

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 18th April, 1978

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

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TWELFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 13th April, on the following motion by Mr MacKinnon—

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 SIBSON (Bunbury) [4.58 p.m.]: I rise to support the Address-in-Reply motion moved so ably by the member for Murdoch.

Mr Harman: They are all leaving the Chamber!

Mr SIBSON: I hope the fact that so many members are leaving the Chamber is no reflection on me and my ability as a speaker.

Mr Blaikie: It is okay; your friends are still with you.

Mr SIBSON: I appreciate the fact that many members still have a great deal of work to do.

I would like firstly to speak in some detail about the disaster that hit the south-west recently. By now we are all fully aware of the extent of that disaster. Firstly, it is most unusual for the south-west to be confronted with cyclonic conditions to any great extent at all, let alone a cyclone of such severity as that encountered with cyclone "Alby". During the day it was evident to me and my colleagues here—particularly the member for Vasse—that we were in for violent weather. As it seemed that something unusual was in store for us, we made a few inquiries. We were told by the Bureau of Meteorology and other places that high winds were likely, but there was no indication of anything worse at that stage.

It was felt cyclone "Alby" had dissipated and, therefore, it was expected the winds would be in the vicinity of only 40 to 50 kilometres per hour.

Later in the afternoon it became evident this would not be so, and I kept in constant touch with Bunbury during the day, because I was here in Perth for the afternoon sitting of Parliament. Reports coming back to me from my family, my electorate office, the office of the Regional Administrator, the Bunbury Town Council, and various other bodies in the town indicated to me that something much worse than anything previously experienced was developing later in the day.

It is unfortunate—and I am not certain of the reasons—that we were not able to obtain a more accurate assessment of the true weather situation, although I appreciate the problems faced by the officers concerned. Firstly, this was not the type of cyclone that we get in my area, and, secondly, perhaps the bureau had some reason for holding back information from the point of view of not wanting to panic people, which is always a very sensible outlook. However, by the same token, had more accurate warning been able to be given, it would have been appreciated by everyone.

Nevertheless, the situation was that the storm reached its height in my electorate at approximately 8.00 p.m., and it was at that time sea water came over the estuary and flooded almost all of the eastern section of Bunbury and part of the Rathmines area. Over the years that area has been subject to flooding, but the floods in the past have always been fresh water from the river system. In this case, of course, the damage was much more devastating because sea water was involved and the flooding occurred so quickly with little or no warning; in a very short period of time the area went from being quite dry to three feet, four feet, and in some cases five feet under sea water.

The immediate problem after the entry of the water, was to get it out again, and some very hasty decisions were taken by the Public Works Department engineers and others to enable this to be done. At this time, the State Emergency Service, in conjunction with Radio 6TZ-CI-NA got together along with the Bunbury Town Council, the office of the Regional Administrator, and all other instrumentalities in the town which were able to do so, in an endeavour to provide assistance and relief to those people who were affected.

At that time the damage to Bunbury was not only flood damage; wind damage was also considerable, and in the Bunbury hinterland region damage was caused by wind and fire. So we had what could only be described as a most unique situation in which we had flood damage, fire damage and wind damage all occurring at the same time. I do not know of any other instance of damage being caused by those three factors simultaneously.

The people, industries, and properties that were subjected to this tragedy were most diversified, because within the region of Bunbury we find industry, agriculture, mining, forestry, and other activities; some in small towns, and others in large towns. The diversity of the situation was unequalled, possibly in the history of Australia.

The State Emergency Service and Radio 6TZ-CI-NA were able quickly to co-ordinate a team of people who provided trucks and labour and helped to find accommodation for those affected. People were able to be shifted into hospitals and other places in order to ensure their safety and comfort for that night.

I can only say in simple terms how appreciative are those struck by the tragedy, and also their friends and families, for the work done by the many people who rallied to the occasion.

I would like to refer to some criticism which has been levelled at the way in which the situation was handled. I say to the critics that, firstly, I do not think they were at all involved in the problem; apparently they were not, otherwise they would have known better. Secondly, I believe the people involved were placed in a very difficult situation. Firstly, they had not experienced this type of tragedy previously; irrespective of how well trained they may have been in all aspects of emergency services it is fair to say that almost all those involved would not have experienced a similar situation previously. Also, communications were completely knocked out only moments before the height of the storm, and this in itself created problems. Had it not been for the CB radio club and its enthusiasts, the situation would have been much worse. The CB radio club quickly organised and co-ordinated work being carried out in the area.

After the electricity failed, the radio station quickly came back on the air, and it was decided to shift the Carey Park headquarters of the State Emergency Service to the radio station, to allow for better communications and closer co-ordination of all bodies concerned. This was done, and it was done very quickly and sensibly; certainly the task of the service was accomplished most successfully.

During the night some 700 calls were handled by the emergency programme service, and all those calls were monitored and handled by the various bodies and organisations involved. We had Government bodies working within the area—including, of course, the State Energy Commission—all endeavouring to restore services. Bear in mind that the total power supply system in the south-west was knocked out by the storm,

and the devastation of the power lines was something we had never envisaged or experienced previously. Therefore, we owe a great debt to the men of the State Energy Commission, despite the fact that criticism was levelled that it was some days before various people had their electricity restored. I believe they were fortunate it did not take longer to restore power.

Mr Blaikie: I believe that due credit should be afforded to the member for Bunbury for the sterling work that he did for the Bunbury community. The SEC staff were subject, quite wrongly, to criticism by uninformed people. They should be commended for their work.

Mr SIBSON: Referring to that interjection, the criticism came mostly from people who were not affected by the disaster, and I suggest that perhaps they did not take a very great interest in the disaster and probably assumed that because they were okay, everyone else was, too.

The Public Works Department was faced with a very real problem in respect of the flooding, because it could not obtain electricity to operate the pumps. Anyone who is familiar with the situation in Bunbury, and particularly the low-lying area to the east of the town, would know it is absolutely essential to have electricity to operate pumps to shift the water. Therefore, the Public Works Department was faced with all sorts of problems during the night, and by 8.00 a.m. a health problem was looming. The men concerned are to be commended for the way in which they quickly brought in auxiliary equipment and found ways and means of overcoming the problem.

The State Housing Commission came to the party to a lesser extent and made arrangements to house as many people as it could. Also, on the matter of housing, some 600 beds were made available by private people through the radio station hookup. This proved one point: in future disasters of this nature, certainly the best way to handle the accommodation of homeless people is to put them into private homes. This has two advantages: Firstly, beds are made available readily and quickly; and, secondly, once families which have made beds available take in the displaced people, they accept responsibility for looking after them in the short term, which is most important. Therefore, that is one lesson to be learnt from the disaster. It is a far better situation than having to set up many beds in a public hall.

Arrangements had been made to bed people in the local Army hall, but whilst this was being organised the wind took away three-quarters of the roof.

I would like also to mention the Social Security Department and the Department for Community Welfare. I commend the personnel of those departments for the expertise with which they tackled the disaster. Officers worked throughout the night and throughout ensuing days to ensure everything possible was done to relieve the agony of the people involved, and to restore everything to normal as quickly as possible.

Almost every voluntary group in the town was involved, and it is very difficult to name each of them individually because so many were concerned. Perhaps one of those that should be mentioned is the Red Cross, whose members' contribution was outstanding, as it always is; they worked tirelessly for many days to ensure everything that could be done for the victims was done. Other organisations such as the Bunbury Voluntary Community Group, and the Community Youth Support Scheme—which is a Government-sponsored scheme to assist young unemployed people—gave of their best during the disaster.

The other old stalwart is, of course, the Salvation Army which was out in full strength. On behalf of the people of my area, I thank that and all other organisations involved. As I said, it is not possible to list each one individually, and there are many people who should be named. However, it is not possible in the time available to me to refer to each of them.

Turning to the State Emergency Service, Mr Les D'vorak, the local officer in charge, is a man with vital experience from his years in the Army. He has had considerable training in the State Emergency Service, and is a man of very definite views and ideas. He was able to take control of the situation and combine his officers and all the volunteers into an army of people who provided the support and relief work which I believe is unequalled in respect of this sort of disaster in this part of the world.

I would like to make special mention of Radio 6TZ-CI-NA, and to thank its management and staff not only for the job they did but also for the way in which they put aside their normal functions and operations and handed over their stations totally to the emergency service at the discretion of those in charge. I wish to thank in particular the programme manager, Mr David Perkins, and Father Brian Morrison, who was appointed to assist him because he has had quite a deal of experience in this sort of work, particularly with radio. Those two people, along with the other staff and helpers, did a fantastic job.

Mr Blaikie: I understand that the member for Bunbury also did a very good job in the community and should be included in the complimentary remarks.

Mr SIBSON: I thank the member for Vasse for his comment. I feel anything I did was only complementary to that done by the others; and my contribution was very small in comparison with that of many other people. Bear in mind, too, that I was unfortunate—or perhaps fortunate—to be in Perth on the night of the storm.

Mr Nanovich interjected.

Mr SIBSON: Perhaps we could dispense with the praise of myself because it is terribly important that we record the fact that many other people were involved. The Bunbury Town Council, including its Mayor (Mr Pat Usher), the Town Clerk (Mr Warwick Carmody), councillors, and staff gained the respect and the gratitude of the people in the town because of the way they reacted to the disaster. The council staff worked during the night because the council had a problem similar to that of the Public Works Department with regard to flooding, the lack of power and pumping equipment, and associated problems. The staff indicated very early in the piece that they were prepared to do whatever had to be done without expecting anything to appear on the paysheet. We commend those people for the work they did.

The Office of Regional Administration under the direction of Mr Peter Beeson, who is the Regional Administrator in the south-west, and his offside, Mr Ken Fisher, along with their staff also did a fantastic job. It is worthy of mention at this time that it was amazing how all organisations and Government bodies worked together. During the crucial part of the disaster, which would have been from midday on Tuesday until about Friday evening, there was not one area of dissatisfaction or misunderstanding. It is an absolute credit to all those Government, professional, voluntary, and individual people and organisations that they worked so well. It is true that tempers were frayed at times, mainly because people were suffering from lack of sleep and stress, but at no time was there any suggestion or thought that everyone should not work; and they worked admirably.

I have already mentioned briefly the happenings of that night and the next morning and I should now like to indicate how we in Bunbury feel about the rest of the region, bearing in mind that it is a most diversified region which relies on Bunbury very heavily. It relies on Bunbury for its services from retail sales and service

industries, for banking, and for many other instrumentalities. Because of that income it provides a lot of employment. So, we were very distressed to hear of the loss in income in coming years for apple and potato growers and people involved in other industries such as milling, beef, and sheep; in fact practically every aspect of the rural industry. Whilst those people will be terribly disadvantaged by the immediate loss of homes, fencing, buildings, hay, stock, and pastures, in the long term they will also be affected by the loss of income because of the loss of fruit trees, stock, and other things. This in turn will be a direct disadvantage for Bunbury itself.

I wish now to mention the part that the Government played in this situation. I should like to place on record my thanks on behalf of the people of Bunbury and the south-west for the way in which the Government responded quickly. On the first day, the Wednesday, the Minister in charge came down to the south-west and did a preliminary survey over two days of the whole of the south-west, including Bunbury and Albany. We are very thankful to the Deputy Premier for his quick response in his capacity as the Minister responsible for the State Emergency Service. This enabled a quick assessment of the whole area to be made and that resulted the following day in the Premier coming down to Bunbury and Albany to set up centres where applications for relief could be received and money paid out immediately to give some relief to those people in greatest need.

The timing and the laying down of the criteria for the relief were an absolute master stroke and I am getting feed-back every day from the people in my electorate and throughout the region showing how thankful they are for that happening.

The Minister for Forests also came into the area to do an assessment on behalf of the Forests Department. She has already indicated the dreadful losses in forestry, not only for now but also for the future, because when we talk about forestry, particularly the pines which were so badly affected, we are talking about losses over a long period which are at this stage very difficult to estimate. We are thankful for her quick response in coming to the area.

We are also thankful to the Minister for Agriculture who did a highly commendable job by travelling through the whole of the rural area with his officers and coming back with about 40 assessments by the Friday afternoon. This allowed an assessment of the total situation to be made so that moves could be made to assist these people through various methods, such as

the Lord Mayor's appeal, the provision of fence posts, and other things which have been done by way of assistance.

I wish also to thank the Minister for Local Government who spent his weekend on an unofficial visit to the area. This was very much appreciated by local authorities and other bodies. He made it his business to visit the area during the weekend in an endeavour to gain an understanding of the problems with regard to his portfolio.

I should like to place on record my thanks on behalf of the people of Bunbury, the south-west, and the other areas involved for the way in which the Lord Mayor's appeal was set up. I spoke to Sir Ernest Lee-Steere on Saturday night and thanked him personally. He pointed out to me that the intention was to raise as much money as possible and to ensure it was distributed as easily and as quickly as possible so that the maximum amount of benefit could be derived from it.

I thank all the people involved, such as Channel 9, Channel 7, the various radio stations, the local authorities, and other organisations and individuals who have thrown everything into this appeal to raise money to assist these people. No matter how much money is raised or how much assistance is given it will only partially repay these people for the amount of loss they have sustained. For this reason I say that when we hear criticisms of what certain people receive we have to weigh that against the total losses because it is the total losses which will take time to assess fully. Whether the people affected be a householder in Bunbury, a fruit grower in Donnybrook, a milk producer in Coolup—which was one of the worst hit areas—or a timber worker at Manjimup, all those people who were dealt a severe blow by this disaster will find their losses beyond all the help they get. Although they are most appreciative of the help they are getting, they will still have a long way to go to bring themselves back fully to the point they were at before the disaster occurred.

I know that in saying these few words I shall miss certain events and omit to mention certain people who should have been included.

Mr Bryce: Including the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SIBSON: There is one, for instance. I presume that in their Address-in-Reply speeches members of the Opposition would have covered that area most admirably; and I say that with no disrespect. I thank the various members for their efforts. I shall not mention them individually although I know that the Deputy Leader

of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition visited the area. I thank them collectively for coming to the area and I know their efforts were very much appreciated by the people. No matter how widely I try to cover this matter I know there will be some areas and people I miss. However, that is one of the things one has to live with.

In the short time left to me I should like to mention one or two other matters concerning my area. One I wish to mention particularly concerns the Alwest-Alcoa projects which are envisaged for the south-west. There is no need to go into the details of the cost of these projects, the work force they will engender, and the industry and commerce which will be created as a result, and what all this would mean to the south-west. But the south-west is in dire need of industry to create job and career opportunities for the unemployed and to allow the region to grow and prosper.

The Government is very much aware of the environmental and other problems associated with this type of project. In recent times some of my colleagues, some members of the Opposition, and I have had the opportunity to look at these areas and to see at first hand what has been done in the past, what is being done now, and what is envisaged for the future so far as bauxite mining is concerned. I am quite certain that every aspect of environmental protection has either been assessed or is being assessed.

I have great confidence in the two companies involved—Alcoa and Alwest. I know their attitudes and approach to the problem are absolutely responsible. I know they realise that future generations depend on them, Government departments, and other instrumentalities to ensure that whatever mining is carried out, water, timber, and the various other aspects are given full protection. We should all work together in an endeavour to ensure that these things are done to make positively certain that the projects are allowed to proceed, because it is essential in this State, particularly in the south-west, to have these industries to alleviate unemployment.

We have an unemployment problem which is of concern, particularly to young people, and to people who have been phased out of other industries such as farming; and the types of jobs which will become available through these industries will give these people opportunities to gain employment.

We should not look at the problem as a means of creating an upset in the community, whether the industry is being handled correctly, or whether the right things are being done. It is very easy

to put fear into the minds of people. We should all work together to ensure that full environmental studies are carried out in a comprehensive and responsible way. Nothing should be put in the way of this industry's advancement. If we hinder the industry's advancement we will put this State back, particularly the south-west, to a position where it will take to beyond this century to recover. I leave this point by stressing the need for this industry to go ahead with all its priorities being attended to.

Over recent times there has been much consternation, unrest, bickering, and arguing about the various aspects of the live sheep industry. I believe this industry is here to stay, but unless all the parties involved in it accept their responsibilities and work together we will be faced with further problems. It is very easy to say that either one side or the other should receive special attention. I believe all sections of the industry—the farmers, meatworkers, processors, abattoir workers, shippers, agents, and the Government—must work together.

This is a total industry and it can survive only if each section of it is prepared to see the other's point of view. Some of the criticism made by certain sections of the industry indicate they are interested only in themselves. This is bad, particularly because their actions will benefit them only in the short term. I realise there are many real short-term advantages to be gained by many people in this industry. But my experience has always been that it is only the long term that really counts. It is not just a matter of raising sheep, sending them away, or killing them at an abattoir; all aspects of the industry must be able to work together. It is a total industry involving many people and much finance, particularly in the case of abattoirs.

If abattoirs are neglected and allowed to run down or are closed down the chances of getting the necessary finance and people interested in re-establishing them are very remote. I appeal to everyone involved in the industry to work together. Unless those involved either directly or indirectly work together and understand the ramifications of the problems the industry will face disastrous consequences.

The State cannot afford to let this happen. It would mean further unemployment and certainly the rural industries cannot afford the setbacks that may result from misunderstandings in this matter. The Government and all sections of the industry have a stake and unless everyone is prepared to accept this as a total industry where the responsibilities are shared the

industry will not be able to carry on as it has in the past. However, I believe there is no reason that it could not carry on as previously.

The next point I wish to raise is that of housing. The housing industry in my electorate and its surrounds has been fortunate during the downturn of recent years; we have had a reasonably buoyant industry. The building industry in the south-west, particularly in my electorate, has played a great part in the provision of housing for the people. As members are aware, it is not possible for the State Housing Commission, particularly with present-day costs and money shortages, to provide housing to meet the needs of all people. It does a commendable job providing housing for people who cannot afford their own homes or pay high rents.

In my electorate the gap has been filled by project builders who have provided housing on either a small or large scale. I commend the industry for the way that it has accepted responsibility in providing homes for people in my area. With due regard for costs the builders have endeavoured to keep prices down.

The Housing Industry Association has a very strong branch in the south-west which has recently set up a housing industry information centre in the State Housing Commission premises. This provides a service not only for people who want to build a home but also for those who desire to extend and improve their homes and require information. I commend the organisation for bringing that facility to the south-west and I believe it will help the people considerably.

The association has run a home-of-the-year contest for the last two years. There were 17 entries in the first year and 35 entries this year. The member for Vasse will be aware that builders from his area fared very well in the awards this year and I was fortunate in that I was asked to present the awards. This scheme has brought about a very healthy competition in the industry and has ensured that the best possible homes, not just the cheapest, are available for the best possible price. Again, this is a total industry involving financiers, suppliers, subcontractors, and so on.

The last matter I wish to raise is that of child rape. In recent times quite a number of my constituents have complained to me about the light penalties handed down in some cases. Having made investigations into the matter it appears to me that some penalties for child rape are indeed light. I have discussed the matter with the Attorney-General and I have ascertained that

in fact the laws are adequate in that they provide still for hanging or life imprisonment. It appears to me that people must become aware of this matter and should speak out and make the judiciary aware that they are not completely happy with some of the sentences handed down.

In almost every instance of child rape it would be fair to say it would be a one-sided matter; the child would be completely innocent. There may be some instance where this could prove to be untrue but in the big majority of cases the child would undoubtedly be an innocent party. That being the case, I believe there is a need for much higher penalties to ensure that this terrible crime is stamped out or at least substantially reduced.

I have only a few minutes remaining and I am not sure how I shall use them.

Mr Bryce: Give it away.

Mr SIBSON: I conversed with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition before the House sat and he asked me how long I would speak for and I promised I would use my 45 minutes' allowance. In order that I do not catch the member unawares I shall use the full time.

In rounding off my remarks I would like to say a few words about next year. As members would know, 1979 is our celebration year and more particularly for Bunbury residents it is the year Bunbury becomes a city. We have assurances from the Minister for Local Government that we will meet the criteria to achieve city status and so we look forward to 1979 because it will be the State's 150th anniversary and the year Bunbury is declared a city. Bunbury will be the first city in the south-west and perhaps the only city outside the metropolitan area. Discussions have been held with the Government in an endeavour to make 1979 a very great year for the town.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.43 p.m.]: In my maiden speech to this Parliament in December, 1971, I expressed a great deal of concern about the lack of democracy applying to the Western Australian Parliament and in particular to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr Bertram: It is even worse now.

Mr BRYCE: Little did I realise then that in 1978—

A Government member interjected.

Mr Bertram: At least they get votes.

Mr BRYCE: —I would be expressing even more serious concern with trends in our democratic system which have appeared on the horizon

in a very real way during the last couple of years. I think it is a very fair and reasonable observation to say that in Western Australia we as a people appear to have been seduced by the comforts and attractions of material affluence to a point where our appetite for these things has almost blinded us to some of the threats which have appeared to our very cherished liberties and other forms of freedom. I regret that Australians—and Western Australians are no exception—seem to have taken many of their freedoms and cherished forms of liberty for granted.

Maybe it is because none of us in this country have had to struggle particularly hard for these cherished freedoms; and I include all the members of this Chamber who participated in the Second World War. A little later in my comments I have a few pointed remarks to put to some members opposite who went away and represented this country in the war, because since the Second World War in this country it has been fairly customary to look at the extreme left or the ratbag right which threatens the security of our system. I suggest to the House tonight that through the efforts of the ALP and the great many decent, honest, and hard-working trade unionists in this country, the appeal of the extreme left in Australia has been just about totally destroyed.

Mr O'Connor: You have to be kidding.

Mr BRYCE: I am not and, for the benefit of the Minister for Works, I intend to illustrate my point. If we did not have an ALP in Australia and a very firmly established and entrenched trade union system, we could expect to see a very vital, vigorous Communist Party in Australia today. The facts of life are that the Communist Party is almost totally discredited and devoid of support. It has no effect whatever on the political scene and I am very proud to say it is the ALP which has played the principal role in this political process.

It is not an original observation of mine in 1978. The great grandfather of the communist philosophy over a century ago (Karl Marx) indicated that the single greatest threat to the communist movement was the rise of the social democratic force in a democratic system. He hit the nail on the head when he said—

Mr Herzfeld: What are you trying to hide?

Mr BRYCE: If the member for Mundaring will bide his time a little I intend to ask him a few pointed questions about what the Liberal Party has to hide in New South Wales with the formation of para-military forces in the Liberal Party.

Mr O'Connor: That has been disputed by the people accused.

Mr BRYCE: It is clearly established in the minds of the philosophers who drafted the communist ideology that they knew that the very best opportunity for them to thrive and to prosper in a political sense and in their appeal to the community was for the nineteenth century British, German, and French industrial systems to expand throughout the world on the basis that it was thriving in the nineteenth century without the existence of a political force which was committed to a firm redistribution of opportunity in those communities.

It has been because of parties such as the British Labour Party, the Scandinavian Labour Party, the Dutch Labour Party, the West German Labour Party, the Australian Labor Party, the New Zealand Labour Party, and the Labour Parties in the other countries of the world, that this redistribution mechanism has considerably reduced the gap between the haves and the have-nots. The reason that in every one of those countries the Communist Parties are bereft of support and following is that the Labour Parties have been vital and most effective in bringing about a very decent and reasonable form of redistribution of wealth and income and, with it, opportunity. We have only to look at countries such as Italy and France to realise that today without Labour Parties they have some of the most powerful communist organisations inside the western bloc.

Mr O'Connor: But haven't they infiltrated your party?

Mr BRYCE: This sort of inane nonsense from the Minister for Works is absolute tripe. He and some of his colleagues have sat in this Chamber and other Parliamentary Chambers in the country for decades making inane and ridiculous suggestions like this in an attempt to discredit the ALP. Little does he know that the mountain of wealth on which he sits would be under threat today if it were not for the efforts of the ALP because we have done more than any other political party to ensure that the extreme left-wing elements in this country have been discredited. Very few people outside this Chamber take any notice—

Mr O'Neil: I think he has convinced himself.

Mr BRYCE: —of the ranting and raving and smearing by the members of the Liberal and Country Parties who suggest that the ALP has been infiltrated by the Communist Party. All the smearing on this particular theme has absolutely no effect.

Very effective Labor Governments, at both State and national levels, and a very effective trade union movement have brought about this realistic form of redistribution which has meant that in this country we do not have a society based on tremendous inequality and differences in opportunity.

Mr Laurance: These advances have been gained in most cases where the conservative parties have been in power for a longer time than the Labor Party.

Mr BRYCE: May I point out for the edification of the member for Gascoyne that most of the principal advances which have been made were made in States such as Queensland and New South Wales where there were State Labor Governments for many years, together with Tasmania and of course this State, where the Labor Party governed for 30 of the last 70 years; and we are very proud of it.

It is in keeping with this general philosophical point to demonstrate that the Liberal Party at a national level was retained in office in 1961 because some of the hard-line Bolsheviks in the seat of Moreton in Queensland preferred to give their preferences to the Liberal Party rather than their real enemy. The hard-line Bolsheviks know that the greatest single threat to their cause is a social democratic party. The member for Moreton was re-elected to the national Parliament and saved the Menzies Government from defeat in 1961 because enough of the hard-line Bolsheviks in that city decided to give their preferences to a Liberal rather than to the Labor Party.

I would like to conclude this aspect by pointing out to members opposite that it is really the efforts of our party and the very many decent hard-working trade unionists who comprise the most effective anti-revolutionary noncommunist political force in this country and certainly in this State—

Mr Laurance: It is good to hear you have no problems and that all is rosy in the garden.

Mr BRYCE: It is actually.

Mr Young: You just have a couple of weeds.

Mr BRYCE: The interesting point about the vested interests of the establishment in this country to adequately protect it is that the establishment has had an enormously lopsided share of the resources. For the Liberal members of this Parliament to appeal to the people when they are on the hustings that the Liberal Party is the party which cares for people is really selling them a pup. They try their utmost to convince the people that the 15 per cent or so who

really had an identifiable vested interest in voting Liberal should be joined by 30 or 40 per cent who could be weaned across.

For the benefit of the House I must indicate that I am not complaining. It is political reality that the members opposite have this enormous political advantage. In terms of the struggle, let us analyse some of the things they rely upon to maintain their position.

First of all there is the Press. We all understand thoroughly and utterly and are advised never to criticise the Press in this Chamber for fear that the politician's worst dream might come true; that is, he may never see his name in print again. When in Opposition the Premier was, for a short time, on the banned list of *The West Australian*—we understand.

The West Australian, which is the principal daily newspaper in this State, has censored the political notes of the Leader of the Opposition. He has had them sent back with an indication that they were not acceptable and must be rewritten. We talk about freedom of speech, but the same newspaper refused to accept a paid advertisement from the ALP at election time, even though members of the party were standing there with \$1 200 and the copy. In this marvellous society of ours with so-called freedom of the Press, the editor exercised his prerogative and said, "That is not in keeping with the editorial policy of the paper. We are not prepared to run the ad."

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: There was nothing libellous about it. We would have been quite happy to change the text had it been libellous.

Mr O'Neil: You said it was not in accordance with the editorial policy of the paper.

Mr BRYCE: He said it was not acceptable to the paper. They were not prepared to accept it.

Mr O'Neil: Check *Hansard*. You said it was not in accordance with the editorial policy.

Mr BRYCE: I am saying that in this country we are losing our cherished freedoms. I think that probably the most recent political event in Western Australia and one which would cause most people involved in active politics to reflect on the unbelievable bias of *The West Australian* was the treatment it gave to the Premier's recent visit to Japan. We were told in headline articles that the Premier was thinking of going to Japan. A day or two later we were told that he had made up his mind to go to Japan. Then we heard he had bought his tickets and had gone to Japan. Then, when he was in Japan, every time he sat down at the conference table we were

told he was in Japan and had had certain discussions. Then we were told he was coming home from Japan; and finally, that he had arrived back from Japan. On each occasion there was a headline story of the event.

The interesting aspect was that on two separate occasions *The West Australian* scrubbed the Press release from this side of the House. We were not permitted to make any comment about his visit to Japan, and the dismal failure it had been at the expense of the taxpayers. Therefore it is no wonder, when the Liberal Party is accustomed to this sort of protection from *The West Australian*, that when the ABC runs a series of items and is prepared to interview members of Parliament from both sides of politics, the ABC is criticised and lambasted as a left-wing communist influenced organisation. I guess that when one becomes extreme enough in one's point of view, once someone begins to present a balanced point of view, then that balanced point of view is labelled as being unbalanced.

Mr Stephens: You say it does not show bias.

Mr BRYCE: I spent a great deal of time as a school teacher.

Mr Stephens. It should have been longer.

Mr BRYCE: Perhaps it should have been and then I might have had more effect on the younger generation. When I was a school teacher it was demonstrated how simple and how effective—

Mr Young: I don't think this is the best of arguments and was not the one on which you based your argument concerning free school books. Don't you think kids are smart enough to recognise bias? You advanced that argument.

Mr BRYCE: I did not.

Mr Young: I am sorry. I thought you did. Your Government certainly did.

Mr BRYCE: I have indicated that the Liberal Party, representing the establishment, must have the Press to keep it in this comfortable little cocoon.

A Government member: Rubbish!

Mr BRYCE: Secondly, the Constitution, drawn up by their forefathers, was designed clearly and deliberately to prevent the will of the people being reflected in the legislation which goes through this place. As everyone knows, we have a Legislative Council with unbridled power to destroy legislation from the other end. Sixty years after the House of Commons saw reason and common sense, we still have an archaic second Chamber which has unbridled power.

Perhaps we will send the member for Vasse on a trip overseas, if he has not already made one; perhaps we will send him to the House of Lords and he will find the House of Lords had its teeth pulled in 1911.

The third element the Liberals desperately need to maintain themselves in their position of power and high office is the rigged electoral boundaries. It is not only in Western Australia that this anomaly exists; Queensland is another example. It took the Dunstan Government nearly a decade in office to introduce into South Australia a fair and decent system of electing the representatives in both Houses of Parliament.

The fourth element is the question of wealth. We on this side of politics understand that whenever we shape up for an election we will be outspent by about \$6 for \$1. It needs all the wealth, all the rigged electoral laws, the nineteenth century Constitution drawn up by their own forefathers, and protection from the Press to maintain the position of the Liberals.

We are disturbed to find when we read the newspaper that in addition to those four elements the Liberal Party in this country wants to add a para-military wing to its organisation.

Mr Young: It does not do you any credit.

Mr BRYCE: Let us have a look at today's newspaper. I intend to commit a number of paragraphs to the record. The news item from Sydney bears the headline "New Lib. claims on ultra-right".

Mr O'Connor: You have not seen the Sydney paper.

Mr BRYCE: This is *The West Australian*, the Liberal Party's newspaper.

Mr Young: You say we should not believe what is in it.

Mr Laurance: Hoist with your own petard!

Mr BRYCE: We find this story in the Liberal Party's own newspaper, *The West Australian*—

New claims about the activities of ultra-right members of the NSW Liberal Party were made last night.

A senior Liberal MHR said that he believed that two former South Vietnamese colonels living in Sydney had been approached over the establishment of a para-military force.

Mr O'Connor: If you want to be fair, what the colonels said was quoted in this morning's Sydney paper. As usual, you are one day behind.

Mr BRYCE: I am not talking about the Vietnamese colonels. I am talking about a Liberal member of the Federal Parliament. The article continues—

The MHR said: "There is a group of people who want to form an organisation which has some para-military aspects in terms of discipline and possible use in time of civil disorder."

And last night Liberal informants told of a meeting of ultra-right Liberals attended by two former Vietnamese colonels now living in Sydney, Mr Vo Dai Ton and Mr Dinh Hung.

They said that the NSW State executive of the Liberal Party inquiring into allegations that ultra-rightists were seeking outright control of the party, would discuss a document produced at the meeting.

In the largest State of Australia concern is publicly expressed by Liberals that this kind of thing is happening inside the Liberal Party.

Mr Shalders: How can you balance that with the Premier's recent statement about the need for a special Commonwealth force in this State? You are talking gobbledygook.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Murray calls it gobbledygook. It is a statement by a Federal Liberal member of Parliament, expressing his concern.

Mr O'Connor: What about the State Labor member of Parliament's statements on the PLO; do you agree with them?

Mr BRYCE: No, and we in this Chamber certainly hope every decent Liberal will dissociate himself from this kind of rubbish and this serious deterioration in the political system in our country. If a group of Liberals are collecting money to form an organisation which has a para-military role—a private army based on wealth—we can imagine what a lot of fun the Minister for Labour and Industry would have had he his own para-military organisation which could affect the outcome of industrial disputes.

Mr Shalders: You are talking about a vigilante type group.

Mr BRYCE: We could imagine the Minister for Labour and Industry acting as "Jackboot Bill" if he had his own para-military organisation to be used in times of civil disorder. Further on the article in *The West Australian* says—

A welcome was given to two Vietnamese army officers—

I am sure this is disturbing to members opposite. Perhaps the member for Subiaco should be

appointed to check all the Vietnamese who are coming into the country.

Dr Dadour: What about the member for Fremantle?

Mr BRYCE: Perhaps the member for Fremantle will help him. The statement goes on to say all at the meeting had been invited to a blood-oath ceremony. I do not know whether that ceremony was intended to preserve the secrecy of the meeting, but the point is in Australia today the sting has been taken out of the lunatic left. The biggest single threat is the ratbag right.

Mr Blaike: Is Jack Marks and he supports your cause.

Mr BRYCE: I repudiate his ideas and I am proud to stand here and say so.

The biggest single threat to our security is the ratbag extreme right, and I want to see some of the members opposite stand up and disown these ratbags because they are the people who in the past—

Mr Herzfeld: Does the honourable member also repudiate the anti-Zionist activities of his colleague?

Mr BRYCE: If the member for Mundaring has the guts to do so, let him say that to the member for Fremantle outside the Chamber and take it up with him.

During the period this Government has been in office a string of events have occurred which have attacked some of our cherished freedoms. We had a great deal of debate on the fuel and energy Bill. Very few people in this country would have thought five years ago that we would have legislation in this State enabling Parliament to be dissolved during a crisis, enabling people to be arrested retrospectively, enabling people's homes to be invaded, and enabling people to be thrown into gaol without trial. Most people in this State would have thought those things impossible. We have seen an amendment to the Police Act stating that a group of more than three people can be classified as a demonstration.

We know similar legislation has been placed on the Statute book in Queensland. The Federal Leader of the Opposition told us here recently of a friend of his who has a family of eight children, and because of that law he is afraid to take his children window-shopping at night. He has to take them in relays because in the eyes of the law he would be committing an offence in view of the fact that a group of more than three people together can constitute a demonstration.

In addition, we have seen this Government bring in legislation to impose a form of political censorship on films. The Minister who administers that Act now has the power, without any qualification, to decide a film will not be shown in Western Australia on the basis of its political message, if he so rules.

A matter which should concern several members of this House is the revelation, following the events in South Australia recently, that the Special Branch of the Police Force in this State keeps files on members of Parliament.

Mr Stephens: Are you worried about that?

Mr BRYCE: Not in the slightest, but I suspect the member for Stirling would be. Bearing in mind the political guru in the Police Force in South Australia—a sergeant of police—who was given the job of keeping a dossier on members of Parliament, we can imagine who is doing the job in Western Australia. On the other side of politics, I imagine there would be a file a mile long on the member for Subiaco because he has had the temerity to stand up and oppose the Premier. The file on the member for Stirling would differ from that on the member for Subiaco only in length. I express concern about you, Mr Speaker, in view of the way the Premier relentlessly pursued you because you had the courage to cast your vote in a certain way on a particular question, which displeased him. One can image a file of some significance on you, Sir. The member for Scarborough would probably rate a mention as well. Possibly all back-bench members of the Country Party will be mentioned in the files of the Special Branch.

Mr Blaikie: Would Jack Marks rate a file?

Mr BRYCE: I am certain he would, and perhaps there are even files on the member for Vasse and some of his friends associated with the League of Rights.

One of the most disturbing features is that the Premier has come out and insisted he has no objection whatsoever to the Commissioner of Police being beyond the control of Parliament. I, for one, would like to register a very serious difference of opinion, because in a democratic political system every departmental head, bar none, should be subject to the control of this Parliament. There has never been any suggestion that the heads of the Departments of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy should not be subject to the control of Parliament, and I can see absolutely no valid or justifiable reason in this day and age that the Commissioner of Police should not be subject to the control of the Parliament. We had

the situation in South Australia where the Commissioner of Police deliberately and knowingly misled his Minister and the elected Government of the day, and he was deservedly dismissed from his position.

Sir Charles Court: I cannot follow you.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier has just returned to the Chamber. Does he want to buy into the debate?

Sir Charles Court: I heard your last comment about the Commissioner of Police not being subject to the Parliament. That is news to me.

Mr BRYCE: He is not subject to the control of the Parliament and the parliamentary representative in the Cabinet, the Minister—if the Premier wants to split hairs.

Mr Clarko: To which political party did Dunstan belong at that time?

Mr BRYCE: We have already been through that drivel. The member for Karrinyup has belatedly arrived in the Chamber. Mr Dunstan may have been a member of the Communist Party. Every Liberal who sought to make a vote out of it at election time has trotted it out, and on each occasion the majority of the Labor Party in South Australia increased.

Mr Clarko: You always rubbish commos. You find them under your bed.

Mr BRYCE: It is the member for Karrinyup who finds them under his bed, and he seems to be quite comfortable. He is happy to turn his back on the para-military organisations appearing inside his own political party.

We on this side of Parliament want to see some reason. We want to see the preservation of the privileged freedoms and the rights of the people which have evolved over more than a century in this country. Whether the threat comes from the lunatic left or the ratbag extreme right, it ought to be condemned, and we are condemning it; but we are not very happy with the lack of response from members opposite, who seem to be hesitant to condemn this kind of move inside their own party.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr BRYCE: Prior to the tea suspension I expressed some of the concern which members of the Opposition feel for the erosion of, and the threat that is being posed to, a number of our fundamental liberties and forms of freedom which we are experiencing in Australia. At the same time an accompanying element has been an unprecedented amount of division and bitterness in our community. Without qualification I would lay a great deal of the responsibility for this

at the feet of the Minister for Labour and Industry. No man, no individual in the Government, has contributed more to the division and the disunity that is experienced currently in our community than the Minister for Labour and Industry. He, more than anybody else on the front bench of this Government, has made provocative statements; he has made insinuations designed to cause disruption and confrontation in so many different situations of industrial dispute, and we have finished up with a degree of dissatisfaction, a degree of disharmony, which is almost unprecedented. What Western Australia needs more than anything else at the present time is for every Western Australian—whether he be a Liberal or a Labor supporter—to put his shoulder to the wheel and—

Mr Spriggs: To have the right to carry on his work without interference.

Mr BRYCE: —to have the right to work.
Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: These people have the right to expect this Government to get off its backside and to provide employment opportunities for every Western Australian. Western Australians want the right to work; 35 000 of them are out of work. They deserve the right to work, and this Government went into office on the promise that it would provide the right to work.

Sir Charles Court: Your side won't let them work.

Mr BRYCE: The Government promised work for all. It promised that unemployment would be solved within six months of its going into office. The Premier promised that.

Sir Charles Court: When did he promise that?

Mr BRYCE: We have seen the number of unemployed grow from 7 000 to 35 000 during the four years that the Premier has been at the helm.

Sir Charles Court: Your people won't allow them to work.

Mr BRYCE: This Government has become the Government of ghost towns in mining areas, and it has become the Government of unemployment. The people want the right to work; they want the opportunity to exercise their right to work, and Opposition members are proud to speak on their behalf.

We know that 35 000 Western Australians have no right to work because this Government promised the jobs but it has failed to deliver the goods. The man in this Government who assumes the responsibility for employment is the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Sir Charles Court: Don't talk rot.

Mr BRYCE: More than anybody else on the Government front bench he has made provocative public statements. He has cast innuendos, he has scattered insinuations hand over fist, and his actions were designed deliberately to provoke people into industrial disputation. There can be absolutely no doubt in anyone's mind that this has been his role. The Minister for Labour and Industry is now commonly referred to in Parliament as "Stormtrooper Bill". Whenever the Government wants to use a ploy to deflect public attention from the economy which has almost ground to a halt, it uses "Stormtrooper Bill". Unemployment has increased more than fourfold, and what do we see in order to provide a distraction—the Government trots out "Stormtrooper Bill".

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I do not think calling members names does anything for this institution.

Mr BRYCE: I said it affectionately.

The SPEAKER: I do not regard it as affection. I ask the member for Ascot and all other members of the House to refrain from saying insulting things to one another. Attack the policies, attack the actions of the opposite side, but for goodness sake do not start attacking personalities.

Mr BRYCE: I accept the point you make, Sir, but let me say with all due respect to you, the Minister plays the role of a stormtrooper.

When we are involved in the consideration of important and serious matters, the Government decides to throw a spanner in the works. We see the Whip go around to the Minister and he is then used as a stormtrooper. We have seen him used to disrupt this Chamber. In this place he uses the same provocation, the same system of insinuation, that he uses publicly in industrial relations. It is designed deliberately for narrow and miserable political ends to provoke industrial disputation.

If the Government does not have the answer to the State's economic problems, let it come forward; let it be big enough to say so. The Government should not prey on industrial disputation; it should not hide behind this smoke-screen. The Government knows its economic policy is not working.

Mr Grayden: Did you give your statement to the Press? I understand you gave it before the tea suspension, is that so?

Sir Charles Court: Of course. The Press will publish anything you say over there.

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister for Labour and Industry has been privy to an abuse of information, let him come forward to say so.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: This probably demonstrates quite clearly what I was saying earlier tonight that the media in this place is run by the Liberal Party. The Minister himself has a very significant shareholding in *The West Australian*. It is no wonder nobody on this side of politics has the influence—

Sir Charles Court: Did not do him much good this morning!

Mr BRYCE: —that the Minister for Labour and Industry has in *The West Australian*.

Mr O'Connor: Have a look at the editorial this morning.

Mr BRYCE: Might I suggest that the editorial this morning was simply an indication of the serious influence that the Minister has. Any responsible editor would have called for his resignation, rather than issuing the mild rebuke that appeared this morning. If the Minister exercises that degree of influence he obviously has, tonight is a living example of it. Representatives of the media have leaked to the Minister information given to them on a privileged basis.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Point of Order

Mr GRAYDEN: On a point of order I ask that that reference be withdrawn. I have not spoken to any members of the Press. However, I happen to know that the member for Ascot gave the Press his speech at the tea suspension.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr BRYCE: The Minister's latest outburst advocating a system of industrial apartheid was the most classic blunder, the most classic misuse or abuse of power and responsibility by a Minister of the Crown, that we have seen in a long time. It took his own Premier only 24 hours to come out in the media and to repudiate his Minister publicly. The Minister's language was so extravagant and his points so overstated that even his own newspaper described it as a ridiculous overkill. I do not have sufficient time to elaborate further on that point. I can assume members opposite would not agree to an extension of time.

Sir Charles Court: We are waiting for the amendment you just passed up.

Mr BRYCE: I point out to the Minister that there is no need for him to write down the amendment as I will make certain he has a copy of it.

Amendment to Motion

I wish to move the following amendment—

That the following words be added to the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency that the actions and public statements of the Minister for Labour and Industry have:

- (a) threatened the continued operation of an orderly system of industrial relations in Western Australia;
- (b) encouraged confrontation instead of mediation and conciliation in industrial disputes; and
- (c) fostered division, disunity, disruption and bitterness in the community.

Furthermore, we regret to inform Your Excellency that the Minister's most recent intemperate and ill-considered statements advocating a system of "industrial apartheid" in Western Australia have had to be publicly repudiated by the Premier.

Therefore, in the interests of:

- (1) maintaining an orderly system of industrial relations in Western Australia,
- (2) restoring harmony in the community,
- (3) ending disruption in the community, and
- (4) assisting the State's economic recovery,

we respectfully advise Your Excellency that in the opinion of the House the commission of the Minister for Labour and Industry should be withdrawn.

We mean every single word of the amendment. Division and bitterness have been sponsored deliberately in this community by the Minister for Labour and Industry with these wild assertions and the miserable insinuations that he makes publicly. They are designed deliberately to provoke people, particularly the opposing parties in industrial situations. While this situation continues, there is no hope that this State's economic recovery will ever occur. We are poised on the brink of great development on the North-West Shelf. There is absolutely no way in this wide world that that project will get off the ground

while this Minister is in charge of the portfolio of Labour and Industry and while he is behaving as an agent provocateur. If he continues to provoke people, Western Australia's economic recovery simply will not happen.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [7.43 p.m.]: I second the amendment, and I am very happy to do so.

Mr Coyne: You don't look like it!

Mr HARMAN: I regard this as one of the most serious amendments we have moved to the Address-in-Reply during this current session of Parliament. One must look very seriously at the remarks made by the Minister for Labour and Industry in recent days. I think his remarks typify the real stupidity of this Government, and those remarks are echoed through the Minister and they must impinge upon the Premier of Western Australia because although he repudiated the Minister, he is inclined to give him support for those particular remarks.

Before I refer to the particular comments of the Minister, I want to refer to some of his previous statements. All of us here will remember some time ago that the Minister wanted an extension of the visa of an American dietitian so that she could accept work here. We must bear in mind that this woman came to Western Australia under a visa to stay for three months only. When the case was presented to the Minister he suggested this woman should be allowed to stay in Western Australia and so deprive a Western Australian of a particular position at the Royal Perth Hospital.

Mr Grayden: Absolute nonsense! They could not even fill the position.

Mr HARMAN: He went even further, and took the matter to the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration. As Minister for Immigration in this State he well knows that one of the cardinal points of our immigration policy is that no person is allowed to stay in Australia when that person comes to Australia on a visa.

Mr Grayden: Absolute rubbish! We are making representations weekly on that basis.

Mr HARMAN: They must go through the screening processes undertaken by all other prospective immigrants in order to be approved for permanent residence in Australia. However, on that occasion, the Minister wanted to flaunt all the previous decisions, and he endeavoured to

convince the Commonwealth Government along those lines. Of course, it came to nought; it did not happen and the woman had to go.

I want to refer to another occasion when the Minister for Labour and Industry has been accused by the Opposition of making all sorts of statements.

Mr Laurance: That is a pretty trivial sort of matter.

Mr HARMAN: The member for Gascoyne might be interested in this one. He may recall an occasion when the Minister for Labour and Industry advocated a system of introducing Kanaka labour into the plantations around Carnarvon. He wanted to bring in people and have them employed on the plantations as indentured labour. This was in the electorate of the member for Gascoyne. He wanted them to be chained to those plantations and not receive any of the wages paid under the Australian wages system.

Mr Laurance: That is really twisting the story.

Mr HARMAN: The Minister for Labour and Industry even took the matter to the Commonwealth, but he was not successful because that was not the sort of thing which was going to happen in Australia. No-one was prepared to see people brought to this country, chained to an industry and paid a much lower wage than the Australian standard.

Mr Laurance: You do not understand the position; they are not paid a wage; they are share farmers.

Mr HARMAN: There again, as Minister for Immigration, he knew Australia's immigration policy. He knew it was based on bringing to this country people who were able to integrate successfully into the Australian way of life. At the same time, however, he was advocating we should go back to the Kanaka system of the 1890s and bring people to the plantations in Carnarvon, chain them to an industry and make them work for a pittance. Of course, he received no support for that proposal because all of us in this House, including Government back-benchers, knew it was never a possibility. I think he was laughed out of the meeting of Ministers for Immigration when he put forward that proposition.

I wish to refer to another statement the Minister made in recent years. When the Minister heard that some States of the United States of America had passed legislation dealing with the right to work, he said "This is what we will do in Western Australia. We will legislate so that people have a right to work."

Where is that legislation? The Minister's statement was made something like three years ago, but we have not seen it. The Minister should well know that any attempt to import United States industrial relations to Australia ignores the whole history of the trade union movement in Australia; in particular, it ignores the dislike and hostility shown by the Australian workers to scab labour.

That little episode by the Minister for Labour and Industry did not last very long. We now move to the period November-December, 1976, in which the Minister said, "I am going to bring in some legislation which will cure the industrial problems of Western Australia. This legislation will solve all our problems." I was quite concerned at the time; I wondered what the legislation was going to be, as I think every other person in this Chamber wondered.

All we found out from the Minister was that he intended to introduce legislation to allow people to opt out of union membership. That was all the big fuss and to-do was about. At that time, the Opposition went along with the proposal because we did not and still do not believe there is a need for compulsory preference clauses in awards.

Mr Tonkin: They were already in the awards at the time.

Mr HARMAN: It is the unions' job to sell themselves and make sure the workers join the unions. The strange thing about it was that the Minister for Labour and Industry claimed that piece of legislation was going to solve all our industrial problems. It has not done that; all it has achieved is that in some of the weaker unions in the white-collar industry, some workers have opted not to join unions. The legislation has not done anything the Minister suggested it would do. So, that was fairly well par for the course in the years leading up to the 1977 election.

The Minister was not content with that because within weeks of the election in 1977 he raced to the Press and made a statement about the industrial situation in Western Australia. The following statement was made on the 28th February, 1977—

The Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr Grayden, yesterday predicted a new wave of industrial trouble in the wake of the State election.

Left-wing unions had adopted a relatively low-key attitude in the weeks before the election so that they would not adversely affect the Labor Party's chances, he said.

But this restraint no longer applied.

Unless moderate and responsible forces in the unions asserted themselves more in the months ahead WA could expect a new wave of industrial trouble.

Picture the scene: We had had no industrial trouble during the months leading up to the election in the early part of 1977. That concerned the Minister. So, he had to do something to provoke some sort of industrial reaction. What did the Minister do? He hopped into the Press and said, "As the Liberal Party has won, there will be a reaction from the left-wing Labor unions." There had been no suggestion of any sort of industrial action, but he wanted to make sure it was going to be promoted. The statement of the 28th February, 1977, continued as follows—

"There is no industrial trouble in WA that cannot be resolved in a commonsense way under existing arbitration legislation," he said.

I want members to note those words in the light of what I intend to say later. The statement continues—

"All that is required is goodwill on the part of those concerned and a genuine wish to resolve the dispute in a rational way.

"The sooner that everyone, particularly union members as distinct from officials, realise this the better for all.

"In the common good, moderate elements in trade unions should now play a much more leading role when industrial disputes arise.

We do not have any criticism of that, because that is the way we believe industrial problems in this State should be solved.

On Monday morning I picked up *The West Australian* at my home and read the headlines; I became a bit apprehensive. Then I started to read on and after a while, I was almost beside myself. I did not know whether I was reading *The West Australian* or some comic book, because here we had the Minister for Labour and Industry promoting some plan which would be so costly to introduce it was quite stupid.

What the Minister was saying was that we need a parallel system, so that we can have a port which is a union port and another port which is a "no-union" port, to use the Minister's own words. He even suggested that a port could be built at Dongara. I do not know what sort of reaction the Premier had when he read that! I suppose he was wondering where he was going to get the loan funds to build a port at Dongara. We discovered tonight from the Minister for Works that no investigations have been carried

out on the feasibility of constructing a port at Dongara and in fact the department is not even thinking about such a move. But here was the Minister advocating that the Government should build a port at Dongara so that it could be used by non-union labour.

If members follow that through to its logical conclusion they will see we would need to develop a transport system so that our exports could be channelled to this port at Dongara, so that non-union labour could be used. Non-union labour could be used to construct new railway lines to service the new port.

If members think that is stupid, have a look at the next proposal put forward by the Minister. He wants to have another power house built so that non-union labour could be employed in the provision of power. He also wants another hospital or two constructed so that non-union labour could be used there.

Mr Davies: Could the consumers choose where they purchased their power?

Mr HARMAN: The whole idea is just too stupid for words. That is why the Opposition wants to reveal to the people of Australia the absolute stupidity of the plan put forward by the Minister for Labour and Industry. It has not been proposed by a little child in the street; it has been put forward by a responsible Minister of the Government. He has advocated the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars to duplicate the existing system in Western Australia so that we could have separate power houses, transport systems, ports, hospitals, etc., one for union people and the other for non-union people. To use the Minister's own expression, it is just too ridiculous in the extreme.

It is no wonder that when the Premier found out about this proposal, his mind boggled and he wondered what the hell was going on with his Minister for Labour and Industry. Of course, one must say the Premier has some brains and sense and he immediately repudiated his Minister and dumped him. The Premier was not the only person to dump the proposal put forward by the Minister for Labour and Industry; the Confederation of Western Australian Industry also dumped it, and dumped the Minister. The confederation said, "It is just not a plan at all" and the Premier said, "There is no plan afoot."

The Trades and Labor Council, of course, was quite outraged when it heard about the proposal and appeared in the Press describing it as an "extravagant statement made by the Minister".

On top of that, I would think every Liberal and Country Party member in this House would also be outraged by the Minister's proposition. In fact, the Minister attempted to compromise every member in this House. The following statement appears in *The West Australian* of Monday, the 17th April—

"We could have non-union ports, a non-union transport system and entire non-union industries to safeguard workers' rights to work," he said.

They are all the things I have mentioned; the Minister was proposing a parallel system, but he did not say where the money was coming from. The newspaper report continued—

"There would be absolutely—
I should like members to mark the word "absolutely". The report continues—

—no trouble in getting such legislation passed through Parliament.

So, not only did the Minister for Labour and Industry put up an idiotic, stupid plan but he also compromised every person on the other side of this House—I would expect them to have greater sense, brains and appreciation of this problem than the Minister—by saying, "I will have absolutely no trouble in getting this through Parliament."

I have not heard any member on the other side of the House object to that statement by the Minister so one would assume they are all led by the nose by the Minister for Labour and Industry and that they all accept this proposition—this stupid and idiotic proposition—which has been put forward by the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Further on in the article to which I have referred which appears in *The West Australian* the following comments appeared—

"We can adopt the parallel non-union system or, alternatively, we can outlaw compulsory unionism in new legislation.

"The parallel system of apartheid is not a long way off.

So I do not know what was in the lunar orbit at that time on Sunday. I will have to check on that. However, one would have to assume that the Minister, as was said by the Confederation of Western Australian Industry last evening, was under some strain which occasioned him to make these sorts of idiotic statements. It may well be that he was under some strain, but he ought to have the decency now, having reflected upon

the silly statements he made, to make an admission that this is just not on at all. This is not a proposition which one could use to deal with industrial relations in Western Australia.

Mr Grayden: Did you hand your speech to the Press also?

Mr HARMAN: The Minister intends to carry on with this particular plan. He intends to argue it. He even suggested tonight during question time that it is as near or as far away depending on what Australian industry does.

Mr Grayden: Did you hand your speech in to the Press also? There are no reporters from *The West Australian* in the gallery.

Mr HARMAN: I am talking to the members of this House.

Mr Grayden: He handed his speech in before tea and then came along and moved the dissent after tea.

Mr HARMAN: The words of the Minister do not worry me. He should be pleased there is no representative from the newspapers and the media in the gallery.

Mr Grayden: Because they already have the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What sort of Press gallery is that?

Mr HARMAN: The Minister ought to be sorry he even had the audacity to make such silly, stupid, idiotic statements.

Mr Davies: Fancy dealing with people who break a confidence. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr Grayden: You know very well that is not so.

Mr Davies: That is exactly what the Premier would say, too.

Mr Grayden: That is a straight untruth and I would expect it from you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grayden: You make that statement outside and see what happens. You will get a libel suit slapped on you so quickly it will not matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr HARMAN: I have been trying to point out to the House tonight how stupid and senseless this plan put forward by the Minister is; but even if in his wildest dreams he was able to get members on the other side of the House—his supporters—to accept some sort of legislation which would provide for all of these facilities, and given that he had a fairy godmother who was able to provide millions and millions of dollars to build these new ports, to build these new power stations, and to

build these new hospitals where all the non-union labour would be employed, given all that, Mr Speaker, in one stroke the whole plan could be rendered void because all that would need to happen would be for the unions to adopt Federal awards. The Federal awards would have greater power than the State awards. The Federal awards would have precedence and would have superiority over the State legislation.

Mr Tonkin: Precisely.

Mr HARMAN: So the whole plan is nothing other than a senseless, idiotic dream and it has been promoted by a responsible Minister of the Government. Not only has it been promoted, but it has been supported also by the Premier. Where is this Parliament going? Where is this Government in Western Australia going when we have forced on us by a responsible Cabinet Minister a plan which has no possibility of achievement? So, Sir, you ask yourself the question, "Why is this sort of tactic being adopted by the Government?" and, Sir, you say to yourself, "The Minister has had a lapse in his concentration and he was caught unawares"—but he has not indicated that; he is still prepared to defend himself—but you must then say, Sir, "What about the Premier?" At least the Premier said, "There is no such plan"; but he indicated tonight during question time that he agrees with all the statements made by the Minister. I think the Premier is trying to have a little bit each way. I do not blame him for being loyal to his Minister and supporting him; but it reflects upon the whole proposal.

I believe the Premier ought to do the right thing; he should reprimand his Minister for the attitude he has adopted. That would be the most decent action the Premier could take and we are advocating that. However, he obviously does not intend to do that so we are asking that the Governor be advised in order that he can do something about the commission of the Minister for Labour and Industry as a responsible Minister of this particular Government.

The events of the last two weeks have indicated that the Government, after having a fairly trouble-free period of time as far as industrial strife in Western Australia is concerned, decided it was about time it exerted some sort of influence to make sure the people of Western Australia continue to be reinforced in the opinion that the trade union movement is a terrible thing. The Government wanted to make sure this attitude, which it has been conditioning the people to believe for the past three or four years, was continued.

The Government picked upon this particular strike and dispute over live sheep as a means by which it could reinforce once again the conditioning which has been in operation for some time—the conditioning to get the people of Western Australia to abhor unions and to make a decision for themselves that there is something wrong with the trade union movement. The Government is very conscious of it and in the last few weeks it has picked this particular issue to reinforce that attitude.

If one really wants to examine all of the issues in the last strike, one will find that the Government comes out of it in a manner which indicates a lack of action, because it allowed the dispute to widen and to get worse without trying to get the parties together. The Minister for Agriculture must be culpable, as is the Minister for Labour and Industry, because even the Minister for Labour and Industry admitted he knew the farmers were going to take direct action. However, the Government allowed this situation to get to the stage where scab labour was used on the wharves to load those particular ships. The Government provoked the situation by bringing in a regulation that pickets could be arrested on the wharf and it now finds itself in a dilemma because that is the only issue which is holding up settlement of this dispute.

Government members: Cut it out!

Sir Charles Court: It is not.

Mr HARMAN: No-one denies it; that is the only issue left when trying to find a settlement to this dispute. We on this side of the House have argued for a long time that the best way to settle industrial disputes is to make sure the parties get together and talk. In 1973 we tried to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act in Western Australia in order that the parties could get together and talk, so that they would not have a walk-up start to the Industrial Commission.

Mr Grayden: Why did not the TLC disputes committee get involved in the live sheep dispute?

Mr HARMAN: For obvious reasons. The TLC had this problem on its hands with different unions being involved.

Mr Grayden: Yesterday it took over the dispute completely. Why did it not do so earlier?

Mr HARMAN: The TLC took over the dispute last week.

Mr Grayden: There is a statement to that effect in the newspaper this morning.

Mr HARMAN: The TLC took over the dispute last week.

Mr Grayden: It may have, but it did not do anything about it.

Mr HARMAN: Representatives of the TLC went to see the Premier last Friday. Did the Minister not know about it? Perhaps they became frightened because the Premier said, "Go and see the Minister for Labour and Industry."

We on this side of the House have been saying for a long time that the best way to solve industrial disputes is to make sure the parties talk to one another. One of the problems with the compulsory arbitration system we have in Western Australia is the parties can adopt very extravagant stances on whatever issue it may be, because they know they do not have to settle the problem themselves. The problem will be settled by a third person, the arbitrator. We have been advocating for some years that the law should be changed so that there is no walk-up start to the Industrial Commission by the employers and that the employers and the unions must get together and negotiate, whatever the issue may be, in a spirit of goodwill and with some idea of trying to solve the problem.

Despite all of that the Government has elected to ignore that proposition and has tried to belittle trade unions and confront them rather than consult with them on every occasion.

I believe I have pointed out tonight the statements made by the Minister are so silly and so idiotic they are surely not worthy of much more debate in this House; but obviously members have a right to point out to the Government and to the public the extremeness and the silliness that this Minister portrays. I am, Sir, therefore very happy to support the amendment.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [8.12 p.m.]: I rise to oppose this motion with all the vehemence I know, because it is a repugnant motion. It is quite repugnant to the facts and it is quite repugnant to the general spirit of government and the conduct of this House. I do not know how the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would have the gall to talk about people wanting to have the right to work when he belongs to a party and he personally is the great link with the left-wing of the trade union movement—

Mr Bryce: Rubbish!

Mr Pearce: Sing a hymn.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —which has done everything it can to try to destroy the right of people to work, and claims publicly that the right to strike is paramount over all other things.

Mr Tonkin: That is not true. We have not said that at all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is basic. Whenever members opposite open their mouths it is always on the basis of the right to strike being pre-eminent in the rights of the workers.

Mr Tonkin: Do you believe in the right to strike?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No.

Mr Tonkin: You do not believe in the right to strike?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I believe in the right to work. When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition lauded the right to work he brought the guffaws, the cheers, and the jeers from this side of the House that he deserved.

Mr Bryce: Thirty-five thousand people want the right to work and you have denied them the chance. Your Government has presided over unprecedented unemployment. There are 35 000 people who have not got the right to work.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition belongs to a party that just loves to have unemployment to talk about. He belongs—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is quite unacceptable that three or four people are interjecting at the one time. I believe the Premier has the right to be heard as has any other member and any member who is addressing the House and making remarks to the Chair will receive the protection of the Chair.

Mr Tonkin: Try to tell the truth about the Australian Labor Party.

Withdrawal of Remarks

Sir CHARLES COURT: I ask that those words uttered by the member for Morley be withdrawn when he says, "Try to tell the truth."

The SPEAKER: I believe the words used by the member for Morley to be unparliamentary and there have been one or two other comments of which I was very close to asking for withdrawal a while ago. I ask the member for Morley to withdraw those words.

Mr TONKIN: The words you wish me to withdraw are that the truth be spoken in this place; is that right?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is not what the member said.

The SPEAKER: The implication was that the Premier was not telling the truth. I believe the words to be unparliamentary and I ask the member for Morley to withdraw them.

Mr TONKIN: Am I being asked to withdraw an implication or the words? I accept I should withdraw words that are unparliamentary but if you, Sir, state you believe I implied things which were not implied I find it very difficult to withdraw an implication.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Morley to withdraw those words to which the Premier has taken exception.

Mr TONKIN: I withdraw those words.

Mr Clarko: It took a long time.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

A member: The Chifley Labor Government introduced—

Mr Tonkin: With very good reason.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. There has just been an example of two members, neither of whom has the call to address the Chair, involving themselves in an argument across the Chamber. That practice has developed here in recent times and it is one that does not do this House any good at all. I would ask members to desist from such actions. The Premier!

Sir CHARLES COURT: If I might go back to the crux of all this. It arose when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had the gall and the hypocrisy to claim—

Several members interjected.

Mr Pearce: Those are unparliamentary words.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it certainly is unparliamentary for the Premier to say that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had the gall and the hypocrisy to make certain claims. Those words have been ruled to be unparliamentary in Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*. Therefore the words should be withdrawn. Oh, the buffoons can laugh and drown out my point of order!

The SPEAKER: There is an example of a member getting up and asking for the withdrawal of words which, in my view, are fairly moderate, and then using an unparliamentary term. I cannot understand how we will make any progress at all while carrying on in this manner.

Mr TONKIN: Erskine May has ruled the word "hypocrisy" to be unparliamentary.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: My ruling is that none of the words to which reference has been made in the recent exchange are unparliamentary.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Sir CHARLES COURT: We know this is a tactic of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: Give the old fellow licence!

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is a tactic of the Opposition to distract the Government from trying to express the facts of this particular case.

Mr Tonkin: We like the truth; we respect the truth.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I come back to the point where I started: I emphasise the right of people to work. We on this side believe in the right to work.

Mr Bryce: Then give the 35 000 unemployed the right to work.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I make the point that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was completely hypocritical in claiming that his side wanted people to have the right to work; his side has done more, in conjunction with the extreme left-wing of the trade union movement, to destroy the right to work and uphold the right to strike as being paramount.

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I take exception to the fact that members on this side are being described as belonging to the extreme left-wing of the trade union movement. That is quite untrue, and it is unparliamentary to impute it to us. We have the situation in Queensland where Bjelke-Petersen is calling the Liberals in that State communists, and I reject the statement by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! When a comment is made about a particular individual, which is offensive, then I will call for the withdrawal of the words used. The words used by the Premier are used in a general form, and similar words have been used in general terms by members from both sides of the House. I do not believe a withdrawal is necessary.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition then went on to make great play of the fact that he laid at the door of the Minister for Labour and Industry the blame, or most of the blame, for divisions in our community. I say quite frankly to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and to all who sit with him, that divisions in this

country of ours—which nearly brought the economy to its knees and nearly destroyed many of the best ways of life we have—

Mr Bryce: It was you yourself.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —were brought about by none other than the Whitlam Government.

Mr Tonkin: You wanted this situation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This country had made a remarkably steady progress, and it had a high standing—a good name—throughout the world. Then we had the Whitlam era and it will take years to overcome that era, I believe, and return this country to the height it can go.

Mr Bryce: What a miserable performance.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had the hide to talk about the great North-West Shelf gas project, and how it will get off the ground, as though he had something to do with it when, in fact, it was the party to which he belongs which did its best to stop the development at every opportunity. That was the Whitlam Government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was this Government which took unilateral action to ensure that it went ahead.

Mr Bryce: You will make sure it is grounded.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will refer to the amendment, which is no more than mischief—silly, political mischief. The little boys saw something in this morning's paper and felt they could cash in on it. They felt *The West Australian* would publish anything they liked to say, whether or not it was stupid.

Mr Bryce: *The West Australian* will not publish anything you do not want it to publish. We wonder whether the Ministers give the headlines to the paper.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When I saw the cartoon this morning, and a recent cartoon depicting me as an arsonist, I hate to think what they would do if they were really trying! I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that this Government has had a fairly rough trot from *The West Australian*. People on the other side need say anything at all and they receive headlines.

Mr Bryce: Who do you think you are kidding?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is right. I remind members opposite of the cartoon in this morning's Press which is despicable. That cartoon was trying to relate our Minister to the communist, J. Marks. We have had similar previous

experience with cartoons, but that is the right of a free Press. I hope the Press will have the good sense to show a bit of responsibility with its freedom.

So far as the last part of the amendment is concerned, calling for the commission of the Minister for Labour and Industry to be withdrawn, I tell the Deputy Leader of the Opposition quite categorically there is no intention to suggest to His Excellency or to anyone else that it should be withdrawn.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: Just continue to repudiate daily what he says, and his statements.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If members examine this amendment they will find it is based on hypocrisy because the Opposition is accusing the Minister of doing the very things which their colleagues in the left-wing element of the TLC have been trying to do for ages, and the very thing my colleague has been trying to thwart. I have news for members over there: I have not had a single complaint about the comments of the Minister for Labour and Industry, but, my word, I have had a lot of messages of praise.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: Of course, from your own people.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have received many messages of approbation on the stand taken by the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Mr Bryce: Do you expect us to believe that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do. I tell members opposite that if they believe I have been picking up my telephone and listening to complaints about the Minister for Labour and Industry they are wrong. I have been picking up the telephone and listening to people tell me that they are pleased that someone is at last trying to talk some sense. Whether one agrees with the words used, or whether one believes the language was extravagant, is beside the point. I remind members opposite that the public is fed up with the actions of the militant left-wing section of the trade union movement. I also tell members opposite that the majority of the members in the trade union movement are also fed up.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: Who are they?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members opposite have been accusing us of not being in touch with the people. I am starting to think we are much more in touch with the great majority of the people than are members over there. Members opposite move in a small circle of people who believe in the same philosophies. If members

opposite met a more moderate and sensible element of the work force they would find that the thinking of that section is quite different. How do members opposite think we get in at election time? The answer is because a percentage of those people vote for us.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the rank and file people believed in the Opposition, and its left-wing colleagues, that would reflect in the ballot boxes at the State general elections—secret ballots of the best kind. However, they do not. They do not reflect federally, or in the State, and what is more if there were an election tomorrow they would reflect in our favour even stronger.

Mr O'Neil: I'd like to see the result of their research into the reasons for losing the last election.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members opposite seem to have completely misread the signs of the times. They have misread the results of the livestock dispute. They have completely overlooked the fact that there has not been a word of protest against the farmers who had the courage to do something, and load the sheep themselves.

Mr Bryce: Who will protest?

Mr O'Neil: It is recorded, and we will use it. You opposed the farmers most.

Mr Bryce: Who will print it?

Mr O'Neil: *Hansard* will, and people will read it.

Mr Bryce: Big deal, and who reads *Hansard*?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I challenge members opposite, and their militant colleagues in the TLC with whom they are in touch, to produce one person who has condemned the actions of the farmers; just one person. The public was relieved, as I tried to point out to the public on "TDT" the other night. However, the "TDT" people told me they had run out of film for that answer.

Mr Bryce: You do go on; no wonder they ran out of film.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I remind members opposite that the average person in this community is very grateful and very relieved that at least somebody as well as the Government was prepared to stand up and be counted on this issue. I congratulate the farmers for the way they controlled themselves. The Minister for Labour

and Industry, the Minister for Agriculture, and I knew—and I think most members opposite also knew—that before the farmers actually went to the wharf there was tremendous pressure from the country. They could have got 1 000 or 2 000 people to go to the wharf, if they wanted them. However, to their great credit their leaders restrained the farmers. The Minister for Labour and Industry advised that there should be no rough tactics and no violence, and that the matter should be handled constitutionally if possible.

Mr Bryce: You encouraged the whole thing.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Eventually, when those men loaded the sheep they behaved in the most exemplary manner. I sincerely hope we will not be in that position again.

This brings me to the comments in respect of the Minister for Labour and Industry himself, and more particularly his remarks during the last few days.

Mr Pearce: Which you repudiated in this morning's paper.

Sir CHARLES COURT: In reply to what has been said by members opposite, I have never disowned the Minister for Labour and Industry. What I did try to do last night and again today was to point out to the people that although he may have put it in fairly colourful language he was saying something that was fact because we will not have to take any action to do what he has suggested; the unions are bringing about their own destruction. That is the message I was conveying. I say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that the militant left-wing of the trade union movement, will destroy themselves.

Mr O'Neil: They have already destroyed the Labor Party.

Sir CHARLES COURT: And, the sooner the better. So it gets back to a takeover of the union movement by a responsible element in order to regain some prestige and integrity like it had under people like Albert Monk.

Mr Bryce: If you are dinkum why do you not give us a list? You will not name one individual as a well known communist. Give us a list of the left-wing element which is causing all the trouble.

Mr O'Connor: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has only to look at the communist *Tri bune* where he will see the names of certain members who contribute to it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I tell members opposite that the people who are the greatest scourge in this community, the people who do the greatest harm, the people with the greatest intellect, and

the people who engineer these things do not carry the banners. Of course they do not; they are too smart.

Mr Bryce: Who are they?

Sir CHARLES COURT: They do have people who do their bidding for them. Therefore, members opposite who do not know those people are being unfair to themselves.

Mr Bryce: You have been in politics since 1953 and you cannot tell us who they are. Where is your sincerity?

Mr Bateman: You will get someone to stir it up.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If these people oppose—

Mr Bryce: These people—where are they?

Sir CHARLES COURT: —who have links with the extreme left in the industrial movement—

Mr Bryce: Who are they?

Mr Bateman: They will never name them.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If members opposite do not know who the power boys behind the movement are, they are a disgrace to themselves.

Mr Bryce: What an idiot you are making of yourself! You are making absurd assertions.

Mr Clarko: You would be no judge, except from your own experience.

Sir CHARLES COURT: What members opposite—and particularly the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—are saying is that they believe in what they have been doing, and therefore they do not have to ask who are the power boys behind this extreme left-wing movement.

Mr Bryce: You were not here for the first 10 minutes of my speech.

Several members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am talking about the amendment before us, and I was here during the whole period that the member led up to his amendment. I was here the whole of that time; do not use that nonsense.

Mr Bryce: You were not here.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to refer to the allegation that the Minister was dumped by his Premier and others. He certainly was not dumped by the Government and he was not dumped by the back-benchers.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: What we tried to do was to explain that the Minister was saying something that many people were thinking and were trying to put into words. He might have made his comments more colourful than was necessary, but I do not really blame him for that. He said that if

the situation continued as it was at that time the unions would destroy themselves. He was asking the more moderate, the more sensible, and the more temperate members in the trade union movement to rise up and take over the movement before it was destroyed completely. Then we would have no unions.

At no stage in my memory has the Minister ever been opposed to responsible, sensible unionism—on the contrary. I know how he goes about his work, and I know the representations he makes to the Government. However, what can we do when we try to co-operate with people such as those involved in the livestock dispute? Do members opposite know that three times—not once, not twice, but three times—the meatworkers' union was given a chance to have an honourable way out?

Mr H. D. Evans: Why did you not convene them?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The farmers suffered the disaster of cyclone "Alby" after two years of drought. The representatives of the meatworkers' union were given a chance three times to my knowledge to do the decent thing on humanitarian grounds. They were given the chance to get out of the situation with some honour. They could have said, "We will let the sheep go, let the works operate, because these farmers have had as much as they can take." Three times they were given a chance, but not once would they budge. They were prepared to see these farmers go under completely, and we must bear in mind that if there are no farmers there is no meat to kill.

Mr Bryce: You wanted the provocation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I reject this amendment. I want to come back to one particular comment made by the member for Maylands. Usually he is a fairly moderate, decent sort of man.

Mr Harman: Thank you.

Sir CHARLES COURT: However, I was very disappointed—

Mr Bryce: That is enough to make somebody cringe.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —when he referred to the farmers as scab labour. They were men of honour—

Mr Barnett: Who paid them?

Sir CHARLES COURT: —they were men who set an example to this community, and this example has been noted right from one end of Australia to the other. People said, "Thank goodness at least someone is going to stand up for their rights and go about it in a sensible way."

To the everlasting credit of these farmers, they went about their business in a restrained, responsible way, and their leaders deserve tremendous credit.

I talked to one of their leaders on the night they wanted to load the sheep at Fremantle. This man must have been under intense strain with 150 farmers dying to get at the job. I talked to this man by phone several times over two to three hours that night, and I was amazed at the way he kept his "cool" and kept the situation under control. So these men deserve a tremendous amount of credit because they did load the sheep, they loaded them sensibly, and they avoided provocation.

Mr Bryce: So you were the real stirrer yourself, and not the Minister. This is the reality of it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I make no bones about it, I have said it before and I will say it again in case members opposite did not hear it. I told the Minister to tell the shippers and the captain that any sheep delivered were to be loaded.

Mr Bateman: Shame on you.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When I was asked that night about the loading of the ship, I said that the loading had to go on because we cannot have the country run by people who wanted to dictate to others, people who wished to push elected Governments about.

Several members interjected.

Mr McIver: What about the time the airline pilots brought the State to a halt?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I was disappointed that the member for Maylands used this term, "scab labour" against the farmers because he knows that in the brotherhood of trade unions that is the worst thing any member can say about another.

Mr Davies: Precisely.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The member for Maylands is normally a decent bloke and it ill-became him to use that term.

Several members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Reference has been made to the charges; the Opposition has tried to lay the blame for the dispute at the door of the Government because we will not withdraw them. We do not have the right to intervene and to give any direction about those charges. Thank goodness we do not have the right. I have not heard any unionists say that we should withdraw the charge against the man who had a rifle. I posed this question to some unionists, and they

said that was a different situation. I want to say this: If these charges were against farmers—and do not forget that farmers could have been charged under the same by-law, the same regulation—

Mr Harman: They were not legitimately on the wharf.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —the members opposite would be condemning the Government for trying to take action to have the charges withdrawn. We would see a march take place, a strike, and stop-work meetings if the Government tried to withdraw the charges against the farmers. I want to say that the Government does not regard these charges laid in the case of these alleged actions as having anything to do with the Adelaide settlement. This was quite clear to us and it was checked by the Minister for Labour and Industry who looked into the background. This was not checked with somebody low down, but rather it was checked with Mr Street when he had Mr Hawke in his office. It was not part of the deal at all.

Mr Skidmore: It is part of the deal; that is how far out of line they are.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This matter related to Trade Practices Act and to Industrial Arbitration Act cases. We have accepted without question that those matters can be deferred indefinitely, if we can obtain a settlement of the strike and if we have a clear understanding that all bans will be lifted from people, vehicles, ships, and places.

Mr Davies: There are no bans. You took it up from the newspaper articles without checking.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Cook says there are no bans, but I have seen the WWF and the TWU ignore the TLC. Members opposite expect us to be very naive. Just because the disputes committee says that the bans are off, they want us to accept it as being true. We know better than that; the WWF and the TWU do what they like.

Mr Davies: You are a know-all; you know nothing about the matter.

Sir CHARLES COURT: At no stage have the arrests and charges been part of the settlement. I gather from the news tonight that the TLC, having wanted the court actions deferred, now wants them heard straightaway. When told they are to be deferred because of police formalities in connection with the matter until they can be dealt with properly on the 15th June—

Mr Davies: Conveniently!

Sir CHARLES COURT: —the TLC now says it wants them heard straightaway. If this is not provocation, I do not know what it is. People have been organised to demonstrate outside the court. Again we will see an abuse of law and order.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: In case the Opposition has not got the message yet, we have no intention of asking for the withdrawal of the commission of the Minister, and we reject the amendment as being just political gall and hypocrisy.

[Applause from Government members]

Mr Bryce: I can't tell you who clapped the loudest, and who is likely to go into the Cabinet next.

Mr O'Neil: It will not be you!

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.40 p.m.]: I hope this amendment to the Address-in-Reply will be defeated. Firstly, it is a nonsensical one, and secondly, it should be defeated because it is based on a series of fabrications.

Mr Tonkin: Most of all it will be defeated because you have the numbers.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is diabolical to twist facts and to seek to slander those who are trying to protect the rights of minority groups. In this particular case, all we on this side of the House are doing is to try to protect the right of a minority group to work. We have had a situation where some very powerful unions in this country have said to others that they are going to black ban certain organisations and people, and they will not give certain people the right to work. When we on this side raise our voices against that, we have an amendment to the Address-in-Reply twisting the facts and condemning us as though we were the instigators of the whole thing.

Mr Skidmore: What we are saying is that it was a stupid statement.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition stood up and criticised me and others about making provocative public statements. This was a classic example of what I am talking about. Just a few days ago we had a union member making a statement in front of 2 000 union members at Fremantle. I will read out these comments, and I would like members to judge for themselves whether or not they are provocative. Bearing in mind statements of this sort, members can see the hypocrisy of the Opposition in moving an amendment of this kind.

I ask members to compare this statement with the statements which I and other members of this House are accused of making. The statement appears in *The West Australian* of the 13th April. It reads as follows—

At a unionists' rally in Fremantle yesterday the assistant secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights' Union, Mr J. Marks, appealed to police present not to let themselves be used again in industrial situations on the wharves.

He said that unions did not believe in violence but if it came "the blood would not all be shed by the workers."

He said: "The cockies will want to put a 24-hour patrol round their boundaries, because there's a very high bushfire risk now."

Mr Davies: That has been repudiated.

Mr O'Neil: It was said. He crawled down as he always does.

Mr GRAYDEN: This Mr Marks, who is a prominent union leader in Western Australia, and a colleague of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, went on to say—

"If this crowd here today had been there yesterday not one of the bloody trucks would have got on to the wharves."

Mr Old: Nice man!

Mr Davies: Like the Premier, blowing his bags.

Points of Order

Mr TONKIN: Mr Jack Marks is a well known member of the Communist Party and I find it offensive, and I think you would rule it offensive, Sir, for him to be called a colleague of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who is a member of the Australian Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: The member will resume his seat. In the first instance I would have thought it was a matter for a member to whom the reference was directed to take a point of order, if in fact a point of order were to be taken, and in the second place, I cannot accept that the words used by the Minister for Labour and Industry are unparliamentary.

Mr TONKIN: A reference to Standing Orders by your honoured self will indicate it is up to any member of the House to take exception to any statement whether directed against him or against another member, and I am perfectly in order to take exception to a statement made against any member of this House on either side.

The SPEAKER: I confirm that is your right, but I said simply that it seemed more likely for the person against whom the remarks were made to have taken a point of order.

Mr GRAYDEN: I did not want to be forced into this position; however, the member for Morley has taken exception to the fact that I say Mr Marks is a colleague of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Tonkin: That is not true.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is not true?

Mr Tonkin: What does "colleague" mean?

Sir Charles Court: Is he a mate of his?

Mr O'Neil: He didn't deny it.

Mr Bryce: You scurrilous twit; you old buffoon. I did deny it, you deaf buffoon.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Tonkin: That is out of order, of course!

The SPEAKER: Order! I said earlier tonight that I did not think members do the reputation of this Chamber any good at all by referring to other members by name. Name-calling is something I thought we left with the playgrounds of the schools we attended.

Mr Grayden: Hear, hear!

Mr Tonkin: What are you doing but name-calling?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call upon members to desist from such a childish practice.

Mr O'NEIL: Mr Speaker, could I go a little further and ask that the expression used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in reference to me be withdrawn?

Mr T. J. Burke: Well, are you?

Mr Tonkin: Is there one rule for one side of the House? Is that what you are saying?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition withdraw the words used, and I hope he would see it as an attempt on my part to try to improve the standard of debate in this place.

Mr DAVIES: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, did you not earlier rule that "buffoon" was a word that could be used? I think you so ruled not less than 10 minutes ago when the member for Morley used it—

Several members interjected

The SPEAKER: Order! It is true at that particular time three words were used, two by one member and one by another.

Mr Tonkin: And I had to withdraw mine.

The SPEAKER: I think I linked the three words together on that occasion.

Mr Tonkin: I withdrew mine earlier.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morley withdrew his word earlier, but not on the occasion to which I am referring. On that occasion it appeared to me there was an equal slight from one side of the House to the other, and in those circumstances I did not call for a withdrawal. However, in this situation the Deputy Leader of the Opposition repeated his comment several times, and added some other words which in my view compounded the error on his part. For that reason I am calling upon him to withdraw.

Mr DAVIES: With respect, Sir, could you tell us whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is to withdraw the term "deaf buffoon", "deaf", or "buffoon", so we will know quite clearly in the future whether there is bias one way or the other in respect of words that can be used and the situation in which they can be used? I ask that with respect and in all sincerity.

The SPEAKER: Might I say that I bend over backwards to be fair in this place, and if someone wants to guffaw and say I have not, then I am sorry if I have failed in my endeavours. I have tried to be fair and to bring some decorum into this place. I have asked the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the word, and I hope he will comply with my request.

Mr BRYCE: I am very happy to withdraw, Mr Speaker, if the Deputy Premier would indicate exactly what words he would like withdrawn.

Mr O'NEIL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said to me across the Chamber, "You deaf buffoon" in about that sort of tone and with the same speed.

Mr Tonkin: If you say it, it is okay.

Mr Barnett: Do you say you are not?

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker, you have ruled that the term "deaf buffoon" is unparliamentary, and I am quite happy to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I call on the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I am not certain what all that was about.

Mr Tonkin: You don't understand yet? Mr Marks is not a colleague of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Morley says I do not understand; however, I am not certain why he and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition

are trying to dissociate themselves from Mr Marks simply because he has been a communist candidate in the past. They have made strenuous efforts in the last few minutes to dissociate themselves from him. I wonder whether they would dissociate themselves from other colleagues of theirs who, for instance, might make contributions to the Communist Party.

Mr Barnett: Do you contribute? Do you have a copy of the *Tribune* in your drawer?

Mr GRAYDEN: Mr Speaker, just listen to this quote from the communist *Tribune* of the 11th August, 1976.

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: Mr Speaker, surely this is not germane to the amendment.

Mr O'Neil: He is probably a contributor.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Several members interjected.

Mr TONKIN: All right; we notice the way the Government is allowed to go on.

Mr Clarko: Another reflection.

Mr Pearce: What an idiotic thing to say.

Mr TONKIN: The point of the matter is that if we are ever to have any decorum in this House, we are supposed to be speaking to an amendment which is clearly laid down. All the guffawing of members opposite will not alter the fact that the Minister is not in any way referring to the subject of the amendment; he is now dealing with contributions to the *Tribune*.

The SPEAKER: As I understand it the Minister for Labour and Industry is referring to a document from which he has not yet quoted, to reinforce a point he is making. I believe he should be given the opportunity to do so.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: As I was saying, Sir, I cannot understand the furious efforts of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Morley to dissociate themselves from any suggestion that they are associated with communists.

Mr Tonkin: We are a constitutional party.

Mr GRAYDEN: Then would the member for Morley tell me what is the attitude of his party towards the sort of thing which appeared in the *Tribune* of the 11th August, 1976? In that issue there appeared an article headed "Special Budget" in which it is stated that the next issue would be issued on Wednesday instead of Tuesday evening, and would cover the Budget speech. It states extra copies would be produced for wider distribution. It then goes on to congratulate various

people who were contributing, and it lists the names of those contributors. Under the Western Australian section, the first entry is, "Grace Vaughan \$50".

Mr Tonkin: That was in 1976.

Mr O'Neil: That is why you wanted to stop him reading it; you knew about it.

Mr Tonkin: Do you think it is possible that anomaly may have been corrected?

Mr Clarko: Which anomaly?

Mr O'Neil: Did the party refund the \$50?

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Morley has taken strong exception to any suggestion that members of the Labor Party in this House are linked in any way with communists or communist sympathisers—

Mr Tonkin: That is correct.

Mr GRAYDEN: —and I am pointing out that members of his party make donations to the Communist Party.

Mr Tonkin: And I am saying that is very much out of date and is no longer the case.

Mr GRAYDEN: I would like the member for Morley by way of interjection to indicate to the House whether in fact the same sort of sympathy still applies.

Mr Tonkin: Sympathy or contribution? What are you talking about?

Mr GRAYDEN: Is the member for Morley's party still making contributions to the Communist Party?

Mr Tonkin: So far as I know, no.

Mr GRAYDEN: Can the member speak for the member for Fremantle?

Mr Tonkin: So far as I know, no.

Mr GRAYDEN: So far as he knows!

Mr Tonkin: If you have any evidence to the contrary, produce it.

Mr Bryce: Has the Minister for Labour and Industry used his private wealth to develop his own para-military organisation? Has "Stormtrooper Bill" built up his own para-military organisation in this State, like the one in New South Wales? That is about the level of your debate.

Mr GRAYDEN: I do not think it is necessary to go further on this point. This is purely a digression which simply illustrates the hypocrisy of members on the other side of this House.

Members opposite go out of their way to create the impression that they are not associated in any way with communists, but when it is pointed out that their own parliamentary colleagues are making contributions to the Communist Party—

Mr Tonkin: When it was pointed out action was taken.

Mr GRAYDEN: What was the action?

Mr Tonkin: Action was taken.

Mr GRAYDEN: Well, we have that admission; what we want to know is what action was taken. What happened at the last election in Western Australia not very long ago? Of course, the member for Fremantle was elected, and he is a sympathiser of the PLO—a terrorist organisation with strong communist links.

Mr Tonkin: Has action been taken in respect of that?

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes, it has been taken all right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Tonkin: Does not that make the position clear?

Mr GRAYDEN: Does it alter the fact that the member for Fremantle is walking around the House with a PLO badge on his lapel?

Point of Order

Mr SKIDMORE: I rise in an effort to get this debate at least a little above the level of the jungle talk we are hearing. I believe the Minister is in no way referring to the amendment before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the Minister for Labour and Industry to direct his remarks to the Chair and to relate them to the amendment before the House.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: Thank you, Sir. Before that digression I was referring to the statement by Mr Marks, which was provocative in the extreme; and yet the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has accused me and other members on this side of the House of making provocative public statements.

Mr Tonkin: Because Marks did it doesn't excuse your doing it.

Mr GRAYDEN: However, we have not heard one word of criticism of the provocative statement made by one of the leading communists in this State.

Mr Bryce: We were happy to condemn it, just as we condemn you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Tonkin interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. I think it is likely that the member for Morley will exercise his right to address the House a little later on this matter. Therefore, I ask him to refrain from interjecting and to prepare himself to speak a little later on, because the constant interjections going across the aisle make it very difficult for the *Hansard* reporters to take down the debate, and also make it difficult for me to follow the debate. I call the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Mr GRAYDEN: The provocative statement of Mr Marks—

Mr Tonkin: Which we condemned.

Mr GRAYDEN: Which the member has not condemned at all; the Opposition has presented a series of fabrications attempting to accuse me and the Government of issuing provocative statements; yet it is prepared to ignore statements of the kind I have read out.

Let us now consider another statement. I will ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to give me his advice as to whether he thinks the statement I am about to quote is provocative. I am referring to a statement which appeared on the front page of *The Sunday Times* of the 16th April under the heading, "Picket breakers banned". I would point out that *The Sunday Times* has a tremendous circulation in Western Australia.

Mr Tonkin: Only for the Readers Mart.

Mr GRAYDEN: I am not sure of the figure, but I think it has a circulation of at least a quarter of a million. This newspaper is sent across the face of Western Australia, and a quarter of a million people would have read that headline. I would like the opinion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as to whether or not what I am about to read out is a provocative statement. The article is subheaded, "TWU hits back at sheep carriers", and states—

The Transport Workers' Union yesterday black banned seven trucking companies, 26 trucks, and a taxi.

Mr Tonkin: Get the later version in today's paper; bring yourself up to date.

Mr GRAYDEN: I will bring you up to date in a minute.

Mr Bryce: Not "Stormtrooper Bill" but "Pugnacious Bill".

Mr GRAYDEN: The article continues—

The union said the trucks and the taxi ran through picket lines in this week's violent action by farmers to load live sheep at Fremantle for export.

Lists of the company names, registration numbers of trucks and the taxi will be sent to all transport terminals, wharves and fuel depots.

Prospects for a settlement of the live sheep dispute are considered dim although parties to the dispute will meet in Canberra on Wednesday.

A Transport Workers Union official, Mr Paddy Hartnett, speaking on his union's ban, said members of the Waterside Workers Federation and Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union would support them.

The bans mean that no TWU, WWF, or AMIEU member will handle products or stock carried on the trucks.

The trucks would also be refused bulk fuel at oil storage depots, Mr Hartnett said.

Any stock carried on the trucks would not be handled by WWF members on the wharves, or by AMIEU members at abattoirs.

One of the banned companies is based in Esperance.

It would have difficulty getting any loads on or off the wharves.

Cartage to and from the wharf comprised the bulk of the company's operations, Mr Hartnett said.

The taxi had been banned because it had brought farmers from their meeting at the Ozone Hotel to the wharf, he said.

Two of the companies banned were specialist livestock carriers.

They also carried much backloading of fuel from oil storage depots to farms.

The bans would mean farmers would have to get other trucks to carry their fuel, or go without, Mr Hartnett said.

The two livestock specialists had been specially banned because of their ingratitude, as well as for breaking through the pickets.

In the TWU owner-drivers' dispute a few months ago, the two companies had been given special dispensation to continue operating on humanitarian grounds because they were livestock carriers.

That is very good, coming from the Opposition and the trade union movement! To continue—

In that dispute they had co-operated with the TWU, stopping at pickets' road blocks instead of charging through as some other trucks had done.

Mr Hartnett said truck drivers who broke the picket lines and their employers faced prosecution in the Industrial Court.

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: I raise a point of order. Mr Speaker, you are renowned for your tolerance in this House, but the extent to which a member can read surely has some limitations.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister for Labour and Industry to refrain from reading very long documents.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I appreciate the point. That was a most interesting statement which appeared on the front page of *The Sunday Times* which was circulated throughout Western Australia, and of course it was provocative in the extreme. It was a statement which made it quite clear that certain people in our community were going to be denied the right to work.

Mr Bryce: Can I answer the question?

Mr GRAYDEN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Bryce: Wants the chance to answer the question.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not think there is anything provocative about that. There is no criticism coming from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with respect to that union leader.

Mr Bryce: Can I answer the question?

Mr GRAYDEN: Instead of that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition moves this censure motion which is a series of fabrications and a diabolical attempt to twist the facts and to make the Government the accused, when in actual fact the villains of the piece are the trade unions who are operating with the support of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: The answer to your question is that as Minister for Labour and Industry you would find your own shadow provocative.

Mr GRAYDEN: Here is another article. I shall read only the heading and a couple of paragraphs. It appeared in *The West Australian* on the 15th

April, 1978, and the heading is, "Tug crews put ban on container terminal". It reads in part—

Fremantle tug crews declared the Fremantle container terminal black for 24 hours from yesterday evening.

A Seamen's Union spokesman said yesterday that the action was one of solidarity with the Maritime Workers' Union because farmers had slipped the mooring lines of the sheep carrier *Mashaallah* on Tuesday night.

I do not wish to continue reading because of the direction you have given, Mr Speaker. Here is a union placing a 24-hour ban on a vessel simply because farmers have slipped the mooring lines. Further on in the article we read this—

The container ship *Encounter Bay*, which has been in Gage Roads for several days waiting to take the *Abel Tasman's* berth, also will be further delayed.

The master of the container ship *Australian Venture* decided to bypass Fremantle after waiting in Gage Roads for some time. The ship sailed for Melbourne early yesterday.

We have a situation in which because of the ban, which was put on out of pique, ships have been held up for days and others have bypassed the Port of Fremantle. Who then is causing unemployment in Australia? The answer is: Certain militant unions aided and abetted by the Opposition in this House. That is just another statement. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether in his opinion that is a provocative statement?

Mr Bryce: I repeat the answer to the question through you, Mr Speaker, to be perfectly orderly: the Minister would find his own shadow provocative.

Mr GRAYDEN: Good gracious me! This illustrates the hypocrisy of the Opposition. Here is another statement. This was published in *The West Australian* on Thursday, the 13th April, 1978. It reads—

Seamen met in Fremantle yesterday afternoon and decided that there would be a total national ban on the *Mashaallah*, *Farid Fares* and *Linda Clausen*, which loaded sheep at Fremantle, Albany and Esperance.

So it goes on but I do not wish to keep talking about that. Here is another one on the 13th April, 1978. It is headed, "Issues in sheep row drag on". It reiterates that statement. It states—

Waterside workers continue with their stoppage.

Seamen decided to retain their national ban on the sheep ships, Mashaallah, Farid Fares and Linda Clausen.

So it goes on. I could keep on quoting because I have cutting after cutting, but I shall not do so in deference to your ruling, Mr Speaker. The point is that the Opposition does not regard those sorts of statements as provocative even though they are aimed at creating unemployment in Western Australia and Australia and even though they are directly aimed at preventing certain people in our community from going about their lawful business, and denying these people the right to work. That is what those statements are designed to do; that is what those actions are designed to do. But there is nothing provocative in them as far as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is concerned!

Instead of that he comes along with this fabrication which is masquerading as a censure motion. I shall read out the first portion of it. He has asked that the following words be added to the motion—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency that the actions and public statements of the Minister for Labour and Industry have:

- (a) threatened the continued operation of an orderly system of industrial relations in Western Australia;
- (b) encouraged confrontation instead of mediation and conciliation in industrial disputes; and
- (c) fostered division, disunity, disruption and bitterness in the community.

It becomes apparent to all that the censure motion is based on a series of fabrications. I want to counter this sort of thing. There is a possibility that certain vessels which took part in the exporting of live sheep are going to be banned forever and a day from Western Australia; that was the statement of one of the union officials. In addition, certain individuals were going to be denied the opportunity to service those and other ships. In the circumstances I simply pointed out to the Press that in the event of these bans remaining the Government could do three things. It could take action under the Trade Practices Act; it could take action under the Crimes Act; and it could take action before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. That is what we will be doing, what we have done in the past, and what we did in the current dispute.

Mr H. D. Evans: You should have done it in January and it would never have got to this stage.

Mr GRAYDEN: If the member for Warren knows anything about the matter, he knows perfectly well that it was not justified at that stage. I am not even going to argue about that point. If there is a black ban we must firstly get evidence and then we can take the action of which I have spoken. But in the event of that being unsuccessful or protracted in the extreme, which it could be, I said that the State has an obligation to honour its commitments to those people who were involved in the recent shipments of live sheep; and that applies to the vessels, the contractors, and the farmers concerned. Irrespective of the side effects, the Government has an overriding obligation to protect those people from this type of union muscle which has been spoken of in the last few days.

If all those actions I have suggested fail, there is one final course open to the Government, which is to ensure that there is a union-free port through which sheep and other goods can be brought into and taken out of the community. That is a course of action if all other methods fail, and it is by no means as ridiculous as it might seem at first glance.

May I say this: We in Western Australia have virtually a parallel system at the present time. The whole of the agricultural industry is virtually free of union labour.

Mr Skidmore: Who said?

Mr GRAYDEN: "Virtually" I said.

Mr Skidmore: What are you talking about?

Mr GRAYDEN: There is a huge section of industry—

Mr Skidmore: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr GRAYDEN: —which is free of unionism. Many manufacturers and shopkeepers will not employ unionists in their particular establishments. That is happening in Western Australia at the present time. There is something wrong with somebody who is not aware of that.

Mr H. D. Evans: What about the shearers and shed hands?

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Warren, of course, must have spent all his time in the bush if he discounts it. That is the situation. We know the situation in respect of transport. Many owner-drivers do not come under the influence of unions. We have a big section of industry and commerce in Western Australia at the present time which is operating quite happily on a non-union basis in our society along with the portion of trade and commerce which operates under the union system. We already have that situation.

If we were to have a port which was operated by non-union labour we would avoid the sort of confrontation we had at Fremantle just recently. We would completely avoid it. The only reason we had the confrontation was that a couple of thousand unionists are and have been employed for a very long time on the wharves and in the precincts of the wharves. That is why we had the confrontation.

Had the same sort of thing happened at Esperance, had it happened at Bunbury, or had it happened at Busselton—I imagine that would have been an excellent site for a union-free port—there would have been no confrontation. It is as simple as that.

Australia is a multi-national country. We have over 150 ethnic groups in this country who are all from different backgrounds and all have different cultures. All I am suggesting is those who believe in unionism and those who do not believe in it should be able to get on equally well under our system. Of course, they can and they are at the present time. Probably 50 per cent of people in our community want to work under the union system and probably 50 per cent do not; but they are surviving happily in our community at the present time.

All I am suggesting is a slight extension which would be to have a non-union port somewhere. It could be Busselton.

Mr Bryce: How do you spell that word “nun”?

Mr GRAYDEN: It could be Esperance; it could be Jurien Bay; it could be anywhere. However, it would overcome the problem. There would then be no confrontation between the unionists and the non-unionists. Why would there be confrontation? Surely the unionists would accept the right of those who do not believe in unionism to survive in this land. Is that too much to ask? I should like to point out there are many parts of the world which do not have a union system and they get on famously.

Mr Bryce: Where—Brazil; Argentina?

Mr GRAYDEN: There are other parts of the world where there are union shops and non-union shops existing happily side by side.

Mr Bryce: Military dictatorships.

Mr GRAYDEN: Similarly there are countries in the world where there are union ports and non-union ports.

Opposition members: Where? Where?

Mr GRAYDEN: I am suggesting something which is totally feasible. If we ever get to a stage in Western Australia where unionism becomes so militant that it becomes impossible and

people are deprived of the opportunity to work, the alternative is the one I have suggested. As I say, it is the last resort because firstly we in the Liberal Party believe in responsible unionism.

Mr Bryce: Is that when you bring in your stormtroopers? Is that when the Liberal Party sets up a para-military organisation?

Mr GRAYDEN: We believe in voluntary unionism. For that reason, we believe if the unions accept their responsibilities we shall continue to make progress in this State and in this country.

Mr Barnett: What do you mean by “accepts their responsibilities”?

Mr GRAYDEN: The only element to which we are taking exception is the extremist groups in the union movement.

Mr Bryce: What about the extremist groups in the Liberal Party?

Mr GRAYDEN: Unfortunately, at the present time the extremist groups appear to be dominating the Labor Party.

Mr Bryce: You approve of them, do you not?

Mr GRAYDEN: These extremist groups are dominating the policies of the Labor Party. These are the people who are dominating the Labor Party and who are causing the industrial unrest which we presently have in Western Australia.

The solution to the present dispute is remarkably simple. It is tremendously simple. All we want is a change of heart on the part of the militant union leaders in our community. It is as simple as that. Then all the disputes simply fade away. If the unionists want confrontation, of course, they have to accept the fact that the Government will take action under existing legislation—under the Trade Practices Act, under the Crimes Act, and under the State Industrial Arbitration Act. We will take that action. That is a foregone conclusion if these bans remain in force.

Mr Bryce: Are you going to set up your own private army?

Mr GRAYDEN: If that is not sufficient then quite obviously we will have to have a non-union port in Western Australia or a section of one of the existing ports will be set aside for non-union labour. In that situation, of course, we would have no problem as far as live sheep and exports of that kind are concerned. I want to emphasise this: I am not suggesting it is a solution. I am saying all parties to disputes in this country—unionists, non-unionists, those who believe in unionism, and those who do not—should be able to get along amicably. It is a relatively simple thing to do. It is a reasonable request. That is

all we are asking. We expect them to learn to live together. However, when we get one section attempting to deny the other section the right to work—

Mr Bryce: Like the extreme right-wing of the New South Wales Liberal Party.

Mr GRAYDEN: —the Government will accept its obligations and do everything necessary to ensure every person in our community has the right to work.

Mr Bryce: What are you going to do to create the jobs to ensure they have the right to work?

Mr GRAYDEN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talks in terms of jobs. This absolutely astonishes me. Here we have a huge unemployment situation in Australia and a huge unemployment situation in Western Australia. The Government is doing its utmost to overcome the problem. We have created 25 000 extra jobs in the last three years notwithstanding the fact that our unemployment figures have swollen as a result of this influx of people from the Eastern States and from New Zealand and notwithstanding that we have this huge Aboriginal problem. What is the Opposition doing? We have seen what it has been doing in the last few weeks. It has been giving its tacit support to unions which are creating unemployment. We have ships bypassing Fremantle at the present time because of this militant union action.

Mr Bryce: That is monstrous nonsense.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Opposition has the gall to express sympathy for the unemployed when it and the militant unions in Western Australia are hell-bent on creating unemployment for the sole purpose of embarrassing this Government. I have only a few minutes left. I listened with interest to the member for Maylands. Virtually every statement he made was unfounded. I am astonished that he made them. I happen to know something of the details of each case. Unfortunately I do not have the files with me, because we did not receive notice of this amendment to the Address-in-Reply until after the tea suspension.

Mr Bryce: You were tipped off soon enough.

Mr GRAYDEN: I can assure the member for Maylands if he wants to check on any of the points he made he may refer the matters to me and I will obtain the files for him in order that he may see for himself exactly what the situation was.

Mr Skidmore: Give it away now!

Mr GRAYDEN: I can assure the member for Maylands he was in error in each particular case.

I shall sum up by saying once again I regard this amendment as a nonsensical one. As I said before, it is founded on a series of fabrications and they are atrocious fabrications. There is not a word of truth in the whole of the amendment. I have already read three-parts of it.

Mr Bryce: It helps if you read the lot. It helps to give a sense of perspective. Read the last sentence; that is the best one.

Mr GRAYDEN: I do not think I will. I shall once again say the amendment is a diabolical attempt on the part of the Opposition to twist the facts and to attempt to accuse the Government of something which is squarely at the feet of the trade unions and the Opposition.

Over the past few weeks they have made the most provocative statements. They have set up an aunt Sally and are now attempting to knock it over. They are the henchmen. Their militant trade union leaders made the statements and having done so they created the industrial trouble. Having disadvantaged workers across Western Australia, having created unemployment, and having caused ships to bypass Western Australia, they then move a motion in this House attempting to lay the blame at my feet and at the feet of the Government.

This is a diabolical thing to do. It illustrates the arrant hypocrisy of the Opposition and particular members of it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition must bear much of the responsibility, because it was he who moved the amendment which was seconded by the member for Maylands.

I will conclude on that particular note. I repeat that it was a diabolical censure motion founded on fabrication.

MR TONKIN (Morley) (9.22 p.m.): The basis of the amendment is that we believe the attempt by the Minister for Labour and Industry to be a trend-setter in industrial relations is laughable. I quote from the Premier's comments in this morning's paper when he gallantly tried to cover up for what we believe is an inept Minister. The Premier said—

I think what Mr Grayden was trying to convey—

He is not sure what he is trying to convey. Not only was he not sure about what Mr Grayden was saying, but he also indicated what he was trying to say, thereby condemning with faint praise.

We respect the Premier's difficult position. I think his performance earlier tonight was magnificent. Obviously he is very good at his particular craft, which is histrionics. He is in the

position where he must either sack the Minister for Labour and Industry, which he would dearly love to do, or defend him. We know the Premier is not often lost for words, but he is reported as saying—

I think what Mr Grayden was trying to convey—

In other words, he did not have the foggiest idea what Mr Grayden was shooting his mouth off about. He could not understand the strange system suggested by the Minister. He did say that extreme unionism will destroy itself and I think the Premier is right. Extremism of any kind will in the end destroy itself. However, that was not what the Minister for Labour and Industry was talking about.

He was saying he would set up—actually plan and construct—a dual system. How will it work? We have asked questions today and it is quite clear that the Minister for Labour and Industry does not have a clue as to how it will work. I would like members of the Opposition to wipe the smirk from their faces and show pity for the colleagues of the Minister for Labour and Industry who have to try to cover up for him and answer those questions we asked about the harbour in the north somewhere which will be non-union and explain what is going on in the foetid imagination of the Minister for Labour and Industry.

A ship will go into this non-union port. Will it use non-union labour or will there be members of the Seamen's Union on it? Presumably that ship will be involved in all non-union labour. What about the goods which are to be transported by that ship? Will they be taken to the port by non-union labour or will the transport be provided by the TWU? How will the goods get to the non-union port?

What is being suggested by the Minister has not occurred anywhere else in the world. It is a complete system of apartheid—of separation. We know that the whole economy of the world is inextricably bound up in its various parts and we know that if something happens here there will be problems elsewhere. If something of consequence occurs in a country like the United States or Japan we will suffer. We cannot keep developments separate. However, the Minister for Labour and Industry alone of all mankind will invent an economy which will be separate. This is the action of the Minister for Labour and Industry. How can the people have respect for a Government or Minister of the Crown who comes up with a bit of nonsense such as this which suggests that it came out of an opium pipe dream or some transcendental meditation—something not belonging to this

earth but conceived on another planet? How can the people in this State have confidence in such a ludicrous dream—or is it a nightmare?

We do not believe the Minister for Labour and Industry was appointed for his profound understanding of economics or of industrial relations. Obviously he does not understand how a community can work when he can suggest such a scheme. He has dreamt up the idea and submitted it, and then the Government has had to cover up for him.

It is quite clear that such a system would never work; so why should this Minister, who has tremendous problems because he is the Minister for Labour and Industry which is a very sensitive portfolio, spend time on such a ludicrous idea? Perhaps we are at fault. Perhaps we should have known better than to waste the time of the House debating such an absurd idea. However, we would be lacking in our duty if we did not draw attention to the matter.

Mr Blaikie: You should speak louder, because most of your friends have left you.

Mr TONKIN: I think they show very good judgment. It is a shame that this amendment has had to be moved and that we have had to draw to the attention of the people the statements of such a Minister. Never before in Australia's history have we had such rantings and ravings from a Minister for Labour and Industry.

Mr Clarko: Do you support a—

Mr TONKIN: The member for Karrinyup poses as an academic, but he cannot understand that what he is talking about is quite irrelevant—

Several members interjected.

Mr TONKIN: Mr Speaker, have you not previously said something about cross-Chamber conversation? The member for Karrinyup is acting like a buffoon.

Mr Clarko: You should recognise one. You make speeches and points of order all the time, but if anyone interjects on you, you get hurt.

Mr TONKIN: I am not hurt.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. We will make more progress if the honourable member ignores interjections and addresses his remarks to the Chair; and I call for fewer interjections.

Mr TONKIN: I was addressing my remarks to the Chair until I was unable to be heard.

Mr Bryce: The member for Karrinyup is a disgrace as Chairman of Committees. He wants to check the Westminster system, and if he does he will find there is no place in the mother of Parliaments—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bryce: You do not know your Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TONKIN: The fact of the matter is that the system proposed by the Minister would not work. We are not surprised that the Minister for Labour and Industry used the term "apartheid". His party has often flirted with the idea. I can recall that when the present Premier was in Opposition—I think that he was the Leader of the Opposition at that time—he said he admired the South African system and felt we had a lot to learn from the way they handled the colour problem. I can recall wondering whether I was hearing correctly, and I checked in *Hansard* the following week to make sure. He was either the then Leader of the Opposition or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he was praising South Africa.

My mind is cast back to the founder of the Liberal Party (R. G. Menzies) who said in 1938 he could find no fault with Adolph Hitler. We find this is the same kind of imagery coming forward with the Minister for Labour and Industry talking about industrial apartheid. At least the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Prime Minister, has indicated quite definitely that the Liberal Party, federally at least, will have nothing to do with the abomination of a system of apartheid which is practised in South Africa. Apparently the Liberal Party in this State has not yet caught up with modern times.

Mr Clarko: Do you know much about it?

Mr TONKIN: We reject this kind of thinking and we object to it. Apparently the member for Karrinyup is following in the footsteps of the Minister and the Premier in defending apartheid.

Mr Clarko: Do you know anything about it? It depends on how you use the word.

Mr TONKIN: We reject this idea, and we also reject the idea that there should be, or could possibly be, a situation where we have two parallel systems. How could that be possible?

Mr Clarko interjected.

Mr TONKIN: Why not be quiet and learn a few manners?

Several members interjected.

Sir Charles Court: It is too much, even for your mind over there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TONKIN: I know you are busy, Mr Speaker, and I am sorry to have interrupted you.

Mr Clarko: And you are talking about manners!

Mr TONKIN: The fact of the matter, Mr Speaker, is that I am trying to get a word in between the interjections. When the member for Karrinyup sees that the Speaker is busy he immediately takes advantage of him, and that is not something any honourable member should do.

The editorial in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* stated that trade unionism is inextricably bound up with the democratic system. The Minister for Labour and Industry—and the Premier has been forced to defend him—is not very much bound up with the democratic system. To say that trade unionism is inextricably bound up, means that it cannot be separated. It is inextricably bound up in the democratic system that history has shaped and workers need, and we believe in the trade union system.

We can condemn the remarks reported to have been made by Mr Marks, and it is most dishonest of the Minister for Labour and Industry to refer to Mr Marks as one of our colleagues—unless all human beings are, somehow, our colleagues. I am sure we would not have a situation where the Minister for Labour and Industry would accept the word "colleague" to be used about almost any person in the community; the word has a special meaning. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of the meaning of the word, or whether he just does not understand it. But certainly, it is improperly used when it is suggested that Mr Marks is in some way a colleague of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or any other person on this side of the House.

Mr Marks is a member of the Communist Party, and although I am not an expert on such a party I believe it is devoted to revolution. We, as a party, state quite clearly in our platform—as we have shown with a long history which goes back to the early days of the century—that we are a constitutional party.

We believe in working through constitutional means; seeking a mandate from the people and accepting the people's verdict. Never in our years in Opposition—and they have been considerable in this country—have we suggested that we should resort to any means other than constitutional to change the Government.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr Laurance interjected.

Mr TONKIN: I consider it is all right for me to reply to the remarks of the Minister for Labour and Industry, and I thought I should make that

point quite clear. We do find that people do not clearly understand the difference between the various sections in the community. The amendment refers to the Minister as a provocator, or something to that effect. The amendment certainly suggests he evokes confrontation. It states that the Minister's ill-considered statements have fostered division, disunity, disruption, and bitterness in the community.

It is no accident that the most inflammable and, if one likes, colourful Minister in the Court Government has been given the portfolio of Minister for Labour and Industry. One might have expected him to be given the portfolio of Minister for Police and Traffic or, perhaps, toning down a little, and I do not suppose one can get too excited about sewerage, the Minister for Works and Water Supplies. Perhaps that would be all right for a person who wants to get tied up with movements and who wants to get away from provoking arguments.

To put the Minister for Labour and Industry in his present portfolio is, we believe, a step which has not led to industrial harmony in this State. If one looks at the records of the three Labor Government States and compares them with the records of the three Liberal Government States—if we include Bjelke-Petersen as a Liberal for the purpose of this exercise; perhaps "non-Labor" would be better—we would see that the industrial relations record for the three Labor States and the three Liberal States is incomparable. In fact, the figures are quite startling and remarkable.

We believe the difference is because the Liberal Party realises—and we saw the Premier in magnificent form tonight—that there are votes in industrial trouble. Every time there is a strike or industrial confrontation the Premier believes his vote goes up, and it is in the political interest of his party.

Mr Clarko: Do you think that is true?

Mr TONKIN: Yes, I do. I also think it is very unfortunate. However, power being what it is, it is inevitable that people will often succumb to temptation. I do not say they on the other side always succumb, but always the temptation is there to get political gain in some way. It is quite clear that political gain does come to the Liberal Party when there is industrial disruption.

I accept what the Premier said; our party wants to get to the people. I believe we are failing if we do not get to the people, and get this story over as quickly as we can. We must inform the people of Western Australia that there are votes for the Liberal Party in industrial confrontation. The people should refuse to vote for the Liberal

Party so that we can get rid of industrial confrontation. Without industrial confrontation, it would no longer pay off politically. We would see a lessening of disputation.

We are guilty because we have not yet got that message over. That is the great challenge before the Australian Labor Party—to ensure it gets its message over to the people.

Mr Clarko: You have to propose firm action and you have never been able to manage that.

Mr TONKIN: It depends what is meant by "firm action" and by whom it is to be taken. It may be the firm action is ultimately in the hands of the unionists themselves.

Earlier tonight the Premier said he did not believe in the right to strike. If we say to labour, "You cannot withdraw your labour, you cannot go on strike", we will have a situation of slavery. If people are forced to go to work day after day whether or not they like it—

Mr Clarko: They can terminate their employment.

Sir Charles Court: And they can use the arbitration and conciliation system.

Mr TONKIN: And they do. Most disputes are settled in that way. Most disputes are not solved by strike action. What happens in the community when people keep trying the arbitration system and see control over their wages while the Industrial Commission says, "Sorry, you are not getting a rise because we have in power a Government which does not believe in price control"? The employee rebels in some way. We cannot have the situation in which the right to strike is denied.

Mr Clarko: The majority of people do not strike. It is unfair to them that a small proportion in strategic industries can keep on striking, while other people—clerks, for instance—cannot strike because it is not effective. What does it matter if the ABC goes on strike and turns off the seven o'clock news?

Mr TONKIN: What the member for Karrinyup says is correct. Some industries are regarded as being on the commanding heights of the economy—the transport industry is one—and a strike in those industries will have much greater effect. The fact is that people who are in those industries on the commanding heights do take action such as strike action; but the fact also is that the gains which are made by way of strike action by militant unions will later be ratified by a Conciliation and Arbitration Commission which receives a submission from a union which was not on the commanding heights. All these people

have, for example, a 40-hour week, and the commission has to say, "In justice, how can we deny it to other people?"

Although it may seem that certain people win their way by militancy and others do not, in fact the non-militants are carried along to some degree by the militants. And it must be remembered, while we are in this holy and pious mood, that the trade unions are created by the capitalist system. They are the creatures of the system, and the system teaches us to make as much money as we possibly can. If one makes a great deal of money it is likely one will be knighted and will be highly respected in the community. Employees will then say, "If that is the name of the game and that is the kind of community in which we live, I will go in for my share."

A few weeks ago the member for Roe referred to a society where he saw great co-operation; namely, in China. Talking of the bias of the Press, it will be noticed that was not reported. Had I made a speech about China it would have been reported because it would have reinforced the idea that we are somehow linked with communists. But the member for Roe was not reported. He was very honest and courageous in saying what he did. I think he went overboard in his admiration for the system. I think there are flaws in the system which he has not perceived. But he was courageous in saying he admired it. What did he admire about it? He admired the co-operation in China. I reserve the right to be critical on some aspects of Chinese policy and the Chinese Government, nevertheless I note co-operation is something which is absent from our community.

When people say the trade unions are being unco-operative and militant, they should remember from whom the unions are learning the game. They should remember the aggressive kind of people who play the stock exchanges and make fortunes. I am at the moment reading a book about Getty and how he made his first million by the time he was 23. He was an aggressive man who made a million dollars long before he was the age of any member of this House. None of us has made millions in that time—or most of us have not. Does that mean we are inferior beings? I do not believe it does. But society rewarded his aggressiveness.

We must expect to reap the harvest of what we sow, and we must expect there will be militant unionism in such a society because people have learnt that force does get one somewhere. There is a great deal of force in our society. It is not always naked but it is always there, and we must be aware of these factors.

In conclusion, I would like to make the point that the Premier has done a difficult job in covering up for the Minister for Labour and Industry who obviously did not know what he was talking about. Nevertheless, the Minister has not been able to defend what he said. All he said was, "The extremists will destroy themselves." That may be so, but we cannot see how a watertight industrial apartheid system can exist. If it is not completely separated and if there is intercourse between one and the other, there will be friction. Some will say, "I will not deal with that sector because I am a unionist", and vice versa.

So I think the views of the Minister for Labour and Industry are quite specious. They have not been thought through. The only defence I can give for the Opposition's bringing this forward is that we believed it was our duty to show to the people of Western Australia that the Minister's attempt is foolhardy and not in the best interests of the State because it has not been thought through.

Above all, we believe the way to industrial harmony, which most people in this country want, is not through confrontation or through picking a fight. It is through mediation and conciliation. There is very little goodwill in this community at the present time, and if because of this confrontation trade unionism is in fact weakened or destroyed to some degree, an essential part of the democratic system will be destroyed. I agree with the comment of the editor of *The West Australian* that the trade union system is inextricably bound up with our democracy.

Therefore we regret this confrontation. We believe there should be co-operation and conciliation and that it has been shown to be successful in South Australia, Tasmania, and New South Wales. We hope Western Australia will attempt to join those other happier States by avoiding the confrontation that has occurred of late, because to pit Australian against Australian and citizen against citizen cannot be good for the future of this country; and that means for the future of all its citizens.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [8.59 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment before the House. The question of trade unionism is very complex. It is certainly very vexed in Australia.

Unionism has reached great heights in Australia, if we are to judge by the incidence of industrial trouble in recent years; and it is a pity that this industrial lawlessness is at its height in Western Australia and especially in the Pilbara iron ore region. It has moved to some degree from the waterfront, where many years ago the relevant union was captured by the communists. For many

years the waterside workers were able to use their strength against the weak members of the work force in Australia.

I believe there is not one person on our side of politics who does not support responsible unionism; I am not opposed to responsible unionism; I am very much opposed to irresponsible unionism, and I am opposed particularly to compulsory trade unionism.

Mr Bryce: What about the right to strike.

Mr CLARKO: This to me is completely against all human rights.

Mr Bryce: Do you acknowledge that workers have the right to strike?

Mr CLARKO: If we look at the universal declaration of human rights we see a clause that states most emphatically that no-one should be compelled to belong to an association against his wish. I believe in that principle without question.

Mr Davies: Do you believe in all those declarations, or are you just selecting one?

Mr CLARKO: All my life I have belonged to unions whenever I was employed in a position where unionism applied. I belonged to the State School Teachers' Union, but I certainly would not want a bar of that union if it were based on compulsory unionism. When I was a young man I belonged to the Clerks' Union. I was put off this union when a fellow came down demanding that I pay my money to that particular union. As soon as I obtained the job of a sales representative, I left the Clerks' Union because I remembered what had happened earlier.

Mr Bryce: Was that a militant left-wing union?

Mr CLARKO: To me the quintessence of this argument is the question of compulsory unionism, and those irresponsible unions which are using force against members of the community.

I could refer to many past actions of trade unions, but I will refer to the classic case in Britain where unionists refused to allow cylinders of oxygen to be delivered to hospitals. As a result of this action, a number of patients died. This was the act of an irresponsible union, and unfortunately the irresponsible unions are calling the tune.

A moment ago a member asked me whether I believed in strikes. Basically I do not believe in strikes because I think they are unfair, and certainly, they are unfair as we see them operating in Australia. I could imagine a situation such as happened a few years ago in Spain where a universal political strike might have been called. I cannot say I am against strikes completely, because there may be some strikes—as in Spain—where I

would accept the workers' right to strike. However, every day in the Australian Press we read about different strikes, and I find I oppose all of them.

Mr Bryce: If you continue on in this way, not only will you never get into Cabinet, but the file on you will continue to grow.

Mr CLARKO: The cabinet the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will go into will be a box with handles on it. I am trying to make some points about unions. I know members opposite are not free to be critical of the unions, because union leaders pull all the strings and grab them by the hair on the top of their heads—

Mr Bryce: Interjected.

Mr CLARKO: I am sorry, that does not apply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, we could say that the unions lead him around.

I say again that we on this side of the House are not opposed to responsible unionism. However, we cannot justify the use of picketing arrangements which are obstructive and lead to violence. I cannot see how any person who believes in human rights and liberalism with a minute "I", can condone pickets standing at the gate of a factory or a wharf to prevent people entering that work place.

In my opinion trade unions should seek to obtain their goals through persuasion, intellectual argument, and negotiation. That is what is wrong with certain elements of the trade union movement in Australia. Australia is one of the most peaceful countries in the world; I doubt whether any other country in this globe can match its record.

Today the only violence which is growing and is disturbing not only the economy but also the ordinary citizen, is this violence by irresponsible people, people who bring about a situation where no bread is baked so that old aged pensioners cannot have a slice of bread. A pensioner has no way of coming back at that sort of person.

I do not know how many people in this Chamber have been on strike during their lifetime. I suspect that the answer would be "very few". This is the great evil of striking; it is not equitable. As I said before, if one is in a strategic industry, one is able to put the crunch on others in the community. The people who are hurt are usually those low on the socio-economic scale. When we have strikes involving the transport industry, it is the people at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy who are hurt the most; it is these people who are then denied transport. Members opposite are supposed to represent these people.

Earlier tonight the member for Morley said that when a strike occurs the Liberal Party believes it is helped electorally. I think it is, and he agrees with my viewpoint. However, why is that so? It is because the ordinary working person in Australia is being unfairly squeezed and hurt. These are the people who suffer. One irresponsible unionist may hurt the family of a man who is a responsible unionist. That is where the system is unfair; that is the evil, and it is where the concept of unionism clashes with human rights and the famous declaration I referred to earlier that nobody should be forced to join an organisation against his wish.

Mr Skidmore: They do not have to.

Mr CLARKO: Unions can achieve virtually full membership on a voluntary basis. I remember talking to a research officer of the School Teachers' Union a few years ago and he told me that throughout the whole of Western Australia fewer than six teachers had refused to belong to the union.

Mr Skidmore: It is much worse today.

Mr CLARKO: The member for Swan says that the number is higher today.

Mr Skidmore: It is.

Mr CLARKO: It might be that this irresponsible element in the unions is forcing more and more people to discard even the best elements of unionism. Probably Australia was foremost in the world in arranging a system of conciliation and arbitration. People throughout the world looked at our system and admired it. When a dispute goes to arbitration, somebody must make a decision; the judge makes a pronouncement and any party to the dispute who does not follow that pronouncement will suffer a penalty.

Back in the 1960s we had the famous Clarry O'Shea case in Melbourne where in effect the system of the collection of fines and so on was destroyed. Many people would not remember this, but most of the penalties emanating from the industrial courts of Western Australia are the result of actions by unions against their own colleagues. Unfortunately, following the O'Shea case, the Federal system of responsible unionism was destroyed in Australia.

Recently I read a very interesting comment about what we could do in regard to unions if they became the law. A person who refused to pay a fine could be sent to gaol, but then perhaps some of the employees at the gaol will refuse to work there and in the end these militant unionists will be able to thumb their noses at the whole community, and they will squash and hurt the little people. The man who

made the comment to which I have referred suggested a very interesting solution, and although I do not say I support it, I would like to put it forward for the consideration of members. He referred to bygone days in England when the Crown of the day was not able to maintain law and order throughout the nation. The action then taken by the Crown was to brand certain people as outlaws.

This man suggested as an alternative to the situation in which unionists cannot be touched by the law or punished, that they should be branded as outlaws. He argued this would mean they would lose a great many of their rights and would have no protection whatsoever. He said it would be a way of bringing them to heel.

I think it is interesting that a political scientist in Australia should put that forward as a method for dealing with extremist trade unions which will not follow the law, because I am certain members of the Opposition understand that ultimately we must have a situation in which penalties can be applied to irresponsible unionists who will take no notice of what is reasonable and proper either initially through conciliation or finally through arbitration. We must have a system of penalties; without it Australia will go downhill.

I regret to say I regard the irresponsible trade union element in Australia as our greatest evil, which is destroying our great nation and preventing us from getting on with the job of creating employment and increasing our standard of living.

This irresponsible element is starting to cause us to make the rules tighter and tighter as a reaction to the situation they create. They are creating a situation in which freedom in Australia, which at present is probably comparable with any other country in the world, is being restricted by tighter and tighter regulations.

So many people say it is up to the ordinary Australian working man to attend his union meetings; but I think it is also particularly a responsibility and a duty of the Opposition not to encourage the sort of action we have seen in the past week. After all, members opposite by 1980 will have been in Opposition for 18 of the last 21 years, and probably they will have a similar record in the next 20 years.

If that is the case and they are going to be on the Opposition benches all the time, let them be constructive and let them try to put forward some ideas to see that unionism in Australia is uplifted, and that unionism is looked at in the light it was looked at in the beginning of the century. Some 75 years ago people looked at unionism in

Australia—and I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with his knowledge of history would know this—as a very fine thing; and that was acknowledged throughout the world. However, I put it to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues that today the general world community considers one of Australia's greatest problems is militant unionism. It is militant unionism which is dragging down the country, and it is militant unionism which is dragging down everyone in the country.

Mr Skidmore: Give some examples.

Mr CLARKO: I would say it is an example if a group of meatworkers take action to prevent the normal trade relations under which a group of people want to have livestock exported from this country to another.

Mr Skidmore: Without commenting either way on that example, give us another example.

Mr CLARKO: There is the case of Mr Latham of Broken Hill—that famous city, that evil city, in which every man is compelled to contribute to the local newspaper. Look at the decisions which come from the Barrier Council in Broken Hill; look at the wicked and disgusting thing being done to Mr Latham.

Mr Skidmore: He deserves every bit of it.

Mr CLARKO: That is the opinion of the member for Swan, and it shows the depth of the gulf, the abyss, between the two of us; and I suggest that is the reason he and his colleagues have been on the Opposition benches for 18 out of the past 21 years, and it is the reason that on the Australian scene the Labor Party has been in power for only three years since 1949.

Mr Hodge: You don't think crooked electoral laws have anything to do with that?

Mr CLARKO: I am glad the member for Melville has said the Federal electoral laws are crooked.

Mr McIver: What about the worker in the Pilbara who was not allowed to change his clothes and who died of pneumonia, causing an industrial stoppage? Don't you think that matter should have been solved by sensible discussion? Look at it from both sides.

Sir Charles Court: If they had gone to industrial arbitration earlier they would not have had the trouble.

Mr McIver: Why not have a sensible discussion? That is ridiculous.

Mr CLARKO: If I may interject, let me point out that while we have this fundamental situation of certain people within our community belonging

to strategic unions which are controlled by people who I believe are not responsible, we will be faced with further unrest. That is the reason the Liberal and Country Parties have been in Government for so long both in the State scene and the Federal scene. We have been in Government for a generation.

Mr Marks has been mentioned. He is a member of the trade union movement, the exact title of his union I am not certain. It was the AMWU before the shipwrights joined it. However, I recall reading an article some years ago in which it was said that union had 135 organisers who were admitted communists. They were full-time, paid organisers of that union. I recall reading that the union stated at an annual meeting that it was collecting more money per annum than it had projects on which to spend the money.

Mr Skidmore: What does that prove?

Mr CLARKO: When we have the most powerful union in the country with 135 admitted communists on its pay-roll, I do not believe that is typical or representative of the work force of Australia. If I walked into the local bar and talked to working people—plasterers, carpenters, fitters and turners and the like—I do not believe I would find they are communists. However, there is no question that many unions in Australia have been taken over by communists. Look at what has happened with the Builders' Labourers Federation in which violence has been used.

I read with interest that Jack Mackie, the man who caused the trouble at Mt. Isa, turned up at a riot in Sydney in which fellows were getting stuck into each other with pick handles and lumps of masonry. Poor old Jack Mackie resurfaced briefly! One could produce an encyclopaedia of examples of extremists in the irresponsible trade unions of Australia having defied, destroyed, and defiled the Australian nation; and that is the real problem with which we are faced.

Members of the Opposition stand up and, as they are required to do, say the trade union movement is a great thing; and they try to get us to name people who are on the left, and so on. Yet, if a member opposite walked down Hay Street and asked a half-dozen people what they thought about irresponsible unionism in Australia, about unions holding the country to ransom, about unions dragging back the growth of our great country, he would find all six people—unless one was Mrs Marks—would say that is what is happening.

Mr Blaikie: I think even Mrs Marks would agree.

Mr CLARKO: Unfortunately, this extremist group is gaining far too much power in this country. Far too much power is also given to people who are not on the extremist, irresponsible left. Bob Hawke gets the most magnificent publicity of anyone in Australia. I do not think anybody else—not even the Prime Minister or Kerry Packer—would receive as much publicity as Bob Hawke. Every time Mr Hawke plays a game of cricket he is given publicity on the television and the newspapers carry a photograph of him hitting a four or two. I have said before that nobody ever denies that Bob Hawke probably received his first pay packet from a multi-national oil company.

Point of Order

Mr SKIDMORE: Mr Speaker, I again direct your attention to the fact that the amendment is relevant to the industrial situation in Western Australia. In the last 12 minutes the member for Karrinyup has done nothing but refer to England, New South Wales, Broken Hill, and other places which have no affinity whatsoever with the amendment before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I do not accept that there is a point of order. The member for Karrinyup has been making reference to those places in support of his argument in opposition to the amendment.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr CLARKO: I was talking about Broken Hill; the member for Swan reminds me of broken Bill. He has raised so many points of order that I am sure he is a black swan and not a white one.

Mr Bryce: "Stormtrooper Bill", not broken Bill.

Mr CLARKO: This subject is too serious for us to try to make petty points. What irresponsible trade unionists are doing is one of the most fundamental problems of this country. The Minister for Labour and Industry said recently that we have a militant group of highly organised trade unionists who are using force and all sorts of pressures to defy and prevent the normal course of justice applying. There is no question that the most specious piece of drivel I have heard for weeks is the statement that the Government should ask that charges against people arrested for breaking the law be withdrawn.

The day this Government comes in and starts this sort of thing, the first people to criticise it will be members on the Opposition benches. We have stayed away from interfering with the judicial process, and we should. But I can tell members that the day these people who have been

charged and who will get a fair trial, go into court, outside the court there will be all sorts of pressures, from union pressures to mob pressures; there will be threats of violence; people outside the court will intimidate the people who might want to walk up and down that street in the normal way; there will be intimidation of the ordinary policeman who has a job to do; they will use noise in an overt way to try to intimidate and prevent justice taking its true course.

Nobody on this side of the House will be aggrieved if those people who were involved in a disturbance on the wharf and who were charged for breaking the law get off; that will not hurt us. The course of law will have taken its proper path and that is all we are concerned about.

However, we are concerned about the rights of the ordinary person to work. We have made this point many times before in this House. The Minister for Labour and Industry has spoken before about irresponsible, evil, militant left-wing unions preventing people from going about their daily business, and working. And did they not choose a dreadful time to try to stop the farmers? I was very interested to see a group of people interviewed on the ABC television programme "This Day Tonight". They were asked whether they were in favour of the farmers or the trade unionists and every man Jack came out in favour of the farmers. What a cruel time the trade unions chose to use their power.

Mr Bryce: Did you watch the entire programme?

Mr CLARKO: I certainly did; I watch the ABC very closely. I have been watching the ABC for about a generation, I suppose, because I am very interested in current affairs. I will not talk about the balance or otherwise of the ABC.

I should like members opposite to drop their charades and to stop trying to twist what the Minister for Labour and Industry was attempting to do. What he was trying to do was to get this country working in a proper and fair way, as the people in this State—the golden flower of the golden sun—have a right to work.

Mr Bryce: The Premier will reserve a place for you, next.

Mr CLARKO: Why should we prevent the ordinary Western Australian from going about his normal business? That is all we are trying to do. We do not go out of our way to apply physical violence, to marshal up a group to intimidate and put pressure on people. All we want is for people to be able to work, and to go about their normal, lawful business. Our whole industrial system is designed to help people keep their jobs.

Mr Hodge: But you do not use it.

Mr CLARKO: Is the honourable member trying to assert that when his party was in Government between 1971 and 1974 there were no industrial troubles?

Mr Hodge: Of course there were.

Mr CLARKO: Yes, of course there were. Yet members opposite come in here with their pious remarks, talking about this Government's "lack of concern for the people". I suggest to members opposite that they refrain from these sorts of attacks, otherwise they are doomed to spend another generation in Opposition. Why do they not say, "We are getting nowhere with the tactics we have been trying on for the last 20 years"? I know that members opposite are used to coming in here and attacking the Government, and then going back to Trades Hall and getting a pat on the back for their efforts, but they are not in touch with reality.

Let members opposite be realistic for a change and say, "We agree with the Liberal-Country Party. There should be effective penalties for people who are not prepared to abide by our system of conciliation."

Mr Bryce: You talk about the Opposition attacking the Government. Your party when in Opposition gave the Tonkin Government absolutely no support on any measure of importance. You had control in the other House and used it time and time again. It was an absolutely disgraceful period.

Mr CLARKO: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is interjecting so loudly he may put me off. We believe we should go through the process of conciliation. Ultimately, someone must make a decision, and that decision should be abided by. People should not try to put pressure on the judiciary, the police, or whatever, but that is what people are trying to do today. They are using pressure and threats of violence to intimidate others.

There are many examples in Australia of this practice. I remember years ago a person trying to drive through pickets at the gates at the Kwinana steel works, and I remember what happened to his motorcar. I do not say members opposite support such actions by directly promoting them. However, it is clear they support them indirectly by their failure to give their support when the Government is trying to arrive at a fair solution.

Look at this Government's record of arriving at a fair system. We are not trying to put any sort of pressure or intimidation on people who are going about their ordinary jobs. For those

who seek improved working conditions and wages, there is a system established, and that system should be applied. If at the end of the line they happen to get a wage decision which is less than they are seeking, it is probably the way of the world. I suspect people in here think they get a bit less than they deserve.

Whether it be a group of highly technical people who strike and hold the nation to ransom or whether it be a group of people who are very unskilled, in my opinion striking in Australia as I see it on a day-to-day basis is unfair to ordinary people.

Mr Bertram: Since when have you been concerned with fairness?

Mr CLARKO: I want to talk about this very serious matter on the basis of fairness. I have talked about justice and how one should not interfere with justice in our courts. I feel that what has happened in this country has been a consistent attempt to subvert the course of justice by the bully-boys of certain irresponsible unions, and I hope they will be advised and encouraged—perhaps even by members of the Opposition, if they are game enough to reach this height—that that is not the way to lead to the development of a country where everybody has work and a standard of living which almost no other country could compare. That is what we want, but we will never get it while we have irresponsible unions which act as they have in recent times.

In particular, I commend the Minister for Labour and Industry for the way in which he tried to put forward a solution to remind the decent unionists of our State and to point out to their wives that fairness will prevail only if we give up all these means of force and coercion and return to the proper means of industrial conciliation and arbitration, when required.

MR HODGE (Melville) [10.17 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, I strongly support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion, moved by the member for Ascot. Industrial relations in this State probably have reached an all-time low since 1974. They have gone steadily downhill since this Government came into office. They have gone downhill rapidly with the present Minister for Labour and Industry at the helm.

The entire emphasis in industrial relations in this State has moved from conciliation and mediation under the Tonkin Labor Government to one of confrontation under this present Minister. This Minister, of course, is an expert on confrontation. The entire Government thrives on confrontation with the trade union movement. As the member

for Morley pointed out, there are votes for the Liberal Party in confrontation and in industrial unrest.

Mr Clarko: Because the ordinary Australian knows what is right.

Mr HODGE: The mediation sections of the Industrial Arbitration Act, which were put in by the Tonkin Government, have never been used by the Court Government. Never once has the Minister for Labour and Industry tried to use the conciliatory process put in the Act during 1972 or 1973 by the Tonkin Labor Government. Those mediation clauses have laid there in the Act and not once have they been used.

This Minister, of course, prefers to use his high office as Minister for Labour and Industry to confront the trade union movement and the unionists of this State to cause industrial unrest. He is a specialist in brinksmanship. It is interesting to compare his performance in the live sheep export dispute with his Federal counterpart (Mr Street). Mr Street seemed to adopt a conciliatory, responsible approach. I believe he telephoned the Minister for Labour and Industry and tried to talk some sense into him.

Mr Sibson: Because he did not understand the ramifications of the situation in Western Australia.

Mr HODGE: I believe he suggested to the Minister for Labour and Industry that it would be a conciliatory, sensible gesture if he dropped the charges which were laid against people who went onto the wharf—charges that were drummed up under phoney regulations which have never come before this Parliament.

The member for Karrinyup talked about bully boy tactics. Members opposite have the establishment at their fingertips; they do not use bully boys, they use the establishment and the Parliament.

Mr Grayden: What laws are you talking about?

Mr HODGE: Which laws were those men charged under?

Mr Grayden: Under regulations.

Mr HODGE: Have they ever come before this Parliament? They have never been considered by this Parliament.

Mr Grayden: Some of them are under the Police Act.

Mr HODGE: The Government adjusts the law to suit itself.

Mr Grayden: That is utter nonsense.

Mr HODGE: The Government invents a new law and it does not even have to go through this Parliament. The Government invents a law to suit itself; it dreams up a law to suit itself.

Mr Old: They are tabled now.

Mr Skidmore: After the dispute.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HODGE: Since this Minister has been in office we have seen a sharp and dramatic increase in industrial violence. Let us consider the violence that has occurred during the last few years. Several union officials have been assaulted and this Government stood by and said nothing about the matter. We have seen people bring Alsatian guard dogs onto building sites and threaten union officials with them. Bombs have been thrown at the home of a solicitor who had defended trade union officials. A solicitor living in Cottesloe had a bomb thrown at his house. A person who has the same name as the Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council had a bomb thrown through his front window.

Mr Shalders: Who did that?

Mr HODGE: Extremists who have been provoked by the rantings and ravings of this Minister. We have seen union pickets hurt by truck drivers driving through picket lines and egged on by this Minister. Of course, to cap it all last week we saw an individual actually shoot a firearm at some unionists. All these things have developed during the last few years. None of this violence existed in this State prior to this Government taking office. Intemperate criticism and inflammatory language used by this Minister are significant factors in the increase in violence in industrial dispute situations in this State.

We often hear the Minister for Labour and Industry talk about industrial matters and industrial disputes. Not once since I have been a member of this place have I heard him attribute any blame in an industrial dispute to the employers' side. I have been a member of this place for just over 12 months and in every speech in respect to industrial disputes the Minister has made the unionists have been 100 per cent in the wrong. There is no apportionment of the blame as far as he is concerned; it is all one way.

I am a unionist. I am a former union official and I am prepared to concede that in some industrial disputes unionists and union officials are partially to blame. I do not believe they are totally right in every dispute. But I have never heard this Minister or anyone in this Government concede that point. As far as they are concerned, all unionists are always in the wrong.

Mr Shalders: If you were in here a bit more often you would hear it.

Mr HODGE: I am here more often than the member for Murray is. The union to which I proudly belong is the Liquor Trades Union. I

have taken out some statistics through that union and I have found that since 1974 the union, through legal action in the industrial magistrate's court, has recovered \$100 000 that has been stolen from the workers of this State by lawless employers. We hear a lot about militancy and industrial lawlessness. Have members ever heard the Minister for Labour and Industry talk about lawlessness amongst employers? Yet the sum of \$100 000 has been stolen from workers by unscrupulous employers since 1974. That is only one industry.

Mr Grayden: You could not substantiate that, of course.

Mr HODGE: I can substantiate it. All these cases have gone through the industrial magistrate's court in Perth.

Mr Grayden: You must realise that there are varying reasons why there are disputes over wages.

Mr HODGE: For the information of the Minister, that \$100 000 has been recovered either through decisions of the industrial magistrate's court or through employers voluntarily conceding that they owe the money and then paying it. In many cases the money was deliberately underpaid.

Mr Grayden: It is a most complicated system.

Mr HODGE: It is so complicated that after having checked hundreds and hundreds of time and wages books in my six years with the union I never discovered an employer overpaying a worker!

Mr Grayden: I will bring some of the pamphlets you are putting out in your electorate and quote them in this House. They contain straight untruths.

Mr HODGE: The Minister ought to know! This Government passed an amendment to the Industrial Arbitration Act which gave the Industrial Commission authority to award wage rises and award conditions. It created an Industrial Commission and gave it power to make laws and industrial agreements. Yet it did not create a force to police those laws. It relies on the trade union movement to do that.

Mr Grayden: That is absolute nonsense. What do you think the Department of Labour and Industry does every day?

Mr HODGE: The Minister's department employs a grand total of three industrial inspectors to enforce award conditions and they have to cover the whole of the State and 500 industrial awards.

Mr Grayden: Absolute nonsense!

Mr HODGE: That is what the Minister told me in answer to a question I asked.

Mr Grayden: That is not the total complement of the department.

Mr HODGE: I am talking about industrial inspectors.

Mr Grayden: Don't you think anybody else works on the same subject?

Mr HODGE: Industrial inspectors are specified in the Act as having responsibility for enforcing awards. There are three of them: a senior inspector who rarely moves out of his office and two other inspectors who are also almost office-bound.

Mr Grayden: You obviously do not know anything about the Department of Labour and Industry.

Mr HODGE: What I know about the Department of Labour and Industry the Minister told me in answer to questions. If the information is wrong he had better admit that he has been misleading the House. Industrial inspectors are inundated with queries about wages and awards. They cannot get out of their office to visit places of employment to ensure that awards are enforced. In answer to a question I asked earlier this year the Minister admitted that there had been only one prosecution of an employer for breaches of awards in the previous 12 months. They hardly made any visits to places of employment in the metropolitan area. They had not been outside the metropolitan area at all for the past 12 months. So it is a laugh; the Government relies on the trade union movement to police the law.

I have been involved in prosecuting hundreds of lawless employers in the industrial magistrate's court. I have appeared as a witness or conducted the prosecution of hundreds of employers who have blatantly breached an award and have been convicted in the industrial magistrate's court. Usually after weeks of research, examining time and wages records, preparing cases, and waiting to go before the magistrate's court, the court deals so leniently with employers that they regard it as a joke.

I was involved in one case which concerned a worker who had been deliberately underpaid \$300 over a period of a few weeks. The magistrate did not impose any fine. He said that the employer had to pay a substantial amount of back-wages, which he should have paid in the first place, and therefore he was not going to impose a penalty.

Mr Grayden: In most cases the employer would be completely unaware of the award.

Mr HODGE: The employer was not completely unaware of it. The inconsistency of penalties imposed by the magistrates is scandalous. In some cases an employer can be fined \$5 for a particular offence and the next week, because there is another magistrate on the bench, for the same offence an employer can be fined \$50 or \$100. There needs to be some consistency in the industrial magistrate's court. That is an area about which the Government could do something constructive instead of coming in here and bashing the unions.

Mr Grayden: I'll bring in some of your pamphlets.

Mr HODGE: There is nothing wrong with my pamphlets. Not only are employers being dealt with leniently by the courts but we have also recently seen a couple of examples of employers losing cases in the courts and then asking the Government to change the rules. Under this Government the laws can be changed to suit the employers. Two recent examples include the proposed amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act where the employers, because they lost a Supreme Court case, a High Court case, and a Privy Council appeal, went to their friends in the Government and asked them to change the law so they would not lose similar cases in future.

We saw the Government reacting also to the wholesale meat companies—Metro Meats—who asked the Government to change the regulations and trump up laws and arrest the picketers. The Government has trumped up the laws; they have not come through this Parliament.

Mr Old: They are on the table now.

Mr Carr: Today; after the event.

Mr HODGE: The Liberal Party in this State pays lip service to trade unionism. The member for Karrinyup said tonight he believed in responsible trade unionism. He used the word "responsible" many times. What does "responsible" trade unionism mean? Does it mean tame cat and ineffective unions; those that do not properly represent their members; or perhaps unions the Government and the employers agree with?

Mr Spriggs: Are you telling the member for Collie that the Collie Miners' Union is an ineffective union and does nothing for its members?

Mr HODGE: I want to know what the Liberal Party means by "responsible unions"? It appears to me the Liberal Party means ineffective, tame cat unions.

Mr Grayden: Not so.

Mr HODGE: Why does not the Liberal Party come out and say it does not agree with unions? It wants to crush unions; it does not want them

in this country. Why do not Government members drop the pretence that they believe in trade unions? They should come out in the open and say they do not really believe in effective unions. Government members believe in unions only when they do not trouble the Government and do not put pressure on the Government or the employers.

The Government wants unions that will not represent workers. The Government ought to get dinkum and admit this instead of carrying on this charade.

Mr Watt: Union members are being lead by the nose by union representatives.

Mr HODGE: Even today's editorial in *The West Australian* criticised the Minister. The editorial was headed, "Grayden gaffe". The Premier said in the same paper that the non-union plan was not needed. One need only think about this plan for a few minutes to realise how ludicrous it is. Imagine having a non-union port, even if it were at Dongara or Geraldton. What about the seamen who work on ships? The Minister might not realise it, but most members of ships' crews are members of the Seamen's Union.

What would be the situation of ships arriving with members of the Seamen's Union on board in ports which are not union ports? It would be ridiculous! If the Minister thinks about this and takes it to the obvious extreme, he will see how ridiculous it is. Would unionists eat food prepared by non-unionists? Would they accept food and drink from people in non-unionist areas?

For once in my life I agree with the Premier when he says the non-union plan is not needed. It is the only time I have been able to agree with the Premier. I understand that not only did *The West Australian* and the Premier write off the Minister's suggestion, but even his friend, Mr Atkinson, of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry squirmed at the idea when he was interviewed last night on television and said he did not agree either. I agree with the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asking that the Minister for Labour and Industry resign so that sanity can return to industrial relations in this State.

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [10.35 p.m.]: In a lot of ways the course of this debate has been eminently predictable. The Minister has been seeking the kind of amendment we have moved for as long as I have been in this House. In essence, I thought something was going to be done about this Minister when the Premier, *The West Australian*, and the Confederation of Western

Australian Industry seemed at long last to have taken a public stand by today rejecting the utterances this Minister has made.

When I first came to this Parliament I was told not to be away from the Chamber when the Minister for Labour and Industry spoke. I was told about "brown bears", a subject raised by the Minister in one of his speeches. Since then we did get a story about a unionist's radio in a caravan. At that time, according to the Minister, there was a caravan in the bush at Wundowie and a prominent trade union member was receiving instructions by radio from, if I recall correctly, Moscow, Peking, and North Korea.

A Government member: Where is he now?

Mr PEARCE: In fact, some investigations were carried out and next day we were subjected to a lengthy tirade from the Minister about how he visited this unionist's flat not far from Parliament House and saw thousands of dollars worth of radio equipment on the wall. Rumours went around about where the Minister had been between the car trip from the Causeway and the helicopter trip.

Points of Order

Mr GRAYDEN: I take strong exception to that statement and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The only grounds for the withdrawal of words is when the words used by a member happen to be unparliamentary or unbecoming in some way. A member may say something which may even be untrue. There is no requirement in our Standing Orders for me to call upon the member to withdraw the words. I cannot find grounds to ask for a withdrawal.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member made the statement that as a result of a visit to this flat—it was a half-hour visit in the course of the trip from the Causeway to Perth—rumours went around about me. I regard that as highly offensive.

Mr Bertram: A statement of fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is a breach of Standing Orders for a member to imply improper motives to another member. I find it very difficult to find improper motives in the light of the words that were used. Admittedly the member said there were rumours circulating, but I cannot tell whether the rumours were good, bad, or indifferent, so I find I cannot ask the member to withdraw his words.

Mr Grayden: I will ask the member to withdraw as soon as leaves the Chamber. I will be waiting out there for him.

Several members interjected.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. Could I draw your attention to the conduct and the action of the Minister as he departed from this Chamber? I ask whether his actions were parliamentary, and if not, precisely what should be done about them?

The SPEAKER: I did not observe any actions of the Minister that offended the Standing Orders of this Assembly and therefore I can see no action that I should be called upon to take.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Could I ask you, Mr Speaker, if you could ask the *Hansard* reporter if he was able to obtain the Minister's remarks as he departed from the Chamber and so determine whether they were offensive. I think, in elaboration of that, if a Minister persists in inviting the members of this House out for fisticuffs, it is hardly becoming of him.

The SPEAKER: The member for Warren has asked if I would ascertain whether or not *Hansard* has recorded the remarks made by the Minister as he left the House. I did not hear precisely the words used by the Minister, so I am prepared to leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells. I shall ask the *Hansard* reporter if he could let me have his record of what was said.

Sitting suspended from 10.38 to 10.53 p.m.

The SPEAKER: The situation which applied just before I left the Chair was one in which the Minister for Labour and Industry had asked for a withdrawal of certain words and I said—

It is a breach of Standing Orders for a member to imply improper motives to another member. I find it very difficult to find improper motives in the light of the words that were used. Admittedly he said there were rumours circulating but I cannot tell whether the rumours were good, bad, or indifferent, so I find I cannot ask the member to withdraw his words.

At which point the Minister for Labour and Industry said as follows—

I will ask the member to withdraw as soon as he leaves the Chamber. I will be waiting out there for him.

They are the words which were used and which have prompted the member for Warren to take a point of order. I cannot accept that there is any point of order when I view the words that were actually said by the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, in considering the point of order and the expression of a member do you have account for the demeanour and the manner which is used?

A Government member: Cut it out!

The SPEAKER: Order! I do have account for the demeanour of people in their conduct in this place; but I did not observe the actions of the member as he left the Chamber and the request of the member for Warren was that I should view the words and on the words that were said give a ruling as to whether or not there had been a breach of the Standing Orders. I find no such breach.

Mr TONKIN: Mr Speaker, you say there has been no breach of Standing Orders. I draw your attention to section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act. Have you, Sir, in fact had a look at that particular section of the Act, because I believe it is clearly a breach of that and this House, of course, has to take cognisance of that as well as being concerned with Standing Orders.

Sir Charles Court: You can only ask questions of the Speaker on notice.

Mr BRYCE: On a point of order, I should like you to rule, Sir—

The SPEAKER: I will deal with them one at a time, if I may.

Mr O'Neil: That is reasonable.

The SPEAKER: I presume the member for Morley is referring to that passage of the section of the Act relating to a member challenging another member to fight.

Mr O'Connor: There was no such challenge.

The SPEAKER: Can I ascertain if that is the fact of the matter?

Mr TONKIN: Mr Speaker, I think it is absolutely remarkable that in fact you have correctly known what I was referring to. If in fact there was no such challenge I wonder how you would have known which part of the section I was referring to.

Mr Bryce: Precisely. The Premier was not even here. He would not know.

Sir Charles Court: I just heard what he said then. In the other Parliament he would not be here now.

Mr Davies: Was it not an easy trap?

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr PEARCE: I must say that I clearly understood the Minister to invite me outside to fight. It is not the first time this has occurred. At the end of my speech I am prepared to go outside and we will see whether he is calling me outside to withdraw the words and we will see what action he takes thereafter. I take it that if the Minister goes through with his implied threat,

it will be incumbent upon you, Mr Speaker, and the House to take some action against the gentleman.

Mr Bryce: And it will demonstrate the point we are making tonight about the Minister's political thuggery. He is a political thug and it is a demonstration—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr PEARCE: I am fascinated to know that at least two members on the Government side also thought that the Minister was challenging me to fight.

Mr Clarko: I was not here, so you are half wrong as usual.

Mr Tonkin: Larrikin behaviour in the Parliament.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bryce: The Premier laughs and thinks it is a joke when the Minister—

Sir Charles Court: When you hear the member for Morley—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Point of Order

Mr GRAYDEN: I take strong exception to the statement by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What I asked for was an apology for those untrue words. You, Mr Speaker, ruled against it. I therefore said that I would go outside—which I intend to do—and ask the member for an apology. What he and I do afterwards is our business.

The SPEAKER: Can I ask the Minister for Labour and Industry to tell me the words to which he takes exception because quite honestly I did not hear the words?

Mr GRAYDEN: What the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said was that I had challenged someone to a fight and what I simply asked for was a withdrawal of untrue words, and I intend to ask for the withdrawal of those untrue words.

The SPEAKER: I find that there is no point of order in the matter raised by the Minister. I ask the Parliament to come to order so that we may proceed with the debate. The member for Gosnells.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr PEARCE: The point I was making before this lengthy series of points of order is that the Minister in his personal conduct in the House

and the way he approaches debates on serious matters is a disgrace to the Parliament and, in fact, the rigmarole of the past 15 minutes demonstrates only too clearly the point I was trying to make by reference to what occurred last year.

Ironically the next point I intended to discuss was the way in which the Minister last session, during the discussion about the union official's radio and a visit to his flat, invited several members outside to fight. This is not the approach to the public which one expects of a responsible Minister of the Crown.

It is remarkable that the word "responsible" is used so frequently by members opposite in approving the conduct of the Minister for Labour and Industry. I thought that when I read the Premier's disavowal of the Minister's statement on union apartheid, and when I saw last night on television the disavowal of the Minister's statement by a gentleman from the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, and when I read the editorial which also disavowed the Minister's statement, the Minister for Labour and Industry was at last being brought to book.

One wonders, in fact, why the Government has put up with this Minister for so long. The answer became clear during the course of tonight's debate: Because the Government sees the confrontation which the Minister engineers with the union movement as being vote catching.

The Premier started to lecture members on this side of the House. In fact, it turned out subsequently he said that the way to win votes is to cause confrontation and get people on one's side; grab some section of the community, attack it as long as it is unpopular, and hope to drag in the votes from people who do not fully understand the situation.

I thought we were to get a degree of responsibility from the Government and a disavowal of its own Minister's statement, but of course we did not. We saw an attempt to bring in the communist smear tactic. I resent the degree of hypocrisy inherent in many comments expressed by members opposite. I particularly single out the remarks of the member for Karrinyup when he said the matter we are discussing is too important for us to descend to petty abuse. That particular statement followed a very personal reference to the appearance of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. After making very petty and stupid points about the personal appearance of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, he had the gall to say this matter was too important to descend to that type of debate.

Mr Shalders: A similar reference was made to me the other night and I took it in good part because I thought it was said in good humour.

Mr PEARCE: On that particular occasion it probably was.

Mr Clarko: I am pleased to hear you say that you will not indulge in that type of debate in the future. It is certainly a change.

Mr Grayden: The member for Gosnells has an apology to make, I can assure him of that.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Labour and Industry has no chance. He should call me outside again and be more specific this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I ask the member for Gosnells to address his remarks to the Chair and desist from making any further provocative statements that could lead to a further exchange with members opposite.

Mr PEARCE: I shall attempt to be unprovocative. It was probably to be expected that the old communist left-wing union smear would be used. However, it comes at a remarkably inappropriate time for members of the Liberal Party to talk about extremist groups because at this very moment people in New South Wales are decrying the fact that the Liberal Party organisation is being taken over by an extreme right-wing group.

Point of Order

Mr CLARKO: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am of the opinion that the comments being made have no relation to the amendment before the Chair in any way. I ask you to rule.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been extremely tolerant of members from both sides of the Chamber, and I am prepared to allow some leniency to the member for Gosnells.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr PEARCE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In fact, the extreme right-wing group which is taking over the Liberal Party in New South Wales has been connected with an extreme right-wing organisation with which members of the opposition benches have considerable ties.

Mr McIver: Members on the Government benches.

Several members interjected.

Mr Bryce: Members over there are in opposition.

Mr PEARCE: I meant to refer to the gentlemen on the benches opposite.

It is well known that the member for Greenough chaired a meeting of the League of Rights in Northampton after being elected a member of Parliament. The member for Moore has spoken at a meeting convened by the League of Rights, and the member for Vasse is well known for his connection with the League of Rights.

Mr Bryce: He probably has a private army hidden at Yallingup somewhere.

Mr Bertram: Fancy being associated with fascism.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: The League of Rights is a neo-fascist organisation which is based mainly in the rural areas of Queensland and New South Wales. It is probably a lineal descendent of the New Guard, a semi-Nazi group which operated in northern New South Wales during the 1930s. It was the same sort of organisation and it espoused the same attitude.

Mr Grayden: What gutter did they drag you out of?

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I presume you heard the Minister for Labour and Industry ask "What gutter did they drag you out of?" I think that under Standing Orders it is the duty of the Speaker to intervene in such matters, and I believe you should be impartial.

The SPEAKER: I do believe the interjection by the Minister for Labour and Industry was unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw the offensive words.

Mr GRAYDEN: I shall withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The member for Gosnells.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr Blaikie: What association have I had with the League of Rights?

Mr PEARCE: I can scarcely be surprised that the members of the Liberal Party are so sensitive on this question of a takeover.

Mr Blaikie: By what association?

Mr Grayden: Will the member for Gosnells repeat the same statement outside so that he can be sued for scandal?

Mr Bryce: How dare the Minister, after the insinuations he has made tonight. He is pleading injured party after the smut he has thrown about.

Mr Grayden: We will soot Dr Dadour onto you.

Mr PEARCE: The point I am trying to make in this matter is that it really adds very little to the political debate, either inside this Chamber or in the community generally. All one tries to do is to point out the consequences of the failures of political parties. We can point to some despicable characters associated with the Liberal Party in one sense or another. Also, there are people who support us publicly and whose support we could well do without. There are associations which cause electoral damage to us, the same as association with the League of Rights can be damaging to the Government.

Mr Blaikie: You would not have the slightest notion of what you are talking about.

Mr PEARCE: What I am saying has been said in this House previously.

Mr Blaikie: Would you explain?

Mr PEARCE: I am not going to rake over what has already been said. If the member for Vasse wants to deny any connection with the organisation, deny it now. Has he been to a League of Rights meeting?

Mr Blaikie: What you are saying is completely untrue.

Mr PEARCE: If the member for Vasse cares to deny, by interjection, that he has had any association with the League of Rights I am prepared to accept his statement and withdraw my comments.

Mr Blaikie: Not only will you accept it, but you will also give me an apology. I will see to that.

Mr PEARCE: Well, deny it.

Mr Blaikie: The member will apologise.

Mr PEARCE: The *Hansard* record will show I gave the member for Vasse an opportunity to deny the connection, and that I offered to withdraw. The member for Vasse has not taken me up.

Mr Blaikie: I can assure you the member for Vasse will take you up, outside the Chamber if you like.

Mr Bryce: Another pugnacious member of the Government back bench.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I cannot believe the situation! The member for Gosnells.

Mr Grayden: The member has not the courage to make the statements outside.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: It seems the House Committee should raise the issue of a parliamentary gymnasium as soon as possible.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: It really does very little for political debate for members opposite to try to suggest—

Mr Clarko: Make a point.

Mr PEARCE: —that the total membership of the Labor Party is associated with the left-wing groups in the unions, and it does very little for political debate for us to suggest that the League of Rights is pulling the strings in the Liberal Party and that when those strings are pulled the Government jumps.

The point is that as far as we are concerned the ALP is not dominated by extreme left-wing groups. In fact, only in the course of last week, several members on this side of the House, both in this Parliament and outside it, have dissociated themselves from the remarks of Mr Marks.

Mr Clarko: Are you associated with Hartrey?

Mr PEARCE: The name is Hartley, and he has nothing to do with the industrial scene in Western Australia.

The whole point of this matter is that complex industrial questions are not to be solved by the name-calling and confrontation which not only characterise the performance of the Minister and the Government in the industrial area, generally, but also characterise their participation in tonight's debate. In their attitudes they have been quite extreme and ready to label and name-call and wipe off by smear rather than face up to the serious issues which the Government should be facing in this extremely important area of industrial relations.

It is an area which requires a great deal of tact and diplomacy. In what was probably one of the best and most moderate contributions to the debate tonight, the member for Melville said he appreciated that there is participation in industrial disputes and very often there is blame on both sides. He was prepared to concede that. He gave the Government a chance to concede it as well, but it refused to do so. Members on the Government side leapt immediately to the extreme view that employers are always right and employees are always wrong.

The statistics mentioned by the member for Melville showed that blame very often falls heavily on management and employers. I brought up in the Budget debate last year the effort I made to have photostated a report on the industrial situation in the Pilbara produced last year by a relative of the Premier. I did not get a chance to have it photostated, but I read it just the same.

The conclusion the writer of that thesis came to was that much of the industrial disputation in the Pilbara was caused by lack of management expertise on the part of the companies. In other words, they could not handle industrial situations and allowed them to develop into strikes and disputes which could easily have been avoided with a little tact and diplomacy at the right time.

It is hardly surprising that management in Western Australia is barely capable of using tact and diplomacy in difficult industrial situations. It operates under the aegis of a Government and Minister who are clearly incapable of using tact and diplomacy. When a Minister can come into this Parliament and subject us to the kinds of tirades that he does and carries on as he does, making extreme and provocative statements, it is not surprising that when he intervenes in an industrial dispute it drags on for weeks. Can the Minister point to a time when as a result of his intervention in a dispute it has been concluded quickly?

When the Government cannot settle things by reasonable discussion and negotiation, straight into a confrontation situation it goes, and the greatest way any Government can confront is to legislate the people involved in the disputation out of their rights, which is exactly what happened in the case of the flour millers. Because the Government could not settle the matter, it had to cover its own failures with emergency legislation rushed through this House.

Sir Charles Court: You are very immature. You know the whole basis of the tactic of the left wing is confrontation. It is the only thing they know.

Mr PEARCE: It seems to me the whole tactic of the Government in these areas is confrontation.

Sir Charles Court: They have no weapon other than confrontation. They will never be reasonable. It is part of their philosophy.

Mr Tonkin: If you were mature you would not refer to the member for Gosnells in such a patronising manner.

Mr PEARCE: If the Premier thinks it is immature to argue in favour of tact and diplomacy, he is welcome to his maturity.

Sir Charles Court: You are saying all the faults are on the side of the farmer. These lovely, lily-white, left-wing unionists!

Mr PEARCE: The Premier obviously has not been in the Chamber for very long this evening. No-one has talked about lily-white, left-wing unionists. We have gone quite some way—

Sir Charles Court: You are saying everyone on this side is intolerant; let us compromise or confer. You do not know what it is like to deal with unions, I am quite convinced.

Mr PEARCE: If the Premier wants to know about the types of intolerances shown and smears used by his members, I suggest he spend more time in the Chamber listening to them.

Sir Charles Court: I spend plenty of time here. Do not be insulting.

Mr Tonkin: You should talk about insulting, the way you spoke to the member for Gosnells a moment ago.

Mr PEARCE: The Premier gets his interjections into *Hansard* without our hearing them. I cannot say I am particularly concerned about threats of being dealt with by the Premier.

Coming back to the amendment, the point which needs to be made is that the Minister for Labour and Industry has not been a credit to this Parliament or the Government he purports to represent in the area of industrial relations. One has only to look at the degree of industrial disputation in the time he has been Minister, the length of time disputes have dragged on, and how they have developed from minor disputes into large-scale confrontations until we have incredible situations such as those with the meat industry dispute, the flour millers' dispute, and the other major disputes in the last few years. The Minister of himself has been totally incapable of dealing with those disputes and has involved thousands of people in the kind of confrontation the Government has engineered.

Mr Grayden: That is quite untrue, but all we can expect from you.

Mr PEARCE: What is required is a more moderate and tolerant approach to unions; not one aimed at getting votes but one aimed at settling disputes. In that regard, I feel the Minister for Labour and Industry has not been a credit to the Government. In terms of winning votes for his party, he has probably been very effective indeed, and some will feel the sting of that effectiveness at the next election.

The Minister's job is not to win votes for his party and create divisiveness in the community but to settle the matters that come before him as Minister. In that respect this Minister has been a considerable failure, and the last part of our

amendment, which suggests the Government consider advising His Excellency that the Minister's commission should be withdrawn and a more tactful and diplomatic person put in his place, should be sent to the Governor.

If we are serious about industrial relations and settling the disputes in the community, we must remove those people who engineer confrontations and exaggerate and inflame disputes which naturally occur. To do that, we must inform His Excellency the Governor in the way suggested in this amendment, and I sincerely hope it will be passed.

MR BLAICKIE (Vasse) [11.20 p.m.]: I rise to make some comments on this amendment. Let me say at the outset that I oppose the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Let me go on to say that I give my total support to the Minister for Labour and Industry for the actions he has taken, and I believe in this Parliament I echo the sentiments of the electors of Vasse, who totally and wholeheartedly support whatever actions he may have taken to bring to an end union stalemate.

The Opposition is trying to rake up further confrontation, but in the event of lack of co-operation from the trade union movement, and if an apartheid-type policy were necessary, I believe that the Minister would certainly have the support of my electorate.

The Minister for Labour and Industry is probably one of the most forthright and outstanding Ministers for Labour and Industry in this country, and he was able to assist a strike-paralysed Australia. The action taken by the farmers has created history.

One of the reasons I was prompted to speak tonight was to correct completely untrue statements about me made by the member for Gosnells. Let other members of the Opposition take heed of what I intend to say now. I want to clear this matter up once and for all.

Mr Skidmore: You have me shaking in my boots.

Mr BLAICKIE: The member for Gosnells has attempted to associate me with the League of Rights. Let me say that I have never had any association with that organisation. I completely and totally deplore the League of Rights organisation, to such an extent that the League of Rights fielded a candidate against me at the last election. The member for Gosnells made pious comments to the House and he implied certain things about me. I can assure all members that he did not have the slightest idea of what he was talking about.

Mr Pearce: I gave you the chance to deny it right while I was speaking.

Mr BLAIKIE: Not only am I denying it, but also I am making a statement now and it will be recorded in *Hansard*. If the member for Gosnells likes, he can send copies of my speech to members of the League of Rights in Western Australia, and these members can tell him in clear and concise terms what the league's attitude is towards me. I will not have a bar of that organisation, and I wanted to clear that up in the first place.

I have pointed out one fallacy in the arguments put forward by the member for Gosnells; his statements about me had no substance or truth in them at all.

Members on this side of the House believe in the basic philosophy that people should have the opportunity and the right to work. If we are to build a better Western Australia, all people must be afforded the opportunity to take home 52 weeks' pay each year.

I believe that Mr Marks would support the Labor movement—he certainly would not support the Liberal Party. The actions of this gentleman over a number of years have been a tragedy to the union movement of Western Australia.

Mr Bryce: He certainly does not support us; he is one of the hard-line Bolsheviks.

Mr BLAIKIE: In fact, Opposition members have rather strange bedfellows. I believe Mr Marks does support the Labor Party. It is rather significant that at the last State election not one member of the Communist Party nominated for Parliament, so I ask members where the votes of the communists would go. The people of Western Australia can draw their own conclusions.

We are frequently told by Opposition members that the worker's only weapon is the right to strike. We do not hear anything about the right to work. However, the unions believe they have the right to cripple economies, to bankrupt nations, and to go from one confrontation to another.

Mr Bryce: Your Minister causes the confrontations.

Mr BLAIKIE: They do not support the development of Australia. In fact, their motives are to wreck Australia—

Mr Bryce: Whose motives?

Mr BLAIKIE: —and that is their intention.

Mr Tonkin: Whose intention?

Mr Pearce: The League of Rights!

Mr BLAIKIE: That is the intention of people such as Marks and company who become rather strange bedfellows in support of the Labor movement.

Mr Tonkin: They do not support us.

Mr BLAIKIE: The honourable member knows better than that.

Mr Tonkin: I know they do not support us.

Mr BLAIKIE: I suggest that if the member for Morley wishes to interject, he should return to his own seat and interject from there.

Mr Bryce: You really are a petty-minded member.

Mr BLAIKIE: The amendment is a farce, and makes a mockery of Parliament. It is rather interesting that a copy of this amendment was given to the Press before it was moved in the House. It will be interesting to see what story the country Press carries, because I believe there is a deadline of 6.00 or 7.00 p.m. for country editions. The amendment was not moved in the House until after 7.30 p.m., so that will be interesting to watch.

This is a compromise amendment directed from Trades Hall, and I believe it is the best deal the Opposition could come up with. In fact, Trades Hall did not really want to castigate the Minister for Labour and Industry—

Mr Bryce: The Chamber of Manufactures wanted to castigate him.

Mr BLAIKIE: —but rather it wanted to castigate the farmers who had the audacity to go on the wharves to load their sheep—their own property—and to obtain income for themselves. Trades Hall wanted to support the meatworkers who were holding this country to ransom. Thank goodness the farmers acted. I would like to congratulate the Minister on the actions he has taken. He will be regarded as one of the most courageous Ministers for Labour and Industry this State has ever seen. I can only hope that his counterpart in Canberra has the same tenacity and the same understanding.

Mr Clarko: Spot on.

Mr BLAIKIE: I do not believe the Federal Minister or the Federal Government really understands what is required by the people of Australia, and I am referring to farmers, people employed in businesses, workers or trade unionists and that is to end the tyranny of militant left-wing unions. The majority of Australians—and not just Western Australians—are thoroughly sick and tired of being held to ransom by militant union movements.

With those remarks I condemn the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [11.27 p.m.]: I rise to enter the debate to support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the member for Ascot. I have sat and listened tonight to a tirade of untruths; we have heard about the Minister's ability to fight, etc., which to my mind adds nothing whatever to the debate.

I was reminded of a story I read once about a fighter who was fond of discussing his fighting prowess in the bar. During the course of a debate he rather upset somebody alongside him, a man who was rather sick of this fighter and his boasting. This man said to the fighter, "Look I do not believe you could lick a postage stamp, and if you did, it would have its back turned." The Minister for Labour and Industry could well reflect on that story and perhaps he could moderate his actions. Instead of always trying to create situations of confrontation with members in this place, he should try to talk things out in a rational way.

The Act under which the Minister seeks to take action is one that came into being in 1912, and has been amended subsequently over the years. We are all aware that after a few years it is usually necessary to amend an Act, but one would think after so long the initial problems would have been settled.

I would like to read some words of wisdom to the Minister for Labour and Industry, and I am reading from the annotation to the 1950 reprint of the Industrial Arbitration Act. The foreword reads as follows—

The annotations to this Act have been made by Mr. F. T. P. Burt, LL.M. (W.A.), a practitioner of the Supreme Court of Western Australia. They are based on a thesis submitted by Mr. Burt in 1945 for the degree of Master of Laws in the University of Western Australia, and have been prepared by him in association with the Editorial Committee of the University of Western Australia Annual Law Review. Mr. Burt's original monograph on this important subject was made possible by a Hackett Research Studentship which was awarded to him by the University in 1941 after he had taken the degree of LL.B with first-class honours.

A. V. R. ABBOTT,
Attorney-General.

Perth, 5th October, 1950.

When one considers the qualifications of this man, who is now the Chief Justice of this State, surely one should say his capabilities should not be doubted and that the words of wisdom he

wrote in the history book in regard to industrial relations should carry some weight when we are considering what the Government should do in respect of industrial arbitration.

When one looks at the Industrial Arbitration Act as annotated by the now Chief Justice, on page 17, section 8 deals with what societies may be registered, and what branch may be treated as a society. That section deals in the main with the organisation of labour and unions, and it says those aspects are fundamental to the Act. In other words, the Industrial Arbitration Act as it was then stated that one of its fundamental tenets was unionism and registration of unions.

So, having set the scene there, it is pertinent to see what were the thoughts of the present Chief Justice regarding the format and the responsibility of trade unions. This is what is stated in the annotations of the present Chief Justice—

Burnside, J., in re Coastal Districts Clerks' Union ((1914) 13 W.A.A.R. 39) put the position thus—

The legislature desiring that industrial peace should prevail considered there was more safety in a multitude of opinion than in the opinions of individuals and so authorised the aggregation of individuals into unions and entrusted the settlement of disputes to these persons subject where necessary to the intervention of the Court.

It apparently approves the substitution of collective bargaining for individual bargaining and confers upon unions the exclusive privilege of approaching the Court.

So we find the 1914 Act formally established a criteria upon which the system would operate. It breathed life into the system and set out the criteria to which people throughout industry would be expected to adhere. I believe the Minister should take heed of those words, because he has abrogated and gone against the tenets of Burnside, J. which were enunciated as early as 1914.

If one compares section 8 of that Act, which was included in part II, dealing with industrial unions and associations, with the present Act as amended in 1963, one finds that the first is virtually word for word with the other. The only changes that have been made are in respect of the change of name when the commission was established. The reason I mention that is to show the Minister that he should adopt a degree of responsibility in the matter of industrial relations.

I have heard so much drivel coming from some members opposite that I despair that we will ever reach a state of good industrial relations while the present Government is in office, because some of its members are so out of date, are so unaware, and are so unable to comprehend what is required in industrial relations that we will have confrontation after confrontation unless they widen their horizons and become a little more than the narrow-minded bigots they are at the present.

I would like to deal specifically with some statements made by those narrow-minded bigots during the debate tonight. The member for Karrinyup said that the people at the bottom are the ones hurt by strikes. I want to say here and now that so far as the strike by flour mill workers was concerned, those workers were at the bottom at that time. They were the most lowly paid workers in this State considering the work they performed.

So far as I am concerned those men are the salt of the earth because they went out in an endeavour to receive some wage justice, and their action was subsequently justified by actions taken by their employers in granting them an over-award payment.

Let us consider the degree of responsibility shown by the Minister by his introduction into this House of a special Bill to take care of 150-odd workers who had the temerity to go out on strike and fight for what they believed in. He introduced a Bill which was passed through this Parliament and became law. On the Saturday morning when the union was in urgent discussion with the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, along with the mill owners and the workers concerned, agreement was reached and a settlement of the dispute prepared. However, the Minister ordered trucks to move in and to take out flour using scab labour.

Sir Charles Court: You could have fooled us!

Mr SKIDMORE: The Premier had better be quiet and listen, because immediately the negotiator for the Confederation of Western Australian Industry heard of the action of the Minister, he raced out and contacted the Minister. He was told by the Minister that it was too late to do anything because the order had been issued. That information came to us not from our representative, but from the representative of the confederation. That indicates members opposite think confrontation is the answer.

Sir Charles Court: It was not confrontation by us, but by you.

Mr SKIDMORE: The Premier can say what he likes about me, but he cannot deny what I have just said is the truth. The dispute was settled prior to the Minister ordering those scab trucks and scab labour to move the flour. So much for the Government's ideas on industrial relations and conciliation.

Let us consider the comment made by the member for Karrinyup when he said more prosecutions were taken by unions against their members than were taken by unions on behalf of their members against employers. I quickly looked up the report of the Western Australian Industrial Commission, prepared by Industrial Commissioner O'Sullivan for the period from the 1st July, 1976, to the 30th June, 1977—the most up-to-date report. It gives the lie to the remark of the member for Karrinyup. He said what he said was so, and therefore it had to be so, and we on this side were arguing about things we knew nothing about. The report of Industrial Commissioner O'Sullivan gives details of the proceedings taken by unions. These are set out in six-monthly periods. The total of industrial actions taken by unions against employers—which the member for Karrinyup said far exceeded all others—

Mr Clarko: I did not say unions against employers; I said unions against their own members.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am coming to that; the *Hansard* record will show what the member said. He said these actions exceeded actions taken by unions on behalf of their members.

Mr Clarko: I did not talk about the other.

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Karrinyup can sit there and squirm, because that is what he said.

Mr Clarko: I am not squirming; you are using a book to suit your argument.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not using a book to suit my argument.

Mr Clarko: Then why don't you?

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Karrinyup made the statement, not me. The report shows that actions by industrial unions of workers against employers during the 12-month period totalled 1 292, and the number of actions taken by industrial unions against workers totalled 702; and the member for Karrinyup said the latter would exceed the former.

I suppose the member for Karrinyup will say all the complaints related to the fact that these workers had not fronted up when they

received a preference clause, and had been bludgeoned into joining the union. The member for Karrinyup cannot draw that conclusion, but I will be kind and say that each of those actions was in that form. Even then, he would be well out on a limb trying to prove his claim. The member for Karrinyup said the unions worked against the wishes of their membership, and I have shown that statement to be false.

Mr Clarko: You have already told us of 702 cases, so you are getting close to what I said.

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes, 702 as against 1 292 cases. In the first six months, the fines amounted to \$18 895.90 and in the next six months they amounted to \$2 741.

Mr Speaker, I do not want to get involved in an argument with the member for Karrinyup; I think I have proved that the member for Karrinyup did not know what he was talking about. In his usual fashion he used rather stupid arguments which had no substance, and recommended punitive measures against unions.

Mr Clarko: You would be a good judge of stupidity.

Mr SKIDMORE: That is the opinion of the member for Karrinyup.

I turn now to the reply by the Minister for Labour and Industry to the remarks of the member for Melville. The Minister referred to industrial actions taken by his inspectors. When one compares *Hansard* to the commissioner's report, it makes remarkable reading. On the 21st September, 1977, the member for Melville asked question 755 in the following terms—

During the past 12 months how many employers have been prosecuted for breaches of awards or industrial agreements as a result of complaints made by workers to Department of Labour industrial inspectors?

The Minister's reply was, "One". That could easily have been the case during that period of time. However, the report refers to 13 complaints up till June, 1977. I am not reflecting on the Minister's answer of "One", but that is what the report states. The conclusion one draws is obvious. The Minister's industrial inspectors are unable to get out and police awards to ensure workers receive their just rights under the terms of their awards, and this failure on the Minister's part causes industrial disputation. The worker becomes disenchanted not only with his job but also with his employer who, knowing the industry, the award, and what should be paid, cheats the worker of money.

This Minister sits in his place and piously says he is doing everything within his power and the confines of the Act to make industrial relations better for the worker, while all the time he has three inspectors doing virtually nothing but answering the telephone. So much for his efforts to seek a solution to industrial disputation. That is exactly what this amendment is all about; we believe the Minister threatens the entire industrial relations situation in Western Australia.

Mr Speaker, I could continue at length quoting rather interesting facts from the Chief Industrial Commissioner's report to June, 1977, but I will refer to only one more case. I refer to the section dealing with breaches of the Act, where complaints numbered 68. So, all in all, it was shown there was a far greater effort on behalf of unions to prosecute employers than prosecutions being taken against people who would not join unions.

I have heard the statement "compulsory unionism" bandied about many times in this House and time and time again I have said that the law—not Skidmore's law, but the law of the Arbitration Court and the Industrial Appeal Court and the decisions of the magistrates who preside over those courts—has shown there is no such thing as compulsory unionism in Western Australia. It is a misnomer, and a figment of the rabid minds of members opposite and those who support them.

Mr Spriggs: You ask the tanker drivers and fuel agents whether it is true.

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Darling Range can say what he likes; I am backed up by the decisions of courts of law. If the Government does not like what is going on, it can act to change the law. If it does not want to take any notice of the Privy Council, it can get rid of it by changing the law. But the Government should be consistent; if it does not like this law it should make it look an ass by legislating to change it. That is exactly what the Government is doing when it refers to compulsory unionism, because there is no such thing.

This matter came before the Industrial Commission and, if my memory serves me correctly—this goes back some way—the commissioners at that time took the view the best interests of the workers, the employers, and the State of Western Australia would be served by inserting into all awards a preference to unionists clause. Members may recall I mentioned the remarks of Burnside, J. in regard to the Coastal Districts Clerks case of 1914, when he enunciated the principle that it is far better and easier industrially to have trade unions than to deal with individual

workers. The commission recognised that fact and in its wisdom said that a preference to unionists clause would allow a strong, vigorous union to develop which would be able to go out and do a job of work for its members and thus improve industrial relations. It was hoped that would bring about a certain amount of industrial peace.

The commissioners were not hoping that all workers would be forced to join a union, and they provided an opt-out clause in the award so that a person could apply to the registrar for conscientious objection, and not be affected in his employment. So, do not let us talk about compulsory unionism. I have heard the Minister for Labour and Industry use the term when slating unions because of certain action, on their part, when in fact compulsory unionism does not exist.

If the Minister cares to investigate the number of prosecutions taken by unions under the preference clause he will find none of those unions involved are the strong unions, which help and offer a service to their members. As recently as last week, the secretary of the AMWSU stated in the newspaper that he did not use the clause and he could not care less if it was taken away from him. The reasons are obvious, because the workers are industrialised; they are attached to one work force, 500 or 600 at a time, and are encouraged to join.

The unions which have to use the preference clause are the ones whose officials must go into thousands of different shops trying to persuade shop assistants to join the union. They use the preference clause in an effort to get shop assistants to subscribe to their union or to a charity in line with the criteria established by the commission so that they play at least some part in providing funds to enable the unions to operate.

I refer now to the dispute which has become known as the meat industry dispute. Apparently, it is the only dispute which has prompted the Minister for Labour and Industry to take such action. I have heard members opposite slating members on this side for being fellow travellers and bedfellows of communists. I have been told the communists are my colleagues. Quite frankly, that does not mean a great deal to me. However, it highlights the fact that apparently there is only one type of political person who should not be in a union, and that is the communist.

I might suggest that some of the membership of my union—the Millers' Union—should not be members of the union because they are Liberals.

That may be wrong too but I do not say it. The Government shows no responsibility by always getting out the red paint brush and larring us as fellow travellers of various kinds of people. I believe in the right of the worker industrially. I do not care what his political affiliations are. If he has the guts, the ability, and the effort to make a move in his union and become a leader, I do not care whether he is a communist or a member of the Liberal Party. That is his right and I do not question it. I hope I have given the lie to the innuendoes which have been cast around this Chamber tonight with regard to members on this side of the House.

The Minister for Labour and Industry spoke about bans that had been imposed by unions. He was caught up in the system of news reporting. Because somebody mentioned that bans had been applied the newspapers immediately printed that and then found out that it was not so. A statement in tonight's issue of the *Daily News* by Mr Cook, the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, makes the situation quite clear. The headline is, "Sheep Dispute Settlement. Charges 'Only Bar' ". We on this side of the House have said consistently that the only issue holding up settlement of this matter—and I should like the Premier to hear this—is the charges against these workers who were apparently in breach of the regulations when they were on the wharf.

Sir Charles Court: Are you asking us just to use political influence and have them withdrawn?

Mr SKIDMORE: If I were in the Premier's position I would try to approach the matter in a rather more sensible way than he and his Government are approaching it.

Sir Charles Court: Such as what?

Mr SKIDMORE: The Premier asked a question and can at least give me the courtesy of allowing me to reply. All that is required is for the Government, through either the Premier or the Minister in charge of the Fremantle Port Authority, to accept its responsibility. Somebody at the FPA must have instituted under the regulations a complaint against the workers by saying to the police, "These people are trespassing under the new regulations. I want them removed." I suggest that for the Premier to sit there in his pious way and say that the Government is not in control of that situation belies the truth because with one telephone call the Premier could instruct the officers of the FPA to remove that order. The fact that the Premier will not do that means that he has decided upon confronta-

tion, just like the Minister for Labour and Industry. Because of his pigheadedness he is not concerned with settling the dispute. Just like his cohort in Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen, he is going to sit there and deny the opportunity for conciliators to find a solution to the problem. Well, the Premier can sit with it and I simply say that if I was in his position I would not want—

Sir Charles Court: What about the charges under the Police Act which have nothing to do with the Fremantle Port Authority? What do you want us to do with those?

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not aware of charges that were taken under the Police Act.

Sir Charles Court: About half of them are under the Police Act.

Mr SKIDMORE: If that is right, the Premier can fix the other half up if he wants to.

Sir Charles Court: No, we cannot.

Mr O'Neil: You just do not know the law.

Mr SKIDMORE: Somebody must have instructed an officer of the FPA to take the action because the inference we get—and it is certainly coming through fairly strongly—is "This is Charlie Court's job and not the FPA." I put it that way because that is the way it was relayed to me by a worker from the waterfront.

Mr O'Neil: He would be a great one to give you advice on the law!

Mr SKIDMORE: Perhaps I do need advice on law.

Mr O'Neil: I said he would be a great one to give you advice on the law!

Mr SKIDMORE: What is that?

Mr O'Neil: You said it was conveyed to you by someone on the waterfront.

Mr SKIDMORE: What was conveyed to me from the waterfront was not a question of law; it was a question of the actions of the Government.

Getting back to the amendment that has been moved by the Opposition, I should like to refer briefly to some of the remarks made by other members and their attitudes towards members on this side of the House. It amazes me that people can be so unknowledgeable about industrial relations. I listened with great interest to the Premier and I was one of those who endeavoured to listen without any great interjections although I must admit I did err on two or three occasions. I certainly was not one of those who was involved in the crossfire in the Chamber

although I am not putting myself forward as a Holy Joe. In listening to the Premier with great interest, I found some of his statements to be rather surprising. It is remarkable that by his rhetoric and ability to speak the Premier could take us back to the Whitlam era. He took us right back to the Whitlam era—

Mr O'Connor: Spelt E-R-R-O-R?

Mr SKIDMORE: No, E-R-A. It is amazing that the Premier can take us right back and say that the matter started when the Whitlam Government caused all this trouble for the Minister for Labour and Industry. How stupid can one be?

Other members talked about incidents in the Eastern States which have no affinity with what took place in this State or with this amendment. Whilst I accepted the Speaker's point of view that members were entitled to raise those issues, I cannot find any reason to support what they said because it had nothing to do with the matter.

The Minister has talked about having a non-union labour force or a non-union port. I know the Minister did not say it that way but I am curious to know what he means by a non-union port and by his repeated reference to non-union labour.

Mr O'Neil: It's the same thing when you talk about the Whitlam error.

Mr SKIDMORE: The only difference between me and the Minister is that he can understand what I am talking about but I am darned if I can understand what the Minister is talking about when he talks about non-union labour. When we look at what he proposed it is a real laugh.

Some of the problems were mentioned by the member for Melville, and I should like to know how this sort of arrangement would be set up. Let us assume that we can separate the north and south wharves at Fremantle and can get a division of ships into non-labour ships and labour ships. I should prefer to say non-union labour ships and union labour ships. How do we convince the Seamen's Union, which is a member of an international movement, to get a ship into a non-union port?

If we talk about the legal aspects of the situation, how do we set up a commission to look after non-union labour? If a Bill is introduced to do that something like the WA Industrial Commission on a smaller scale would have to be set up; it could not be done in any other way. If the Minister for Labour and Industry wishes to repudiate the whole of the industrial system in this State, he should go ahead with his non-union

port and non-union labour and say that the Industrial Commission has failed in this State dismally since 1912 and, therefore, is of no consequence.

What the Minister is saying about a non-union port with non-union labour is ridiculous. We would have to put a preference clause into the award of the non-union port for the non-union labourers. We would need a preference clause for non-union workers to join non-union ports. That is exactly what the Minister's comments would mean. If we have a commission which is to deliberate in a dispute involving a worker who is a member of a union and who comes along for a job in a non-union port the commission would have to determine several important issues. There would need to be a contract of service giving a worker the right to work. The Government members have been talking about a worker's right to work for some time.

What the Minister is saying is that a unionist who is a member of a union and goes along to a non-union port will not get a job. So much for the comments of the Minister and other Government members about their true beliefs of people having the right to work. Here is an instrument of torture. A union member would be told he could not get a job, because it was a non-union port.

A Government member: He could resign.

Mr SKIDMORE: Perhaps he could. What about the question of award cover and whether a worker is a union or non-union member? Will we have non-union award cover? We would have the position of one side of the wharf being covered by legal contracts of service and the other side without them. How would a commission determine this matter?

Mr Harman: It would have no jurisdiction.

Mr SKIDMORE: A commission would have no jurisdiction at all. How would the new commission sort out this problem? Would a commission be able to say the non-unionist had a right to an award? We would need parallel awards to cover the two situations of unionists and non-unionists. I could not think of anything that could cause industrial unrest quicker than that situation. It is so ludicrous and stupid that one wonders at a so-called responsible Minister even suggesting such action be taken. If I had the time I could run through many facets of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Tonight I have commented on only two aspects of the Act to show the sheer stupidity of the Minister's suggestion. I believe I have shown the impracticability and the impossibility of the

suggestion working in this country, and most of all I condemn the suggestion as one that would do nothing but harm.

I have already pointed out previous actions of the Minister, such as when he ordered the trucks to go to the flour mills in South Fremantle after an agreement had already been reached. I can name the member of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry who left that meeting and rang the Minister's office.

Mr Grayden: That is your excuse.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is not my excuse. The man concerned, Mr William Brown, who was at that meeting was at the time negotiating on behalf of the employers. When he heard the report he said, "For Christ's sake, don't tell me that has happened; let us get onto Grayden." I will say that outside the House for the Minister.

Sir Charles Court interjected.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is not a story; it is true. One thing the Premier cannot accuse me of being is a liar. The Premier would not know the truth if he fell over it.

Sir Charles Court: Did you say that happened on Saturday?

Mr SKIDMORE: It was on Saturday.

Sir Charles Court: That is not my recollection. The day we got the stuff out to the flour mills was a week day.

Mr SKIDMORE: The question I raise is still pertinent. The confederation at that time had reached agreement but the Minister upset the whole matter by moving the people into the industry. In fact, from my knowledge of the matter it appears he had been informed of all the discussions. If he had not been, why was he not? He was worried about the millers and so he took that provocative action. He did not want the dispute to be finalised; he wanted confrontation with the trade union movement.

Sir Charles Court: Don't blame the Minister.

Mr SKIDMORE: I believe the Opposition has proved conclusively and without any shadow of doubt all the issues we have raised tonight. We have proved that the Minister has lost the confidence of members on this side of the House, if in fact he ever had it, and the Opposition believes the House should respectfully advise His Excellency that in our opinion the commission of the Minister for Labour and Industry should be withdrawn.

The Opposition has put this amendment forward in the interests of the workers. We reject the larrikinism and the irresponsibility of the Minister in his interference with the trade union movement.

The Minister says he will do one thing but does something else. The Minister does not keep promises. He has lost the confidence of the workers in this State and he has no right to be a Minister. I support the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [12.07 a.m.]: I am constantly surprised at the Government's double standards. Tonight we heard the Minister for Labour and Industry talking about material being fed to the Press and then being fed back to him. I can remember him on other occasions being aghast that things should be mentioned in this House that allegedly came to the member who mentioned them clandestinely.

However, the Minister himself had no hesitation whatsoever in using something which had been given to the Press on the understanding that no malpractice was involved. I think someone obviously passed it on, because he knew exactly what was going to happen. It is perfectly true that when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition got up to speak tonight, in accordance with our usual custom when we are going to move an amendment on any matter, we sent a copy to the Press just as soon as it was moved. We handed copies of the amendment to the Clerks of the House and to Government members.

This is done as a matter of courtesy and as a matter of privilege. If the Government is so lacking in political or governmental sense and nous it reflects highly on how insensible the Government is to the situation. It highlights the fact that there are standards for the Government which are different from the standards imposed on members of the Opposition. Next time Government members start talking about information allegedly given to them clandestinely we shall not take them to court. We shall not finish up in the police courts as the Government has done on other occasions, much to the disgust of many members of the community. Instead we will remind them of what happened tonight; of the processes which have been followed tonight, and have been followed for years and years.

It shows how addled the thinking of the Minister for Labour and Industry must be, because he said the Opposition gave a written speech to the Press. There was no written speech to give to the Press. If the Minister likes he could come across and read all the notes the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made. I am trying to highlight the double standards under which this Government shamefully operates. It is quite disgusting and sickening to me to see the Government setting

one standard for itself and another standard for others. If there is to be a raising of standards in this House we would expect it to come from both sides and not from one side as has been the case tonight.

Mr Grayden: You are contradicting your deputy leader.

Mr DAVIES: Mr Speaker, if the Minister would have a look at the notes of the earlier *Hansard* report he would see that in some of the interjections he suggested that the speech had been handed in. The deputy leader said no speech had been passed to the Press, because there was no speech.

Mr O'Neil: You are dead right; there was no speech.

Mr DAVIES: Here is the speech as it was at the time it was supposed to have been passed to the Press. How the Premier giggles in his embarrassment! He even goes red now because I am highlighting the double standard by which he operates with all his moralistic leanings, but which he changes as the occasion demands. It is very astutely done and very well done politically, but it does him no good whatsoever.

I will just highlight the fact that if the Minister wants to come over and look at the notes, these are the notes from which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke. If the Minister suggests this is a speech and if he can produce a speech other than the amendment which was handed to the Press, then of course he is quite welcome to do so. How could the Minister suggest that a thing like this "3 Japan Australasian Dawkins Keating Press release" constitutes a speech? There it is.

Mr Grayden: Let me see it.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister should wait his turn. I have 41 minutes to go and I intend to take up the whole of the 41 minutes. If the Minister can contain himself until then I shall be pleased to table these notes on behalf of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Watt: You are not going to make the same speech, are you?

Mr DAVIES: I would hope the Minister would listen to what I have to say rather than bury his head in these notes and try to make some mischief of them.

Mr Grayden: I can read them myself.

Mr DAVIES: I am quite certain the Minister can have these and what is more I shall give him a bonus. I shall give the Minister my notes to

have a look at also. It is a special prize, if he is a very good boy and does not interrupt too much.

Mr Clarko: Are your notes counterfeit?

Mr DAVIES: There is the double standard under which the Premier operates. I hope as I proceed I will be able to show that the Premier has not been as zealous as he might have been in getting this strike settled. Indeed some other members of the Government might have been able to activate themselves, including the Minister for Agriculture, who shrugged the whole thing off by saying, "That committee will not meet while there are pickets on the wharf." Once the pickets were removed by action of the police he did not activate himself to call the committee together. What is wrong with the Minister for Agriculture? Is he frightened of the Premier? Did he not have the guts to go in and do what had to be done? When the pickets were removed irrespective of how they were removed, he should have shown some leadership.

Mr Old: Absolute rot!

Mr DAVIES: We know what the leadership of his party is. The Minister should have called a meeting; but he did not activate himself. There has been another one-man band in this organisation.

Sir Charles Court: Just have a look at your front bench. Look at the support you have.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: Standing there like Horatius, except you have no bridge!

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr DAVIES: This is the usual thing.

Sir Charles Court: Tremendous support.

Mr DAVIES: When the Premier gets embarrassed, or when the Government is starting to be cornered or is cornered, this is what members opposite do. They draw attention to some minor matter such as this: There are no members sitting around me. One member is at a constitutional conference; one is home sick; the other member who has been here all evening has gone out for some refreshment; and the member on the end had to attend a political function himself.

I can remember the Premier nipping off the other night about 11.30 and saying, "I do not care what happens. I want another two speakers before you go home." He went home to bed. We left the House at 20 minutes to one in the morning.

Sir Charles Court: I did not.

Mr DAVIES: These are the standards; one-manship. It has shown through time and time again; but perhaps it is the Premier's age that requires him to go to bed early. These are the kinds of things that happen. If the Premier wants to set the debate on the standard he just showed by trying to divert attention, I am quite happy to take it to that plane. He can go as low as he likes and I will endeavour to accommodate him. I cannot guarantee I will be able to get down there, but I will try hard.

Sir Charles Court: You are making a fool of yourself.

Mr Old: As usual.

Mr DAVIES: Here we are; these are the insulting remarks that come over once the barb starts to hurt a little. First of all I should like to talk about some of the actions which have taken place and some of the actions which have not taken place. I have referred already to the fact that there seems to be a reluctance on the part of the Minister for Agriculture to do anything about the matter. He merely abdicated the whole situation when the pickets were on the wharf. That is where his responsibility started and finished.

Mr Old: You know nothing about it. You are fishing.

Mr DAVIES: At any time he likes the Minister is quite welcome to stand up and take part in the debate and tell us what happened; but he has been strangely quiet.

Mr Old: And if I told you, you would say I betrayed a confidence, as you did a while ago.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister goes strangely quiet. He abdicated at that one point; that was the beginning and the end for him. He has been quiet in the newspapers.

Mr Old: You just do not know. You have no idea.

Mr DAVIES: I am inviting the Minister to take part in the debate and tell us how he quickly brought the dispute to a conclusion.

Mr Old: Then you would stand up in your pious way and say, "You betrayed a confidence", as you did a while ago. That is your style. I know it well. You talk about double standards—you have treble standards.

Mr DAVIES: At least I make an attempt, whereas the Minister for Agriculture contents himself with a few interjections and looking over

his glasses. We do not want the Minister to betray any confidences; but he could at least tell members the actions he took.

Sir Charles Court: He did plenty.

Mr Old: Those who count know.

Mr DAVIES: Nobody has told us what the Minister for Agriculture has done.

Mr Old: You go and talk to the secretary of the union and find out for yourself.

Mr DAVIES: We should find out what the Minister has done, because in the talks I have had with the trade union I could not find out what he has done.

Sir Charles Court: They do not trade confidences either.

Mr DAVIES: That is a stupid remark.

Mr Old: You made the stupid remark in the first place, because you are a stupid fellow.

Mr DAVIES: Some of the farmers themselves realise they have been overshipping quotas and they realised this last December when something was asked to be done.

Mr Old: What quotas? You went on today with a lot of rot in the paper.

Sir Charles Court: What quotas?

Mr DAVIES: The understanding that was reached. I shall tell members to whom they should talk when I have finished speaking. He fed me this information.

Mr Old: Tell us now.

Mr DAVIES: I cannot.

Mr H. D. Evans: He accepted two to one.

Mr Old: Who accepted two to one?

Mr DAVIES: There we are. The Government does not even know what the quota system was.

Mr Old: It has nothing to do with us.

Mr H. D. Evans: It was three to one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. It must be very difficult for the *Hansard* reporter to try to report the speech of the Leader of the Opposition when two other members are engaging in a conversation in voices as loud as that of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Old: I am trying to get some information.

Mr DAVIES: This is the situation. When we look at some of the things that have happened and some of the things that have not happened and some of the things that should have happened I believe it constitutes the heart of the motion which has been moved tonight. There has been a great deal of ineptitude on the part of the Government and some action needs to be

taken particularly in regard to the Minister who is in charge of industrial relations and his commission to look after industrial relations.

However, the Premier, firstly with his rhetoric, said we were mischievous, and secondly he blamed Whitlam, then thirdly he said something about "talking sense". He then said everyone was fed up with trade unionists, which was a sweeping remark. He has been saying that since about 1953 and I must confess people are starting to believe him.

I am quite certain we will hear more and more from the Premier. I am quite certain also that the day there is a breakdown in the trade union hierarchy, as there will be if this continues, will be the day the Premier will rue. He comes back and once again shows the age gap. He talks about the old times in the days of Albert Monk.

In the days of the ACTU and Albert Monk, a man for whom I have the greatest respect and with whom I had a lot of contact, the trade unions were still getting a bashing. Then it was the miners, Jim Healy, the waterside workers, the transport workers, and the railway workers all ruining Australia in the days of Monk. I just cannot believe—

Sir Charles Court: If you made an arrangement with Monk it was honoured.

Mr DAVIES: What does that mean?

Sir Charles Court: He could come out in the morning and at night he could say that a dispute was settled on a certain basis.

Mr DAVIES: I agree, but what does that imply?

Sir Charles Court: It is not so today.

Mr DAVIES: Who does the Premier say does not—

Sir Charles Court: Did not the ACTU president announce that it was settled, and it was not?

Mr DAVIES: To all intents and purposes it was.

Sir Charles Court: The local people laughed at him.

Mr DAVIES: We have a lot for which to thank Mr Hawke in industrial relations. More strikes have been settled through his efforts than through the efforts of any Governments or employers. He has a good rapport with the Minister for Industrial Relations in the Federal sphere and in the other States. I do not think he enjoys that relationship here, because that relationship is not wanted here. He can talk man to man and lay it on the line fairly clearly both to trade

unions and employers, as well as to Governments. That has been the mark of his success. The fact that he has not been over here means obviously that the Government has not wanted to talk to him and it again reflects the insincerity of the Government in this case.

The Premier then said that on three occasions the meatworkers had the opportunity to opt out of their strike. They could have done so on humanitarian grounds.

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr DAVIES: He said they could have done the decent thing—one of his favourite words. He said they could have retired with honour. Three times he mentioned the unfortunate situation regarding cyclone "Alby". I want to remind the House that the meatworkers offered to work on weekends to kill the stock the farmers brought in, but I did not see that option taken up.

Sir Charles Court: How cynical was that!

Mr DAVIES: What did the Premier want?

Sir Charles Court: They refused to do the decent thing over the exports.

Mr DAVIES: The Premier wanted to use it to break the strike when they were trying to do their best to ensure that the farmers did not lose everything.

Mr Grewar: Why should they lose anything?

Mr DAVIES: There was a chance for them to do something, but what occurred? The other side thumbed their noses at them.

Sir Charles Court: It was a smart trick.

Mr DAVIES: It was not. The Premier wanted them to throw overboard all principles, because of the situation which developed through no fault of anyone. It was a smart trick on the Premier's part, and a good debating point. To suggest that it was a smart trick on the part of the meatworkers is just a cynical approach. What could be worse?

I want to talk a little on some of the things that—

A Government member: Talk about the unions.

Mr DAVIES: I will. They are on my list. I have only 28 minutes remaining, but I will not disappoint the honourable member. I will say a few words about them shortly.

I want to review the situation which had developed by the end of the week, when it was quite apparent the only thing concerning a settlement of the strike was a matter in regard to the cases which were likely to come before the courts. I spoke to the Premier about this and he said, "Well, you know; that is the situation. We will not break the law." I agreed. The law should

not be broken. However, I did suggest that the Government might be able to find some way out. I have heard of a *nolle prosequi*. I know that a case was not proceeded with when a chap was killed with a windlass. In fact, in several instances a *nolle prosequi* has been entered into and the Government has covered itself by saying that under the circumstances this was the best thing to do. Because it was one isolated case and there were no trade unionists involved the Government was prepared to do this. However, in this case although the option is available to the Government, it will not do anything about it. We believe the circumstances are the same.

Sir Charles Court: They are not in this type of charge.

Mr DAVIES: These are cases where the Government has been prepared to act through the Crown Law Department. I am not suggesting it has been at the direction of Cabinet, but no doubt the Crown Law Department has sent the matter to Cabinet and Cabinet has agreed as to whether or not a *nolle prosequi* will occur. So there are the circumstances, and for the Government to moralise on this and say that it does not interfere is not in accordance with the facts.

After I had spoken to him, there was to be a meeting between Peter Cook and some representatives in his office at 2.00 p.m. on the Friday afternoon. This meeting took place and as members are all aware there was a long discussion and I think a very hopeful Press report followed the conference after the meeting had taken place between Mr Cook and Sir Charles Court. Sir Charles said once again that they would not interfere, and once again the trade union movement had put forward some very interesting facts which, the Premier said, he would like to have a look at.

I understand that Mr Ted Boylan was at the meeting with the Minister for Labour and Industry, and the Minister suggested they might be able to give an answer to these very interesting points while the members were still on hand. However, the Premier said, "No." He said he would let them know later.

Peter Cook rang the Minister for Labour and Industry on the Saturday afternoon and the Minister apparently told Peter Cook he had had nothing further from the Premier. The Minister then rang Peter Cook on the Sunday morning and said they had had an opinion from the Crown Law Department, and they would arrange for Peter Cook and his counsel to see the Attorney-General on the Monday.

Mr Grayden: You have the facts completely wrong.

Sir Charles Court: It is not particularly relevant, but the facts are not right and Mr Cook would admit it. On the Sunday he was dealing with me.

Mr DAVIES: Then the Premier rang about 5.30 p.m. on the Sunday and said that an appointment with Mr Medcalf had been set up for the Monday at 2.00 p.m. Members must keep in mind that they had an opinion from the Crown Law Department.

Mr Grayden: The facts are wrong. I did not know about the Crown Law Department opinion.

Mr DAVIES: I have some scribbled notes here and am trying to read them.

Sir Charles Court: It is not relevant, but I spoke to him more than once on the Sunday afternoon after I received the Crown Law Department opinion and the Attorney-General's interpretation and I conveyed it to Mr Cook. He said he had something further on the legal side and so it was arranged that the legal man would see the Attorney-General at 10.30 a.m. the next day.

Mr DAVIES: That is so, and Mr Brooksby went to see the Attorney-General, who had a senior officer from the department with him, and he looked rather strange. He said, "What have you to say? Why are you here?"

These points had been discussed and a Crown Law Department opinion had been obtained. It was suggested they could be discussed further with the Attorney-General and there could be some argument back and forth between the Attorney-General and the trade union counsel as to whether or not the submissions which had been made had in fact any relevance following the debate which was likely to take place.

The Attorney-General seemed to be at some disadvantage and did not know really why Mr Cook and Mr Brooksby were there. Mr Cook gave a superficial outline of the reasons for his presence and I understand Mr Brooksby also gave some detail of what had happened.

The Attorney-General asked them to state their case and the trade union movement then repeated the whole of the reasons for the earlier submissions, and on which a Crown Law opinion had already been given.

Sir Charles Court: That is not quite right. The arrangement was that I told Mr Cook on Sunday afternoon—and he will have to confirm this because it took place with others on the telephone, unfortunately—the Attorney-General's interpretation of the opinion; that was that the regulations were followed. Mr Cook then volunteered that they might have additional legal information which could be pertinent, and I

suggested he should arrange for his lawyers to meet the Attorney-General. However, Mr Cook went along himself.

Mr DAVIES: I think he had to go along.

Sir Charles Court: It was meant to be a professional talk amongst lawyers on some of the legal implications which might have some effect on the case.

Mr DAVIES: After Mr Cook put the case to the Attorney-General there was no indication by the Attorney-General that he would reply.

Sir Charles Court: And for good reason.

Mr DAVIES: I cannot understand the good reason.

Sir Charles Court: It is not unusual for lawyers to convey, at a professional level, some aspect which they feel may be helpful in resolving a particular case. But once a political atmosphere is introduced it is another matter altogether. The Attorney-General did say that the matter would be considered.

Mr DAVIES: That is unusual because the matter goes straight back to Cabinet and becomes political again.

Sir Charles Court: No, it did not.

Mr DAVIES: The Attorney-General was not able to give an answer to what had been raised because of some moot political point, or because of some judicial nicety. Having stated the whole case, Mr Cook was left to leave the meeting. I understand that at about 2.00 p.m. Mr Brooksby was contacted and told that further matters had to be put to the Crown Law Department. He was told the matter could not be discussed any further because it was going to Cabinet.

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr DAVIES: It went to Cabinet, and no facts were disclosed as to what happened. However, we do know that at about 5.30 p.m. the Premier came out of Cabinet and arranged to ring Peter Cook and tell him the Government could not do anything in regard to the suggestions put to the Crown Law Department. He said there was no legal basis. However, I think it is significant the Premier was able to tell Mr Cook that the cases would not be proceeded with in Fremantle until the beginning of June and in Albany at the beginning of May. What a strange situation! The Government would not allow any political interference; it would not brook any interference whatever.

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr DAVIES: The Premier said that the union should talk to the police about the matter; that it was entirely up to the police. The Premier was

able to come out of Cabinet and tell Mr Cook he was not able to do anything, but that the police would not proceed with the cases next week.

Sir Charles Court: That information was conveyed to us in the ordinary way.

Mr DAVIES: We look at it with suspicion.

Sir Charles Court: You can if you want to.

Mr DAVIES: We look at it with suspicion, especially as it relates to what I have said earlier. Arguments which quite properly could have been advanced in court had been conveyed to the Crown Law Department. New evidence was rejected. Mr Cook was told the Government had gone as far as it could, but the Police Department would do something. That seems suspicious.

Sir Charles Court: The police, or anyone prosecuting, has to acquire a court. Because of the number of cases, the first day they could get the court was the 1st June. There is nothing clandestine about it.

Mr DAVIES: That was very convenient, to say the least.

Sir Charles Court: I hope that tomorrow the TLC insists on the cases being dealt with because we have done our part.

Mr DAVIES: I am quite certain it will, if it wants to.

Sir Charles Court: They announced it tonight. It will be up to the magistrate, not you or me.

Mr DAVIES: It is apparent that having heard all the arguments, and having had them vetted by the Crown Law Department and rejected, the Government was able to say that it would not do anything.

Sir Charles Court: It has nothing to do with us at all.

Mr DAVIES: I repeat: there is some suspicion.

Sir Charles Court: Your foolish mind can keep its suspicions.

Mr DAVIES: I think I have good ground for looking at the record of the Government with regard to this whole matter. I want to talk about the regulations which appeared on the Table of the House tonight. The regulations were tabled, and according to section 36 of the Interpretation Act once the regulations are published they become law. Once they are published they have to be tabled in the House within six sitting days. The regulations were published on the 5th April, and as members are aware tomorrow is the sixth sitting day. So, they came in at the death knock. The Government has kept them back as long as possible. Had the

regulations been tabled earlier, the Government well knows what action the Opposition might have taken, and what action it probably still will take tomorrow. It is just another little thing—the regulations were held back.

Sir Charles Court: It has no legal significance at all.

Mr DAVIES: It was done deliberately. They could have been challenged. Action will be taken under the regulations without any challenge by Parliament, the highest court in the land.

Sir Charles Court: They can be challenged tomorrow.

Mr DAVIES: The position might have gone too far, the way the Government has handled it. I am quite certain the Government has deliberately delayed the tabling of the regulations. It is in line with the policy of the Government which is followed from time to time.

The Government has had a continuing record of trying to bait the unions instead of trying to co-operate with them. Some 200 unions are registered in Western Australia, both under State and Federal jurisdiction.

Dr Dadour: You are going over old ground; say something practicable.

Mr DAVIES: I sometimes wonder about the member for Subiaco, but no doubt he enlivens things a little. I repeat—and I make no apologies to the member for Subiaco because I think he was out of the House—it is always the unions that are accused of being troublesome. They have to be put down, and if they are put down everything will be all right!

The history of unionism shows that things get much better as the unions become stronger. It is not the case which the Premier makes out. I remind members that not so long ago the Government was appealing to the unions for co-operation. Co-operation was offered by the unions. It was pointed out at the time that the unions were just as anxious as the Government to get some of these rumoured projects off the ground, especially when they meant jobs for some of the 35 000 unemployed. The unions will be only too happy to go along with the Government. The trade unions said they would co-operate, but I think the mood of the unions could be completely different now. I am not suggesting they will be obstructive in any way, but if they stick to the requirements of the slow processes under the Industrial Arbitration Act, that could slow down the whole of the work force.

They will not be obstructive. They will just be doing what is required to be done when on occasions they could close their eyes to some of the things that need to be done. The Government should remember this, because the trade unions will remember it. The trade unions are quite disgusted with the treatment they have had this time at the hands of the Government, and they will not have the short memory the Government might hope they will have.

Part of the amendment deals in particular with the attitude of the Minister for Labour and Industry and mentions his disruptive tactics and confrontation rather than mediation and conciliation, and the fact that his actions and the actions of the Government have fostered division, disunity, disruption, and bitterness in the community.

While the Premier might think it is all his way and he is able to tell us what people are thinking and that we ought to get out and talk to people to find out what they are thinking, let me tell him many people in the community are upset by his attitude. People with a lot of principle believe there is a need for strong trade unions and want to see the trade unions allowed to operate in an atmosphere which will benefit the workers, instead of their constantly having to waste time on confrontation with the Government.

At this stage I want to draw attention to some of the attitudes of the Minister for Labour and Industry. I do not have to go back very far. The altercations usually seem to be between the member for Morley and the Minister for Labour and Industry. On page 2285 of *Hansard* on the 5th October, 1974, you, Sir, had to come into a matter brought up by the member for Morley when he had taken exception to the Minister's saying, "Why not come outside?" That was in 1974. A little later on, on the 23rd April, 1975, we find this passage on page 1071 of *Hansard*—

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

Mr Nanovich: I could not agree with you more.

The member for Morley then went on to address himself to the question. Then we had a piece in the *Daily News* on the 24th April, 1974, when the Minister said he wanted to "put it on the line". Almost four years ago he said—

I have never known this type of thing to be as bad as it is now. It is lowering the dignity of Parliament and it is embarrassing to members.

The Minister said that. The gall of the man! That the worst offender should come out in the Press and moralise on the dignity of Parliament after what he has said, and the number of times you, Sir, have had to take him to task!

On the 3rd September, 1975, on page 2525 of *Hansard*, again he is saying, "How much longer is this going to go on?" On the previous page he said—

You would not have the courage to say that outside.

That seems to be his major contribution to debate: "Come outside", or, "You would not have the courage to come outside." On the 8th October, 1975, on page 3305 of *Hansard*, the Minister said—

I would like to be in a boxing tent with the honourable member right now. I would welcome that. However, it probably would not be worth while because I do not think he would last long enough for me to enjoy it.

He takes exception to anything that is said. It is the nature of the man to be disruptive and always to want to trot somebody outside.

Mr Bryce: Just a bit pugnacious.

Mr Rushton: He is a positive Minister.

Mr DAVIES: On the 13th September, 1977, he was at it again, offering to trot people outside. That continued for a period of about three days. It was reported in *The West Australian* and the *Daily News*. There was an article by Kerry Coyle on the 16th September, 1977, when the ALP objected to some of the things that had been said, but the Minister thought it was his unfettered right to continue in this way. It went on until he actually became silent. On the 23rd September, 1977, the following appeared in a newspaper—

The volatile Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr Bill Grayden, today parried questions about an incident when he removed his shirt and tie at a private Parliament House function.

He just did not want to make any comment on it. I think the Premier had come down on him at that stage and said, "Cool it, man." It even brought a cartoon of "Battling Bill" going into the Chamber and the Premier saying, "Expecting another hard day in the Assembly today, Bill?"

This is the man who says we must raise the standard of debate in the Parliament. This is the Minister whom the Premier has so vehemently defended by saying it is an injustice on the part of the Opposition to suggest he is doing these things. I will stop at that point because I think

we have proved quite conclusively that every word in the amendment is truthful and we are able to justify it. In fact, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when he moved the amendment, did just that, and subsequent speakers from this side of the House have done it. Members on the other side of the House have contented themselves with histrionics and a reluctance to debate the matter in any depth.

If we are to continue in a decent way, we must take some action to stop this kind of thing going on in the House. I believe it can be done. It will need a genuine approach on the part of the Government, and particularly on the part of the Minister for Labour and Industry who to this stage has shown a marked reluctance to compromise in any way. I believe he is a whipping boy for the Premier. He can do and say some outrageous things and get away with them. The member for Gosnells drew attention to some of the outrageous things he has said from time to time. We have been content to overlook them but we cannot overlook them any longer.

We believe the whole trade union movement has suffered because of the Minister's attitude. We believe the Government is happy to have him. The Government does not want industrial peace; it is itching for confrontation all the time. We believe the best efforts have not been made to settle the past tragic disputes. At a time like this when we hope the Government will be working to some beneficial end, we find it taking the opposite attitude.

I congratulate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on moving the amendment and give it my whole-hearted support.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to make the papers available to be placed on the Table of the House for the information of members and to remain there for the rest of this sitting.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Bateman
Mr Harman	

(Teller)

Noes 27

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Mr Clarko	Mr Old
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Neil
Mr Cowan	Mr Ridge
Mr Coyne	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr Laurance	Mr Williams
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Taylor	Mr P. V. Jones
Dr Troy	Mr Crane
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr McPharlin
Mr Jamieson	Mrs Craig
Mr Grill	Mr Sodeman

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [12.52 a.m.]: I welcome the opportunity to speak in this Address-in-Reply debate in support of the motion moved by the member for Murdoch. It is not my intention tonight to speak for any length of time, but I, like other members, would like to state my commendation of the Government, the Ministers, and the State authorities involved in the wake of the recent cyclone and fire disaster. The rapid assistance given to the stricken people by the Government not only was commendable but also shows the compassion of the Premier. The State Energy Commission has every reason to be proud of its involvement. Its employees worked under extremely difficult and dangerous conditions to restore power throughout the State in a manner that could only be described as remarkable. The people involved in fighting the fire outbreaks—the forestry workers, volunteers, and the SAS men—were equally tremendous.

At that time the State was a tinder box, and to achieve control of these fires was little short of a miracle. In the area involved people from every walk of life will take a long time to recover from the effects of this disaster. I commend the member for Murray for his donation of a day's pay towards the Lord Mayor's appeal and I am confident all members of this House will support the appeal in whatever way they can.

This disaster, added to the extreme problems experienced by farmers over several years, is almost too much. Mr Speaker, I believe you

could well understand the actions taken by the farmers when they were dealt another blow by their fellow countrymen. I refer, of course, to the loading of livestock, and I would like to express my backing for their action. I commend the Government and the Ministers who I am sure were completely behind the farmers.

If it is to remain effective, the Government must continue to support these people in their struggle for survival. Every man, woman, and child in this country has the right to work and to go about their lawful business. Like other members I condemn the Opposition for not offering support to these people.

Last week in this House we debated an amendment to the Address-in-Reply in regard to workers' compensation and the proposals of the Government to legislate, or to discuss legislation, to control the present abuses of the system. Many figures were quoted, and while figures are perhaps very necessary to obtain information they allow the most outrageous misuse of facts that we can imagine.

The figures that interest me are the correct ones and they show overwhelmingly that since the introduction of 100 per cent compensation, pay outs have increased by 300 to 400 per cent, and premiums have risen by 1 000 per cent in some cases, placing an intolerable burden on small businessmen in this community. The small businessman is still an important part of our community. He employs by far the greatest percentage of the work force, and at present he is battling to survive. While I am not suggesting this is the only problem facing him, it has been an added burden.

We heard that prior to this present legislation there were 29 000 claims a year. Last year there were 34 000 claims, and to me this proves that considering the increase in the work force the number of accidents a year has not increased. However, the pay-out figures have increased by 300 to 400 per cent and this can only indicate that a small percentage of the people are abusing the system and taking advantage of the increased compensation to such an extent that, unless the Government and the unions are prepared to do something about it, the crippling pay-outs will increase and the insurance premiums will rise with them. I make my feelings clear on this matter. I am in favour of bringing sanity back into the situation.

When the judicial inquiry is in progress, I would like to see it go as far as examining whether or not workers' compensation should be the workers' responsibility, and provision made for this in award payments. We could then allow a reduction in premiums by way of a

no-claim bonus, and no doubt this would reduce insurance premiums by 50 per cent overnight. It would create also provision for a worker to insure himself for a larger sum if he so desires.

Some of the figures quoted by Mr Cook of the Trades and Labor Council are as misleading as any figures I have ever heard. We see Mr Cook on the television saying to the people of Perth, "How would you like your payments reduced by \$32 a week?" Nothing could be more misleading. If a worker will lose \$32 a week in compensation payments, Mr Cook is indicating—according to my simple mathematics—that workers are being paid in the vicinity of \$210 a week.

Mr Skidmore: It is the average weekly earner he is referring to. Do not distort the truth.

Mr SPRIGGS: His figures are completely misleading, and I would say the advertisement is completely ineffective. The advertising campaign is probably costing \$50 000 or more.

Mr Skidmore: What are you worrying about it for?

Mr SPRIGGS: He is asking people to ring up their members. I am a member of Parliament, and I have not received one phone call about the advertisement. That is how effective it is. The TLC considers that the people are idiots.

Mr McIver: It would be a waste of time to ring you.

Mr SPRIGGS: That is right.

Mr Blaikie: I had one phone call, which was in support of the reduction.

Mr SPRIGGS: I would imagine it is about time members on the other side of the House started to act responsibly and consider the position of small businessmen and the burdens that have been placed upon them—

Mr Davies: Such as pay-roll tax.

Mr SPRIGGS: —and the unemployment which exists. It is time members opposite considered all the pressures placed on small businessmen.

Mr Davies: It is a pity the Government does not look at a few of them.

Mr SPRIGGS: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition is right; perhaps the Government is looking at some of them; however, the Government needs the support of the Opposition, not just complete opposition.

I would like also to express to the House and to the Minister involved my dismay, and certainly the dismay of a large percentage of my electors—and I believe of a large section of the community—at what I consider to be a complete disregard of the censorship of films regulations regarding

"R"-certificate films shown at drive-in theatres. I have no doubt that if we look at the newspaper now there would not be more than one or two drive-in theatres showing films that could be described as anything other than filth. As I understand the law, "R"-certificate films may be shown by drive-in theatres, and control must be exercised by the people responsible for showing them to ensure that children under the age of 16 years are not permitted to see them.

Mr Davies: It is 18, isn't it?

Mr SPRIGGS: No, it is 16.

Mr Davies: Have you seen any of them?

Mr SPRIGGS: No.

Mr Davies: Nor have I; so how do you know they are filth?

Mr SPRIGGS: My electors know they are filth.

Mr Davies: No-one forces people to see them.

Mr SPRIGGS: No, but drive-in theatres happen to have no screening whatsoever around them.

Mr Davies: How many people do you see looking over the fences of drive-in theatres?

Mr SPRIGGS: Every drive-in theatre in the metropolitan area is open to the public.

Mr Davies: How many people do you see around the boundary?

Mr SPRIGGS: I do not care about that; I am saying it is a breach of the law.

Mr Davies: If the parents cannot keep their children at home, there is something wrong.

Mr SPRIGGS: That is the greatest heap of rubbish I have heard in my life. Does the Leader of the Opposition always know where his children are until they are 16 years of age?

Mr Davies: It is 18 for "R"-certificate films.

Mr SPRIGGS: It is 16 years of age.

Mr Blaikie: Why don't you give him a fair go and let him continue?

Mr SPRIGGS: It is no credit to us if no control is being or can be exercised over open air drive-in theatres. I would ask the Minister responsible, if the present Act does not allow prosecutions, to consider legislation to facilitate them. I have no argument with people who wish to see "R"-certificate films provided they view them in theatres where they can be controlled. I believe the people showing these films at drive-in theatres have destroyed the purpose for which the theatres were designed; that is, to cater for the family man who finds it difficult to attend theatres with a young family, but who can no longer take his

family to drive-in theatres because of the type of films displayed. I repeat that I believe these people are breaking the law and should be prosecuted.

Another item affecting my electorate, which embraces the Shires of Kalamunda and Armadale-Kelmscott, on which I would like to speak concerns the rates paid by orchardists. Under the Local Government Act insufficient relief is able to be given to these people who provide a large percentage—in fact, 52 per cent—of the domestic fruit eaten in Perth. As a result of the spread of urban areas and the close proximity of the orchards to Perth, the orchardists are now facing large increases in land values, which have risen to unacceptable heights. Under the present Act shire councils are not able to provide relief from rates to these people, and I believe they should be given relief.

I know we have a Minister for Local Government who understands the problem, and I would like to see relief forthcoming from within the Cabinet for legislation to overcome this serious situation.

I would like to refer to one other point which I realise is probably controversial. I notice the Leader of the Opposition is not present in the Chamber, and I am aware that other members have congratulated him upon being elected to his position. I would have liked to congratulate him, because I knew him as a Minister and had dealings with him, and I had a fair amount of admiration for him. However, I lost that admiration on the night I attended with other members the vice-regal reception in this building when I believe the Leader of the Opposition cast a slur upon the vice-regal office.

Mr Pearce: Rubbish! That is absolute nonsense. Half of us were at that function.

Mr SPRIGGS: As far as I am concerned, the Leader of the Opposition removed any chance I had of offering congratulations to him.

Mr Pearce: What was the slur? Repeat it.

Mr SPRIGGS: Certainly I will repeat it; I can repeat it almost word for word. In his address the Leader of the Opposition stated quite clearly that he felt the Governor-General (Sir Zelman Cowen) might possibly bring back dignity to the vice-regal position. No dignity has been lost from the office of Governor-General, and the Leader of the Opposition cast a slur not only on the office, but on the Governor-General himself.

Mr Pearce: Nonsense. He was saying he would be a fine Governor-General.

Mr SPRIGGS: Mr Speaker, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Adjournment of Debate

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [1.07 a.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 16

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman

*(Teller)***Noes 25**

Mr Blaikie	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr O'Neil
Sir Charles Court	Mr Ridge
Mr Cowan	Mr Rushton
Mr Coyne	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr Laurance	Mr Williams
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

*(Teller)***Pairs**

Ayes	Noes
Mr Taylor	Mr P. V. Jones
Dr Troy	Mr Crane
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr McPharlin
Mr Jamieson	Mrs Craig
Mr Grill	Mr Sodeman
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr O'Connor

Motion thus negatived.

Debate Resumed

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [1.11 a.m.]: The first thing I wish to do is apologise to the Premier for trying to take the business of the House out of his hands. I knew I would never be able to get away with that. However, the reason I called "Divide" was to voice my protest at being asked to speak in the Address-in-Reply debate at 11 minutes past one in the morning. I am the only member of this Chamber who has been asked to do that during this debate.

Sir Charles Court: You should talk to your mates about this one. If you want to keep on moving amendment after amendment, of course we must sit late.

Mr HARMAN: If the Premier likes, I will take him back to the 1971-1974 era when, as Leader of the Opposition, he moved amendment after amendment. However, the Premier at the time (Mr J. T. Tonkin) always tried to make sure the House adjourned early so that members would not be here until the early hours of the morning and so that they would not be subjected to the scene to which I am now subjected, being asked to make a speech at 11 minutes past one in the morning.

Mr Young: You are not the first, and you will not be the last.

Mr HARMAN: I am the only member in this House who has been asked to make a speech on the Address-in-Reply motion at this hour of the morning. On every other occasion when an amendment has been defeated there have been one or two speeches at the conclusion of the amendment just to take the time up to midnight. It is not good enough to expect a member of Parliament to stand and speak in the Address-in-Reply debate at 11 minutes past one in the morning.

Mr Herzfeld: Are you not capable?

Mr HARMAN: I am quite capable, but I am saying it is very difficult for members to sit around here at this hour of the morning and listen to me. In addition, it imposes added burdens on me, because I have been working all day.

I thought the first thing I should do was to make some criticism of the Premier. I refer to the recent decision of the Australian Government on the question of overseas loans. The House will recall that some time ago the Premier endeavoured to establish some sort of scheme whereby the States, independently of the Australian Government, could go overseas and borrow funds in the name of the State.

One can imagine the spectacle if such a proposal ever got off the ground: We would have our Premier, the Premier of South Australia (Mr Dunstan), the Premier of Victoria (Mr Hamer), the Premier of New South Wales (Mr Wran), the Premier of Queensland (Mr Bjelke-Petersen), and the Premier of Tasmania all racing off to New York where all overseas funds are borrowed, and fighting amongst themselves to borrow funds on the overseas market.

Mr Hassell: That is why it had to go through the Loan Council.

Mr HARMAN: That is right; members can imagine what would happen if they did not go through the Loan Council. Two things would happen—

Sir Charles Court: The proposal was that it had to go through the Loan Council.

Mr HARMAN: And the Premier does not want it to.

Sir Charles Court: Of course I do; read the guidelines.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier does not want it to.

Mr Hassell: That is not accurate.

Mr HARMAN: I intend to read to members a Press release put out by the Premier which will prove my point. Members can imagine the spectacle of all the Australian Premiers rushing over to the New York loan market, fighting to get certain funds at certain interest rates. What would happen, of course, is that the financiers would be playing the Premiers off against one another. They would be looking at the performance of each State and deciding on that performance the interest rates they would apportion to the loans.

Mr Young: The other States would not get much under that formula.

Mr Blaikie: And Western Australia would do very well.

Mr HARMAN: Perhaps; that question is very difficult to answer. However, it would not take long under this system before the States would be given some sort of rating on the New York market, similar to the system adopted in Canada, where States are rated on their ability to run their own finances.

The second problem which presents itself concerns the national Government. If States are to run around, borrowing funds on the international market, it will pose a problem for the national Government, because it is the national Government which has the deciding control over our fiscal and monetary policies, and which determines the supply of money and the interest rates to be applied.

Mr Young: You are so wrong, because approval must come from the Loan Council, and such conditions would be imposed.

Mr HARMAN: That is what the Premier objected to.

Mr Young: No, he did not. He was the architect of this scheme.

Sir Charles Court: You had better discuss it with me so that I can help you get the right slant on it. You are not helping yourself at the moment.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier objected to the Prime Minister having the power of veto.

Sir Charles Court: That is right. If the Loan Council meets and if there is a majority, we say it should go through.

Mr HARMAN: Yes, if there is a majority, but the Premier knows he will never get a majority on the Loan Council.

Sir Charles Court: Of course we can have a majority on the Loan Council, but the Commonwealth wants a power of veto even if we have a majority and we say, "Not on your life!"

Mr HARMAN: The Premier objects to the power of veto?

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr HARMAN: He wants to be able to raise funds overseas without any involvement by the Commonwealth.

Sir Charles Court: No; I think we had better have a seminar on it, but not tonight.

Mr HARMAN: Yes, that would be a good idea; I would like a statement on the matter from the Premier. He never contributes to this debate; perhaps he can follow me. What the Premier in effect is saying is that he wants to be able to raise funds overseas and forget about the Commonwealth interest.

Sir Charles Court: Do not be silly. You are saying that all the Premiers, including the Labor Premiers, would be irresponsible.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier does not agree with the Prime Minister having the right of veto. *The Australian Financial Review*, a fairly discerning newspaper, supported the view taken by Mr Fraser on that occasion that the Australian Government ought to have the final say when it comes to the States borrowing overseas. But the Premier disagrees with that.

Sir Charles Court: As do other Premiers.

Mr HARMAN: He does not agree with the Prime Minister that the Australian Government should have that power of veto with regard to monetary and fiscal policies in Australia. He is saying that because we could borrow funds overseas through semi-governmental authorities we will place in jeopardy any sort of national policy which the Australian Government may be contemplating. It may be contemplating a devaluation or a revaluation because at present—and

no member opposite will deny this—it has absolute power over the Australian economy. The stand taken by the States would mean that that power should be diluted so that the Australian Government should not have this absolute power. I do not think any member of this Parliament would accept that proposition, because that would be placing the national economy in further jeopardy.

Sir Charles Court: Say you have every State in favour—the whole six.

Mr HARMAN: That is a hypothetical position.

Sir Charles Court: No, it is not. In most instances that would be the case, because the States would have mutual interests in assessing one another's needs.

Mr HARMAN: Let us say every State is in favour of a certain proposition.

Sir Charles Court: You say the Commonwealth should veto that?

Mr HARMAN: That is right. In a country such as Australia the national Government should have the final say when it comes to overseas borrowings, because the States are concerned only with the interests of themselves.

Sir Charles Court: The interests of the people.

Mr HARMAN: Yes, of their own people in Western Australia or their own people in South Australia—

Sir Charles Court: You are the people who are saying we should have more money from the Commonwealth Government to get on with capital works.

Mr HARMAN: So we should, but the Government should be responsible to one central authority to borrow these overseas funds.

Sir Charles Court: No. Canada does not and has not done for years.

Mr HARMAN: But Canada has a different economic system from ours.

Sir Charles Court: No, it does not.

Mr HARMAN: It does, and the Premier knows what it is.

Sir Charles Court: They do not have the safeguards we do, because the proposition I put to the Commonwealth Government insists and ensures that the States go through the Loan Council machinery.

Mr HARMAN: The second thing we have not been able to glean from the Premier is what these funds, which are to be borrowed overseas by

the States, will be used for and who will pay for them. Obviously if one borrows money one has to pay for it.

Sir Charles Court: They are going to capital works which enable them to finance their capital costs.

Mr HARMAN: Can the Premier give me an illustration of that?

Sir Charles Court: The thousand-mile pipeline from Dampier to Perth is to be financed with this sort of money and the whole basis of it is that it has to be self financing both as to repayment of capital and the interest.

Mr HARMAN: For the first time we are hearing—

Sir Charles Court: This has been said a thousand times publicly.

Mr HARMAN: Well, we have not heard it. It is the first time we have heard about the pipeline costing.

Sir Charles Court: Good heavens!

Mr HARMAN: In the form the Premier is suggesting tonight.

Sir Charles Court: It has been talked about a dozen times.

Mr HARMAN: It has been talked about.

Sir Charles Court: It is a matter of Government policy. When we announced we had signed a contract of \$2.5 billion-worth of gas over 20 years it was conditional on our building the pipeline.

Mr HARMAN: How much money is involved in this?

Sir Charles Court: The pipeline? I have said that a dozen times. It is \$400 million approximately.

Mr HARMAN: The Government is going to borrow \$400 million overseas?

Sir Charles Court: With the permission of the Loan Council.

Mr HARMAN: Which is to be used to build a pipeline down to Perth.

Sir Charles Court: It will be self financing.

Mr HARMAN: Who is going to pay for that?

Sir Charles Court: It is self financing.

Mr HARMAN: The people of Western Australia, the people who use the gas.

Sir Charles Court: Out of the price of the gas.

Mr Mensaros: Who will pay for it if you get the money from the Commonwealth Government?

Mr HARMAN: What I am saying is that if the Commonwealth Government is borrowing, it is part of the Commonwealth Government's involvement in the projects of Australia.

Sir Charles Court: But we still have to service it. We service every dollar it gives us through the Loan Council.

Mr HARMAN: We ought to know a bit more about it.

Sir Charles Court: Don't you take an interest in the Budget?

Mr HARMAN: I do, but I want to know how much it will cost the people of Western Australia. How much are they going to pay for the gas?

Sir Charles Court: You do not think Father Christmas is going to provide power lines or pipelines?

Mr HARMAN: No, but I should like to know how much the people of Western Australia are to pay for it when the occasion arises. It has also been suggested that some of this money to be borrowed overseas will be used for infrastructure in association with the development of resources in Australia.

I am not opposed to overseas money being borrowed and being used in resource development, but I am opposed to the way the Premier wants to do it; that is, in a situation which has not the approval of the national Government. I should like to see that development occur through overseas finance from a central Commonwealth authority such as the AIDC.

Sir Charles Court: Heaven forbid!

Mr Herzfeld: We have heard it all before.

Mr HARMAN: It will be able not only to borrow finance but also to participate in a programme of resource development.

Sir Charles Court: Tell us one winner they have backed.

Mr HARMAN: That is the proposition I should like this Government to aim at rather than borrowing independently for a project which is not nationally approved. It may well be that in the years to come that sort of finance could be put into a resource development which may not turn out to be a winner. I am worried that if that occurs in years to come our rating on the international market may well come down to B or C or D and we may find ourselves in jeopardy when it comes to borrowing finance at the right interest rate.

I put these matters in a rather provocative way so that I might stimulate some sort of thinking amongst people interested in the subject to see whether things are as the Premier describes them in the various statements he has made.

The second matter I wish to raise is the report by Forbes and Fitzhardinge on the Canning River and the Swan River. This report was commissioned by the Environmental Protection Authority and took some time to prepare, but it was aimed at the protection and use of the Perth rivers system. The Government commissioned the report and said that the diversion of Hackett Drive into the Esplanade at Nedlands should not be allowed, and that the proposed Swan River Drive should be abandoned.

Members will recall that Swan River Drive was first of all introduced in the Stephenson Plan to run from Perth via Burswood Island across the Swan River and the Maylands peninsular and link up with the Gosnells-Beechboro Highway. It was a road that would traverse most of the wetlands of the Swan River on the upper reaches of Maylands and Bayswater. It is a road that has come in for questioning in recent years as to whether it should really be used at all.

There are something like 123 recommendations in this report and the Government has decided that they should be treated as discussion points. The Government is not intending to make any early decision on those points. I believe we are entitled at least to have that report tabled in the House if it is going to be a point of discussion. At the appropriate time I would like the Minister for Conservation and the Environment to table the report so we can read it thoroughly and perhaps have some public debate on it.

Some of the other recommendations made are quite important. It is recommended that aquatic wildlife reserves should be established on big areas of the river which are important to fish and wildlife. Fortunately along the foreshore of the Maylands area of the Swan River there are some large areas which are the habitats of wildlife and I am hoping the Government will agree that those areas should be reserved for that purpose.

The report recommended that laws prohibiting the use of trail bikes on Government reserves should be strictly enforced along river foreshores. At the moment we have a problem with trail bikes being taken onto these reserves and causing a great deal of damage. There must be very little power available for the Government or the local authorities to do anything about this activity on the reserves. It was a great comfort for us tonight to hear that the Government is finally resolving

its differences with its legislation and is proposing to place relevant legislation before the Parliament again.

The report also recommends that high priority should be given to installing deep sewerage in areas near rivers. Members may not be aware that a large area of land next to the Maylands peninsular is not sewered. The area is ready for development. It is an area of land on which facilities, including a police complex which will grow as the years move on, have been constructed and it is obvious this sort of complex will need a sewerage system. It is an area to which I hope the Maylands Bowling Club and the Maylands Tennis Club will move. This is conditional upon the final approval of the Minister who is at present examining the proposition.

If sewerage is connected as soon as possible it will mean that the peninsular area, which has been dormant for many years, will now be able to be properly developed. I think members should bear in mind that the area contains the old Maylands aerodrome, which was granted to the State by the Commonwealth some years ago on the condition it be set aside for parks and recreation.

Mr Davies: Is that where the academy is?

Mr HARMAN: It is being used by the Police Department as an academy, as horse stables, and as a radio complex, among other things. The development of the area is being inhibited by the lack of sewerage. Plans have been drawn up by the City of Stirling to have the old Maylands aerodrome developed into a public golf course. Given the present finances allocated to the States and in turn allocated to local authorities, and given the demands on local authorities' finances for projects which probably have greater priority than a public golf course, a local authority like the City of Stirling finds it very difficult to provide money for this sort of development, bearing in mind it has other public golf courses.

I am suggesting that the Government and the local authority ought to consider the proposition whereby a private person or firm is able to provide the finance and build the golf course, and then, of course, after liaison with the authority, receive the fees for its use. I do not think this would be any problem for the Government or the local authority, because they must realise they do not have the necessary finance to give effect to the development. If there are people or firms in the community with the necessary money who are anxious to develop an area as a public golf course, I believe the Government and the local authority should give the proposition consideration.

Mr Davies: What about those units of Bond's? Are they on deep sewerage?

Mr HARMAN: Yes, they are. That is a private development by the Bond Corporation. If the Government considers the peninsular it will find the area is ripe for development. There are certain areas which should have been reserved for parks and recreation, and there are other areas which could be developed for residential purposes, given a sewerage scheme for the area.

There seems to be a tendency these days to concentrate on inner city living. Already there are developments which have been approved by the City of Stirling which would be sort of multi-density accommodation and could get off the ground if sewerage were connected to the area.

It has been a perennial request by me to approach the Government every year for the last 10 years to give effect to some sort of sewerage proposal on the Maylands peninsular. Each time, I receive a reply from the Minister that the matter will be considered when finances are available.

Mr Davies: Apart from the aerodrome, is there much private land built on there?

Mr HARMAN: Quite a lot. The area is ready for residential development, and given a sewerage system there these plans could be proceeded with. It would mean that people could live in close proximity to the city in an environment which would be nice to live in. The area has good views of the river and the city. Residents there would have access to at least one sporting outlet. There would be others that would be developed in the immediate vicinity, such as the Maylands Bowling Club and the Maylands Tennis Club.

At the same time the movement of these clubs from the heart of Maylands would mean that that part of the area could be developed as a passive recreation area. We could have an area that has blossomed with home units and flats and has a burgeoning commercial area with large supermarkets. In the years to come it will be necessary to have this sort of passive recreation centre in the heart of the development so that those who want to use the facility can do so.

It seems to me that the Minister would be well advised to consider these aspects when he comes to making his decision on the transfer of these facilities, bearing in mind the total planning concept which is put forward for this particular area.

In other words, there would be an inner city suburb which is largely concerned with home units and high-rise, multi-density living, with

large supermarkets and shopping centres, and in the centre of that area we would have a passive recreation area. That would be possible if the present site of the Maylands Bowling Club and the Maylands Tennis Club was moved down to the peninsular, and both clubs have the accord of their members to do that. It would be possible then to develop that area as a possible recreation centre.

The next matter I wish to pursue is the question of the Oombulgurri people at Wyndham. There has been some debate and questions posed in respect of these people. Members will recall that the Aboriginal Lands Trust has suggested and recommended that one particular company be allowed to prospect on the Aboriginal reserve known as the Forrest River Reserve. The Government has decided it would like to see two other companies having the right to prospect on the Forrest River Reserve.

Mr Mensaros: The Government did not say that. The Government has simply said that the minerals belong to the Crown and it is not for any group of people to decide who should dig the minerals. It should be open tender and those who apply will get it on the decision of the Mines Department. That is what the Government said.

Mr HARMAN: I hope the *Hansard* reporter took all that down, because I did not hear it. The Government has reached an impasse, because the Commissioner of the Aboriginal Planning Authority, in the position he holds under the Aboriginal Planning Authority Act, finds he cannot agree with the proposition. He can only support the recommendation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust; so the Government has a position here where it needs to change the regulations if it wishes to do whatever the Minister was suggesting. In other words, that another company—

Mr Mensaros: Any company still needs a permit based on the legislation.

Mr HARMAN: —would need to have a permit to go onto the reserve; therefore, the regulation needs to be changed.

The conflict here, of course, is that the Aborigines in the area wish to see only one company prospecting on the reserve.

Mr Ridge: Their advisers do.

Mr HARMAN: And the Aboriginal Lands Trust has accepted that point of view and made that particular recommendation. The Minister for Community Welfare suggests it is "their advisers". Who are "their advisers"?

Mr Ridge: It includes the Aboriginal Legal Service, for a start.

Mr HARMAN: Who else?

Mr Ridge: They will do for a start.

Mr HARMAN: That is a matter we can pursue in the next few days. Does the Minister mean individuals in the Aboriginal Legal Service, or does he mean the Aboriginal Legal Service?

Mr Ridge: I mean the Aboriginal Legal Service staff; but other people advise them also.

Mr HARMAN: And who are these other people?

Mr Ridge: You should know. You are a former officer of the Native Welfare Department.

Mr HARMAN: That was 10 years ago.

Mr Ridge: And you will probably be aware that officers of various Government departments advise these people.

Mr HARMAN: Are these people not capable of making up their own minds?

Mr Ridge: Apparently not. It seems that other people in the community feel they can advise them.

Mr HARMAN: The member for Kimberley is saying the Aborigines in the area—the Oombulgurri people—are not able to make up their own minds about an issue.

Mr Ridge: I can assure you that many of the Oombulgurri people have indicated to me they would be very pleased to see the reserve opened up to the type of prospecting that the Government has in mind.

Mr HARMAN: That is not in accord with the information I have.

Mr Ridge: These people can express their own opinions; but once they get into the council group they are guided by people who force their opinions on them to some extent.

Mr HARMAN: So these people are being led by some other people.

Mr Ridge: I am not saying that.

Mr HARMAN: The Oombulgurri people are being led. They are not able to make up their own minds. They are being led by other people.

Mr Ridge: Misled perhaps would be a better term to use.

Mr HARMAN: According to the Minister they are being misled by other people. Some time ago I asked the Minister a question as to when he would bring this regulation forward and gazette it, and when he would table it; but he is not able to give me any sort of indication at all. What I am suggesting will happen—and it happened before in December, 1976, as a result of action taken by the

Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife—is the Government will wait until this Parliament rises some time in May and it will then either gazette the regulations just before we rise or just after. As a result, we will not have the opportunity to debate whatever regulations the Government brings in until Parliament sits again in August, because under the rules of the House 14 sitting days can elapse before the Government needs to table a change in regulations which has already been gazetted.

I am suggesting, and the Minister can deny it if he likes, that the Government is deliberately playing around with this amendment so that we will not have the chance to debate it in this particular session of Parliament.

Mr Grayden: You are not really serious about that accusation, are you?

Mr HARMAN: I am making that accusation. The result of that action will be that the two companies assisted by the change in the regulations will then have the opportunity to enter the reserve during the dry season and, given the time that Parliament can debate it, a decision will not be reached before August-September-October by which time, of course, the whole matter will be a *fait accompli*. That is what the Government intends to do. That is how it will mislead the Aborigines on the matter of the Forrest River Reserve.

Mr Ridge: You are taking a guess there; nothing more than that.

Mr HARMAN: I am taking a guess there all right; but the Minister has not denied it, has he?

Mr Grayden: You know what the position is with regulations. It is a continuing process.

Mr HARMAN: In December, 1976, a couple of days after Parliament rose, we saw the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife gazetting these regulations which incorporated massive changes. The Minister for Labour and Industry ought to talk about regulations. He put an Act through this House in 1974 and it has not yet been proclaimed, because his department and the Crown Law Department have not been able to finalise the regulations. Four years have passed and we are still waiting for the Act to be proclaimed.

Mr Grayden: It will be proclaimed very shortly; but it takes that long, strangely, if you have to negotiate with unions and manufacturers.

Mr HARMAN: It is fairly obvious from the reaction of the Minister that is the sort of action the Government proposes. In other words, the Government intends to stop members debating

this issue in Parliament until some time in August-September next year. I give notice now that, on the information available to me from the Oombulgurri people, the Opposition will be moving to disallow any change in the regulations which gives the Minister—

Mr Ridge: You surprise me.

Mr HARMAN: —ultimate power. It might surprise the Minister for Community Welfare. The Opposition will oppose any change in the regulations which gives the Minister ultimate and absolute power. In other words, the Minister would be ignoring the wishes of the people in that area. That is what he would be doing.

Mr Mensaros: You are suggesting public servants should have more power than the Minister who is responsible to the electors.

Mr HARMAN: I hope *Hansard* is taking down the Minister, because I cannot hear him.

Mr Mensaros: You are suggesting that a public servant should have more power than the Minister who is the only one responsible to the Parliament and the electors. That is what you are suggesting.

Mr HARMAN: No, I am not. I am suggesting that the wishes of the Aborigines should be protected, and that is all he is doing. I am sure he is protecting those wishes. He is not bowing to any other pressures.

Mr Ridge: How many other Acts or regulations are there under which a departmental officer has the overriding say in the matter—in other words who overrides the Minister?

Mr HARMAN: He is not.

Mr Ridge: He is.

Mr HARMAN: If the Aborigines had recommended that the other two companies be permitted, he would have gone along with the recommendation.

Mr Ridge: It is wrong that a departmental officer has the right to determine, over and above the Minister, who should go onto a place.

Mr HARMAN: That was written into the Act.

Mr Ridge: That is right, and we want to change it.

Mr HARMAN: It was not done on that occasion.

Mr Ridge: We want to do something about it now.

Mr HARMAN: I know, but it has been raised now, only because the commissioner is protecting the wishes of the Aborigines, and the Government wishes to override the commissioner.

Mr Ridge: We believe we should have the final say in this matter, not a public servant.

Mr HARMAN: The Government believes that and it covers up by saying it is going to have further consultations with the Aborigines. What does that mean? Does it mean that the Government will bombard the Aborigines with some other proposition so that they will agree?

Mr Ridge: We have clearly indicated there will be consultation.

Mr HARMAN: Is the Government going to bombard the Aborigines with some other proposal which will extract from them a "Yes" to the proposition that the two other companies should go there?

Mr Ridge: As to how we deal with them is our business at this stage.

Mr HARMAN: It is the business of Western Australia how the Government deals with them and that is one of the things I find very difficult to comprehend, because there does not seem to be any suggestion by the Government that the Aborigines are being consulted.

Mr Ridge: Of course, because we do not have the ability to do what we think is necessary, but once we have we will consult them as we have given an undertaking to do so.

Mr HARMAN: When?

Mr Ridge: As soon as we are ready, and there is a good reason for that amended regulation not having been tabled now. There is a very good reason for it.

Mr HARMAN: Can the Minister tell us what it is?

Mr Ridge: No.

Mr HARMAN: I cannot understand what the very good reason would be.

Mr Ridge: That is okay.

Mr HARMAN: I would like the Minister to inform the Parliament what it is.

Mr Ridge: As far as I am concerned, it is not in the best interests of the Aboriginal people to explain to you what the proposition is.

Mr HARMAN: If it is not in the best interests of the Aborigines, we will wait to find out.

An Opposition member: And the Minister will not tell the Parliament.

Mr Ridge: I will tell the Parliament when I am good and ready.

Mr HARMAN: I wish now to refer to a matter I raised the other night concerning housing. It is being raised continually in my electorate where

we have applicants for homes. They are eligible for finance at 5½ per cent if they earn below a certain income level per week. I have cases where people are turning down promotions, because if they accept the promotions they will not be eligible to take advantage of the 5½ per cent money. However, because there are such long delays in housing allocations for purchase homes, they find they must accept promotion and then they are above the \$167 a week limit. When their turn is reached they are then eligible for the money funded through the building society the interest on which is at least 10 per cent. So people find themselves paying \$143 a month for their purchase home when they pay 5½ per cent, but when they are not eligible for that finance they pay \$210 a month.

The Government has always argued that it has a policy to assist people on low incomes to obtain finance for housing. However, I put it to the Government that it is not succeeding in any way at all with that policy, because these people are waiting a long period of time to get a house and when they finally get it they then do not have the opportunity to borrow the money at 5½ per cent, and so must accept the alternative at 10 per cent or above.

The Government should examine its housing policy to ascertain whether or not it can ensure that the funds available at 5½ per cent continue to be applied particularly to people on low incomes. If the Government makes an examination of this situation it will find to its astonishment that its policy of providing funds at low interest to families on low incomes is not really succeeding.

With those remarks I support the motion.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [1.57 a.m.]: I wish to raise several matters of considerable importance, but because of the lateness of the hour I shall be brief. I refer to the Partridge report of 1976, or more correctly, the report on post-secondary education in Western Australia. The report recommends that the Teacher Education Act of 1972 should be repealed and replaced by legislation to provide for the establishment of a multi-campus institution to be known as the Western Australian college of advanced education.

I totally disagree with that recommendation and I would like to state briefly that in my opinion the Partridge report in the chapter dealing with teacher education fails to submit arguments to support the recommendation. In fact, it tends to do the opposite. It tries to argue on the basis of administrative, economic, and educational grounds that the Western Australian teachers'

colleges should be placed together rather than apart as separate colleges. One of the arguments used is related to size. It is claimed that these teachers' colleges have or will have over the next few years a student population in the order of 2 000, with the exception of Claremont which has 1 000, and that they are too small.

In my view the small size is a virtue. I remember that when I was a student at the University of Western Australia there were about 2 000 students and it did not seem to me or my colleagues at the time that the number was too small to be effective.

It is interesting that the Partridge report makes a number of assertions without backing them up with any significant evidence, and I could produce—but will not do so, because of the lateness of the hour—an amount of statistical information which would reject some of its assertions.

One of the assertions is that the teachers' colleges separately were overloaded with senior staff. The statistics show quite clearly that this is not the case. The percentage of their staff at ordinary lecturer level is much greater than at, say, university level.

If the teachers' colleges of Western Australia were to be placed into one single institution then we would have a college which would be equivalent to the third largest in Australia.

Of the 71 colleges of advanced education as listed in 1978, Churchlands ranks No. 23; the Secondary Teachers' College, No. 27; Mt. Lawley, No. 35; and Claremont, No. 54. It seems to me that the first three of those colleges certainly do not tend to be too small.

It is also important to realise that in Western Australia the Western Australian Teacher Education Authority, simply called WATEA, was formed some years ago when the Act was first established in 1972, but now that we have the Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission, simply called WAPSEC, WATEA is now redundant. The Partridge report states that certain things could or should be done by an all-co-ordinating body, and that I believe that WAPSEC can effectively do them.

It seems very strange that Western Australia should be the only State in Australia in which the earlier-mentioned proposition should be advocated. To me it is even more strange to find that Partridge, who was responsible for this particular report into post-secondary education affairs in Western Australia, should only this year head a committee of inquiry into the position in Victoria. The report of that committee was diametrically opposed to the Partridge report in this State.

The recommendation in Victoria was to do away with two of the co-ordinating bodies which is significant because unlike them WATEA does not have the right to approach directly the Commonwealth bodies associated with their field. I think it is also important to state that one of the recommendations is that these new colleges, in their new forms, should have boards which do not have on them members other than their academic representatives and students. I think the member for Swan would agree with me that community members on college boards have added a great deal of depth and vitality to these particular separate colleges.

Mr Skidmore: They certainly have; I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr CLARKO: The report shows that the boards have been a great boon to the healthy development of those colleges. In fact, the Partridge report states, in reference to single colleges, that "the balance has moved well over to the side of allowing the colleges very considerable independence".

My question is: why continue the situation where we have this intermediary, that is, WATEA? That organisation is doing things and making decisions for which other institutions or the colleges should have the responsibility. Alternatively WAPSEC should be handling those matters.

It is interesting to note that in Western Australia the amount spent *per capita* on co-ordinating post-secondary education is estimated to be \$49 per student, whereas the Australian average is \$38 per student. In Western Australia we have WAPSEC and WATEA doing the same things.

Mr Skidmore: And neither of them doing it very well, would you not agree?

Mr CLARKO: I believe evidence would show that if there were any weaknesses in our system at the present moment, greater autonomy in the colleges and great responsibility for WAPSEC would lead to a better situation. That is no reflection on the people associated with WATEA. It cannot justify itself any more.

Nowhere in Australia is there a single college of education handling teacher education. In addition to the Partridge report on the situation in Victoria, a report has also been completed in South Australia, called the Anderson report. The representatives of that committee came to Western Australia to look at our position and rejected the WATEA system.

The separate teachers' colleges have been most responsible. They have developed very healthily. They have shown a capacity to handle administra-

tion well. By controlling their own budgets they have acquired a greater sense of responsibility than they might otherwise have done.

To me there should be a simple system without many difficulties. With regard to major matters of policy which need to be determined within the teacher education system, the current situation is: an individual college having come to its own conclusion must then put it to WATEA. WATEA then refers the matter to its advisory committee, and the advisory committee reports back to WATEA. It then reports to WAPSEC, which refers the matter to its specialised advisory committee, which reports back. WAPSEC then reports to the Federal Council of Advanced Education. That council sends the matter to its advisory committee, and then to the Tertiary Education Council. Sometimes the matter has to go down the line again.

I submit that system is too cumbersome and is applied with difficulty. It is likely the decisions reached are not as sound as they otherwise might be.

I wish to touch quickly on the question of educational efficiency. The Partridge report suggests a combined multi-campus institution would enable staff to move from one institution to another. That is entirely unlikely. Within the universities we have, even between faculties on the same campus there is rarely any movement of staff. There is rarely movement between the high schools. That applies even when the institutions are run by the one organisation, the Education Department. In addition, the geographic locations of our teachers colleges are some distance apart and a great deal of time would be wasted travelling between them.

It is my view this particular proposition of the Partridge report can be totally discounted by his subsequent recommendation in Victoria. The recommendation cannot stand up and I hope the Government will consider this matter at an early date. Hopefully the Government will support the argument I have put forward. I understand the teachers' colleges are mainly of this opinion although at one stage the view was put forward that their staffs would be given greater protection if they were covered by one body and were able to move from one college to the other.

I think the planned closing of the Graylands Teachers' College indicates that staff is protected. Already there is the situation where staff do move from one college to another. I believe this will continue. With regard to the sharing of courses and the formation of courses, that could still be overseen by a body such as WAPSEC.

In conclusion, I believe the time is ripe for us to dispense with WATEA, and to give the power that is necessary to WAPSEC to allow each of the separate teachers' colleges to go its own healthy way.

Adjournment of Debate

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) (2.08 a.m.): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Debate Resumed

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) (2.09 a.m.): I moved for the adjournment of the debate in protest at my being forced to address the House at such a late hour, and to protest at what we have come to know as the Premier's dominance of his party, and by that means his dominance of the Parliament.

I want to look at the relevance of the parliamentary institution in several of its aspects in the 1980s. I commence my remarks in the Address-in-Reply debate by saying it is not my intention when commenting on the institution or any of its aspects to cast aspersions on any office holder in this Parliament or any other person who happens for the time being to hold any particular office to which I might refer.

I consider the annual opening of Parliament—the tea party to which we are subjected at the beginning of each parliamentary session—to be a farce. I consider it to be a complete waste of the taxpayers' money, and I am of the opinion that the Address-in-Reply debate could proceed in response to a reading by the Clerk or by yourself, Sir, of the speech which is prepared by the Government. I would even be prepared to put up with a reading of it by the Premier.

I do not think it is necessary for us to subject the servants of this House and all those involved in the preparation of the opening to what is in my opinion quite a ridiculous event. I suggest serious consideration be given to doing away with this annual event. I would be prepared to agree to a triennial opening—one per Parliament. We could put up with that.

The same people are invited each year. If we checked the list of invitees by members, Ministers, or yourself, Mr Speaker, we would find almost always the same faces are seen at each function. That is my first point in stating that we should make the Parliament relevant to the 1980s by encouraging participation of the public in our considerations and debate of their affairs. I think we should do away with functions like that.

I have absolutely nothing against the Governor personally. In fact, I have met him and find him to be quite a pleasant fellow. But I suggest his relevance is related to the relevance of the Queen to Western Australia in 1980, and when regard is had for the fact that only 26 per cent of those who migrated to Australia in 1977 were from Britain or Northern Ireland it becomes apparent that a large percentage of our migrants owe no natural allegiance to the Queen of England, and that would apply also to the vast majority of post-war migrants.

Reference is made in the Governor's Speech—which, as has been indicated, was written by the Government—to the success of the Queen's visit last year. To be honest with ourselves, the public reaction to the Queen's visit was not overwhelmingly enthusiastic. The same people were invited to the different functions.

Sir Charles Court: It was the greatest assembly ever of the public at large for a Royal visit.

Mr T. J. BURKE: If we compare the numbers of people who appeared when the Queen last visited this State with the numbers who attended functions and gathered to see the Queen on this visit—and our population has since doubled—as a percentage of the population it could only be seen as a real decline in the interest of Australians in the Monarch. I suggest this is related to the fact that a very large proportion of the population today—as the Minister for Immigration indicated, 150 different ethnic groups are represented here—owes no natural allegiance to the Queen of England.

Sir Charles Court: It is they who were most excited about the visit.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I think it is wrong for any Government to corral the school children of the State and force them to stand along the sides of the roads. That is in fact what happens on Royal visits. The vast majority of the crowds comprises school children who are handed a flag and told to wave it. Children of migrants, who in many instances are from parts of the world where there is no natural allegiance to the Queen, are regimented and their allegiance to the Queen is imposed upon them.

I am quite certain the Queen is a very fine woman. I do not envy her her position. I do not envy the position of any member of the Royal family, and I think recent criticism of certain members of the Royal family was very offensive. But the fact is that Australia in the 1980s will be probably the most cosmopolitan country in the world. It has derived about 40 per cent of its population from post-war migration, and a

survey would probably reveal that the 25 per cent of them who are English migrants feel no real allegiance to the Queen of England. It is of no use kidding ourselves about the allegiance of Australians to the Queen of England. I do not think it is very real at all.

Sir Charles Court: Is that official ALP policy?

Mr T. J. BURKE: Of course it is not. I am relating my remarks to the institution of Parliament, and the Western Australian Parliament in particular. I will conclude by commenting that perhaps I can understand the relevance of the Queen in the English context. In fact I think only last week someone indicated that the Royal family was underpaid for its entertainment value, and I am sure if we took into account the tourist earnings attributable to the Royal family we would find the cost of its upkeep is a good investment for England.

Mr Speaker, I asked your predecessor (Sir Ross Hutchinson) in the last year of his occupation of the Chair to give consideration to improving the Chamber. I know you have made some improvements, Sir, but I think many more improvements could be made.

Mr Clarko: Air-conditioning?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I think we should have air-conditioning. It is a very hot Chamber. I feel very sorry for my colleagues opposite—and particularly the Deputy Premier—who have to sit with their coats on.

Mr Blaikie: What about the member for Vasse?

Mr O'Neil: I feel sorry for you. You are very rarely here.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am coming to that point.

Mr O'Neil: If we improve the Chamber, can we have the pleasure of your company more often?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I cannot guarantee that, and I think I am probably justified. I believe the seating in the House should be changed. It is definitely not orthopaedically correct. It is obviously designed for show more than for comfort, and if we sought the opinion of an expert in this field I am sure he would support my comments.

Mr Clarko: The member for Avon finds it very comfortable.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am pleased. The member for Avon works very hard.

I want to compliment you, Sir, on the improvements you have made, but in 1978, heading into the 1980s, the members of Parliament in the State of Western Australia should be provided with something better than these fans.

I would also like to comment on the dress of members in the Chamber. I know you, Sir, have made the point that it is up to members to move as regards dress, and I do not want to contradict you; but as long as the Premier dominates his side of the Chamber we are unlikely to achieve much in the way of reform, even though we all know that in mid-summer it gets extremely hot in Western Australia, and particularly in this Chamber. I guess that I should be happy I am able to take off my coat.

Mr Blaikie: And undo your tie.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Yes, I would prefer not to wear one. It is definitely not necessary to one's performance as a member of Parliament to wear a tie. I am even more concerned about the attendants in this Chamber than I am about members opposite. We are approaching the 1980s, and yet we expect our attendants to wear winged collars and tails. I am quite certain if they were able to be frank with you, Mr Speaker, they would be more than happy not to wear these garments.

Sir Charles Court: Are you sure of that?

Mr T. J. BURKE: If they were at liberty to say what they thought, I believe they would say they would like to get out of the garb they are forced to wear. I do not think it adds anything to the Parliament of Western Australia that attendants are forced to wear such hot clothes. This is an area where reform is needed as the attendants remain in the Chamber right throughout the session. They deserve our consideration.

I know, Mr Speaker, that I will upset your Clerk Assistant, and probably your Clerk as well, when I say it is quite unfair to require them to wear winged collars, academic gowns, and wigs, in our summer heat. You too, Sir, have to wear a full-bottomed wig, a gown, and all the frills.

The SPEAKER: Hold no fear for my comfort; I am quite happy.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am feeling for you, Sir. I am quite sure the members of Parliament of Western Australia and the people, for that matter, would welcome the change. Visitors here take less interest in the debates in this Chamber than they do in pointing out the unusual things they

see, and among the most unusual things they see—this is from school children to pensioners—and upon which they comment is the dress of the Speaker and his Clerks.

I tell you quite frankly, Mr Speaker, I was shocked to hear that when the Clerk Assistant returned to Australia recently he had in his luggage your new full-bottomed wig.

I want to comment on the accommodation and facilities of Parliament House. Before the Premier reacts, I will let him know I intend to get around to the electorate offices before I finish my speech. The business of the State is surely the most important, if not the biggest business in Western Australia. Yet at Parliament House we have the poorest facilities. We have been arguing about air-conditioning for the eastern side of the House for years, but nothing has been done. I do not blame this Premier or this Government for it, because successive Governments have failed to come to grips with the problem. Of course, over the period the cost of air-conditioning has escalated and now it would probably cost more to air-condition the front of the House than it cost originally to build it.

Mr Skidmore: You could do it for about \$400 an office.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Few junior clerks in private enterprise or in Government employment in Western Australia do not at least have the facility of air-conditioning. It is felt by the Government or by private enterprise, that in the Western Australian climate it is necessary to provide air-conditioned accommodation to obtain the best from employees.

We have a farcical situation at Parliament House where members are required to share offices, sometimes four to one office. No doubt the Premier will react by referring to the fact that we have electorate offices. But the reason for our electorate offices is to provide a facility for our constituents and to make ourselves available to them, rather than to provide a member of Parliament with an office.

While I consider that State members of Parliament are really no more than glorified social workers, we, or at least the Cabinet, are considered to be the board of directors of the State. Twelve Cabinet members share a room, and members are four to an office in Parliament House, and we are expected to give proper consideration to our responsibilities.

I would like to comment on the provision of facilities and amenities for the staff of Parliament House. The present situation is pitiable. I do

not think any other institution in the State—whether Government or privately owned—provides so little in the way of facilities for its staff. In fact, I can understand why the Parliament refuses to permit the staff of Parliament House to join unions, because the staff would have good grounds for a strike.

Mr Skidmore: The Factories and Shops Act inspector would have a birthday.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I do not know what provision is made in this place for fire prevention but I understand there is none. Let us hope the building does not catch fire.

Mr O'Neil: You must walk around with your eyes closed.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Not at all.

Mr O'Neil: You don't walk around at all?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I spend more time in this place than does the Deputy Premier. I do not mean I spend more time in the Chamber, but I spend more time in the building itself. I doubt whether the Deputy Premier will contradict me when I say that a tragedy could result if we had a fire at the same time as a breakdown in one of the lifts. In 1964 we must have been sold the most inefficient, unserviceable lifts available.

Sir Charles Court: Surely at your age you do not use the lift?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am not talking about myself, Mr Speaker; I am talking about older people like the Premier.

Mr Nanovich: He gets up the stairs quicker than you do.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Many pensioners visit Parliament House, and these people are around the same age as the Premier.

Mr Nanovich: Don't they visit you in your electorate office?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I agree it is essential that Parliament meets if only to question the actions of the Executive, particularly an Executive dominated by someone as forceful as the Premier. Some people admire him, but it is recognised he is a dominant person.

Mr Blaikie: The pride of our State.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I do not want to offend the Premier, but if he wants to be repatriated to England I will pay his fare.

It is a great waste of time for members to sit in this Chamber day in and day out, being forced to listen to or to sit through debates or legislation they cannot be expected to take an interest in. Let us face it; none of us takes

an interest in everything. We have *Hansard* recording all that goes on here, and an index is drawn up by the *Hansard* staff so that it is very easy for us to discover any information we require. I am of the opinion that in the 1980s Parliament should give consideration to the formation of a much broader committee system, perhaps modelled on that in the Federal Parliament. I think the Federal Parliament has a fine committee system. The basis of this system was established and promoted by people of the same political colour as our present Government.

The point I am trying to make, and I am certain that if members are honest about the matter they would agree, is that we waste an awful lot of time in this Chamber. I feel certain that with a notice paper we can anticipate who needs to be in the Chamber at any time. It would be the Minister, the shadow Minister—now that we have a shadow Ministry—members of the relevant committee on our side, and members of the relevant committee on the other side who take an interest in the particular subject. That would free many members to occupy themselves with tasks which I believe are much more important to the people we are supposed to be representing.

I am of the firm opinion that the Parliament would operate just as successfully—in fact probably more successfully—when we take into consideration the sort of goings on to which we were subjected earlier this evening.

Perhaps to encourage this reform you, Sir, might give consideration to providing members with a facility similar to that provided in the Federal Parliament; that is, an old-fashioned radio receiver in members' offices so that they can listen in to either Chamber at any time and keep up with the debate while continuing their work, and in my opinion be much more productively employed.

I would seriously suggest that consideration be given to my request for the installation of radio receivers in members' offices.

I share the concern of all members of Parliament and, of course, the people generally, at the increasing unemployment in our society. I consider unemployment is a form of oppression and I believe Governments, and for that matter, all people who are in a position to do something about it, should be taking whatever action is at their disposal to provide employment for people.

I would refer to what I consider is discrimination in order to lead into a proposal which I believe may provide at least some jobs for our young people. At the present time unless a male has seen war service or has served overseas—albeit at Rottne Island; and I do not decry the

contribution of those who have served overseas—he is discriminated against. The simple fact of the matter is that our male senior citizens are being discriminated against.

Women are able to retire at the age of 60 years and receive a pension; however, men must wait until they are 65 years of age unless they have seen war service, in which case they may retire at 60 years of age. I am certain those who are eligible for service pensions would not object to the Federal Government allowing men between the ages of 60 and 65 years to retire if they wish to do so.

This would create the opportunity for employment at the other end of the scale. I am certain many of the people to whom I refer are in Government positions. Even if my proposal creates only 10 or 100 jobs, it would be a contribution towards overcoming the problem of unemployment among our youth—a problem which will remain with us for generations unless we come to grips with it now.

Mr Clarko: You could have parliamentarians retire at 40, and civil servants retiring at 30.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I was going to suggest 55 years of age for parliamentarians! That is a way in which the Federal Government could make a contribution.

I suggest there is a way in which the State Government also could make a contribution. There are areas of employment where, because of the nature of the employment, particular stress is placed on employees, resulting quite often in mental illness and heart disease. Taking instances which have been brought to my attention, I refer to policemen, firemen, prison officers, ambulance drivers, air traffic controllers, and—as the member for Karrinyup suggested, and I am quite happy to include them—politicians. I would also include any other areas of employment where it can be shown that the nature of employment places particular stress on the employee.

I suggest the State Government is in the position to make it optional for many of these employees to retire at the age of 55 years. I know some work would be involved relative to the superannuation schemes, but I am aware that many people would take advantage of this proposal. I sincerely request that the Premier give consideration to introducing a form of optional retirement for people in particular areas of employment in which a stress factor is involved.

I am extremely concerned about both the long-term and short-term effects of unemployment on our youth, because we are continually reading of concern being expressed by people all sides consider to be experts in the matter. I am not about to quote an expert, but an unusual survey which appeared in *The National Times* of the 3rd-8th April, 1978. The article is headed, "Why the unemployed don't want to marry". Although that might sound funny or unusual, I think if members read the article the concern expressed by those who wrote it would appeal to them as real. The article states that one-third of the unemployed group said they never wanted to get married, compared with one-tenth of the employed group.

It goes on to say that apart from the divergence on attitudes to marriage, unemployed youth were significantly more depressed, lonely, frustrated, and bored than their employed peers. Later it continues on to say that while it was clear the unemployed had similar aspirations to the employed and could not be distinguished by non-conformist attitudes, they were being prevented by their joblessness from working towards these goals and were constantly feeling frustrated and pessimistic.

Members are all aware of many articles and many points of view which express concern about the possibility of long-term social disruption as a result of the continued unemployment of young people. Young people, who have done the right thing by their parents and peers and who have in many instances stayed at school and studied hard to achieve the academic goals that society expects of them, often find they cannot get a job. Young people who have carried on to tertiary education quite often cannot get a job.

A case in point is the 1 000-odd teachers who are still looking for work in Western Australia today, and it appears that number will be increased by next year's output of teachers. I am greatly concerned by the off-the-cuff statements that we hear from time to time by our State Minister for Immigration and his Federal counterpart.

Every time either of these gentlemen makes a statement about increasing our migrant intake, they build up the hopes of so many migrants who are seeking to reunite their families. They rush to their members of Parliament with their hopes built up and we can only tell them that, in the case of our State Minister, it is just another outburst while in the case of the Federal Minister, his statements are hard to understand.

Mr Nanovich: In all sincerity, do you think the system was any better under the Labor Government?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I accept the honourable member's question as sincere. The point I make is that it is wrong to build up the hopes of people who have been trying over the years to reunite their families. Possibly, there are some members here tonight who have had personal experience of this problem; if not, they would be aware of the matter from contact with migrants who are attempting to bring their families to Australia.

The simple fact is that there is no way we are going to increase immigration while we have such a high rate of unemployment in Australia; it would be foolhardy and wrong. The Federal Minister knows when he says the Government is going to increase immigration by a certain percentage to take in specialist trades or skills that there is no justification for his statement; the State Minister knows the same.

The latest figures I have on this matter relate to the period ended the 31st August, 1977, and I should like to go through them briefly for the information of members. In the semi-professional group, the unemployed totalled 9 000 while the positions available numbered only 2 000; in white collar industries, 83 000 people were unemployed with only 6 000 vacancies; in the building trades, 13 000 people were unemployed, with only 7 000 positions available; in the metal workers and electricians' trades, 13 000 were unemployed and 2 500 positions were available; and in the semi-specialist positions, 93 000 people were unemployed while only 5 000 vacancies were available.

The point I make in all sincerity is that it is wrong for Government Ministers to build false hopes in people who have a natural desire to reunite their families. As I tell people who come to me seeking assistance to reunite their families, it is highly unlikely we will be able to achieve that objective while the unemployment figure is as high as it is.

I wish to comment briefly on the Road Traffic Authority which I believe is giving the police in this State a bad image. I do not believe it is necessary for the authority to continue operating in such a manner and it could very easily overcome public feeling against it. From my own observations, I know the authority is continuing to operate in a furtive manner in its efforts to apprehend motorists. One finds officers hiding behind bushes and corners in their efforts to score a catch.

How its officers are able to apprehend a particular motorist when three motorists are travelling in formation, simply by the use of a radar gun, I will never know, but I have seen it done. In fact, only recently while travelling along Karrinyup Road, three cars were travelling abreast, and one was waved down by an RTA patrolman.

Mr Clarko: I hope it was not you.

Mr T. J. BURKE: No, it was not. Might I suggest to the RTA and police agencies generally that consideration be given to an alternative method of policing our roads. For example, on main roads like Karrinyup Road and Morley Drive, one RTA vehicle could patrol from West Coast Highway through to Wellington Road while another could go in the opposite direction. The officers could apprehend motorists if they are speeding or breaking the law in some other manner, but just to be seen is a deterrent and this deterrent application would have a far greater effect than the present methods being adopted. RTA vehicles could patrol Albany Highway, Great Eastern Highway, Wanneroo Road, Stirling Highway, Canning Highway and Guildford Road in the same manner.

I am certain that with no additional use of manpower or vehicles the RTA would achieve more in the way of policing our roads than by the present methods; certainly, it could go a long way towards overcoming the objection the public have to the authority.

I notice the Minister is not present in the Chamber at the moment. I noted recently when reading the quarterly statistics for the whole of Australia that South Australia was the only State which was able to achieve a reduction in the incidence of fatalities on its roads in the first quarter of this year. I am not claiming this was due to the fact it has a Labor Government; I am simply pointing to the facts. Perhaps the Minister already has undertaken an inquiry of the South Australian Government to ascertain whether some particular method is being used to achieve this success; if not, I request the Minister to take such steps.

Mr Rushton: I think our fatality rate per 10 000 vehicles is the lowest in Australia.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am referring to the actual statistical reduction in the number of fatalities which was achieved in South Australia. I do not want to get involved in statistics with the Minister.

Mr Rushton: In fact, our rate of fatalities per 10 000 vehicles might be far lower than theirs; I understand we are the lowest State in Australia.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I thank the Minister.

I wish now to comment on the activities of the Perth City Council. Firstly, I have a barb to direct at the council. I was quite disgusted by the actions of this authority through its parking committee in the destruction of homes in Nelson Crescent. Some beautiful old homes were demolished at a time when there is a crying need for accommodation in Western Australia, particularly in the inner city area, and precious little need for additional parking facilities. I think it was very wrong of the council to permit the demolition of these homes, particularly in view of the fact that the Lord Mayor indicated to me that a committee had been established to investigate the question of the relative needs of car parking and accommodation.

The houses were demolished from the inside, and before anyone was aware of what was going on, they had knocked the guts out of the old buildings, and they were useless. I have conveyed my objection to the furtive manner in which the local authority went about this destruction. I do not think it was serving the best interests of its ratepayers or the people of Western Australia in doing what it did. In my opinion, the council was attempting to provide a facade for the trotting grounds; this reveals a total lack of regard for the real needs of the people.

The council recovered from its position with a recent decision to invest the interest from the proceeds of the sale of endowment land at City Beach to improve other parts of the local authority area. Anyone who lives in City Beach or knows something about the area will realise little more needs to be spent there. It is the most improved part of our State.

However, in other parts of the Perth City Council area, such as Leederville, North Perth and parts of Perth itself, a lot of money needs to be spent, and I believe the authority's recent decision is to be praised. I am quite disgusted by those members of the authority who represent and, in some cases, live in the coastal wards who objected to this decision. Surely they would have to agree no additional money needs to be spent on these areas whereas we could easily find things on which to spend money in the central area.

I have no objection to these moneys being spent on the development of facilities for the general public, and I would be interested to know what stage a particular proposal in which we were all interested some years ago has reached. I refer, of course, to Bold Park, where things seem to

have gone very quiet. I reiterate my strong objection to developing land for subdivision in the area and indicate to the Minister I will fight it if any such proposal is in the pipeline.

If the opportunity presents itself we could have some indication from the Government of what stage these proposals have reached. I should also be interested, as this matter relates to the local authority, in knowing what stage the Forrest Park development has reached. This is a matter of interest to all the people of Western Australia, particularly the people of Perth, and we have heard little about it in recent times.

Another matter which involves both the Government and local government is a subject in which I took an interest on my return from America in 1971; that is, cycleways. The present Minister for Local Government would be aware that his department brought down an excellent report in October, 1975, on the question of cycleways, a report which should have seen more implementation than it has to date. I urge the Minister, in the interests of the conservation of power, and in the interests of the health of the community, to take further action at an early date to provide cycleways along the lines of the report prepared by the department in 1975.

I wish to refer now specifically to my electorate. All members will be aware that in recent times Perth has seen a growth in the provision of medium-density accommodation; and I am very pleased about that. I am very pleased at the lead given by the local authority by its encouragement of people to live in the city. I have not seen much support for this lead from the Government.

At the same time my constituents in the Leederville area have recently voiced their opposition to proposals to develop high-rise buildings in that area. They have my strongest support. I am totally opposed to any further high-rise development in the city because I think it is against the better interests of Perth. We are proud to boast that we have the finest city in this country and one of the finest in the world and I want my children and grandchildren to be able to voice the same claim.

I wish to make one other point in the two minutes remaining to me. I want to compliment the Chairman of the MTT. Since his appointment he has done an excellent job and in this respect I make reference to the recent co-operation between the MTT, the Government, and local government in the extension of the "clipper" service. This is a selfish interest but I believe it would serve more than those whom I represent if the "clipper" service were extended north through Beaufort

Street across Walcott Street and down William Street. It would discourage many people, not only those residing in my electorate, from coming into the city by car. I believe also that encouragement should be given to extending the "clipper" service to the West Perth area.

Mr Williams: It would be pretty good to Canning Bridge also.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I agree. On a previous occasion I put that forward as an alternative to extending the Freeway. Many people come from other parts of the metropolitan area to consult doctors and other professional people in the West Perth area and serious consideration should be given to extending the "clipper" service to that area.

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

House adjourned at 2.54 a.m. (Wednesday)

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

POWER STATIONS

Production Costs

320. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Will he advise the monthly power production costs per unit of electricity at the following power stations for the last six months period ended 31st March, 1978—

- (a) East Perth;
- (b) South Fremantle;

(c) Bunbury;

(d) Muja;

(e) Kwinana?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The average power production costs per unit for the six months ended 31st March, 1978, are as follows—

	c. per kwh
East Perth power station	3.14
South Fremantle power station	2.05
Bunbury power station	1.49
Muja power station	1.15
Kwinana power station	3.39

These costs include fuel, capital charges, operation and maintenance charges and do not indicate the preferred order of operation of the various power stations.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Contracts to Hugall and Hoile

463. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) In each of the last two years, will he please provide details of all contracts/work awarded to/carried out by Hugall and Hoile?
- (2) In each instance:
 - (a) what was the nature of the work;
 - (b) how was it awarded;
 - (c) what was the cost; and
 - (d) was it performed satisfactorily?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Work	Awarded	Cost \$	Satisfactorily Performed
East Wanneroo primary school grounds' water reticulation	Architectural division quotation	3 143	Yes
Yanchep primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	3 040	Yes
Gibbs Street primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	3 124	Yes
Bullcreek primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	4 109	Yes
Burrendah primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	3 109	Yes
Phoenix primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	3 097	No
Northampton junior high school grounds' water reticulation	do	12 977	No
Osborne Park Hospital grounds' water reticulation	do	5 249	Yes
Mt. Henry Dental Therapy School grounds' water reticulation extensions	do	2 388	Yes
East Victoria Park primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	5 331	No— Late in completion
Pinnaroo Valley Memorial Park grounds' water reticulation	do	6 000	Yes
Woodlupine primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 765	Yes
Kardinya primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 862	Yes
Huntingdale primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 862	Yes
Greenwood primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 467	Yes

Work	Awarded	Cost \$	Satisfactorily performed
East Victoria Park primary school grounds' water reticulation extensions	Architectural division quotation	3 576	Yes
West Balcatta primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 765	Yes
West Greenwood primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 765	Yes
Withers primary school, Bunbury—bore and pump	do	9 803	No
Cambewarra primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	2 919	Yes
Allendale primary school, Geraldton, grounds' water reticulation	do	9 173	Yes
Craigie high school, stage 2, grounds' water reticulation	do	1 572	Yes
Darlington primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	7 347	Yes
Eden Hill primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	4 824	Yes
Wanslea Home bore and pump	do	8 833	Yes
Byford primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	8 574	Yes
Eastern Goldfields high school grounds' water reticulation	do	8 886	Yes
Beaconsfield primary school bore and pump	do	6 245	Yes
Doubleview primary school bore and reticulation	do	23 798	No
Karawarra Apartments grounds' water reticulation	Public Works Contract	79 980	No
Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre car park grounds' water reticulation extensions	Local purchase order	240	Yes
Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre Psychiatric Unit grounds' water extensions	Local purchase order	4 987	Yes
South Kalgoorlie primary school grounds' water reticulation—treated effluent	Architectural division quotation	11 473	Yes
Westminster primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	5 862	No
Beaconsfield primary school grounds' water reticulation	do	9 455	Yes
Forrestdale primary school bore and pump	do	7 369	No
Carine primary school bore and pump	do	8 372	No
Cooloongup primary school bore and pump	do	6 238	No
Wattleup primary school bore and pump	do	7 660	No
Gosnells high school grounds' water reticulation	do	3 292	No—late in completion

PUBLIC SERVANTS

Annual and Long Service Leave

464. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

What policy does the Government have in respect of clearance of annual and long service leave, either accrued or current at the time of retirement of—

- (a) civil servants;
- (b) teachers;
- (c) police officers;
- (d) others?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Annual leave and long service leave are granted for recuperative purposes, therefore, it is general policy to require the taking of leave rather than authorise extensive accumulations. Within this general policy the principal factor which determines whether approval will be

given to accumulate leave, including leave prior to retirement, is departmental convenience. In the specific case of—

- (a) Public Servants—the Public Service Act and Regulations allow the permanent heads of a department and the Public Service Board flexibility in the clearance of leave based on the concept of departmental convenience. Generally, there is no objection to an officer deferring annual leave and long service leave prior to retirement.
- (b) Teachers—a policy similar to that applicable to public servants is followed with any accumulation of long service leave being subject to departmental convenience.
- (c) Police officers—annual leave may be accumulated for the completed year prior to the year in which they retire plus *pro rata* leave credited to them in their retirement year.

With respect to long service leave, officers may accumulate two complete entitlements plus *pro rata* proportion to date of retirement. Any accumulations of leave are subject to the overriding factor of departmental convenience.

- (d) Others—the policy adopted by authorities employing significant numbers of employees, other than public servants, teachers, and police officers, is that leave be taken as it falls due but accumulations, including accumulations prior to retirement, may be approved if departmental convenience is not affected thereby.

RAILWAY BRIDGES

Katanning-Boyup Brook Line

465. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would the Minister advise what would be the cost of replacing the burnt out railway bridges on the Katanning-Boyup Brook section of railway line?
- (2) Will the Minister be making a submission to the Federal Government for finance to replace the bridges?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), how much will he request, and when?
- (4) Assuming he will be making a submission and the reply is in the negative, will the Government allocate the necessary funds?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), when can it be anticipated a start will be made to renew the bridges?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) \$131 000.
- (2) Yes. Under present arrangements between Commonwealth and the States financial assistance is provided for restoration of State assets damaged by disasters of the nature recently experienced. The cost of restoration of the bridges will be included in the total claim by the State.
- (3) Application will be made for the total amount involved and will be made as soon as Treasury is able to collate the cost of damage to all State assets.
- (4) It cannot be assumed that the Federal Government will not accept the cost of repairs.

- (5) This has not yet been determined and will be influenced by weather conditions—but in the meantime services are being maintained on the line by operation from both the Bunbury and Katanning ends.

HEALTH

Quo Vadis Centre

466. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Health: Will he take early action to have a red phone for the use of patients installed in the Quo Vadis centre?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No. Quo Vadis is in an STD area, therefore a red phone cannot be used for a call to the Perth area.

Any patient wishing to make a telephone call to the Perth area from Quo Vadis can do so under existing arrangements, which have been in effect for the past 2½ years.

RAILWAYS

Parcels Depot

467. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact the goods parcels office at the Perth railway station is to close down?
- (2) If "Yes" is it a fact the office will move to the Kewdale marshalling yards?
- (3) If answer to (1) and (2) is "Yes" is the Minister aware of the amount of time that will possibly be lost by Government departments and private firms in picking up and delivering goods from the Kewdale goods terminal?
- (4) Will the Minister also advise, in view of the pending transfer, if arrangements are being made for a pick up and despatch depot in Perth to overcome the time problems?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The existing rail served parcels receipt and delivery depot in Roe Street will cease to operate in its present form as from Monday, the 3rd of July. However, facilities will continue to be provided for acceptance of parcels up to 20 kg, which will be transported by departmental truck services to Kewdale—for consolidation with other country and interstate freight—or to destinations in the metropolitan area.

- (2) Parcels receipt and delivery facilities already exist at the main metropolitan freight terminal at Kewdale and these will be extended as necessary.
- (3) As the 20 kg limit will cater for most parcels delivered by Government Departments and private firms, little time is expected to be lost. There are carriers who will pick up parcels greater than 20 kg if required but most businesses have their own delivery services to the Kewdale depot.
- (4) The Perth pick-up service will be limited to the "up to 20 kg" parcels accepted at the receipt depot referred to in the answer to question (1).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Wanneroo Shire Council

1. Mr NANOVIK, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Has the Government now agreed to allocate a site in the Joondalup Regional Centre to enable the Shire of Wanneroo to build new offices?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The Government has agreed to the new council building proposed by the Shire of Wanneroo being allocated in the Joondalup Regional Centre, as soon as it is practicable to do so. The details are being negotiated at the present time.

NATURAL DISASTER RELIEF

Farmers

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

Are farmers who suffered damage from cyclone "Alby" and the resultant fires, and who are able to obtain finance from their own banks and/or stock firms, eligible for emergency relief loans at 4 per cent?

Mr OLD replied:

I have advised farmers repeatedly that if they wish to apply for a 4 per cent loan they should do so and have the matter assessed by the committee.

INDUSTRIAL APARTHEID

Plans

3. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Can the Minister advise when he formulated his plans for the introduction of industrial apartheid into this State?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The possible implementation of the plan is as near or as far away as the unions themselves decide. We already have a situation of industrial apartheid in Western Australia.

A large section of industry—primary industry, agricultural industry, and secondary industry—is virtually outside the union system. A big section of industry itself is outside the system, as is a big part of the transport industry. All that is necessary is a union-free port and the two parallel systems would be in operation. There are union-free ports in England. There is also the situation in some parts of England where there are closed shops for unionists and closed shops for non-unionists.

What I am suggesting is not radical in any way. It could be brought into effect terribly simply. However, the matter is entirely in the hands of the unionists.

INDUSTRIAL APARTHEID

Consultation with Employee and Employer Organisations

4. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Is the Minister aware that Mr Basil Atkinson, of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, last night repudiated the concept of industrial apartheid in Western Australia?

Following that observation, I ask the Minister whether he has consulted either employer or employee organisations with respect to the formulation of this plan for industrial apartheid?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I can well understand the views of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, and these views would be virtually the same as those I hold.

Mr Bryce: That is not what was said last night.

Mr GRAYDEN: For this reason let me make it clear that the policy of the Liberal Party and the Government is to support responsible unionism. We want a system of unions operating within the existing system. If unions are to go outside that system—and some unions are—and deny other individuals in our community the right to work, obviously certain actions have to be taken.

The Government can take action under the Trade Practices Act, the Crimes Act, or through the Industrial Commission. The Government has those measures available but it may still have a situation where one section of the community is denying the other section the right to work. In that event the Government has to take action.

Mr Bryce: Answer the question.

Mr GRAYDEN: As a last resort, what I am suggesting is a practical thing. It is practical for the reason that we have 150 races in Australia with all sorts of backgrounds and cultures. Those people get on together under our social system and work amicably together.

Mr Bryce: Including Vietnam colonels!

Mr GRAYDEN: Unionists on the one hand, and non-unionists on the other hand, could work together amicably in our social system. That is not an outrageous statement. It can be relatively easy; it has been done in other parts of the world.

Mr Bryce: Have you consulted anybody?

Mr GRAYDEN: In the circumstances, there is no occasion to consult anyone.

INDUSTRIAL APARTHEID

Government's Authorisation

5. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:
Did the Government authorise the Minister for Labour and Industry to formulate a plan for industrial apartheid in Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:
There is no need for Cabinet to give such an instruction. We have a Minister who has enough intelligence to make up his own mind.

INDUSTRIAL APARTHEID

Legislation or Guidelines

6. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

I ask the Minister simply whether draft legislation, or draft guidelines for a system of industrial apartheid in Western Australia has been drawn up?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

No such plan is necessary. A week ago we had precisely the situation I envisaged with a large section of industry operating outside the system. We had a section of the port which was outside the union system inasmuch as non-union labour was used for loading the ships. Quite obviously, that can be repeated over and over again. However, in a situation where there is confrontation, where outside people are usurping the role of unionists, it is desirable the work should be done through another port; for instance, where waterside workers were in favour of working.

Mr B. T. Burke: What port?

Mr GRAYDEN: Say, Esperance, for a start. That port provided waterside workers most of whom, I understand, came from the farms. Those workers might well say that they are prepared to work.

Mr B. T. Burke: What about the cost implications of using Esperance?

Mr GRAYDEN: We are not talking about the cost implications; that does not come into it.

Thinking in other terms, the Government could enable an overseas company to put in a wharf at Jurien Bay on the basis that it would be a non-union labour port, if the Government wanted to go that far.

Mr B. T. Burke: What about Scarborough?

PORTS: NON-UNION

Jurien Bay or Dongara

7. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:
Has any work been undertaken to estimate the cost of establishing a non-union port at Jurien Bay or Dongara, as proposed by the Minister for Labour and Industry?

Sir Charles Court: He did not propose it.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No.

WATER SUPPLIES

Chlorination

8. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Will the Minister take immediate steps to alleviate the over-chlorination of water supplied to consumers in the Swan View area, and thus allow the children and staff of the Swan View Primary and High Schools to drink uncontaminated water again?
- (2) What is the cause of the frequent over-chlorination of water in this area?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Chlorine dose-rates at the point of supply, the Greenmount reservoir outlet, are regularly checked and adjusted to ensure correct dosage. However, a check on water at the schools will be carried out and adjustments made if warranted.
- (2) The application of chlorine is an essential process in any public water supply and dosages are adjusted as appropriate. The sensitivity of people to chlorine varies widely.
The water board has had only a few complaints from this area.

DAIRYING

Milk Shortage

9. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Agriculture: No doubt the Minister is aware that the serious shortage of whole-milk and milk products throughout the State is affecting supplies, especially to the eastern goldfields area. The disruption of supplies has forced the local dairy to operate on a day-to-day basis. Can the Minister tell the House how long the present crisis is likely to last, and what steps the Government is taking to alleviate it?

Mr OLD replied:

It is anticipated that supplies of market-milk will return to somewhere near normal within the next two to three weeks. It is not anticipated there will be any great shortage.

In regard to the Government's actions to alleviate the situation, the Government has made certain concessions to dairy farmers through the Dairy Industry Authority and these will assist greatly in allowing them to supply whatever milk they can without penalty either for quality or quantity, provided no apparent

attempts are made to bolster quality by means other than natural. By this means we feel dairy farmers will be encouraged to return to normal production as soon as possible. Apart from that, no plans are afoot for reconstitution or importation of milk at this time and I am assured that provided there is no panic buying the supply is adequate to service Western Australia's needs for market-milk.

INDUSTRIAL APARTHEID

Premier's Comments

10. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

With reference to the industrial apartheid suggested by the Minister for Labour and Industry, in this morning's edition of *The West Australian* the Premier is quoted as saying, "I don't think we need to have such a plan." I ask the Premier: Is that an accurate report of his remarks?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Those remarks, taken in context with the other comments I made, are correct. Likewise if one studies the comments made by the Minister for Labour and Industry, one finds they are correct also. With respect, I invite the Leader of the Opposition to read the remarks in the context of the total comments made.

TRAFFIC

Off-road Vehicles: Legislation

11. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

I preface my question by advising that I have given some notice of this question as it is directed to a Minister in another place. My question is as follows—

Will the Minister take steps immediately to introduce legislation to control off-road vehicles and, in particular, trail bikes that are creating havoc with people's lives in the Midland, Bellevue, Koongamia, Helena Valley, Boya, Guildford, and Mundaring areas?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The question I received was directed to the Minister for Local Government and therefore I give the following answer—

Legislation to control off-road vehicles is in the course of preparation and will be introduced in the current session.

NATURAL DISASTER RELIEF

Farmers

12. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that Government officers state that farmers suffering storm damage and who are able to borrow from banks are not eligible for emergency relief loans—and the Minister for Agriculture prevaricated quite successfully on a similar question a few minutes ago—and also that a member from another place quoted on air that the Premier says such farmers are eligible for emergency relief loans, will he explain whether access to bank finance precludes farmers who suffered storm damage from emergency relief loans?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I can only assume the honourable member is going on a fishing expedition and endeavouring to act in the role of a stirrer.

Mr H. D. EVANS: No, just seeking clarification.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to say that the answer given earlier by my colleague, the Minister for Agriculture, is the right answer. If the honourable member knows people who want to be considered for such loans, will he please encourage them to make an application, rather than go stirring around the place.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Are they considered or not if they have access to private borrowing?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to make another observation if the honourable member will listen. When we receive applications for assistance, it helps our consideration to know whether or not the applicants are entitled to alternative

forms of relief. I suggest the honourable member should stop stirring and let the people have access to the proper authorities. In this way they may probably be given assistance in one way or another—assistance of which the honourable member may not be aware at this stage.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What utter rubbish!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I repeat that persons who have suffered storm damage should make applications so that the authorities can deal with them in the proper way.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Will they be considered?

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Anzac Day

13. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

As members well know, next Tuesday is a holiday for Anzac Day. Can the Premier tell us what arrangements have been made for the sittings of Parliament next week?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Anzac Day being a sacred day, there will be no sitting of the State Parliament. So that the parties may hold their party meetings on the Wednesday, and working on the assumption that country members will return to Perth that morning, it is intended that the Wednesday sitting will commence at the normal time of 4.30 p.m.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Impact Statement: Wagerup Refinery

14. Sir CHARLES COURT (Premier):

I wish to reply to a question asked last Thursday by the member for Rockingham. The honourable member asked—

(1) Is it a fact that the Premier has given an assurance that an environmental impact statement on the Wagerup refinery proposal will be available for public perusal for a period of 12 months or more before action is taken by the Government?

Mr Barnett: Two months.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am reading this question from *Hansard*. My reply to this part of the question was as follows—

- (1) I cannot recall the precise nature of the comments I made, but I will have the matter researched and give the honourable member an answer on Tuesday next.

I have had the matter researched and I can find no statement made by me to the effect that the Wagerup refinery proposal will be made available for public perusal for a period of 12 months or more before action is taken by the Government. However, if the honourable member has information to the contrary, would he please make it available?

The honourable member then asked—

- (2) Can he advise when the statement will be available for public perusal?

My reply was as follows—

- (2) I do not know the exact date when the study and statement will be available, but I understand that the time is not far off. I can find out between now and Tuesday and give the honourable member a more precise answer.

I now inform the honourable member that the statements are in the course of preparation and more precise details in regard to timing no doubt will be covered by the Minister for Industrial Development when he introduces the two appropriate Bills on Thursday.
