill of Rights for individual unions, should be introduced.

Mr. Jones: I hope this case of trade unionism is a little more accurate than the last one you presented in the House.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, the 1965 one.

Mr. Jones: The one that I commented on in the *South Western Times*.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That one was dead right. The member for Collie happens to be wrong in his dates. In the Press I sorted out fairly well the one to which he is referring with the correspondent who signed it on behalf of the member for Collie.

Mr. Jones: The people did not fall for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Some people did not fall for it.

Mr. Court: The member for Bunbury was proved right on that occasion.

Mr. Jamieson: He was not, and the firm is still hostile.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Works would not know what firm it was. The Minister makes guesses and sometimes he is right and sometimes he is wrong, and on this occasion I suggest he is wrong.

Mr. Jamieson: You told us when you referred to the case that it happened only recently.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, I know; it happened five years previously, but I corrected my statement, and the Minister for Works has seen the letter in the Press about that. However, that is another story. Let members on the other side of the House prove this one to be wrong, because they seem to be getting a little upset.

Mr. Jamieson: I am not upset, but you want to put the boots into the trade unions every time you get up. The boilermakers union will answer you any time.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I have a great deal of respect for the Owen Salmons and the Bob Andersons, but I have no respect for the Paddy Troys, the Marks and the Bastows, and I believe they are pretty good mates of the Minister for works. They must be because he defends them left, right, and centre. It will be harder and harder, as the opportunity presents itself, for him to defend them.

Mr. Court: The trouble on the other side is that they represent the union bosses and not the workers.

Mr. Jamieson: For your effort, that is great.

Mr. Court: You just do as you are told by the union bosses.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Because we have compulsory unionism certain people get office within the unions and then they opt out of their duties. If the Government has the interests of the workers at heart, let it introduce a Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act, along the same lines as the Bill of Rights. The only provision in the Industrial Arbitration Act that looks after the rights of the unionists is to be found in section 9B.

Mr. McIver: You would have the workers working 24 hours a day. You would not know the first thing about trade unionism.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Would I not? The member for Northam would be a little surprised because I happen to have looked at both sides of industry and the member for Northam has looked at only one side. However, let the Government introduce some amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act: amendments that can be written into the rules of the unions; that is, all of them and not some of them.

Mr. Jones: Why didn't your Government write them in?

Mr. WILLIAMS: That is a good question. However, members on the other side of the House represent the little man; they have been telling us that for many years. So let us see what their Government will do for the worker.

Mr. Jones: If you are so sincere in your belief, why could you not persuade your Government to do this?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I did my persuading the same way as the member for Collie does his persuading now that he is a member of the Government; that is, he shouts out what should happen in the caucus room.

Mr. Jones: I have nothing to hide; the industry I represent is the best in Australia.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Let us see the Government introduce some amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act to give some rights to the unionist.

Mr. Bryce: What happens to such amendments in another place?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Let us consider the Companies Act. In that Act 79 sections are included to look after the interests of a shareholder, and those sections cover 80 pages. All those sections in the Companies Act set out the rights of an individual shareholder in any company.

Mr. Bertram: In what respect?

Mr. WILLIAMS: In all sorts of respects. Some member may say, "What is the comparison between a union and a company?" Probably there is not much of a comparison, because as a shareholder of a company I become a shareholder of it on a voluntary basis, but as a worker I am compelled to join a union or I do not get a job. I know one man who left the State because he would not go down to the Industrial Registrar and apply for a license to work and to pay his fees into Consolidated Revenue, because he wished to opt out of becoming a member of a union on account of his conscientious beliefs. He was quite right in thinking, in his own mind, that he would like to see the representatives of the little people take some action in regard to this and to see how interested they really are in trying to put some rights for the unionist in the Industrial Arbitration Act, which rights will then be incorporated in the rules of the union. I am referring to such matters as secret ballots, and so on.

Let us see how interested the representatives of the little people really are in looking after the rights of the workers by introducing such amendments. A great deal of lip service has been given by some people to this particular facet of trade unionism but nothing much is done about it. We have heard a great deal said about there being less strikes under the administration of this Government as compared with the position under the previous Government. It is interesting to look at the record in this regard. I would point out that anyone can examine such a record by obtaining a copy of the Industrial Commission's report.

We must bear in mind that the Industrial Commission was established by a Liberal Party Government when it was in office in 1963. There was a great deal of hullabaloo when that Bill was going through this House and many nasty statements were made in regard to it. One of the statements was that it would rob the workers of their rights.

Mr. Jones: It still does.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will come to that. It was suggested at the time that the men would be working over the weekends and would not be paid penalty rates, and all that sort of thing. However, when the Carlisle branch of the A.L.P. submitted a motion to the State conference in 1966 or thereabouts that if and when a Labor

Government was returned to office it should be called upon to repeal the Industrial Arbitration Act and introduce the original piece of legislation, Mr. Coleman said, "This is the best piece of legislation I have seen at any time for workers in Western Australia."

Mr. Jamieson: He did not say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: He was reported as having said that. The Minister will have an opportunity to tell us what he did say if he so desires. He can check the industrial records, but what this has to do with Governments, I am not sure.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Before the tea suspension I was getting to the question of industrial unrest.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bunbury has another four minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might have been six, but four will do. As I have said, I was about to mention the question of industrial unrest and how it might change from Government to Government. I was asked what I would know about unionism—I think it could have been the member for Northam in all his humour who asked that—and I think I answered it to some extent.

We on this side of the House know a great deal more about unionists and unionism than the Government gives us credit for. Many unionists come to us from time to time with their problems, and this is what we base our judgment on as, I dare say, do the members on the Government side when they talk about unionism.

I would suggest, however, that some of the members on the other side of the House might only know what they have been told about unionists: it is not what they themselves actually know. I say this because in the last six years we have had people on the Government side elected to this House who have really played very little part in the affairs of unionists.

Mr. Jones: I hope you are not talking about me.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I was about to say that with the exception of the member for Collie and the member for Northam, who incidentally sit together, the other members on the Government side are what we might term, loosely, intellectuals.

Mr. Court: Very loosely.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I did not mean that in a derogatory sense and I apologise for the *faux pas*. Perhaps it might be better if it were placed in inverted commas! Some of these members would not know what a unionist would do in his actual day-to-day work.

As we all know, we have had school-teachers elected to this Chamber as representing the workers—of course they also

represent their own profession—we have had three lawyers, businessmen, and similar types of people who are also supposed to represent the worker.

I believe that we on this side of the House know just as much about the problems of the unionists as individuals as do members on the other side of the House. I make the promise that some time in the next 12 months, or possibly earlier, I will give members on the Government side the opportunity to indicate whether or not they support the right of the individual unionist, because I propose to endeavour to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act in so far as it relates to the rights of unionists.

Mr. Jones: Would you agree with retrospectivity?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do make this promise.

Mr. Jones: All you have been doing is complaining; is this a threat?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I make this promise on behalf of other people. I do not want members to get me wrong; because the promise is made on behalf of other people.

Mr. Graham: How many, and what percentage?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would not like to say, but there are plenty of them. They do not necessarily vote for me but that, of course, is their own business.

I would now like to touch on the matter of industrial trouble as it has affected one Government or another. I refer particularly to the number of man days lost through strikes. The figures I have show that in 1965-66 the man days lost totalled 4,118; in 1966-67 the total of man days lost was 2,702.

Mr. Graham: Under the Liberal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The figures for 1967-68 indicate that 5,233 man days were lost; while those for 1969-70 show that the number of man days lost was 79,559. In 1970-71 the man days lost through strikes totalled 178,578 of which more than half—about 100,000—were during the time the present Government has been in power.

Mr. Graham: Wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It is not. Coincidentally these may have been "gerried" by certain people to put us in the position in which we are at the moment.

Mr. Bryce: That works against us.

Mr. Court: What an intellectual school-master we have over there.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Health) [7.36 p.m.]: I have not yet had an opportunity to congratulate you Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the position you now hold. I appreciate

that your appointment was the result of unusual circumstances, but nevertheless we are pleased to see you elected and to know that you will apply the same principles that have been applied by your predecessors. We look forward to your occupying that position for many years to come.

Last night I think we saw one person in this House allow all his hates, his prejudices, and his disillusionments to manifest themselves into one of the most unprincipled, undemocratic, unfair, untrue, and irresponsible breaches of parliamentary privilege that I have ever witnessed during my 10 years in this Chamber.

Mr. Court: For how long did you rehearse that?

Mr. DAVIES: The honourable member can say what he likes about me at any time at all, whether it be inside or outside the House, provided of course he sticks to the truth; but I do not like to hear him vilifying senior civil servants who are doing a splendid job and who are unable to hit back at the member concerned, because he has the advantage of parliamentary privilege. I invite this member now—and I refer to the member for Subiaco—

Dr. Dadour: I hope it is outside.

Mr. DAVIES: —to say outside what he has said about Dr. Davidson in this House. As I have said, the honourable member can say what he likes about me.

Dr. Dadour: You would be in the same pickle if I took advantage of that.

Mr. DAVIES: I wondered how long it would be before the member for Subiaco started to interject. I have a copy of his speech with me and from it I see that we gave him a fair go last night until his abuse got beyond reasonable bounds.

If the member for Subiaco wishes to interject he is at liberty to do so and I will deal with his interjections as they are made; but if he says outside the House what he said inside Parliament about the Commissioner of Public Health, I am sure he will find himself with a law suit on his hands. This is the real test; to say outside the House what he said in the House and to justify the words he used.

Dr. Dadour: Would not that be applicable to every member in this House?

Mr. DAVIES: Early in the session the first words I heard from the member for Subiaco were, "You will be hearing from me." I was looking forward to hearing from him, because I thought we would be given some constructive criticism, he being a member of a distinguished profession. I was looking forward to his remarks with interest even though he indicated that I would not welcome what he had to say. Nevertheless I did look forward with a great deal of interest for the contribution he might make to the good of health in this State.

Dr. Dadour: You are doing a lot.

Mr. DAVIES: As we all know, the opposite has, of course, been the case. The member for Subiaco has come to me on several occasions and made suggestions. I do not know whether or not it is because I have not listened to his suggestions or have not done what he has asked, or have not danced to his tune, but we now find the member for Subiaco acting like a truculent schoolboy, with language to match. We also find ourselves in the position where senior and distinguished civil servants have been vilified under privilege.

I know the member for Subiaco himself has had some experience a long time ago at Royal Perth Hospital and this is where I consider that in his case a little learning is a dangerous thing.

Dr. Dadour: It is better than none at all.

Mr. DAVIES: Those of us who do not possess the necessary knowledge are prepared to learn but those who have a little knowledge and imply that they know everything are of course the most dangerous.

The fact is that the honourable member—or I should say the member—was associated with the Royal Perth Hospital some considerable time ago. Since then, apparently, he has been prepared to listen to malcontents rather than carry out definite research in relation to the current position.

I think this is a matter for grave regret, because at any time, as I have already indicated, there exists an open invitation from the Board of Management of Royal Perth Hospital to any member of Parliament—whether he be in the Federal sphere or a State member—to visit the hospital and to learn something of what is done, which might help him use the knowledge to the greater advantage of health in this State; or perhaps to apply constructive rather than destructive criticism.

That invitation has stood for many years; it stood even during the open week at Royal Perth Hospital; yet I did not notice any member from this Parliament taking advantage of the invitation in order that he might give us the benefit of his criticism as a result of such a visit.

I interjected last night that the member for Subiaco was not game to go down to the Royal Perth Hospital. The honourable member should not be frightened to do so because he will be welcomed; the members of the board will be able to put him right and show him what is going on. They will also be able to assure him that there is no reason to listen to malcontents who are looking for a mouthpiece to put their side of the story. But the honourable member would not go down to the hospital to see the position for himself nor would he try to judge the matter objectively.

The same thing applies to the public health authorities. I am pleased to say that from time to time members have approached the Public Health Department—either Dr. Snow, Dr. Davidson, or somebody else—and have been readily given the information they required. Members have visited the department for one or two hours; they have talked with our officers and have sought information. These are the people who will be able to provide constructive criticism; it is they who have done their homework and, as a result, it is they who know what they are talking about.

This is the sort of thing we would expect from a member of the medical profession with the training and medical knowledge possessed by the member for Subiaco. We would expect him to try to advance the cause of health matters in this State instead of adopting the attitude he has.

As I said, I believe the honourable member feels disillusioned, because he has not been able to have somebody dance to his tune; and I certainly will not dance to his tune. He made it perfectly clear early in the piece that he did not like Dr. Davidson; that we would have to watch him.

I certainly find nothing to complain about in Dr. Davidson. He is a man with a multitude of jobs to perform and he performs them well. I would go so far as to say he is one of the most capable civil servants in Western Australia.

It is of course axiomatic that a man who works and makes decisions will make errors and tread on people's toes. This is the hallmark of a person who works well and thoroughly. I am sure that even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made some mistakes from time to time.

Mr. Graham: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. DAVIES: We have heard about some of them recently, directly and indirectly, in this House. The fact remains that it is not my intention to be dictated to by any one person, whether it be Dr. Davidson, Dr. Dadour, or any other member of the medical profession or, for that matter, any person who is not a member of the medical profession. I will carry out my own research, do my own homework, and make up my own mind. I will not interfere, and I will not make the appointment to the Royal Perth Hospital that the member for Subiaco has suggested.

As I have said, I will not interfere with the everyday management of the Royal Perth Hospital with a view to helping one of his friends obtain a senior position. This sort of thing is left entirely to the board of the hospital to manage. It is not my job and I am sure the member for Cottesloe—who is an ex-Minister for Health—will agree that it is not the Minister's function to enter into the day-to-day

running of the hospital, because administrative officers are employed to do that type of work.

Mr. Hutchinson: You must of course know about it.

Mr. DAVIES: In some cases, no. There is such a thing as delegated authority and provided action is taken within the bounds of that authority it is such authority that is responsible for any appointments which might be made.

Mr. Court: Does this mean the Minister is telling the House that no matter what the member for Subiaco says he will take no notice, despite the fact that the member for Subiaco is one of the most responsible general practitioners in the State?

Mr. Graham: Where did you hear that?

Mr. Court: One has only to talk to his electors.

Mr. Graham: He made the most irresponsible speech which has been made here in 25 years.

Mr. Court: The electors swear by him, and some notice should be taken of those electors.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: I wish the member who interjected had listened to me. I said that I will listen, I will read, I will learn, I will research, and I will take advice from anyone inside or outside of the medical profession.

Mr. Court: But you then said you would take no notice of the member for Subiaco.

Mr. DAVIES: However, the advice I listen to has to be unbiased and it is fairly apparent that the advice which has been given to the member for Subiaco, which advice the member for Subiaco has given to me, came from a biased person. The member for Subiaco made this quite clear in private conversation with me.

Mr. Court: What is the private conversation the Minister is talking about?

Mr. DAVIES: Conversations we have had outside the Chamber when I first met him, and when he started to warn me about someone. However, there was only one person who was a malcontent and he cancelled an appointment to see me in my office today. I ask: Why cancel an appointment to see me? I was prepared to discuss his point of view with him. The material which has been put forward here is directly parallel to some of the thoughts which have been conveyed by that same person concerning this atmosphere of petty jealousies, petty personalities, and petty empire building which the member for Subiaco claims operates within the medical profession.

Mr. Court: It is quite plain to us that it is possible you will talk in this manner and blab it to the whole world.

Mr. Graham: He has shot his bolt; he is finished.

Mr. DAVIES: At last the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has become an authority on health matters.

Mr. Court: I have not mentioned a single word about health.

Mr. DAVIES: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had a finger in every portfolio and he has at last found that he is an authority on health.

Mr. Court: I have not said a word about health.

Mr. DAVIES: I am seeking constructive criticism.

Mr. Court: The Minister has been speaking about the only experienced doctor in the whole of Parliament.

Several members interjected:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: I will treat matters in confidence, and I will not be like the member for Subiaco who, in his speech last night, betrayed confidences. We have some respect and there is a feeling among the older members of the House that we know exactly where we are going.

Mr. Court: You are making the Speaker blush.

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that the members for Subiaco first of all became disillusioned about questions which were asked in Parliament. Every member in this Chamber has asked questions and not received the answers he expected. I am sure the member for Boulder-Dundas knows, as would the member for Kalgoorlie, that one should never ask a question before one knows what the answer will be.

Mr. Hartrey: Very well put.

Mr. Hutchinson: I hope that will never be the case.

Mr. DAVIES: I think there are many cases where one tends to imagine what the answer will be, and then one becomes truculent if one does not receive that answer.

Mr. Hutchinson: Well, the Minister has changed since assuming office.

Mr. DAVIES: I had that experience over 10 years of asking questions, further questions, and rephrasing the questions until I received the answer which I felt was correct.

Mr. O'Neil: The answer you wanted!

Mr. DAVIES: The answer one expects to get. On occasions I had to give up. This of course, is what the complaining member has not yet realised: The game of question and answer in Parliament is a game of thrust and parry. However, I have given factual answers.

Mr. O'Neil: That is a poor theory.

Mr. DAVIES: That is the experience I had when in Opposition.

Mr. O'Neil: The situation has changed now.

Mr. DAVIES: I was thrusting with the question and the Minister was parrying with the answer. The fact is the sooner the member for Subiaco realises the situation the better. On one occasion in the corridor I suggested how he should rephrase some of his questions if he did not like my "Yes" and "No" replies.

Dr. Dadour: The sooner the Minister tells the truth the better.

Mr. DAVIES: Now we are back to personalities. This is the last thing members opposite can fall back on.

Mr. Jamieson: They are pretty good at that.

Mr. DAVIES: I have told members opposite what I think, and they can say what they like. I will stand by the work I do. It will be better than that done by the previous Administration.

Mr. Rushton: What ego!

Mr. DAVIES: It is not ego; it is because of application to my job. I am prepared to listen. I realise I have a tremendous amount to learn and I spend a lot of time reading. I understand that some previous Ministers went into their jobs believing they knew everything, just as the member for Dale believes he knows everything.

Mr. Rushton: The Minister is getting to personalities again.

Mr. DAVIES: No. I intended to quote some of the speeches we have heard previously in this House which would indicate that what I have said is true. The fact remains that at no time have I given wrong answers to questions, and at no time have I not given as much information as I could in reply to a question.

Another fact is the more questions the member for Subiaco asks, the worse the record of the previous Administration becomes. It has been quite impossible to bring the situation up to date in the short time we have been in office, particularly with regard to financial problems.

Mr. Rushton: What are the financial problems?

Mr. DAVIES: We have not been able to right all the matters which lacked attention, and did not receive the attention they deserved.

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister is now being critical of the Commissioner of Health.

Mr. DAVIES: The Commissioner of Health is only one spoke in a large wheel.

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister has changed his tack now.

Mr. Rushton: Will the Minister tell us about his financial problems?

Mr. DAVIES: I will not tell the member for Dale about my financial problems, but I will say that about 1965 the Medical School was announced with a flourish of trumpets, a display of models, plans, and sketches, and it was dripping with words of glory in advance. In fact, the whole venture fell rather flat and at the end of 1970 less than half the amount of money which was to be spent on the medical centre had actually been spent. That is the dismal account of a venture which was handed over to me and I am now being criticised because not enough money is being spent on the centre.

More money has been spent during the last financial year than was spent in any previous year.

Mr. O'Connor: How will the future road programme go?

Mr. DAVIES: I do not interfere with portfolios handled by other Ministers.

Mr. O'Connor: The Minister is part of the Cabinet.

Mr. DAVIES: If I can make a good job of handling my own portfolios I will be satisfied.

Mr. O'Connor: So will I.

Mr. DAVIES: If the member for Mt. Lawley would like to query the Minister dealing with the subject he mentioned I am sure he will be obliged with a factual reply.

Mr. O'Connor: The Minister is saying it is no concern of his?

Mr. DAVIES: My concern is to get as much money as I can to be spent on public health, and I am grateful to the member for Subiaco for constantly drawing attention to this matter because that attention might help me when funds are being allotted.

Mr. Hutchinson: That is part of the work of the Opposition; to try to attract more money.

Mr. DAVIES: I am grateful for that, but I think there should be more reasonableness and fairness about it. It seems there is an attempt to tear down what we are trying to build up. The member for Subiaco was attempting to place a schism between the Royal Perth Hospital and the Medical School when, in fact, the schism exists only in the minds of two or three persons.

Mr. Hutchinson: But he has highlighted some of the problems that do exist, and it is one of the responsibilities of Opposition members to do just that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: And Opposition members have done it for a long time.

Mr. DAVIES: I was not unaware of the problems which exist. The problem of the laboratories which the member for Subiaco has highlighted at considerable length is a problem that was handed down to this Government, and it was brought about purely by the fact that two factions could

not agree. As a result of a cut in loan funds it is necessary to alter the building programme and it appears we will save a considerable amount of money and we will be able to provide adequate facilities for all those who require them, including requirements for teaching.

There is one matter which requires attention, and that is part of the laboratory facilities about which the member for Subiaco has been asking questions; I refer to the morgue. It was apparent that this would be the one deficiency, and we are working towards overcoming the deficiency. I think in answering a question from the member for Subiaco I indicated that this was a matter for concern. We are not unconscious of the position, and we know what is required. We know it is a legacy which has been left to us and I am doing my very best to try to get it up to the programme, and not let it slip behind as it has done in the past.

Mr. Hutchinson: The Minister will not have a magic wand to wave.

Mr. DAVIES: I think a proper application to the planning could be a big help. I am sorry to say—

Mr. Jamieson: And I am sorry to say.

Mr. DAVIES: —there are some difficulties in that regard. I have taken it upon myself to ensure that the joint planning committee becomes an operative committee.

Mr. Hutchinson: But the advisers on the project are exactly the same as those who advised us.

Mr. DAVIES: No, I find there has been no firm policy of reporting to the trust. There has been no communication regarding what was happening. People were going straight to the Treasury instead of working through the one channel. Representations were made from different quarters for different projects. It seems a clash was occurring between people in the profession and it was having an adverse effect.

Mr. Hutchinson: It is most interesting and I would like to hear some of the details.

Mr. DAVIES: Had there not been clashes between personalities, and had different viewpoints not been pushed, both the north and south blocks of the health laboratories would have been built. There was money available but because of a number of circumstances the buildings were not constructed as planned and we are now able to alter the programming. Perhaps we will restrict some of the building and yet still satisfactorily provide the accommodation which is necessary.

Mr. Hutchinson: I agree with that.

Mr. DAVIES: This is the type of thing which has been happening. There have been too many pressures and too many promises instead of a responsible approach.

I am not saying that the people concerned have been irresponsible. People have been working long hours, starting at seven o'clock in the morning and working well into the night. These are some of the astounding facts which have come out in my investigations, and they will be overcome. I think we can use the joint planning committee to a great deal of advantage.

Mr. Hutchinson: I hope the Minister will realise that a good deal of assistance came from the member for Subiaco.

Mr. DAVIES: I do not acknowledge that. I know that what has happened has only been to promote the point of view of some of his colleagues. The member for Cottesloe is suggesting he is better able to push than I am when it comes to an allocation of funds, and I am sure the honourable member knows how difficult it is to get funds. Education did very well this year, but unfortunately it was not possible for us to use up all the money that had been allocated to the Medical Department, which I insisted should be mentioned in the report which I have tabled.

Mr. Thompson: Does not the co-ordination of the various committees fall within the orbit of the people to whom you would delegate authority to oversee? Would that not have been the case with the previous Administration also?

Mr. DAVIES: This is all relatively new. The trust, the centre, the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and the Royal Perth Hospital are all working together. They were not properly applying the delegation of authority that was given to them. As the member for Bunbury gave a promise, so I also give a promise on that matter.

Mr. Thompson: Between you and those committees there are surely some fairly senior officers of your department who are supposed to be keeping an eye on co-ordination.

Mr. DAVIES: They come from everywhere. There has been a change in the administration of the Public Health Department since the last under-secretary retired. A Director of Administration has been appointed in lieu of an under-secretary, and he and the Public Health Commissioner have defined lines of duty. This has helped but it is only in the last few months that things have crystallised and we can see where we are going.

The member for Subiaco was very critical about the money spent on the Royal Perth Hospital. He has made it quite obvious he does not like Royal Perth Hospital. I was rather distressed, and I think it shows something of his outlook when he accused the Chairman of the Board of Royal Perth Hospital (Mr. Reilly) of using his influence as a director of *The West Australian* and the *Daily News* newspapers. I saw in this evening's paper that this had

been denied, and I am pleased because, although Mr. Reilly might like that power, I am quite positive he has not got it.

The member for Subiaco might think there will be a great rush of letters in the paper supporting him. If that is the way he thinks, perhaps I am entitled to think the other way. In any case, it was a very unfair and unkind thing to say of Mr. Reilly, who has been a splendid chairman of the board and who devotes a tremendous amount of time to the hospital, free of charge, when he could be using his talents for some financial reward.

I intended to say something about Royal Perth Hospital. There is only one word I can use for the tenor of the remarks the member for Subiaco made in regard to the Premier; that is, "insulting." Again it is obvious he had not made any inquiries or done his homework. He talks about the Premier going over and "being buttered up." This, of course, is so far from the truth that it is incongruous. The fact remains that the plans that have been announced for Royal Perth Hospital have resulted from a detailed report compiled over a great many years by responsible officers. I do not intend to table the report for him or anyone else to see, but if he is game to come to my office I will let him have a look at it.

Dr. Dadour: Did you say "game"?

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that the work has been detailed. I have read through the report. Everything I could possibly think of has been answered in it, and there is not the slightest doubt that the correct decision has been made for the effective use of the land that is available. It will be in the correct position and the appropriate authorities have agreed about that. If in 20 years' time it proves to be otherwise, I will apologise to the member for Subiaco; likewise I will want to know why all those highly-paid Government officers gave me a recommendation of that kind.

Having decided on this, and having looked at it and had the common sense to plan ahead, I considered an announcement must be made, and I invited the Premier to make the announcement when he opened Royal Perth Hospital week—not when he "went over there to get buttered up" but when he went over there to say something sensible, to tell the people what would happen in the future with regard to Royal Perth Hospital.

We do not need to keep this kind of information in the dark. It is forward planning and if there is any criticism of it we are pleased to hear it. But to say there was a complete lack of planning in this connection indicates that the honourable member, once again, did not have the common decency to make any inquiries

or do any homework, and it is a sad reflection on the House for this type of attack to be made.

Although I am due to present some trophies at eight o'clock, I am sure I shall be forgiven for being late when it is known I am putting the member for Subiaco back on the rails. The last comment I want to make is in connection with the suggestion that Dr. Davidson prevented a man being employed.

Here again, the member for Subiaco is the mouthpiece for a malcontent who has made submissions to me and whose file I have read at considerable length. I went back to the office last night and read it again, and I am quite certain that the decision made by the previous Administration to dispense with the services of this man when he failed, after several requests had been made, to report for duty at the conclusion of his long service leave was the correct one, and I endorse it 100 per cent.

It was quite evident that the person concerned had been treating the department with contempt. Every possible action was taken, including asking the member for Kimberley and the president of a shire council for their views about this man, and all agreed that the proper action had been taken. This was a decision of the previous Minister, made in 1968, and, having read the file on several occasions, having spoken to this man's wife, having spoken to the man himself on the telephone, and having had a look at his record in the department, I am quite happy to endorse the decision. I do not believe the department should employ him.

There is nothing at all to prevent him from going into private practice if he wants to. To suggest that the Commissioner of Public Health could reach out so far as to prevent this man receiving an appointment in a hospital is ridiculous beyond words and does no justice at all to the facts of the case. As I said, I am only too happy to endorse the action taken by the previous Minister.

I am sorry to say I have no intention of resigning from Parliament or tendering my resignation as a Minister.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The member for Subiaco should think of it seriously.

Mr. DAVIES: That is entirely up to the honourable member. I think, but I make no comment on that. I believe the attack which was made can only do a great deal of damage to the Public Health Department in this State. It can do little to heal the rivalry, or the alleged rivalry, between the Perth Medical Centre and the public hospitals, particularly Royal Perth Hospital. It is insulting in the extreme and—

Dr. Dadour: Do not be too holy, please!

Mr. DAVIES:—until the member for Subiaco can back up his statements—

Dr. Dadour: You still have not answered my questions. You had better answer the questions I have asked.

Mr. DAVIES: I have dealt with Royal Perth Hospital, the Perth Medical Centre, and Dr. Davidson. If I stayed here until doomsday, I doubt if I could satisfy the member for Subiaco.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I wonder what Mr. MacKinnon thinks about some of these questions.

Mr. DAVIES: The member for Subiaco has clearly indicated to me that my thoughts have no credence unless they are in line with his own. For the life of me, I cannot agree with the statements he has made.

Dr. Dadour: Tell me about the letter from Royal Perth Hospital which you had in your pocket. You knew the things I said to be correct. Tell us about that.

Mr. DAVIES: Which one?

Dr. Dadour: You know the letter. By God, you know the letter! You have shown me the letter and I have seen it elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIES: Which letter?

Dr. Dadour: You know the letter.

Mr. DAVIES: The one from the clinical staff which supported me?

Dr. Dadour: From a certain doctor who used to be at Royal Perth Hospital.

Mr. DAVIES: That was a member of the Board of Royal Perth Hospital who wrote to me suggesting you were right?

Dr. Dadour: Suggested I was right! Who should know better than he?

Mr. DAVIES: I received many more letters pointing out that the honourable member's remarks were—

Dr. Dadour: How much more proof do you want?

Mr. DAVIES: —dismally—

Dr. Dadour: You are dodging around corners but you are not making any sense.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Why doesn't someone certify him? Mr. MacKinnon may well do it.

Mr. Graham: At short range or long distance?

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that I received a number of letters. I will stay and play as long as the honourable member wants to ask questions because I have nothing to hide, whereas he is speaking only from one side—

Dr. Dadour: I am speaking from the right side.

Mr. DAVIES: —voicing the desires and thoughts of the malcontents who do not want to come and speak to me direct but would rather—

Dr. Dadour: Do you consider these people to be malcontents?

Mr. DAVIES: It is quite easy to see what is going on.

Dr. Dadour: Do you consider the medical professors in our Medical School are malcontents? One may be, but what about the other four or five?

Mr. DAVIES: This again shows the lack of imagination or the lack of logic in the thinking of the member for Subiaco.

Dr. Dadour: Answer the questions!

Mr. DAVIES: He imagines that the people who go to him are the only people who have any views, whereas I have a very thick file on the medical laboratories. I might draw attention to a statement in today's paper which was made by Dr. Lawrie, who has just returned from the World Health Organisation, which is adopting the system of health laboratories as a world standard, as I understand the report.

Dr. Dadour: Read the report very thoroughly and you will see why.

Mr. DAVIES: I have not had a chance to speak to Dr. Lawrie but I think the statement he made indicates we are not as badly off as the member for Subiaco and some other people indicate—particularly the person who declined to come and talk to me and who said he did not want to keep the appointment which had been made some weeks ago.

I like Professor ten Seldam, the retiring head of the department. He has a great deal of good common sense and logic, and many good arguments. He has talked the position over with me and made written submissions to me. These are the people who count. These are the people who have worked in the job for years and who know what they are doing and where they should go.

Mr. Hutchinson: Who are the malcontents?

Mr. DAVIES: Those who have been running to the Press and making statements lately.

Dr. Dadour: We have to make them.

Mr. DAVIES: Their colleagues have been saying to us, "Please do not associate us with that outburst. We are all happy to let things go along and make the appropriate decision at the appropriate time." These are the people—

Mr. Court: Before you sit down, now you have vented your spleen on the member for Subiaco, will you give us five minutes and tell us something about the Medical Department?

Mr. Graham: A most unwarranted personal attack.

Mr. Court: He has made allegations about the service. You are only indulging in personalities.

Mr. DAVIES: Let us go through his speech again and I will very quickly—

Mr. Rushton: Cut duplication.

Mr. DAVIES: He spoke about psychiatric reports from a distance, I think. At the time I was out with an officer from another department—not the Public Health Department. The honourable member spoke about that matter; and after the tea suspension I think he slipped into an attack on answers to questions. I think I dealt with that at some length. Then he referred to the Premier being buttered up, beating off his mouth, or some such barroom language, about matters relating to Royal Perth Hospital. I think I tried to point out that a decision was arrived at after extended investigations, and it was a matter of planning ahead.

The member for Subiaco then referred to Dr. Davidson and his alleged incompetence. He also referred to the fact that he allegedly sacked a man. I can show the honourable member the file in this regard, just as I will show it to any other member. The fellow was not sacked, although he treated the department in a rather disgraceful manner. Then he went on to refer to the medical centre. I have tabled the plans, and I have told the House what has happened in regard to the north and south blocks, each of the wings, and the deficiency in the morgue, which is being attended to. What have I left out?

Mr. Court: You have not told us anything about the medical services: you have dealt only with personalities.

Mr. DAVIES: I have dealt with everything in the member for Subiaco's speech. Would the Deputy Leader of the Opposition like a treatise on epidemiology; or would he like me to acquaint him of the fact that at any time one in eight of the patients in our hospitals are natives? Would he like me to tell him that we need 120 new beds a year to keep up with our requirements?

Mr. Court: You are missing the point.

Mr. DAVIES: I am dealing with the debate as it occurred last night. I have dealt with it point by point. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to get up on his number nines and say what he would like me to tell him, I will be quite prepared to provide the information to him either in writing or in this House.

Mr. Court: My understanding is that the member for Subiaco has challenged the accuracy, the completeness, and the frankness of certain questions dealing with the administration of services. I thought you would have wanted to defend your answers and to explain what is right or wrong about them.

Mr. DAVIES: According to the honourable member every answer I have given is evasive and not to the point.

Dr. Dadour: I said "many"; I did not say all.

Mr. DAVIES: If the honourable member would detail those questions, and prepare his charges in a specific manner, then I will gladly answer them in a specific manner. I have answered the member for Sublaco in precisely the same manner in which he made his attack. I have answered his charges. What is next?

Mr. Court: That is not my understanding of the position at all. All you have done is bandy personalities.

Mr. DAVIES: I have dealt with every aspect. Now that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is invited to he cannot name one I have not dealt with.

Mr. Court: The member for Sublaco was referring to the meat of the questions he asked and the answers given to him.

Mr. DAVIES: As far as I am concerned every answer is true and accurate. If the honourable member likes to name any specific questions I will deal with them and give my opinion. I certainly will not go right through the multitude of questions asked by the member for Sublaco about Royal Perth Hospital, the medical centre, and various people. If any answer is not right I will indeed retract it. However, the answers are as given.

Dr. Dadour: Just answer one question: Who will have control of the clinical work at the medical centre? Answer the question now, not in six months or 12 months.

Mr. DAVIES: I have already told the honourable member what I am doing about the medical centre. I am in the process of seeking an informed opinion.

Dr. Dadour: Haven't you got all your opinions?

Mr. DAVIES: No, I have not got all my opinions yet.

Dr. Dadour: You are mighty slow.

Mr. DAVIES: Actually, I have more work to do than to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister's time has expired.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [8.19 p.m.]: Before the Minister for Health leaves the Chamber I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. Davies: You will have to hurry, because I have to present some trophies.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would not like to delay the Minister from presenting his trophies; but I would like him to withdraw himself from the conflict in which he has become involved, to be less of a centralist, and to think about the economies suggested by the member for Sublaco.

Mr. Davies: Put a hospital at Rockingham!

Mr. RUSHTON: I say the Minister should think a little further; there are more facilities than the two mentioned in the previous argument. The member for Sublaco mentioned economies, and I can think of two spheres in which economies could be practised. I put this to him with the Christmas spirit that goes with it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What brand of Christmas spirit?

Mr. RUSHTON: I suggest the Minister should think about the Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital and the need for theatre and X-ray services there. I think the Minister should not centralise everything in one place. Anyway, I thank him for pausing to hear my remarks.

Mr. Davies: Thank you.

Mr. RUSHTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your election to your high office. I also congratulate the Chairman of Committees, and the member for Ascot on his election to this Chamber. Already the member for Ascot has displayed a frightening understanding of the representation of people. However, give him a few years and he might realise that people outside the central city area are entitled to be represented and that the philosophy of one-man one-vote one-value needs to be watered down a little, especially when he looks to his own party and considers the method of election in that party.

Mr. Hartrey: We have a preferential system.

Mr. RUSHTON: There is a preferential system! When that is achieved the honourable member can come back and tell us about it. Let his party be consistent, without the hypocrisies which are attached to it. I would like to mention briefly the request of my leader for an inquiry into the most important question of a long-distance psychiatric report on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This is a diabolical thing.

Mr. Bertram: The request was a long time coming.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier asked why did not the Liberals do something, but he was referring to two or three years ago and he made another untrue statement.

Mr. Jamieson: We don't need a long-range report on you.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not know when the report was concocted, but it was certainly about three or four months before the election; that is why I think it should be inquired into.

Mr. Jamieson: I do not think it did very much damage.

Mr. RUSHTON: We are not concerned merely about the member in question; everybody knows how untrue the report is because he is the most stable man in this House.

Mr. Jamieson: I would not say that. I have known him longer than you have.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have known him long enough to know everything that was said is totally untrue. Let me put it this way: At every election we have whispering campaigns.

Mr. Jamieson: That is strange coming from your side.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is the bread and butter of the Minister's party.

Mr. Jones: You are letting out trade secrets.

Mr. RUSHTON: The sinister part about the psychiatric report is that it was documented; that is why it is so unacceptable. I think there will be little hope for the people of this State on the day the political world sinks to that level. Surely members on the other side of the House should join with members on this side in calling for an inquiry. Why should a man be persecuted in this fashion? It is this man today, but it will be another tomorrow.

Mr. Hartrey: What good would an inquiry do?

Mr. RUSHTON: It would flush out many facts; I am sure of that.

Mr. Bertram: Such as?

Mr. Jamieson: Like what?

Mr. RUSHTON: Let us get to the bottom of it. Do members opposite believe it is a fair thing?

Mr. Jamieson: I do not believe it is fair at any time; but I have been the subject of this sort of thing, and I have had to put up with it just as you will have to put up with it.

Mr. RUSHTON: Does the Minister believe that such a report was prepared?

Mr. Jamieson: It looks fairly obvious; I do not think anybody is denying that.

Mr. RUSHTON: So we have progressed to the stage where the Minister agrees that a report was prepared.

Mr. Jamieson: I do not know who prepared the report, but there are all sorts of people around other than doctors.

Mr. RUSHTON: Then why should those people be permitted to do such things?

Mr. Jamieson: They write all sorts of things about me, and also about you.

Mr. RUSHTON: Is the Minister agreeing that these things should continue?

Mr. Jamieson: We always hear you espousing the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the Press.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am proud of that. I believe in it.

Mr. Jamieson: Now you want to restrict their freedom.

Mr. RUSHTON: Statements have been made that some people know who prepared the report. This has been stated in the Press.

Mr. Jamieson: If you know them, name them. You are under privilege, so name them.

Mr. RUSHTON: Perhaps I can fit in a word between the Minister's interjections.

Mr. Bertram: You are taking a long time.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am saying that it has been stated in the Press that some people know who prepared the report. Why should not they be made to name the person?

Mr. Jamieson: Do you know who it is?

Mr. RUSHTON: No, I do not.

Mr. Jamieson: Are you sure?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am quite sure. I know that when I was going from door to door during the last election campaign this matter was raised so often that there was certainly a campaign based on this document.

Mr. Jamieson: Oh?

Mr. Bertram: How is it that nobody else encountered it during the campaign?

Mr. RUSHTON: I reported it to campaign headquarters; and I found that similar reports were coming in from other sources.

Mr. Bertram: Something like the red bogey.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is simply persecution of an individual with intent to defame his character, and the character of his party. That is all it is. I can only ask members on the other side to understand how serious is this matter and to support the Leader of the Opposition in his call for an inquiry.

Mr. Graham: Why should they? All these incidents took place ages ago.

Mr. Court: What do you mean by ages ago?

Mr. RUSHTON: It was about 14 months ago, just in nice time for the elections.

Mr. McIver: Be honest: How could you have won Ascot?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am talking about the last general election.

Mr. Jamieson: How could you have won that, having regard for the way you were going?

Mr. RUSHTON: That was pretty good work—a 16.4 swing—not bad at all.

Mr. Jamieson: As a former bank clerk, you should be able to figure better than that. You are simply fooling yourself.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would the member for Dale please answer this question: If the events took place some 14 months ago, why did not his Government initiate an inquiry when it had an opportunity to do so?

Mr. RUSHTON: Let me put it this way—

Mr. T. D. Evans: Answer the question.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am happy to. First of all it was within a few months of the election.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You said it took place 14 months ago.

Mr. RUSHTON: I said it happened when I was campaigning.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You said the events took place 14 months ago. I heard you say that. Why didn't your Government initiate inquiries?

Mr. RUSHTON: The events took place 14 months ago, which means that it was four months before the election.

Mr. Graham: What has the election to do with it?

Mr. RUSHTON: That is what the whole thing is about.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Well, why did not you initiate an inquiry? You had the opportunity.

Mr. RUSHTON: What a time to hold an inquiry, with a general election coming up!

Mr. Jamieson: You could have scored political capital from it.

Mr. RUSHTON: What about the remarks of the Premier? What was he doing?

Mr. T. D. Evans: All the more reason for you to hold an inquiry.

Mr. RUSHTON: What a nice time to hold an inquiry in the middle of an election. Who would have believed us?

Mr. T. D. Evans: You are about as sincere as a spider coaxing a fly into its web.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to interject on the interjectors and tell them that I am simply asking for an inquiry. It is quite obvious to the public that there should be one. If no inquiry is held it will be a denigration of this House of Parliament.

Mr. Graham: Why did not your deputy leader move earlier?

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to put a question to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Court: If you had not prorogued Parliament we could have dealt with the matter earlier.

Mr. Graham: Don't be silly. You could have done something 12 months before.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to continue, if I may.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Dale.

Mr. Graham: The do-nothing Minister.

Mr. Court: You will hear more about that in a minute.

Mr. Graham: We would like to hear it.

The SPEAKER: Order The member for Dale.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will now direct my attention to another question which seriously affects Yundurup.

Mr. Graham: That is news!

Mr. Jamieson: On the canals again!

Mr. RUSHTON: The other day the Deputy Premier said that he would ensure that the file from the Lands Department would be made available to members. I have not seen it yet. I did hope the Premier would be present, but unfortunately he is not.

Mr. Graham: The Minister for Lands has extended an invitation to you.

Mr. Williams: It was on the understanding that the information was available on a confidential basis.

Mr. Graham: The Minister would make it available to the member for Dale. That was what I said.

Mr. RUSHTON: Will the Minister table it tomorrow, as well as the letter written by Sir David Brand dated the 26th March, 1970, to the Yundurup Delta Society? Would the Minister also table the report by the Treasury and that by the Department of Development and Decentralisation?

Mr. Graham: You have not even the guts to ask for it to be tabled.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am asking now.

Mr. Graham: This is not the proper way to ask for these papers.

Mr. RUSHTON: Would the Minister like me to place questions on tomorrow's notice paper?

Mr. Graham: It is up to the honourable member. The Minister for Lands will give the answer.

Mr. RUSHTON: I put this to the Deputy Premier: I would like to have the file produced in this Parliament. I would like to see the letter from Sir David Brand dated the 26th March, 1970, as well as the three reports—from the Treasury, the Rural and Industries Bank, and the Department of Development and Decentralisation—relating to the Yundurup project. I will give the reasons.

Mr. Graham: There is a proper way to ask for these.

Mr. RUSHTON: Would the Deputy Premier like me to put the matters on the notice paper?

Mr. Graham: It is up to you.

Mr. RUSHTON: If I put these matters to the Premier will he see that the reports and documents are produced?

Mr. Graham: It is up to you and up to the Premier.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier might be able to answer this: Will he—seeing it is his responsibility as he is in charge of the Department of Development and Decentralisation—also obtain and present to us a clear undertaking that the promoter of the Yundurup canals project did not know of the conditions prior to September; and will he table the information for our benefit?

Mr. May: Question time is tomorrow!

Mr. RUSHTON: I am suggesting the Government is not playing the game straight down the line. It should come clean and let us see the facts, so that the people of the State may be able to judge.

Mr. Graham: You just bandy words around. If you want information there is a proper way to get it. You have not done that. What is the reason? The reason is that you like to be a rabble-rouser.

Mr. RUSHTON: The other day when I asked a question I did not get a true answer. However, I will place these matters on the notice paper. All I am seeking are the real facts.

Mr. Graham: Why did you not obtain them before you opened your mouth?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier is suggesting that I will get an answer?

Mr. Graham: I have told you to do something of which you have been aware for weeks, and you know you are entitled to it.

Mr. RUSHTON: If the Deputy Premier gives me a clear undertaking these reports will be tabled when I make requests to the various departments concerned I will be very satisfied. I have no intention of continuing, because the Deputy Premier implies that he will see I am given this information.

Mr. Graham: I told you to ask the questions. I gave you no undertaking. Each Minister is in charge of his own department. There is no dictatorship amongst the present Ministers as there was when you were the Government.

Mr. Court: The Deputy Premier is getting nasty!

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier did imply the other evening that the Minister for Lands would produce the file.

Mr. Graham: You are the Sir Echo of your Government!

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier gave that undertaking, but the file has not turned up. I will place questions on the notice paper. We will then see how sincere are the answers to my requests.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have a standing invitation to come to my office.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is a different issue, and the Government guarantee involves \$1,750,000.

Mr. Jamieson: There are also some private documents on the file.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not want the private documents.

Mr. Jamieson: But if the file is tabled it could be detrimental in some respects.

Mr. RUSHTON: Then let us have a summary of the facts.

Mr. Jamieson: You would be better off in seeing the reasons for everything. You would then be satisfied.

Mr. RUSHTON: The people in the Yundurup project are entitled to have their affairs kept private, but the Government which is committed to the tune of \$1,750,000 has a responsibility to tell Parliament.

Mr. Jamieson: You should have thought of that before your Government went into the scheme.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is not the position at all.

Mr. Jamieson: Of course that is the issue.

Mr. RUSHTON: The environmental protection issue is applicable to both sides.

Mr. Jamieson: That is the issue, because the alternative requires the Government to spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars to fill the canals in. They cannot be left like that.

Mr. Mensaros: The issue is—

Mr. Jamieson: Don't you talk! You have a vested interest. Just as long as your wine cellar remains intact you are happy.

Mr. Court: The Government has had its chips.

Mr. RUSHTON: This Government states it has had to give a guarantee for \$1,750,000, because it considered it had a moral duty; but that can be easily disproved. The fact is the Government based its claim for the granting of assistance on the fact that a person had been given a letter or a lease on the 3rd September which did not include the full details of dredging. That is what the claim is based on, for the Government to enter into a financial commitment on behalf of the State. If it can be proved that the people concerned did know the terms and conditions, surely the argument of the Government goes overboard.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Legal opinion was that the Crown was in a very weak situation.

Mr. RUSHTON: If the person or persons concerned knew about these conditions prior to September he or they would not have a case. The Government seems to have fallen for this sort of thing.

Mr. Jamieson: That is different from what the Crown Law Department thought.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Legal opinion indicated that the Government was in a very weak position.

Mr. RUSHTON: In one similar instance a primary industry applied for a guarantee, and the Government rejected it; yet in the Yundurup case the Government has given a guarantee.

Mr. Jamieson: It will not cost a cracker.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is a contingent liability.

Mr. Jamieson: It will not cost the State a cent.

Mr. RUSHTON: There is a contingent liability of \$1,750,000. The Minister for Lands is directly involved in this issue. Why does he not produce the file to satisfy the House and the people of the State in regard to the claim of viability? The project was viable on the 3rd September, but not viable some time in December. Why does not the Minister demonstrate this?

Mr. Graham: What would that do? I have some very interesting papers relating to the Coral Bay venture that was backed by your Government.

Mr. RUSHTON: What has that to do with the issue before us?

Mr. Graham: The Coral Bay venture has fallen on its face, yet you are criticising us.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is a continuing guarantee.

Mr. Mensaros: The Government has—

Mr. Graham: You get back into your wine cellar, and stop there!

Mr. Court: Step it up. You are embarrassing the Government.

Mr. Graham: You are just proving that you are prepared to sacrifice anybody for your own selfish interests.

Mr. Williams: The Deputy Premier is running true to form.

Mr. RUSHTON: I hope that members opposite will allow me to continue.

Mr. Court: The Government does not want these speeches to be taken down.

Mr. RUSHTON: Getting back to the guarantee of \$1,750,000—

Mr. H. D. Evans: Before you go any further, the offer and acceptance were made.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am dealing with the Yundurup canals project. It is not that I am attempting in any way at all to denigrate the Government, but it is acting totally against the best interests of Western Australia.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There is just one point. You have a look at this with me. I will demonstrate fully anything you want

demonstrated. The offer was accepted on the 4th September, but the company was not notified there had been a change in the terms of the arrangement until December.

Mr. RUSHTON: But the company knew it before.

Mr. Fletcher: I wish the member for Dale would sit down and let other members speak. *Hansard* has difficulty in getting the remarks down.

Mr. RUSHTON: Has the Minister for Lands said everything he wishes to say?

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is the issue.

Mr. RUSHTON: That point has been disproved, if that is what the whole case of the Government is based on. The Minister is way out of touch with events. He has acted unwisely, and his Government has sold out the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Your Government should be ashamed of itself for two-timing Miss Watters.

Mr. RUSHTON: Let me answer the Minister's question. The whole basis of the moral claim of getting the Government involved in the guarantee is based on the fact that the Minister for Lands knew that on the 3rd or 4th September certain undertakings were given, and the terms of dredging were changed in December.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The offer was made and accepted. The terms were subsequently changed.

Mr. RUSHTON: That offer was subject to the Governor's approval. Is that the right terminology?

Mr. H. D. Evans: In other words, a substituted agreement was rung in.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government should produce the letters, the facts, and the reports, and thereby let the people of Western Australia be the judges.

Mr. Jamieson: You know nothing about the matter.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government is not prepared to let anybody know.

Mr. Jamieson: You are at liberty to look at the papers any time you want.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government could keep out the private matters, and summarise the other matters for the benefit of Parliament.

Mr. Jamieson: Even if that were done it would not satisfy you. You would say something was missing.

Mr. RUSHTON: All I want the Minister to take up is the fact that a letter was written by Sir David Brand on the 26th March, 1970.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Put your request forward in the proper way.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is the place where we debate these issues.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It seems to me the member for Dale is boring rather than dredging!

Mr. RUSHTON: Is the Minister for Education happy with that remark? Now that he is satisfied we can continue. The Minister for Lands has made me an offer. If I can prove to him what he has said is not correct, the whole basis of the Government's reason for entering into the \$1,750,000 commitment on behalf of the people of Western Australia would be unsubstantiated.

I will prove how, in fact, its reasoning is not factually based. For instance, on the 26th March last a letter was written by Sir David Brand to the Yundurup Delta Society setting out the terms and conditions. I am waiting for the Government to table that letter, so that everybody can see it. On the 5th June and the 7th August, 1970, this letter was read out at meetings of ratepayers, at which the proprietors of the project were present and they heard all the facts. This was a Cabinet decision. These facts clearly set out the conditions.

I am not asking the House or the people of Western Australia to accept my word. I want the letter to be tabled for all to read. I do not want it to be thought that I am giving a wrong impression. Let the letter be tabled and allow the people to decide what is right and what is wrong on this question of the commitment of \$1,750,000 on a speculative project which the Government has said it must back because of a moral obligation. Surely it is reasonable that the Government should produce the facts, not involving anyone's private affairs, but the facts which should be available to the public to support its claim concerning a moral obligation.

Let the Government prove that this project was viable on the 3rd September, but not viable at some time in December because the so-called terms and conditions had changed. In fact, the proprietors knew the Government had applied the conditions. It was the subject of a Cabinet decision and therefore it was not the decision of one section of the Administration. All I am asking is that the Government face up to its responsibility.

Mr. Graham: Which the Government has done.

Mr. RUSHTON: It has not.

Mr. Graham: How would you know?

Mr. RUSHTON: It is making false claims.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is not.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is making false claims and—

Mr. Graham: You open your mouth and all sorts of tommyrot flows out!

Mr. RUSHTON: That is not so.

Mr. Graham: You say anything.

Mr. RUSHTON: Coming from the Deputy Premier—

Mr. Graham: A verbal Niagara Falls!

Mr. RUSHTON: All I am attempting to do is—

Mr. Graham: To rabble-rouse!

Mr. Mensaros: Words, words, words!

Mr. RUSHTON: I think we are entitled—

Mr. Graham: To have a sense of responsibility.

Mr. RUSHTON: —to know the facts on a matter of such importance. The Minister indicated in his kindly way the other night that we would have the files from the Minister for Lands. That is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Graham: Will you read what appears in *Hansard*?

Mr. RUSHTON: I asked the Minister to bring it along. Mr. Graham said—

The Minister for Lands said you are welcome to have a look at it.

We have part of the story only. The official story is on the file.

Mr. Graham: I said the Minister would welcome you at the office to have a look at it, and that statement still stands.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is a bob each way, and the Minister is pretty good at that.

Mr. Graham: You quote the exact answer loud and clear.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister said—

You are welcome to have a look at it.

That can be implied both ways. I said I wanted to look at the file here. I agree the Minister did not say—

Mr. Graham: If you want to have a look you can see the file.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why not table it?

Mr. Graham: That is up to the Minister for Lands, and he has given you some reasons already.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think this is a reasonable request.

Mr. Graham: You don't want to see it. You want to create some trouble if you can.

Mr. RUSHTON: No, I do not.

Mr. Graham: That is all you are interested in.

Mr. RUSHTON: I want the Minister to support the claim concerning a moral obligation.

Mr. Graham: You will be satisfied if you go to the office.

Mr. O'Neill: That would not satisfy everyone else.

Mr. Graham: The invitation is open to the member for East Melville too.

Mr. O'Neil: The Press, too?

Mr. RUSHTON: Is this not a matter of importance? The Government has claimed that as a result of a mess made by the previous Government it had to enter into this commitment because of the moral obligation involved; yet the Government is not prepared to table the information so we have the opportunity to see what the moral issue is. We have disproved one argument already raised. Let us have the other one.

Mr. Graham: You were so irresponsible when in Government and you are equally irresponsible in Opposition.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is not fair.

Mr. Graham: It is in accordance with the facts of the situation.

Mr. RUSHTON: We are asking for the facts.

Mr. Hutchinson: We want the veil of secrecy lifted.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Look who's speaking!

Mr. Graham: You have been listening to the gentlemen at the other end of the building.

Mr. Hutchinson: I am echoing the words uttered by you people over there.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is not a laughing matter.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Satan quoting the scriptures.

Mr. RUSHTON: If the Deputy Premier will not commit himself and say we can have the information, I can only try again tomorrow during question time by asking for the information to be tabled. If he refuses to produce the information, this could indicate the Government is hiding something.

Mr. Graham: The offer made the other day still stands.

Mr. Court: That is only of a confidential nature. Once the honourable member visits the office and views the file, he cannot mention the file again. That is why you want to trap him into it.

Mr. RUSHTON: I certainly do not wish to break faith with the Minister should I accept his invitation. All I am asking for are the simple facts. Firstly I want a copy of a letter written on the 26th March which the Premier can table, and the letter contains only certain information. We have been told there are three reports from various sources. Why can we not see these if everything is aboveboard?

Mr. Graham: Everything is aboveboard.

Mr. RUSHTON: Prove it. The Minister has not proved the project was viable in September and not in December. Why not grant my request and let us finish with the issue?

Mr. Fletcher: I wish you would finish with tedious repetition.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister for Lands claimed the decision was made for moral reasons. It did not take 30 seconds to shoot those reasons down.

Mr. Lapham: Would you sit down?

Mr. RUSHTON: I will, but will the honourable member ask his Premier to bring this information to the House? That is all I want. If I am given that undertaking I will resume my seat immediately.

Mr. Williams: That is a temptation, too.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is a reasonable request. The people of Western Australia are entitled to the information. They have been told this commitment of \$1,750,000 is the result of the wrongdoing of the previous Government.

Mr. Graham: Quite right.

Mr. RUSHTON: If that is so—

Mr. Graham: That is about the only truthful thing you have said tonight.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government has made the charges, let it substantiate them. Surely it is reasonable that the Government should stand up to its accusations. We will see the answers given tomorrow. I am sorry the Premier is not here now so that he can answer my request.

Mr. Fletcher: You are lucky he is not.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am regretful because he could have said, "Yes, you can have the information."

Mr. Graham: That was offered to you nights ago.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister has offered to allow me to see the file, but then I cannot say anything about it. Surely my proposition is reasonable? Has the Labor Government backed this luxury project and entered into the arrangement in good faith? Is everything all right?

Mr. T. D. Evans: That will be the day when you can say such a thing about the Labor Government.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why not let me finish?

Mr. Graham: Why not be honest? On numerous occasions your Government said it would not lay papers on the Table of the House, but would make them available in the office of the Minister concerned.

Mr. Hutchinson: And what did you say?

Mr. RUSHTON: On this issue? No, of course not!

Mr. Graham: On different issues, but it is the same principle.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not wish the Minister to disclose anyone's private affairs.

Mr. Graham: Most of the time when in Opposition we accepted the attitude of the Government—most of the time.

Mr. O'Neil: We do, most of the time, too.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am asking for—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): Order! I suggest the member for Dale has been asking for papers to be tabled long enough. I suggest he is indulging in tedious repetition.

Mr. Lapham: You are right, too.

Mr. RUSHTON: It has been clearly indicated that we are not going to get anywhere with regard to our requests on this project. We will wait to see whether we get any satisfactory answers to the questions tomorrow so that the people of Western Australia might know how valid are the arguments of the Government.

I would briefly like to touch on the speech of the member for Bunbury. The interjections made when he was speaking were to the effect that he had not seen the other side. How better could he have gone about ascertaining the facts from the other side? He checked the information out with the employer. If that is not proof of the situation what is? I commend the member for Bunbury for raising this matter in the House in the hope that this type of affair will not continue. Surely it is foreign to all of us.

Mr. Jones: Are you another expert on the trade union movement?

Mr. RUSHTON: No, but I have been associated with it a lot longer than has the member for Ascot and many others on the Government side.

Mr. Jones: You are not a full bottle on it. You would be surprised what we know about the employers' organisations too.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): Order! The member for Dale will continue.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is a tremendous presumption to say that anyone sitting on the Government side of the House represents people and we do not; whereas, in fact, the situation is very close to being the opposite. The Government operates in a way that indicates it represents very small sections of the community, and even then those sections are not too sure they are being represented. At least the followers of the members on this side of the House know that everyone is represented through the whole strata of life and all sections of the community.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Who told you that rot?

Mr. Graham: Fairy stories.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why should not everyone be given a reasonable opportunity to share equally in this world instead of just the one section the Government represents? An entirely false impression is given concerning members on this side of House. Many of us have had association membership and union membership.

Mr. May: Everyone originally came from there.

Mr. RUSHTON: Last year we heard a lot about the little people. Who is a little person? I do not believe there is any such person. All people are equal.

Mr. Graham: They got beaten at the last election.

Mr. Jones: The member for Bunbury suggested that certain amendments should be made to the arbitration legislation and I asked him why his Government had not done something about it in the last few years.

Mr. Court: We made many amendments.

Mr. O'Neill: I think you will find that the Act was amended almost every year.

Several members interjected.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will close on that point.

Mr. Williams I raised the matter—

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): Order! Order! The tenor of this House degenerates at times with all the interjections. If the member for Dale would get on with his speech we might get somewhere.

Mr. RUSHTON: Thank you, Sir. I am very grateful you have told those members who have been so unreasonable with their interjections that they should not have been making them. We have been attempting to obtain certain facts, but we have got nowhere. I believe the submission of the member for Bunbury was worthy of consideration. I also commend the member for Subiaco for the matters he raised. I am very concerned that because of the confrontation about which he spoke the hospital at Rockingham and the extensions and extra services to be provided at the Armadale-Kelmscott District Hospital could be set aside. The tendency towards centralisation also worries me. I want all issues to be placed in their correct priority and consideration given to them. We will look to this in the future.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [8.58 p.m.]: I propose to use this opportunity to discuss, in a much quieter vein than has been the case recently, a problem which has only lately become somewhat controversial; namely, adult education. As I have said, the problem only recently arose but it is fairly important from an educational and social point of view. It is an entirely unpolitical topic and I wish to deal with it in this manner.

Adult education was recently the subject of a rather unfortunate, and what I would term, snap decision by the Minister for Education. We all know the difficulties which seem to arise in connection with adult education which is a field that is more important in its total implication than most people realise.

Members are aware that adult education has been organised through the university and not through a division of the State Education Department nor through any statutory body as is the case in some other States.

It may be of interest to members if I spend a few minutes going back over the history of adult education in Western Australia. I understand originally it was called an extension board and during the first World War, in 1913 or 1914, classes were established within the State in consultation with Trades Hall. Later on, in the 1920s, although adult education was not union based any more, there were still two people on the adult education authority delegated by the executive of the Australian Labor Party. Slowly it became a university-controlled exercise with no great official status but, with the support of the university, readers and councillors were involved.

It is interesting to trace the history during the second World War. From 1939 to 1945 the Army Education Service—if it did not take over adult education—was served by the same person who was concerned with adult education; namely, Professor Alexander. At that time the Army made use of many of the facilities which were available to adult education. The position was reversed after the war and the library and many other facilities which had been acquired by the Army were used by the university and used in adult education. It was also an interesting and good vehicle, if I may use that expression, from the point of view of the public relations of the university.

We all know that in 1954, through the Adult Education Board and by way of a subcommittee, the university decided to organise the Festival of Perth. Ever since, this has become more and more popular and, indeed, it serves the interests not only of the people of the State but of people all over Australia.

Although the director of the board, which is actually a committee of the University Senate, had professorial status, he was not a member of the professorial board. He did not receive a salary as other professors did.

Adult education gradually developed and many classes were held. Some activities were concerned with entertainment but others were classes to enable adults to obtain mature age matriculation. Facilities for this existed for adults in the metropolitan area as well as in the country.

Later the line of thinking of the university was to draw the Adult Education Board nearer to the university itself. There was a library in the city in Howard Street, which was discontinued and classes were concentrated even more at the university. I think I am right in saying that at this stage it was again called an extension service.

Fairly recent experiments in this field were, I understand, very successful. The results of examinations by people who passed through these classes were excellent. The courses themselves were extremely good and were self-supporting from the financial point of view.

It is unfortunate that the present director is due to retire. I also understand a few other positions apparently are to become vacant. For some reason or other the university did not advertise these positions. Some people say it was lack of interest, but others say there was no consensus of opinion as to how the advertisements should be worded. In an event there appeared to be a crisis in the field of adult education and I admit there was some cause for the Minister to make a decision.

I would be only too glad to hear to the contrary from the Minister but, as I understand it, there is no evidence that his decision was taken on the advice of people who are involved in this matter. Some of them have spent their lifetimes associated with adult education. Many individuals and bodies, too, with real understanding of this subject would have been able to give advice and represent every point of view.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I think the member for Floreat should read the answer given to a question asked in another place today.

Mr. MENSAROS: That may be so, but I cannot be aware of this at this point of time. In any event, it appears a rather quick decision was taken and one which perhaps lacked the consultation which it merits. After all, as I have said, it is an extremely important question. I am not suggesting any big words such as "Royal Commission" but there is a heaven-sent opportunity for the Minister to invite a few people to have a discussion, almost on an informal basis, because many would be glad to give him their advice on all aspects of adult education. Information obtained from them could prompt the Minister to formulate a short-term plan as well as evolve some other plan to take care of adult education in the future. As I said before, this is not a political matter. It is not a question of losing face or something of that nature. I earnestly prevail upon the Minister to do this.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Minister did not act blindly. He collated a great deal of information but his capacity to manoeuvre was extremely limited as the member for Floreat knows.

Mr. MENSAROS: I realise the Minister is not in a position—indeed, neither are we in a position—to direct the university what to do. I am making suggestions to the Minister with all goodwill. I want to help in this situation and I am not hitting at anyone or anything. Many people have been closely associated with

adult education and, with all due respect to the Minister, know much more on the subject than he or I. These people should have been consulted and still could be.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The views of some of these people were considered.

Mr. MENSAROS: I shall name one person, Professor Alexander, who has the respect of everyone in the community and who has spent his lifetime associated with adult education. He was not asked as far as I know, but no-one in this State knows adult education better than he. There are many other people, too.

I am merely pointing out what I have heard, read in the Press, seen on television, or ascertained from people to whom I have spoken. I am sure the Minister, too, spoke to as many people as time allowed. The general consensus of opinion which I heard is that it is a bad move to take adult education classes away from the university. I emphasise again that I know the Minister cannot influence the university directly but he could indirectly. This would perhaps be better than giving the classes to the Education Department. The reasons people think this way are manifold.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is not correct to say we are taking classes away from the university. The university ceased to provide certain classes whereas those classes are being provided by technical education and have been provided for some years.

Mr. MENSAROS: I know this and I can sympathise with the Minister. The position is, as I said before, the university by, perhaps, failing to advertise certain positions, shortly will not be in the position to organise some of the work which it has done for years and years. However, this does not prove that we should throw up our hands or that the responsible Minister should say, "Nothing can be done and I will do the next best thing by starting classes somewhere else."

I do not intend to be long in stating the position as I see it but I am trying to point out that most people who are concerned with this question—including myself because I tried to concern myself with it before it became a matter of public attention—think it would be wise for the Minister to try to influence the university to continue the work it has done. The Minister well knows the means by which this could be done; namely, the various commissions which could be heard.

My contention is that it is quite a different matter to educate adults than it is to educate school children. It does not matter whether the subject is the same, because the difference is very real. People who are adults obviously have different interests, information, and outlooks in life. They think quite differently from school children. Perhaps they may have less knowledge of the subject but

they have infinitely more knowledge in other spheres which they have acquired from experience in their adult life.

When we take these factors into consideration the teaching approach, whether it is to prepare adults for matriculation or to teach them any other subject, must be entirely different from the method used by teachers of the Education Department. I am not scolding this system, because I consider it is one of the best. I have said previously that it is better than systems existing almost anywhere else I know of. I stand by that statement. However, it is not geared to educate adult people.

Mr. Graham: Give it a go.

Mr. MENSAROS: The university conducted the classes on a tutorial basis. Experienced professors and readers were brought in. These people listened to the adults all the time. These were not routine classes held in routine classrooms as is the case with the Education Department. This is the point I am trying to emphasise. It is vitally important, and it seems the university is better suited than the Education Department to conduct these classes. The results prove this contention. I understand that all the people who have attended the classes given by the Adult Education Board have achieved better results in examinations than others. I understand that people who went to a refresher course and then went to the university also showed better results. It was a tremendous cushion for adults to go in this way from a life where they had not studied for a long time to the university. They were prepared for the different method of study which exists at the university.

I suggest at the same time that the classes did the university a great deal of good. The university should see this. Often members in this Parliament criticise the university and say the academic staff is in an ivory tower and inbred in a way in that scientists teach others to be scientists and that those taught in turn teach others. Perhaps the society does not receive as much gain as people may be entitled to expect from the amount of money, Commonwealth and State, which is spent at the university.

Perhaps this is one reason for the university to take the opportunity to give these classes. It would be good public relations for the university to organise the classes as it has done in the past. Perhaps it could even extend them. In the past the classes have been extremely successful and not a great deal of the money available to the university has been touched, because I understand the classes were entirely self-supporting. In other words, the fees paid by the adults who were attending covered the extra fees paid to the tutors. I understand there was only one person on the secretarial staff but, with all respect, we know that every department has secretaries for everything and likes to indulge in red tape.

There is another reason. If we think in industrial terms we could say that a factory would wish to use investments put into buildings. Why could we not think the same way with regard to the university?

There are hundreds of millions of dollars poured into Australian university buildings, classrooms, laboratories, and so on. Let us be quite frank; these facilities are not efficiently used. There are 26 or 28 teaching weeks in a university year plus five or six examination weeks and only post-graduate students undertake studies beyond that. Adult education and refresher courses are increasingly needed in every profession and trade. We should take any opportunity afforded us to use these facilities for adult education. New techniques are being developed all the time and nobody is satisfied that what he learned 20 or 30 years ago will suffice today. We would do a service for the economy if we utilised these university facilities.

Mr. T. D. Evans: At some time in the future I would like to hear the honourable member give his view on the open university concept.

Mr. MENSAROS: I will do that. I am indebted to the Liberal Party Education Sub-Committee where these matters are discussed with the aid of highly qualified people. While I am dealing with this subject I would suggest this comes into the concept that from some political points of view no amount of money is enough for education. I suggest we should rather seek more value for our money.

At Teachers' Union meetings one hears nothing else but this cry of more money for education. It is always the Liberal Government which is at fault. Now we have a State Labor Government the Federal Government is blamed for the lack of money for education. Where would the Teachers' Union lay the blame if we had a Commonwealth Labor Government? Instead of crying out for more money we should attempt to get better value for our money. This suggestion of mine would be one way to accomplish this.

I want to emphasise again that this is the time we should investigate the field of adult education. We would not need to spend money—I am quite sure many people would be willing to give advice in an honorary capacity. This should not have been a snap decision.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was not a snap decision. You referred to a snap decision, but it was not a snap decision.

Mr. MENSAROS: This decision was made a short time after the matter arose. The matter was raised during the term of the Minister's office as Minister for Education, which has not been long so far. I am asking the Minister to initiate an

inquiry without necessarily spending much money. He could persuade the university in a polite and proper way to continue these courses. I have spoken to many people on the Professorial Board who would support such an investigation. I have not made any inquiries myself; I am just saying we should look at the suggestion of a continuation of adult education at the university in this State.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Before the member sits down I would advise him to read the answer given in another place this afternoon.

Mr. MENSAROS: I will.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [9.20 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to deal with a subject which is in the nature of an emergency to my constituents. First of all, however, I avail myself of the opportunity to pay a tribute to your late predecessor, Mr. Speaker, whose memory we all hold dear. I recall with sadness it is only five months since I was admitted to this House at his gracious hands and he began to preside over this Chamber. He was in every way a just and friendly man, a true Christian and a loyal Australian. It is fitting that his epitaph should be the words of Holy Writ, "The bodies of the just are buried in peace but their names live on from generation to generation."

To you, Sir, as his successor, I express my sincere congratulations and I am already appreciative of the able manner in which you are following in the footsteps of a great predecessor.

I am also happy to welcome the latest acquisition to the ranks of the Government Party—the new member for Ascot. He has already distinguished himself in his maiden speech and in his activities with the party as a new member. I foresee for him a brilliant future, and I am sure he will serve well not only the party he represents in Parliament but also the State. Primarily he is a citizen of the State and as a member, responsible for its well-being.

My prime object in rising is to deal with a medical subject. I rather regret I did not have the opportunity to speak immediately after the Minister for Health. I would have taken the opportunity to compliment him on what I deemed to be a very fair, balanced, temperate, and statesman-like utterance concerning the business of his department. In saying that I intend no reflection on any other member of this House. However, I feel the Minister was put in an embarrassing situation yesterday and had to put up with some taunts which were not warranted and not even very parliamentary. He graciously, justly, and very capably acquitted himself this evening in reply. I am happy to compliment him *in absentia*, although I would be much happier to compliment him if he were here.

Let me pass from that subject to that function of his department which gravely concerns my electorate. I am the member for Boulder-Dundas. Some members may even wonder where Dundas is. Dundas of course is Norseman which is facing a very grave medical crisis at the present time.

The shire offices of Dundas are situated in Norseman, and repeatedly in the last few years the shire has made considerable sacrifices to secure a resident medical practitioner. Two years and a few months ago I acted in my professional capacity in the drawing up of an agreement by which the Shire of Dundas paid a substantial amount of money to induce a medical practitioner to remain in the town for an agreed period of two years. The shire guaranteed the medical practitioner a very handsome income, and although he received more than the guarantee he still saw fit to leave at the end of his two years, as he was, of course, quite entitled to do.

The Shire of Dundas is now left in the situation that it has a well-equipped hospital which is not much use without a medical practitioner. The Shire of Dundas stretches almost from Boulder in one direction, to Salmon Gums in the other, and the people in this shire have had to fall back on the services of the Flying Doctor. A disturbance has occurred which is not my immediate concern, nor do I intend to say much about it. However, it has resulted in the Flying Doctor resources being denied to the town of Norseman. I have told the Minister this and on tomorrow's notice paper there will be some questions asking for relief in this immediate emergency.

Last night the member for Ascot spoke about the malapportionment of representation in this House. The people in the outback appear to have great political influence because 6,500 of them elect someone in my place, whereas it takes 20,000 people sometimes to elect a person to a metropolitan seat. For all that, people in Dundas, Boulder, and places like these are deprived of many amenities which the 20,000 people in a metropolitan electorate can readily enjoy.

The proposition that we should put further difficulties in the way of the outback people, whichever political party they support, does not commend itself to me.

I am pleased to see the Minister has returned to the Chamber. I repeat we have a real emergency on our hands and we are asking urgently for relief. I would like to draw the Minister's attention to my remarks.

Mr. Davies: I might save the honourable member some time; we have declared Norseman a region.

Mr. HARTREY: I am much obliged to the Minister. That was the first thing I intended to ask.

Mr. Davies: That was accomplished today.

Mr. HARTREY: Can the Minister do anything in the interim such as appointing a Government doctor?

Mr. Davies: What about Dr. Dadour?

Mr. HARTREY: I do not think he would go, but we would welcome him. As a matter of fact, one member told me tonight that there are 14 doctors in his town, and it is not a metropolitan town. I do not know why there are 14 doctors in a certain country town and none at all in Norseman. We are prepared to guarantee any income up to \$20,000. A hospital would be at the doctor's disposal and a house and surgery provided at a very reasonable rental. God only knows why we should have to beg, but we do have to. The time has come for some amendment to this antiquated Statute, the Medical Act of 1894, which precludes many persons qualified in other areas from rendering help to people in need. I do not want to labour this point tonight as I would not be popular in certain quarters.

Mr. Court: If the philosophy of the member for Subiaco is followed you would have plenty of practitioners for this area.

Mr. HARTREY: That may be so, but I have another suggestion to make. There are many young fellows going through the university now who have not yet passed their final examinations. We are told they have to be asked easy questions or they will not pass them at all. I have this on the authority of their own professors. They would not know at present a carbuncle from a wart. Yet as soon as these men graduate they can set up as dermatologists in Perth. A dermatologist of course is lucky, because his patients never get better and they never die.

One of the most brilliant medical proposals submitted in this House—and I commend it to all parties—was that no man should specialise in anything until he has had at least 10 years' general medical practice.

Mr. Rushton: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTREY: What good is it if a man knows about eyes and ears and does not know about kidneys and bowels? Is it not well known that kidney trouble affects one's eyesight?

Mr. W. A. Manning: It depends what party you mean.

Mr. HARTREY: I do not think one's political party affects one's health. I think I am more healthy politically, over here than I would be if I were on the other side of the House. In any event, I will last longer.

Mr. Court: There has been a fair bit of liver trouble on the Government side of the House recently.

Mr. HARTREY: I think I have made my point and I do not intend to indulge in any further controversial remarks. I thank the House for giving me the opportunity to express my thoughts and I thank the Minister particularly for taking action as far as he has been able, but I hope he will be able to do something more for us through the department by way of the temporary arrangements pending our being able to take advantage of what he has done already.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [9.31 p.m.]: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me add my congratulations to the other remarks that have already been made on your election to the Chair you now occupy. It was indeed unfortunate that you assumed this office in the circumstances that arose. Nevertheless, we feel honoured that you should be our Speaker. We know, having worked with you for so long when the House has been in Committee, that you will bring to the office of Speaker a great deal of credit and will follow in the path of your predecessors who occupied the same position.

Quite frankly I rise to my feet this evening a little bewildered. During the past two or three days we have heard many speeches made in this House which makes me wonder where this Parliament is heading. Even tonight there has been a great deal of conjecture in the speeches that have been made by members from both sides of the House and I was beginning to wonder what sort of House this Legislative Assembly has developed into. In saying that I am not casting any blame upon you, Mr. Speaker, especially after giving you credit a few moments ago; I have no intention of taking it away now. Nevertheless, I was wondering what point we have reached with this Parliament of ours.

Indeed, many of the people who read the newspaper reports of the debates that take place in this Assembly must also be bewildered and wonder where we are heading. For instance, I draw members' attention to the remarks that have been made in this Chamber in the last couple of days concerning the negotiations that have been entered into between Messrs. Hancock and Wright and the previous and present Governments.

Having spent some time in this Parliament as the elected member for the Avon electorate, I have been completely nonplussed following the statements that have been made in recent days, and the people of this State must be equally nonplussed and bewildered. What has transpired has developed into something almost sinister. Accusations have been made about the leakage of information from Government departments and of the untold wealth that is being made by certain people. This is something that is completely foreign to the State of Western Australia.

If this state of affairs is to continue, the good name that we have built up in the last few years must surely be at stake when this type of publicity circulates overseas and becomes known to the Governments of those countries that have confidence in us; especially those countries that are the source of our markets. Therefore it would appear the member for South Perth was not far wrong when he suggested that the air should be cleared.

I hasten to add that I am not taking one side or the other in this issue. I am merely saying that when accusations of the type we have heard lately are made, and when it is openly admitted that a psychiatric report has been made on a member of this House, it is about time the matter was cleared up. The Premier has said he is not happy about a Royal Commission, being appointed. I must admit that I am not happy about a Royal Commission, either. I have rarely seen any good arising from the appointment of a Royal Commission. I also think that bringing people to the Bar of the House to answer such accusations will not be very effective, either.

However, surely we have a Standing Order or some rule of Parliament that will enable us to sort this matter out, especially when it is one that is important enough to be raised in this House. The reputations of certain people are at stake, but I suppose that does not really matter in life. However, when the good name of a Government of a State is at stake I think an inquiry should be held to clear the matter up. When accusations have been made and we continue to leave the matter in the air after great play has been made upon it and a great deal of publicity has been given to it, I do not think that is good enough, because the people continue to be bewildered about what is going on.

Steps should be taken to clear the whole matter up so that we may know where we are heading and ensure that there is nothing sinister in regard to it. If this is done we will be able to retain the good name we have built up all over the world in the last few years.

Last week, when visiting the Eastern States, I witnessed at first hand over-the-border trading in wheat between Victoria and New South Wales. It was a horrifying experience to realise that this trading was actually being carried out and there did not seem to be any great concern about it. In fact, it was being carried out in broad daylight. I was equally surprised to learn, when in South Australia a few days ago, that two truckloads of wheat have come from Western Australia into that State as a result of over-the-border trading. As I say, I was horrified to discover that this trading was going on and that it is not a cloak and dagger exercise.

This trading over the borders of the States is being done in the open and people quite frankly talk about it and they say

that nothing can be done about it. They say, "We are acting under the protection of section 92 of the Constitution which states that there shall be free trading between the States. No Government will ever alter that." So the trade continues. What is the effect of this trading across the borders of the States? I believe that in Victoria and New South Wales approximately 10,000,000 bushels of wheat has been sold on the blackmarket alone. One need only visit those States to find ample evidence that this trading is being conducted and to realise that it has an immediate and detrimental effect on Western Australia. I will admit that many people in the Eastern States have said, "If it were not for the desert we would be engaged in that trading, too."

However, if many farmers were to indulge in this practice we might as well say "goodbye" to the orderly marketing of grain in Australia. There is no doubt that this practice is rocking the boat and removing the foundation stone of our orderly marketing system. We have established wheat quotas Australia-wide and these are split up from State to State based on the production of grain over a previously specified number of years so that farmers can receive their just rewards according to the amount of wheat they have grown and sold over those years.

However, when they are granted a quota and they also sell millions of bushels of grain outside their quota—I admit that there are not many farmers engaged in this practice, but there are enough—they are receiving a handout that is not available to all farmers in Australia.

This over-the-border trading practice could have a cumulative effect. It could result in other malpractices starting up; other types of trading being conducted outside the Wheat Stabilisation Act. Eventually we could find that the one solid plank that we have in the farming industry today could be rendered useless because of the loopholes that are being found in the system and the fact that some farmers are taking advantage of these loopholes.

The wheat industry is a grower industry. It is one of the tightest industries known in Australia. It is tight because our forefathers made it so in the interests of all the grain growers in the Commonwealth. The stabilisation fund, the foundation of the whole system of orderly marketing, is looked upon with a great deal of envy by Australian wool growers. They are now saying, "Let us place the acquisition of wool and the sale of wool under a system similar to that which is used for the marketing of wheat." We have also heard it said that the abattoirs system should be based on a toll system similar to that used by the C.B.H.

We admit that this system of wheat marketing is operating extremely well, but if this type of blackmarketing in wheat is allowed to continue the ultimate result will be that it will spoil the whole industry in which many of us have spent our lives and in which we have a great deal of faith. I am not too sure what the Minister for Agriculture can do in respect of this black-market trading. I realised it was being practised, but I did not realise the magnitude of it, and I am not too sure that any of us have an answer to the problem except to suggest that section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution should be amended. I feel that if that section cannot be amended, quarantine measures or some other system should be examined or devised at the next meeting of the Agricultural Council in an endeavour to stamp out this practice.

On visiting the border towns situated along the Murray River one is amazed to find stock feed wheat receival depots on both sides of that river. Anyone in Victoria can drive across the New South Wales border and dispose of a load of wheat. Likewise, any New South Welshman can drive across the Victorian border and dispose of a load of wheat. This is happening not only in regard to wheat; it is happening with barley, which also has tight strings attached to it. This is a practice that is rocking the orderly marketing boat at the moment. This is the type of selling which, as I have already said, is reputed to have disposed of 10,000,000 bushels of wheat in the last 12 months. This wheat is being delivered mainly to stock feeders.

As most members know, our whole system is based on a guaranteed home consumption price and an export price but I will not go into the ramifications of that at this stage. However, any market that is satisfied by illegal trading tends to rock our whole orderly marketing system and affects all the growers of Australia. At this point I ask the Minister to bear in mind it could affect the whole of the rural economy and, in turn, affect not only the economy of the State but also the economy of the Commonwealth. We should keep in mind that we are still dependent on the primary industry to stabilise our economy.

I repeat I am not blaming the Minister by any means, but I am drawing his attention to the fact that I view this practice with a great deal of concern and if it is at all possible, through his good offices on the Agricultural Council, Western Australia could raise this point in a concentrated endeavour to see if something can be done, and if he is successful at the next meeting of that council we will be much better off as a result.

I must take this opportunity, although I do not absolutely welcome it, to repeat the contents of many speeches I have made on the Address-in-Reply over the years.

Mr. Jamieson: You have made some good ones.

Mr. GAYFER: However, I must deal with the provision of water in the agricultural areas, and particularly those areas in the electorate of Avon. The history of water reticulation in the State is indeed an interesting story.

I admit that in 1946-47 the then Labor Government decided to introduce a comprehensive water scheme which would have covered most of the agricultural divisions. I also admit that a great hue and cry was created at that time by those in the area who were against such a scheme. I further admit that because of the pressures on them, many politicians in another place actually defeated the proposal of the Hawke Government. However, despite these admissions, I maintain that that action should not be visited back, as the Bible says, on the succeeding generations of farmers.

The position concerning water reticulation can best be summed up in the words used by Franklin D. Roosevelt who, in 1933, when he commenced the great Tennessee River project, said that water and electricity were no longer luxuries; they were necessities. If he thought that way back in 1933, surely the Commonwealth Government should believe the same thing and wake up to the fact that the centre of the original scheme—the Avon electorate—is almost entirely without reticulated water. I blame the Commonwealth Government directly in this matter. The first two extensions of the modified comprehensive scheme have just been completed but, I repeat, the Avon electorate is almost completely without reticulated water.

This is not because of any lack of representation, talking in this House, or visits to the office of the Minister for Water Supplies and his secretaries in an effort to bring pressure to bear on those concerned in order to assist the State to get money from the Commonwealth. Somewhere along the line it has been decided that the Avon electorate, which is one of the most easily diversified areas of the State, should be bypassed when consideration was given to water reticulation. Apparently it is thought that the Avon electorate has enough water to keep going. Why I do not know. For three years now it has been necessary for water to be carted in areas of the Avon electorate. This was also necessary all through winter in the shire of York. It has also been necessary in the areas of Wamenusking, Brookton, and Beverley, right in the centre of the Avon Valley. It appears water carting will be necessary for many years to come.

People talk about dams, water catchments, and the like. On a recent tour of the area I inspected over 90 dams, all of which had contour drains running into them, but none contained any water. This is a serious position.

In front of me I have two petitions, one from the area called Wamenusking which is situated between Quairading and Corrigin, and another from just east of Brookton. They have been signed by many farmers who desire urgent consideration to be given to the extension of water supplies into their areas. Both petitions have been sent to the Minister for Water Supplies, but I know that the stock answer given will be that in the next few months the Minister's officers will be considering the contents of the seventh proposal which will be presented to the Commonwealth Government in order that finance might be obtained on the same basis, presumably, as other schemes have been financed; that is, a 50-50 basis. The Commonwealth Government will then sift through the ramifications to establish whether the request is justified.

The Commonwealth Government has before it at the present time a proposal concerning two areas in the Avon both of which were given high priority by this Government and the previous Government. The Federal Government has also agreed that it should have a high priority, but unfortunately no funds have been forthcoming. We have reached a stage in this State where something must be done to draw particular attention to the fact that the whole of the original comprehensive scheme should be put into effect.

Mr. Jamieson: How about getting Hallett and Maisey to do something over there?

Mr. GAYFER: The interjection of the Minister is very interesting and I could follow it up by spending some time reading through numerous letters I have here.

Mr. Jamieson: Could I see your pile of papers before I make any more interjections?

Mr. GAYFER: I did not particularly want to refer to correspondence on this subject. I thought I had been handling the matter as a centre party member, as I claim to be, instead of engaging in party politics which has been indulged in by members quite a lot tonight. I purposely tried to avoid this aspect. I have here letters involving representations made by Mr. Maisey, Senator Prowse, Mr. Hallett, and other members; and I have the appropriate replies.

Mr. Jamieson: They must keep stirring, or we will not be successful.

Mr. GAYFER: Copies of all the letters have been faithfully forwarded to the Minister's office and they are on his files. When I have received anything which I felt should be on his files I have forwarded it to him. As a matter of fact I perused one of the files this afternoon and noticed that some of the letters were there for his information.

A concerted effort has been made in an attempt to have the water reticulation extended to this area. I do not know what powers the Minister possesses. I often wonder whether the second phase of the Ord dam has been responsible for robbing southern Western Australia of water reticulation for all time. I wonder whether the Commonwealth believes it has done enough in this State concerning water reticulation. However, we and our fathers before us have been in the area for over 100 years and we want water urgently. We do not need any enticement to go into the area, we are there.

We pay our rates and taxes and have contributed to the coffers of Governments over many years. It is not that we have not earned this water. If anyone visited this old part of the State he would realise the urgent necessity for water. This does not apply to just a portion of the area but to the whole area.

It is all very well for the second phase of the Ord dam to be constructed, but I must be honest and say that I thought the first stage would have meant a bonanza, but I am convinced after a recent trip to the area, that full advantage is not being made of the first stage, let alone the second stage. I have seen no great attempt by the Northern Territory and others to plan for the use of the water.

Mr. Jamieson: It must be done with Commonwealth help. The Northern Territory cannot move unless the Commonwealth moves because it has no money of its own.

Mr. GAYFER: I hope that now so much money has been expended, some use will be made of the water provided. However, I still maintain that the \$80,000,000 could have been equally well spent in the Avon electorate, because all farmers in the electorate would then have sufficient water.

Mr. Jamieson: It is pretty good for breeding Johnson River crocodiles.

Mr. GAYFER: That is all right, and in time the project might be proved to be one of great foresight; but my father and grandfather like many others did not have any inducement to farm in the Avon electorate and, after all the years the families have been there, the water is still not available. Members who know the area well will realise all the work which has gone into it. They will know of the effect of the salt which destroyed what water was available. The area is in desperate need of total reticulation.

I was a little surprised the other night to learn, on my return from the Eastern States, of a decision by the State Electricity Commission to cancel temporarily its decision to extend the power line from Corrigin to Kondinin. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn asked some very inter-

esting questions on this point and it would appear that in order to economise—for the sake of \$75,000—the promise of the line had been withdrawn.

My electorate reaches to within a few miles of Kondinin, where the member for Merredin-Yilgarn takes over. Immediately the announcement was made I received many letters and urgent communications from the Shire of Corrigin and other people seeking information on the reversal of the decision.

The answer given to the question asked by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn possibly sorted out the matter to a degree, but nevertheless it would seem to me that it is not right to go back on a promise involving an expenditure of \$75,000. I know the Minister for Electricity is already having a look at this matter and I hope he will prevail on the State Electricity Commission at least to reconsider the extension to keep faith with the people in the area. It is not an easy matter for members of Parliament to have to go into their electorates and try to explain, nicely and sweetly, exactly why a sum of \$75,000 cannot be spent on the extension of a power line.

Mr. May: There has also been representation for the line to be extended to Kukerin, and that promise was given by the State Electricity Commission in 1969.

Mr. GAYFER: Fair enough; I am not asking about that matter but I do know we were expecting the line to be extended to Kondinin during this summer, and then on to Kulin in the area of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. We are both vitally concerned with that area and so I ask the Minister, if he will, to prevail upon the State Electricity Commission to have the work done.

Another matter which concerns me is a road truck service operated by the W.A.G.R. between the towns of Brookton and Bulyee. When the railway line was closed in that area the Government of the day set up a road truck service to operate between the two towns. After a period of time the traffic decreased and a smaller truck was put into service. Last year it was decided that a mailman with a utility should be employed by the W.A.G.R. to operate a service and supply fresh vegetables and bread to the residents in the area.

In recent months the town in the middle of the area, the town of Aldersyde, has closed down its co-operative store. The store operations have been transferred to Pingelly, which is some 28 miles away.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. GAYFER: What concerns me is that the farmers in the district have bought the entire block of shops at Aldersyde, including the new quarters for the manager, and

they were relying on the fact that the truck service was operating and would be able to transport fresh vegetables and other necessary items the 20-odd miles to the town.

After investing their money in the organisation, and supporting decentralisation, and attempting to keep their activities within the town, they received notice that the road truck service was to be discontinued within a matter of a few weeks. I appeal to the Minister concerned with this matter to take it up because the people of the town have made a definite attempt to keep the town operative.

Mr. May: The position has been represented to the Railways Department.

Mr. GAYFER: I have represented it to the chief traffic manager, and I am now appealing to a Minister of the Crown to keep the service operating for a period of six months so that the people in the town can ascertain whether any increase in traffic will warrant the continuance of the service and allow the Aldersyde complex to continue to operate.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.02 p.m.]: I shall be brief, and I raise a query in the hope that it may facilitate some discussion during the debate on the Estimates. Unfortunately, the Attorney-General is not present in the Chamber, because the matter I wish to raise is of direct concern to him. If he is within the precincts of the House I hope he will return because his presence will greatly facilitate what I am about to say, and he will be able to supply the answers I hope to receive. Of course, we are running against time and if one has to place questions on the notice paper it could easily be that the replies will not be available until after the session has ended.

I refer specifically to the answers given by the Attorney-General in respect of some questions related to the document which has been circulated by the T.L.C. and U.F.G.A. I asked him a series of questions and it is important that I recite at least the second part of the question which referred to the document. I then asked whether he had seen the document and he answered, "Yes." In the second part of the question I asked the Attorney-General whether he considered it to be a document which complies with the requirements of the appropriate Statutes, including the Companies Act. I specifically referred to appropriate Statutes, as well as the Companies Act, because there are other ways in which various organisations can be brought into being.

There are associations which are properly formed, and there are co-operatives and companies. Also other bodies are convened by Statute. I think for all practical purposes, and for the purpose of this

exercise, we can refer to associations, co-operatives, and companies. The Minister answered that in his view the document does not come within the provisions of the Companies Act. Having gone that far I expected he would state that it comes under some other Statute, or that it does not come under some other Statute.

Members who have been interested in company law and company activities for a long period of years will recall a period in the history of this State—and probably of other States—when we had some very unsavoury experiences in respect of prospectuses. I am not suggesting this one is unsavoury but I go back to the Barker era.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition know the essence of a prospectus? The essence is that it must invite the public to subscribe. That document does not do that.

Mr. COURT: I am coming to that point, because I think the Minister has missed the import of the document and the import of a prospectus.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No I have not.

Mr. COURT: The Barker era may be remembered by older members in this Chamber. It was long before I came into Parliament and I doubt whether there is any member still in Parliament who was here at that time, with the possible exception of the Premier.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I was a member of Parliament at the time.

Mr. COURT: At that time there was a general spring cleaning of the whole set-up throughout Australia to make it extremely difficult for what was known as share hawking. I was young in my profession at the time but I remember it was a great scandal. Some very firm and clear-cut rules were brought in. As is customary with all such things, it does not matter how tight and comprehensive people make the rules, there is always some bright person who finds a way around them. For this reason, from time to time this State and the other States have found it necessary to expand the definitions and bring in new items. Generally there has been a tightening up and an extension of the requirements for prospectuses.

In my experience, the Registrar of Companies has been extremely jealous of the provisions of the Companies Act in respect of prospectuses. All members who have had professional experience in registering prospectuses know that the Companies Office goes through them with a fine tooth comb. This is becoming more severe rather than less severe. Also, the Stock Exchange is becoming more critical and demanding in respect of prospectuses.

The vital point is that a person has to go through this procedure before he can go to the public. A person simply cannot

conceive an idea and launch it on the public. This is the crux of the matter. It has to be registered and to run the gauntlet of comprehensive sections of the Companies Act. I invite the attention of members to part IV of the Companies Act under the heading, "Shares, Debentures, and Charges." With the effluxion of time this will be further amended to tighten up and expand the requirements of this section.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I refer the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the definition of "prospectus" in section 5 of the Act.

Mr. COURT: I am conscious of it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You do not appear to be.

Mr. O'Connor: Are they permitted to take any money?

Mr. COURT: If the Attorney-General will be forbearing he will see I am trying to reach the point of assisting him to obtain the necessary information to guide the House as to whether further amendments are necessary. The two vital things are shares and debentures. These are the two which are defined. Definitions of both are fairly comprehensive. There is also a special provision in the law for certain types of corporations to be exempted; these are known as "prescribed corporations" and include banking corporations, within their particular law, and a number of other corporations which obviously cannot be administered under the Companies Act nor is it desirable that we should try to administer them under that Act. In each case exemption has been granted because the corporations are under tighter supervision from somewhere else.

We also have legislation for co-operative and provident societies. Again, they have to be registered. A person cannot put a notice up on a wall saying, "This is a co-operative or provident society and is in business." He would immediately run into trouble with the registrar who wants certain rules observed. That is fair enough.

The Minister is trying to imply that because there is no reference to shares or debentures, in the ordinary or accepted sense, there is no prospectus. I want to invite his attention to the fact that the whole objective of the amendments that have been made over the years is to make it more and more difficult for people to invent ways whereby they can gain control over other people's money for various purposes without conforming with the Statutes.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That particular document makes no attempt to get hold of anyone's money. There is no offer to subscribe.

Mr. COURT: I said that I do not want to speak for long and if the Minister will listen to me for a moment or two we will

probably proceed more quickly. If he understands the point I am making in turn he can do some research.

I come back to the point that the whole objective has been to try to avoid devices whereby people can go outside the definition of a share, outside the definition of a debenture, and outside the requirements of the provisions concerning prospectuses in the Companies Act, provisions of the Co-operative and Provident Societies Act, or the Associations Incorporation Act for the purpose of gaining access to other people's money.

I am not saying these people have anything but the best intentions but it is a prerequisite of this type of flotation or formation—call it what one will—that the rules under which a person contributes should be clearly defined.

I have not yet received back from the Minister the highly colourful document I lent him. However the photostat copy I have states at the top, "Proposed T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. Co-operative Meat Sales." Part of the document refers to the fact that this is to be a substantially nonprofit enterprise to be known as the T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. Co-operative Meat Sales of West Australia. I hope it is not intended to be a forerunner of the little signs we sometimes see in offices which state, "This is a nonprofit organisation, but it did not start off that way."

As I have said, the document states that it is to be a substantially nonprofit enterprise to be known as the T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. Co-operative Meat Sales of West Australia. It is a prerequisite of the Co-operative and Provident Societies Act that certain words shall be included in a name when it is approved. Those words are not included in this name and they cannot be included until it is registered as a properly acknowledged co-operative; that is, if it wants to be a co-operative. If it wants to be a company it has to be registered under the Companies Act. If we read further down the document which has been distributed we find the following references:—

A member of the Association who subscribes one hundred (100) dollars per year or

A widow or minor being resident proprietor will receive the advantages mentioned in 9 and 10 above.

The reference is not only to a co-operative but also to an association. There is also reference to subscriptions. This is the critical point to which I invite the attention of the Minister and I ask him, with respect, to have some research made on the T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. Co-operative Meat Sales of West Australia in fairness to the people of that organisation as well as the people who have sent along amounts of \$100. They should know what they are subscribing to.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Are the people who send \$100, or any sum, invited to send the money and, if so, to what address?

Mr. COURT: On the front of the document it says in the boldest possible letters, "Prospectus, 1971."

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That does not make it a prospectus.

Mr. COURT: It does to many of the people who receive the document.

Mr. O'Connor: Is the Premier saying they are telling lies?

Mr. COURT: I realise that to call a document a prospectus does not necessarily make it one within the meaning of the Companies Act. It would be possible to have a prospectus to join a medical fund or for a host of other purposes. I do not argue on that basis. However, on reading into the document and considering its total concept and contents I find it difficult to see how it could be read as anything other than an unauthorised prospectus within the meaning of the Companies Act.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Putting it another way you are saying that is a prospectus.

Mr. O'Connor: No, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is asking for an investigation.

Mr. Reid: When they knock on the doors of farmers they call it a prospectus and ask for \$100.

Mr. COURT: I am saying that to the layman this appears to be a prospectus. As an accountant I could not claim it is a prospectus within the meaning of the Companies Act. As a professional man I would refuse to act for a body like this on the grounds that it was risking a serious infringement of the Companies Act, the penalties for which are very heavy.

Under the Companies Act, part of the registration process entails the answering of many searching questions. If there are any matters of a technical nature involving expert opinions, reports must be provided by people who must state their qualifications so that they are known. In this way it is known whether they are highly qualified, partly qualified, or not qualified at all. This is basic to the whole concept of raising money.

If this is not a prospectus that has to be registered and it can be used for the purpose for which it is being used, I would suggest—if we forget, for a moment, that it relates to the T.L.C. or the U.F.G.A.—

Mr. T. D. Evans: That has not influenced my opinion.

Mr. COURT: If this sort of document is lawful, it is time we altered the Act. If this group of people can do this, it will be only a matter of days before some of the people who are always looking for loopholes in the share hawking and prospectus laws will be using this sort of

document. Several times in recent years we have tightened up the law because people were finding loopholes by which they could obtain large sums of money from people without issuing a prospectus or being in any way bound by the Companies Act.

We brought in a number of Bills. I will not itemise them all. We tightened up the Marketable Securities Act, the Stock Exchange Act, and the Companies Act in order to bring within the network of the Statutes documents under which people are invited to subscribe money. If the Minister is naive enough to say this is not a prospectus in the mind of the layman, and it is not an invitation to contribute money on certain terms, I do not know what is. As an ordinary, simple-minded person, I would say on reading this that it was asking for money from me. Under the heading "Subscription" it goes on to say—

A subscription will not be a loan.
It will not be interest-bearing.

From what the Minister has said by interjection, I assume that is one of the reasons he has held it is not a prospectus, a share, or a debenture within the meaning of the Companies Act. He might be right. I assume he has had the benefit of Crown Law advice as well as his own, although he does say quite frankly that it is his opinion. He does not say it is a Crown Law opinion.

The document goes on to say—

As a farmer may invest in say a motorcycle or a JAY-AR crop sprayer as one of his tools of trade, he may also consider this investment to be one of his tools of trade.

Again, there is not only a reference to "subscription" but also to "investment."

If somebody has found a device, I must admit it is a fairly cunning one. I know the lengths people have gone to in order to find ways around the Companies Act, the Associations Incorporation Act, and so on. Just forget who puts this out. I think the Minister should be giving very careful thought to an amendment of the Statute because when some of these smart alecks find a way around the law they move so quickly that people and large sums of money are parted overnight.

It is no good putting advertisements in the papers to warn people. We know of old they will not be told. If someone comes along and tells a nice story, shows them a nice, shiny paper with pretty pictures on it, and it happens to be something that appeals to them at the time, they pay up; and, with due respect to the member for Subiaco, the softest touches for prospectuses and share hawkers are doctors.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It could be a case of fools and their money being soon parted.

Mr. COURT: Any share hawker makes a beeline for the medical profession if he wants to raise money. Share hawkers do not have much chance now because the registrar and other people are rather vigilant.

Mr. Bertram: Is not share hawking illegal?

Mr. COURT: It is, unless one can conform with a very limited number of cases provided for in our Statute. One must be very smart to get away with share hawking. When registering a prospectus today—particularly one that will be quoted on the Stock Exchange—many questions must be answered, and rightly so because the intention is to take money from the public.

I hope at the appropriate time the Minister will have regard for what I have said and will let us know—perhaps by answers to questions or by comment on the Estimates—why he and the Crown Law Department believe this document is not caught up under one of the existing Statutes. I find it hard to believe, and I am not a legal man. I am not putting forward the views of anyone else. I am an accountant who has had much experience with this type of document. In view of the words used in this document, I find it hard to believe it does not get caught up under the Companies Act.

That does not mean to say the authors could not put forward a prospectus that would be accepted in all good faith by the registrar. When he has done his job, it is up to the people who put their money into the project to do so with a full knowledge of the facts. If, on the other hand, they want to be a co-operative, they should take action to be registered under either—

Mr. Graham: What is the purpose of your remarks? Is it to protect unsuspecting persons or to knock the project?

Mr. COURT: I have two purposes. One is to ensure this is not a new device which the Parliament and Governments have been watching for over a number of years; not because it is this one or any other one but because of past experience. It is up to this Parliament and this Government to undertake their responsibility by looking into this matter to see whether legislation is required. If the people concerned comply with the legislation they will raise money on their merits.

It is not a question of stopping anything. I would be the last person to tell people they should not put their money into a proposition provided it conformed with the requirements of an exacting Companies Act which stipulates what a prospectus should contain before it is registered. That is all I am arguing at this stage. The merits of the proposition are another matter which I do not want to discuss tonight.

Assuming the Government makes a favourable decision, the Premier has given an undertaking that before the Government proceeds with financial assistance for this particular project it will be submitted to Parliament for ratification. We cannot ask for more than that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Before you leave the subject of whether this is a prospectus or a device, I advise that I have made arrangements for a copy of your speech to be given to me, and the matter will be given consideration in the light of your comments.

Mr. COURT: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I hope in doing so the Minister and his officers will have a look at the notes accompanying the document. This is another aspect of the matter, because one of the very important requirements in regard to a prospectus is that the application must be identified with the prospectus. It used to be an old trick to have a prospectus that conformed with the law but the application form was separate; people could sign the application forms, indicating that they had read the prospectus, but one could never be sure they had done so. The practice now is to incorporate the application form as part of the prospectus and it must be detached before it can be sent off. In this case there is a series of notes which are mimeographed on a loose piece of paper which is quite independent of the glossy printed form that is set out as "Prospectus, 1971."

I do not want to give the impression that this matter has been raised only because the document bears the names "T.L.C." and "U.F.G.A." at the top of it. That is another matter. It is worth mentioning that somewhere along the line there was an arrangement between the U.F.G.A. and the Government at the time of the election. There has been a public denial of this by the Premier but the U.F.G.A. has not gone along with this denial. It is rather interesting to us that all of a sudden the T.L.C. has become the friend and partner of the U.F.G.A. I do not propose to canvass the merits or otherwise of the proposition itself at the present time.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It would not be an unusual combination, would it?

Mr. COURT: It is passing strange to some of us and had there not been this public controversy between the Premier and the U.F.G.A. after the elections it probably would not have appeared to be quite as strange as it now appears. This is not the purpose of my discussion at the moment but it is when one reads the propaganda about the T.L.C. side of this project and certain comments that have been made by Mr. Hawke of the A.C.T.U. that the pattern starts to take shape. I am not here to argue that; we will deal with that at a later stage. I would like the Minister to have a good look at what I have raised.

This man might be as pure as the driven snow, but someone else who is not pure could seize on this and he would soon put it to an illicit use. I hope the Minister will treat this as a matter of urgency.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [10.25 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on this particular subject, and to state why we are interested in it, as the Deputy Premier requested.

A neighbour of mine received a copy of this circular on Monday last. As described by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it is a coloured form with an attachment. My neighbour also received a similar duplicated attachment saying that the promoters would like him to look over the papers enclosed and they would call on him within a few days to collect the subscription.

This is called a prospectus but a prospectus usually has some authorisation and includes a list of directors. There is nothing on this except the heading; no indication as to who authorised it.

Mr. Bertram: It sounds to be a misnomer.

MR. W. A. MANNING: It is mis-something—it is certainly a mistake.

We should concern ourselves with this because people are being asked for a subscription of \$100—and some are actually paying it. However, one must look closely to see that this calls for \$100 every year with no return. There are no entitlements, no shares, and no debentures. It is purely a subscription which goes to those promoting the scheme at the present time. We are not told who is promoting it, except for the two names appearing on the front. This gives no plan for the proposed use of the money.

A provision is also included that the two organisations promoting the scheme are to receive $\frac{1}{2}$ c each on every pound of meat which goes through the works. This money will be paid for promotion alone; that is, a full cent a pound goes to the promoters—not to pay expenses but purely for promotion.

Mr. O'Connor: This is supposed to help the farmer.

MR. W. A. MANNING: That is right. But the farmer has to pay \$100 whether the works are established or not. Not only that, the Government is also talking about guaranteeing \$9,000,000. We are concerned with both issues in this case.

Some of the statements being made should be investigated, and I refer particularly to an advertisement in *The West Australian* of the 6th December. Amongst other things it states—

Overseas markets will be developed and expanded and already big contracts have been made with Russia, Canada and the Middle East countries.

I stress the use of the word "contracts." This is a very definite statement.

Mr. Jones: Could that be a misprint, "contracts"?

MR. W. A. MANNING: This says "contracts have been made."

Mr. Jones: But could this be a misprint?

MR. W. A. MANNING: So this is another "mis." The member for Mt. Hawthorn was wondering about this—it is certainly no misprint. It is a false statement. I would like to quote the question the member for Moore asked today. It reads as follows:—

With respect to the advertisement headed "TLC-UFGA Co-operative Meat Sales" which appeared in *The West Australian* of 6th December—

- (1) Has a company been formed?
- (2) If a company has not been formed, by whom in this State have big contracts been made with Russia, Canada and Middle East countries?
- (3) What is the extent of these contracts?
- (4) When does the Government expect to be in a position to make a decision with respect to the requested guarantee?

The answer to the first question was "No," and this is in fact so; no company has been formed. Subscribers would be giving \$100 to anybody who wishes to take it, as long as a receipt is issued. Parts (2) and (3) of question 14 concerned the contracts and this is the answer the Minister gave—

Only preliminary contacts have been made with possible importing countries. No contracts have been made.

This is the Minister's statement today and yet we have this advertisement appearing in *The West Australian*. It appears not only in this paper but also in others.

I do not know whether this is an infringement of the Companies Act. Certainly the statement cannot be countenanced because it is so contradictory.

I appeal to the Premier and to Cabinet to ensure that the matter is thoroughly investigated before one dollar is put into the scheme, let alone a guarantee of \$9,000,000.

Mr. Graham: I would have thought a Country Party member would be more interested in getting abattoir facilities than knocking an endeavour to create them.

MR. W. A. MANNING: That is quite right, Mr. Speaker. I am very much interested and the Deputy Premier knows I have been interested for a very long time.

Mr. Graham: And you have got exactly nowhere.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am also interested in ensuring people do not lose their money. I am interested in these statements being made in advertisements at the present time. If the Minister wants to guarantee something, let it be something safe. This matter certainly requires investigation. We do need country abattoirs but let us be careful and ensure they are established on the right basis.

Mr. Graham: This will be done by this Government. It was not accomplished by the Government you support.

Mr. Reid: The situation should be clarified.

Mr. Graham: The Katanning abattoir is now half completed.

Mr. Williams: You are all talk; all wind.

Mr. Graham: Take a trip to Katanning.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is important because statements have been made by the Premier and the Deputy Premier that consideration is being given to a guarantee of \$9,000,000. This is not chicken feed, and yet the Government is proceeding on the basis of statements like these.

Mr. Graham: Do you think we should not investigate it?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am urging the Deputy Premier to investigate it.

Mr. Graham: That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If statements are made about the likelihood of the establishment of this abattoir and a guarantee being made available, some sort of—

Mr. Graham: Has any Minister said that? Has any speaker for the Government said that?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Deputy Premier has said it himself.

Mr. Graham: That the Government was likely to guarantee it?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Does the Deputy Premier refute the statement now?

Mr. Graham: You are making the speech; you tell us what I said.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am making my own speech.

Mr. Graham: You are making it up as you go along.

Mr. Williams: You are all talk.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I know exactly what I am saying and the Deputy Premier knows I am speaking the truth.

Mr. Graham: You know I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is what is raising the Deputy Premier's ire at the present time.

Mr. Graham: You could not raise my ire.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I repeat: I have been urging for some time the urgency to establish country abattoirs. However, let us be careful; we must not throw the State's money away on fruitless guarantees. We must not allow people to pay money into an organisation which has no background. I agree one cannot save fools from their own foolishness, but after all we have a responsibility to make matters such as this public. That is why I make these remarks.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [10.35 p.m.]: I do not intend to speak at any length. I wish to complain about the quality of a reply I received to a question asked of the Minister for Education concerning the problems faced by Patch Theatre. The other evening I spoke on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) and I referred to three subjects—one of them related to Patch Theatre and its problems.

From long experience I knew that I should follow up my speech with some questions, because frequently one's speeches are overlooked by Ministers; although we are happily surprised from time to time. Subsequently, I directed a question to the Premier and I received a reply which, although it does not satisfy me completely, is frank, open, and honest. In effect the reply states that the door is still open to the Patch Theatre organisation to approach the Treasury for financial assistance in its problems of securing a new site and perhaps instituting a building fund of some sort.

I also asked a question of the Minister for Education, in which I requested him to give consideration to having a representative of the world of theatre in Western Australia appointed to the Arts Advisory Board. The Minister denied my request, and I cannot disagree with his answer. Apparently the opinion is that in this case it is better not to have representatives of any facet of cultural life, but rather to appoint people who will represent all interests. I think that is fair enough.

My third question is the one I wish to complain about.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Be careful.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: In that question I referred to my speech on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) and I asked the Minister if he would ensure that negotiations would be reopened in an effort to reverse the August decision, when permission to perform at country schools was withdrawn from the Patch Theatre Touring Company.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I would like to interject and draw your attention to the fact that permission was actually withdrawn from Patch some considerable time ago. I think what happened in August resulted from an episode at Esperance which was

not authorised by the Education Department. I understand your own Government withdrew permission from Patch several years ago. The authorities at the school in question—I think it was Esperance—made arrangements with Patch without Education Department approval, and the event took place. It was your own Government which decided that drama exercises would be permitted in schools through the National Theatre, and only that theatre. Your own Government decided that, not our Government. That is my advice.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister for Education displays a good deal of ignorance of the subject. If he read the speech I made on the Appropriation Bill—and I think he listened to a portion of it—he would appreciate that the Patch Theatre Touring Company began its operations in country schools in 1969.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That could be so; I am not sure.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is my understanding.

Mr. T. D. Evans: But your own Government withdrew permission.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It may be that prior to that date Patch Theatre had permission to tour country schools and that permission was withdrawn; but that is not so to my knowledge nor to the knowledge of the Minister for Education. Apparently permission was withdrawn after the end of the 1970-71 financial year.

I must proceed with the case I was presenting before the Minister interjected. I, too, interject; so I appreciate that one must have interjections. However, I wish the Minister would hold his interjections until I complete the particular point I was presenting.

I am complaining about the quality of the Minister's reply to my question. Patch Theatre was granted permission to further its aims and objectives in the cultural life of the State in the manner which I detailed in my speech. I do not want to go over all that again. I asked the Minister whether he would ensure that negotiations would be reopened with a view to reversing the decision.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You did not refer to the 1969 permission in your question.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I referred to it in my speech, and the Minister was present when I spoke about Patch Theatre! That is why we have eyes to see, ears to hear, and intelligence to appreciate.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Heavens above!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I would hope that the permission which has been withdrawn will once again be granted to the company; or at least the Minister should have a close

look at the situation. Apparently it was a Government decision that the permission should be withdrawn.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I understand it was a departmental decision made in the lifetime of your Government.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Was the Minister not aware that permission had been withdrawn from Patch Theatre?

Mr. T. D. Evans: I was not aware in 1969.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: No, the company began to tour country schools in 1969. An officer of the Education Department, when giving an appreciation of this to his top officers, stated that fact and said that the year 1969 was a successful one apart from some minor failures here and there. I mentioned this in my previous speech. Then permission was withdrawn in mid-1971.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I differ with you in regard to the time the permission was withdrawn.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I am telling the Minister. I can see that he has not researched this subject. In any case, the Minister may read my question and the answer he supplied to it—and I might mention that this important point received no publicity at all.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Who is to blame for that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: If the Minister reads the question and answer he will realise there is a lack of appreciation and intelligence in the reply. The Minister should have a look at it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: He has had a look at it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Well! The Minister condemns himself more and more. I hope other people will look at this very bad reply.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Read the reply.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I thought the Minister would never ask.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You were seeking publicity; I am giving you an opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is not so. When one is a Minister it is easier—

Mr. Graham: You should know.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: In brief, I referred to my speech and asked, in regard to problems being faced by Patch Theatre, whether the Minister would ensure that negotiations are reopened with representatives of the theatre with a view to reversing the August decision to withdraw permission for the touring company of Patch to perform, by arrangement with administrators and teachers, at country schools. I would mention here that I have seen copies of Education Department papers relating to the performances of

Patch in 1969, 1970, and 1971. The reply of the Minister is as follows:—

It is not the intention of the Education Department to re-open discussions with Patch Theatre with a view to permitting it to present plays in country schools.

That part is straightforward. It simply says, "No" to my request. I can excuse that reply because I can understand it. However, it continued—

The department has for many years followed a policy of allowing only one organization in each of the performing arts, music, ballet and drama—to give performances during school time. The approved organization in the field of drama is the National Theatre. Any departure from the established policy would result in considerable disruption to school programmes which would be detrimental to the children's education.

The latter matter is one I raised in my previous speech as being the obvious excuse. However, that part of the question was dealt with by saying that the department has for many years followed a policy of allowing only one organisation in each of the performing arts to give performances during school time. I told the Minister that in my speech and if he studied my question he must have known that the policy was departed from.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Was it departed from by the department or by particular schools?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: There was a whole list of schools. I am asking some further questions on Friday next and I hope the Minister will be able to give me answers to them. One of the questions will be in regard to the country schools programme that has been carried out during the last few years by the Patch Theatre Touring Company. I will also ask him to list the country schools programme for the same period that has been carried out by the National Theatre. I then want to know if he will list the country schools programme before Patch Theatre commenced visiting the schools.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I will be pleased to answer the questions.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I hope the Minister will because he promised to give attention to the subject when I raised it previously. It appears to me from the Minister's interjections that he has not studied the situation. Will he look at the document to which I referred and from which I quoted, and which was made out by one of the departmental officers? It was an appreciation of the role of Patch Theatre in regard to tours of country schools and I was trying to get some sort of answers not

only to the questions I will submit for answers on Friday, but also to those questions that remain unanswered.

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

MARKETING OF LAMB BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER BILL

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 10, 11, 19, and 23, to which the Assembly had disagreed.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments on which the Council insists are as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 5, page 4, line 9—Insert after the word "Governor" the words "on the recommendation of Parliament".

No. 10.

Clause 19, page 15, lines 27 and 28—Delete the words "may determine whether".

No. 11.

Clause 25, page 21, line 5—Add after the word "report" the words "and in any case he shall not make any defamatory statement concerning any person".

No. 19.

Schedule, page 26, line 33—Delete the words "The Police Force of the State and".

No. 23.

Schedule, page 27, lines 27 to 30—Delete the words—

Western Australian Trotting Association constituted under the Western Australian Trotting Association Act, 1946.

Western Australian Turf Club constituted under the Western Australian Turf Club Act, 1892.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: There is no necessity again to go into the reasons why this House disagreed originally to the amendments made by the Legislative Council. I therefore move—

That the Assembly continues to disagree to amendments Nos. 1, 10, 11, 19, and 23 made by the Council.

Mr. COURT: I do not propose to speak at great length on the motion moved by the Premier. He has the numbers in this Chamber and he has made up his mind he will use them. We have said what we wanted to say on this Bill during the various stages of it and I gather there was further debate last night on the amendments submitted by the Legislative Council, many of which were accepted by the Government, but others were not. We now have the Bill returned to us.

I believe that if the Premier wants his Bill to become law he would be well advised to accept the amendments insisted on by the Legislative Council. We must realise that this Bill will be breaking new ground in this State. I think the Legislative Council has argued in a very constructive way. I think it will be admitted—although it may be hard for some to accept this—that some of the amendments are desirable in this type of legislation, and others would be arguable. However, my own view is that we would be wise to accept the Bill if the Government wants a parliamentary commissioner in this State, and if we find later that the Legislative Council amendments are too restrictive we could deal with the matter on its merits point by point as we often do in legislation.

It should be clearly understood by the Committee that once the Bill goes to a conference of managers one cannot be sure what will come out of it. If there is a degree of insistence by certain members and there is an uncompromising attitude adopted by others the Bill could go out the window. I oppose the motion put forward by the Premier, but on the other hand I feel it my duty, on behalf of my colleagues to point out the danger to the Bill if it is submitted to a conference of managers.

Mr. Graham: What do you mean by "danger"?

Mr. COURT: I make it clear that we on this side of the Chamber, although we do not like the Bill, have not attempted to obstruct it. I do not think the Premier or the Deputy Premier could honestly say this for one minute. We might have criticised the form but we have not attempted to stop the Bill. We do not oppose giving expression to the general principle although we do not like it. This, of course, does not mean to say that because the Government says it has a mandate from the public, it can do anything it likes in the Bill. This is where the Legislative Council has genuinely used its rights. Otherwise we could have a crazy set-up under which the Government would have a blank cheque to do what it likes.

Mr. Graham: I think you have a crazy concept that anything the Legislative Council wants is right, but anything this Chamber insists on is wrong.

Mr. COURT: We have argued long and consistently and I am just making our point clear. I am assuming the Government will use its numbers to support the motion moved by the Premier, and I think it is my duty, on behalf of my colleagues, to point out that if the Bill goes to a conference of managers one cannot be sure how the Bill will come out or even if it will come out at all.

Mr. Graham: You are making out that the Legislative Council is your secret weapon; you are threatening us with it.

Mr. COURT: It is unfortunate that the Deputy Premier is in such a bad mood these days and has again adopted this approach.

Mr. Graham: The trouble is that you think you are still the Government.

Mr. COURT: I return to the point that neither we in this Chamber nor those in another place have attempted to stop the Bill. They are not attempting to stop it now. I am only making it clear that if the Bill goes to a conference of managers the Government will have to accept what comes out of it. I do not propose to make any further comment.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I make no complaint whatever about the attitude of the Opposition in this House with regard to the Bill. I think the Opposition acted very fairly indeed, and for that I am most appreciative. I would point out, however, that the Legislative Council sent down to this Chamber 25 amendments, of which 20 were accepted. Surely it cannot expect us to agree to every amendment it has made without our making an attempt to dissuade the Council from insisting on some of its amendments.

Let me take as an example the first amendment made by the Council. I have read the speeches of the members of the Council. In regard to the first amendment which provides that Parliament shall appoint the ombudsman the idea was based on the New Zealand Statute, in which country there is only one House of Parliament; and, of course, the Government is in control of that House. So in New Zealand the Government virtually appoints the ombudsman.

Mr. Mensaros: For the term of that Parliament only.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What difference does that make? It will always be a Government appointment.

Mr. Court: But it dies with the Government.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is all right, but it is always a Government appointment. So it is merely camouflaging the position to say it is an appointment of Parliament.

Coming to Western Australia where there is a Labor Government, but where Labor has always been in the minority in the

Council, let us assume that the initiative is taken in the Council and it determines who is to be the ombudsman, and it takes the same attitude with regard to that amendment as with other amendments; it refuses to budge. If the choice of the Council is different from that of the Government we would end up with no ombudsman, unless the Government gave way and allowed the Council to decide who should be the ombudsman. What self-respecting Government would accept a situation like that? For that reason I am prepared to go to a conference of managers of both Houses to argue the point; I am not prepared to concede, simply because the Council says this is what it wants.

I think the intention of the Council was based on a misconception of the true position, and it completely overlooked the fact that in New Zealand where there is only one House of Parliament the Government always has control of it. So virtually it is an appointment by the Government.

I should point out that in Western Australia the Government appoints the Auditor-General. There would be just as much sense to argue that because the Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament the Parliament should appoint him. No Government would be prepared to accept that situation. It is because I believe that common sense ought to prevail that I am not prepared to accept the insistence by the Council that its amendments be agreed to. Having got through 20 of the 25 amendments it has made it has done very well. The Assembly should be realistic on this matter and insist upon the opportunity of having a further discussion.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am amazed the Premier is taking the attitude that he has. He has fought for the appointment of an ombudsman for a number of years, and here he is on the verge of succeeding.

Mr. Graham: Appointed by whom?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not concerned by whom.

Mr. Graham: But you ought to be.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Premier has an opportunity now to have the appointment made under this legislation, but he is rejecting the opportunity for the sake of one or two things. He may have a sound argument in what he has put up, but there is a doubt on the argument he has used in support of the appointment of the ombudsman. He has referred to the need to appoint a man with high qualifications, etc. In appointing such an officer it does not matter very much which House of Parliament makes the appointment, as long as the right person is selected. The Premier has said the appointment should be made. I have great regard for the Bill, but if we insist on opposing the amendments made by the Council the Bill will be thrown out.

Mr. Jamieson: You are prejudging the Legislative Council. It might be prepared to discuss this. Why should you prejudge the Council? Have you some information?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I recall when the Local Government Bill was before us some years ago; it contained 700 clauses.

Mr. Graham: Apparently your party made a decision yesterday.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not issuing a warning. I am pointing out a grave possibility. Having got the Bill through to this stage, I hope the Premier will grasp the opportunity of having the appointment made.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I heard the interjection of the Deputy Premier that our party had probably made a decision at its party meeting. When he hears what I have to say he will no doubt agree that no such decision has been made.

In this situation I must disagree with my colleague and go along with the reasoning of the Premier. If we were in government and the Labor Party were in the majority in the Council, the argument would be different. I cannot see how any responsible government should be subject to dictation by the majority in another place in regard to an appointment such as this. This is one time that wiser counsel on this side of the House should prevail. We ought to agree this should be a Government appointment. By camouflaging the appointment with the use of the word "Parliament" in a situation where there are two Houses, but where there has always been a Liberal-Country Party majority in the Council, we are merely kidding ourselves that this will not be an appointment that is to be determined by another place. I support the Premier's comments.

Mr. COURT: I wish to say a few brief words so that I make our position perfectly clear. We have made our protests and stated our reasons. We are adopting the attitude that the responsibility of subjecting the Council's amendments to a conference of managers is entirely up to the Government. If the Bill is lost the Government will have to accept the responsibility. This is not a threat.

In subjecting this to a conference of managers, we might come out with a Bill in the form which the Government wants; we might come out with a Bill in the form which the Legislative Council wants; we might come out with a Bill in a form that has been amended by mutual consent within the Committee, some of the amendments never having been dreamt of when the Bill was before the Chamber; and we might come out with no Bill at all. Those are the four alternatives.

Mr. Graham: There is a responsibility on the other place, too.

Question put and passed.

Report

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Assembly's Request for Conference

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I move—

That the Council be requested to grant a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Council, and that the managers for the Assembly be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Court), the member for Boulder-Dundas (Mr. Hartrey), and the mover.

Question put and passed and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 11.06 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 9th December, 1971

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.05 a.m.]: Mr. President, I ask that questions on notice be postponed to a later stage of the sitting.

The PRESIDENT: Leave granted.

POTATO INDUSTRY

Inquiry by Select Committee: Statement by Chairman

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [11.06 a.m.]: As Chairman of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the potato industry I wish to make a statement to the House. I wish to advise that the committee made application to the Premier to have the Select Committee converted into an honorary Royal Commission in the knowledge that this session of Parliament may terminate fairly soon and Parliament will be prorogued accordingly. However, I have since been advised by the Premier's Department that the actual prorogation of this session of Parliament will not be made until late in February.

This being so, the Select Committee intends to carry on taking evidence and continue its work.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER BILL

Assembly's Request for Conference

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference on amendments Nos. 1, 10, 11, 19, and 23 insisted on by the Council, and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.07 a.m.]: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to; that the managers for the Council be The Hon. L. A. Logan, The Hon. I. G. Medcalf, and the mover; and that the conference take place in the Select Committee room at 2.30 p.m. on Thursday, the 9th December, 1971.

Question put and passed and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st December.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [11.08 a.m.]: This is a simple machinery Bill. It has a very unglamorous title—Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—for what I consider to be a very important subject. My party does not intend to oppose the Bill in any way. It does bring into focus the changing circumstances in which we live. I suppose one could almost call the measure the emancipation of the fairer sex, and I am only too pleased that I am not a misogynist when seconding the Bill.

I do not think there are any brave members in this House who would say "No" to the second reading of the Bill, or indeed to any other stage of it. Some honourable member did comment on the war between the sexes, but you, Mr. President, and I know that there could never be war between the sexes; there would be far too much collaboration with the enemy.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are in good form so early in the morning, Mr. Williams.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Have you joined the women's liberation movement?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Not on your life! I have passed my sputum test. The whole point in this measure is to introduce a new concept in regard to the continuation of the Government's work.

This presents a completely new concept concerning women at work. The cry has always been that women are underpaid and that they are second-class citizens; but that is merely a catch phrase. I for one have never regarded the female of the species as a second-class citizen. Someone far more sage than I once said that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world; and this, of course, is true.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Don't forget that a lot of men have rocked the cradle!

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Yes indeed, but when men do that they find themselves tipped out!