

this very matter. Undoubtedly the article was written earlier. The Government would not have known the amendment was to be moved. If members read it they will find that the article follows the lines of tonight's debate.

There is nothing wrong with the action taken by the member for Warren; in fact, it was laudable. He piloted the legislation through the House and he has had a personal interest in it. No doubt people from the farming community have requested him to take some action.

The only point on which I would agree with the Premier concerns the wording of the part. It is certainly a bit obscure, but in any case mostly lamb and hogget are marketed. Not much mutton is marketed. If the part had been proclaimed it would have done no harm. I suppose some people might have tried to get a few scraggy sheep through and this might have been responsible for some other body having a say in the activities, too. They are the ones who put most pressure on the Premier.

The motion is quite justified even though it does not make sense as it reads and even though we will conclude this comedy of errors by calling for a division, if necessary, to put over our point of view. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—17

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr May
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. B. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr Mensaros
Mr Clarko	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Gibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Young
Mr Laurence	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Taylor	Mr Rushton
Mr Bryce	Mr Thompson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Stephens
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Coyne
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Nanovich

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 10.42 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th March, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (9): ON NOTICE

1. LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Accounts, Report, and Throughput

The Hon. G. W. Berry for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Have the annual financial statements and accounts of the Lamb Marketing Board been certified by the Auditor General?
- (2) When is it expected that the annual report will be tabled in Parliament?
- (3) What weight and numbers of lambs have been handled for each of the past 18 months?
- (4) What has been the monthly cost of running the Board for each of the last 18 months?
- (5) What increase in staff and running costs have occurred since the inception of the Board?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The W.A. Lamb Marketing Board has advised as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In approximately two weeks.
- (3)

	No	Weight (tonnes)
July 1973	87 673	1 157
August	112 233	1 586
September	158 172	2 319
October	274 685	4 203
November	163 308	2 474
December	59 639	928
January 1974	54 367	834
February	40 713	614
March	40 157	609
April	58 327	846
May	58 444	870
June	55 540	847
July	90 419	1 361
August	140 688	2 086
September	226 783	3 334
October	280 003	4 021
November	200 884	2 866
December	63 569	893

- (4) The published report of the Board for the period 2nd December, 1972 to 30th June, 1973 showed overheads to be 0.895 cents per pound. The cost to the Board of its representatives was 0.82 cents per pound.

For the year 1st July, 1973 to 30th June, 1974 the equivalent figures were 0.918 cents per pound and 0.617 cents per pound.

Estimates for the period 1st July, 1974 to 31st December, 1974 indicate the equivalent figures to be 1 cent per pound and 0.62 cents per pound.

The monthly variability of costs for the 18 months period in question is as follows—

Cents per lb		1973	1974
January	1.473
February	1.988
March	1.802
April	1.96
May	1.423
June	1.4
July	0.78	1.093
August	0.78	.91
September	0.611	.67
October	0.381	.71
November	0.727	1.11
December	1.172	3.36

- (5) On 2nd December, 1972 the Board commenced operations with a staff of 18, which increased to 21 in January 1973, and 27 in July 1973. The current staff totals 28. Increases in running costs are reflected as indicated in part (4) of this question.

2. HEALTH AND COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRE

Women's Centre Action Group

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health:

Further to my question of the 18th March, 1975, and the Minister's reply of the same date, concerning a State grant for the Women's Health Centre—

- (1) What are the alternatives being explored?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that—
 - (a) the Women's Centre Action Group held discussions with the Commissioner of Public Health, the Secretary of the Public Health Department, the Director of the Health Education Council, the Director of Community Health Services, as well as other people involved in community health services, family planning, etc., concerning the submission of the application for Federal funding;
 - (b) the official application was only lodged in September after consultations with, and assistance from, officials of the Public Health Department;

(c) the group was under the impression that it had done all things necessary in respect of the application, because it received no advice to the contrary during its discussions with these people;

(d) the State contribution for this financial year would only be \$10 000 (representing 25% of capital costs—\$7 000; and 10% of operating costs for 3½ months—\$3 000);

(e) the Perth City Council has approved the premises in which it is proposed to establish the centre;

(f) the health services which would be provided by such a centre are badly needed in Perth; and

(g) the centre would be modelled on the Leichhardt Women's Centre in Sydney, which is an outstanding success?

- (3) If he is aware of the above facts, will the Minister review the position and ensure that the centre is established by the necessary funding being provided by the State Government?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) The possibilities of assistance from Lotteries Commission and a suggestion that other organisations such as Rotary, Lions, etc. be approached by the Group, and whether the Group would have any possibility of raising funds by public contribution.
- (2) (a) Yes.
(b) Yes.
(c) Yes.
(d) Yes.
(e) No formal notification of this has been received from the Perth City Council or from the Women's Centre Action Group.
(f) No.
(g) The Leichhardt Women's Centre of Sydney is not funded by the New South Wales Government.
- (3) The position will be kept under review.

3. TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Greyhound Racing: Investments

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Education representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What are the Totalisator Agency Board investments to date on greyhound racing in Western Australia—
 - (a) on course; and
 - (b) TAB shops?
- (2) What are the respective amounts received, by those entitled to do so under the Act, out of the investments?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) (a) On course period 12/12/74 to 13/3/75—\$1 157 490.50.
 (b) T.A.B. shop period 12/12/74 to 13/3/75—\$808 029.00.
- (2) From the T.A.B. (period 12/12/74 to 25/1/75)—\$15 130.47.
 From the Totalisator Duty Act (period 12/12/74 to 6/2/75)—\$11 946.15.

Total—\$27 076.62.

Distributed as per the Greyhound Racing Totalisator (Distribution and Racecourse Development) Regulations, 1974 are—

Greyhound Racing Control Board—\$9 476.80.

Canning Greyhound Racing Club—\$6 769.17.

Race Course Development—\$8 122.95.

Special Purpose—\$2 707.70.

Total—\$27 076.62.

4. SUGAR PRODUCTION

Kununurra

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

What is the current position in respect to the negotiations and investigations into the production of sugar in the Ord River valley?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Cabinet will consider on Monday next, the proposed terms of reference for a full feasibility study of the establishment of a sugar industry on the Ord River.

Since the visit to Queensland of the Hon. Premier and Hon. Minister for Agriculture in January, a consultant has visited the Ord area and has had discussions with the Cabinet Sub-Committee

considering this matter. His report was received early this week and will be the basis of the Cabinet consideration.

Experimental work is proceeding in the valley.

5.

RAILWAYS

Forrestania Line

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Railways:

Is there any plan to construct a railway line from Forrestania in the future to link up with the railway from Kalgoorlie to Esperance to serve the nickel complex at Forrestania when developed?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

No. So far as the Railways Department is aware this nickel project has not progressed to the stage where any detailed planning on transport modes has been carried out.

6.

STATE FINANCE

Revenue from Licenses

The Hon. G. W. Berry for the Hon. C. R. ABBEY, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to my question of the 18th March, 1975, regarding Finance—Revenue from Licenses—

- (1) What was the number of motor vehicles registered during the year ended the 31st December, 1974?
- (2) Were any other administration costs involved beyond standard collection fee allowed to the local authorities and the Department of Motor Vehicles?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

(1) The figures to 31st December are not yet available from the statistician. At 30/9/74, there were 536 224 vehicles registered.

(2) No. The \$4 registration or recording fee is payable for the initial license and for each renewal whether made six monthly or 12 monthly.

This is an assessed figure to cover administrative costs. On previous experience, approximately two thirds of registrations/renewals are for 6 months and the remainder for 12 months.

7. HOUSING

South Hedland: Cost of Services

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the cost to provide services to a single detached residential allotment in the third and fourth residential nuclei in South Hedland?
- (2) What services are provided in this cost?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) \$3 991.
- (2) Survey and planning; roads; filling and drainage; water supply—including headworks; sewerage—including headworks; electricity—including headworks; footway construction and lighting; landscaping of footways.
It is pointed out that the charges for water, sewerage and electricity include costs for major headworks but do not include major headworks contributions made by companies under the Iron Ore Agreement.

8. FIRE BRIGADES

Storage of Petroleum Products

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Education representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that during the recent fire which destroyed the Mobil Depot at Norseman and endangered the town for five hours, no technical details concerning the storage tanks and how to deal with them, were available to the permanent and volunteer fire brigades?
- (2) Is he further aware that the technical details of the storage tanks were only available from the Head Office of the Mobil Company in the Eastern States, and the fire could not effectively be fought until the information was supplied by telephone?
- (3) In view of that situation, will the Minister obtain all data of storage tanks in the various depots in the State, and have them available to the Fire Brigade and volunteer fire-fighting services to effectively fight fires without delay?
- (4) Will the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board make available road markers and breathing apparatus to volunteer fire brigades?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes. It was necessary during the fire fighting operations at Norseman to obtain engineering advice from the company and this is proper practice. Permanent brigades are instructed and trained in the fire fighting procedures for fuel storage installations but each outbreak has its own particular technical problems. It would be impractical to endeavour to schedule the requirements to meet all of these possible eventualities and the current system whereby the volunteer brigade contacts its District Officer is a sound one. Volunteer fire brigades are instructed by permanent fire officers who make regular visits to the town.
- (4) Road markers are being progressively supplied to all volunteer fire brigades and the need for breathing apparatus in volunteer brigades is currently under review.

9.

HEN LICENSES

Wyndham

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is a person in, say, Wyndham, required to obtain a license to keep more than 20 hens?
- (2) Is it a fact that no new licenses are likely to be issued by the Western Australian Egg Marketing Board for two or three years?
- (3) Is it a fact that a person wishing to keep hens in Wyndham would have to "acquire" a license from an existing license holder, even though the nearest available seller is at least 2 500 km away?
- (4) Is it a fact that the current asking price for a license is at least \$5.00 per hen, meaning that the Wyndham man wishing to conduct a small business with, say, 2 000 hens to meet local needs, would have to pay more than \$10 000 to someone almost across a continent even though he could not possibly supply eggs to the Egg Marketing Board or receive any benefits accruing from an orderly marketing scheme?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Yes, the licensing provisions of the Marketing of Eggs Act cover the entire State of Western Australia.
- (2) Yes, as far as the South-West Land Division is concerned.

- (3) and (4) No. New licenses may be issued north of the 24th parallel and south of the 24th parallel and outside the South-West Land Division to people in certain isolated areas provided the supply of locally produced eggs is not adequate to meet the demand in the immediate localities involved.

I understand the current asking price for a license in the South-West Land Division to be approximately \$5.00 per hen.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill.
2. Health Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 29th March, on the following motion moved by the Hon. I. G. Pratt—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

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

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [2.54 p.m.]: I feel honoured to have again the opportunity to take part in the Address-in-Reply debate and to be able to pass some comments on the Speech delivered by His Excellency, the Governor. I intend to make some observations in regard to things that are happening in my province, and also to comment on the performance of the Government.

Before I proceed with the main part of my speech, I would like to touch on two incidents which have taken place during this debate. First of all I would like to compliment Mr Withers on the excellent address he gave us last night in relation to his travels around the world. It was very pleasing to know that a member, elected by this Parliament to undertake a study tour, was able to report so comprehensively about it.

It was equally pleasing to me to know that Mr Withers has taken off his political blinkers and that he visited some countries which have a different political philosophy from that practised in the greater part of the western world.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He does not have political cataracts, like others we could name.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the Liberal Party had adopted a similar attitude 24 or 25 years ago in respect of the Soviet Union and Red China, considerable advantage would have flowed to this country in regard to trade. It is good that the honourable member's horizons have been widened a little.

When I spoke to the Address-in-Reply debate during the last session of Parliament, I was embarrassed for the very first time in this House. I felt very hurt when Mr Withers took a point of order about my remarks, and I was a little flabbergasted because it was my first experience of this kind, although not the last.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It certainly won't be the last one either.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was called to order on a statement I made regarding Mr Jack Munday, a gentleman who had some association with the Communist Party in Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes, some association!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not know much about the gentleman. However, somehow or other Mr Withers got the wrong impression because he thought I was associating him with Mr Munday. He was very hurt and he called on me to withdraw my remarks. I would like to quote from *Hansard* of the 7th August, 1974. Mr Withers said—

I find the words objectionable and I ask for their withdrawal. In reply to my question, "What do you mean by 'in your camp'?" Mr Cooley replied, in reference to Mr Jack Munday, that he supported people "who traditionally support you". I take this as an offence, "you" being "me, W. R. Withers, member for the North Province". I deny that I have ever been—or I ever will be—assisted by a communist.

It is pleasing that in the short period of time which has elapsed since then, Mr Withers' attitude has expanded to the point where he was assisted by communists. It has done the honourable member the world of good to go to these countries and to receive assistance from the people there. I have visited that part of the world and I have found the people can assist us considerably, regardless of our politics.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That does not apply to their fellow Chinese, of course; they just shoot them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: When are you going over there?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It seems to me that Mr Withers is almost a convert because he made favourable comments in

respect of the Chinese people, and unfavourable comments about the people in Moscow. I thought I should mention that, because if members opposite could broaden their outlook in such a short period—

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is why we are called liberals.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We found that out when we sent Herbie Graham away on the very first study tour.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: When are you going?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I went on the second one.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: When are you going again?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I did not say anything about Mr Withers—I said that I agreed with him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Some it widens mentally, and some it widens physically.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The next point I would like to make before coming to the body of my address is about the attitude of some members of this House. I have taken offence on a number of occasions, and I feel I must draw the attention of the House to some of the comments made during the debate the other night when my leader's amendment was before us. I made a statement that a person on a full pension is entitled to free treatment by a general practitioner but he is not entitled to free treatment by a specialist if the general practitioner refers him.

I was accused, by a former Minister for Health, of talking balderdash and rubbish. I told him I thought the position was true, and he said it was not. The present Minister for Health was also in the House at the time and by his silence he apparently agreed with what Mr MacKinnon had said—that if a person was referred by a general practitioner to a specialist the specialised treatment he received was free. This is not the position at all.

I have, at some pains, taken the opportunity to go into this matter and have made inquiries from the Social Services Department who advised me that when a pensioner comes under the health benefit scheme he obtains, in the first instance, a medical entitlement card which entitles him to free GP treatment if he is enrolled under the pensioner medical service. He receives free hospitalisation as a public ward patient and also free medical service through the out-patient department of five major hospitals. By a coincidence he could get the specialist of his choice to treat him. The five major hospitals are, the Royal Perth Hospital, Sir Charles

Gairdner Hospital, the Fremantle Hospital, the Princess Margaret Hospital, and the King Edward Memorial Hospital.

If a pensioner requires specialist service and he obtains it outside those five hospitals, I am informed by the department that he must meet the full account of the specialist. This was refuted the other night by a former Minister for Health.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are falling into the same trap I was complaining about. That might be the law of the land but it is not what happens, because there are specialists in Bunbury who treat these people free.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Some of them may be benevolent enough to do do this.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Will it be different under the Medibank scheme?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, and the person concerned will be able to have a specialist of his own choice to treat him. That is the difference.

Perhaps I should now get on to the main theme of my address. Previously I had taken the opportunity and a fair bit of time to express the hope that the Government would enter into a better field of industrial relations with the trade union movement and that it would recognise the trade union movement as a body representative of a large number of people in the country.

I do not know whether the Government took heed of what I had to say—as did Mr Withers—but I must say that the Government has gone part of the way—perhaps one-millionth of the way—towards meeting the wishes I expressed last year, because when one of the occupants of the Fremantle Port Authority left, the Government filled the vacancy with a union man.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Nothing; it is good. So the Government has gone part of the way in meeting the wishes I have expressed. The last time there was a vacancy and a trade union man was taken off he was replaced by somebody from another political party.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Have there been examples of the Labor Government making appointments from the Employers Federation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, but the Labor Government has been impartial in its appointments in most directions. If Mr Griffiths is referring to the main industrial body—the Industrial Commission—I can say that no Labor Government in this State has ever appointed to that commission a person who has had any affiliation with the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia; nor, for that matter, has it appointed anybody who had affiliations with Trades Hall in Western Australia.

I would say the Government has also made a very benevolent gesture in making premises available to the Trades and Labor Council at Port Hedland at a rent of \$100 a year.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am glad you are refuting some of the comments made by your leader in this House the other day.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am giving the Minister's Government some credit.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Your leader did not.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister's Government will not give anybody any credit. I have always said that I will give credit where it is due, and I am doing so now by saying the Government has gone part of the way to meet our wishes.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: You could draw attention to the reappointment of the Chairman of the Port Hedland Authority.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Is he a member of the trade union movement?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I recall Senator Wheeldon appointing two very good Labor supporters to the Repatriation Commission—they were Mr Pearson and Mr Ilbury.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In the Governor's Speech the Government has broken some new ground and has made reference to the introduction of an Act of Parliament which will set up a directorship to administer an apprenticeship and trade training scheme in accordance with the wishes of the Trades and Labor Council. But, true to form, there is no reference at all to the question of improving industrial relations in Western Australia, despite the fact that the Government made a lot of promises before election time that it would ensure that this came about.

When he closed the last session of Parliament, Mr McNeill gave us an assurance that everything we said would be taken into account. I made reference to the benefits that could flow to the Government and the community generally by adopting such an attitude. I quoted other countries like Great Britain and West Germany which have entered into proper and sound industrial relations. But still nothing has been done.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought the things you had just mentioned would help.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I agree these small things have been done, but nothing of a major nature has been undertaken to improve industrial relations. I hope Mr McNeill does not think that what has been done will go very far to meet the things about which I spoke last year. What has been done will only scratch the surface.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought it was very significant; apparently it was because you found it significant to mention it on this occasion.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have been accused so often by the Leader of the House and by his colleague, the Minister for Education, that I am here to push, as its president, the viewpoint of the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia. That is not true at all.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You have given us a fairly good imitation of this.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am here to push the viewpoint of the many thousands of electors whom I represent in the North-East Metropolitan Province; those who depend on the Trades and Labor Council and the Labor Party for some support and comfort out of life, which is not given them by the Liberal Party Government. The Government has not done anything to advance the welfare of the people who constitute the majority of my constituents. If the Government could point to anything it has done I would be prepared to listen and modify my remarks.

However there is nothing that those on the other side of the House would do to discriminate in favour of underprivileged people. In fact, those members on the other side of the House would go the opposite way. In the last Parliament they discriminated against underprivileged people.

The Hon. N. McNeill: On the one hand you say we do nothing for underprivileged people and then, on the other hand, you say we are not prepared to discriminate.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, the Government would not discriminate in favour of underprivileged people. That is what I am trying to say. There are many underprivileged people in this State, in case Government members, sitting in their ivory towers, have forgotten. Those members should go out and have a look around, and if they did so they would see what is actually happening among underprivileged people. Further, if they did so, they would then try to do something for these people. However, members sit here year after year and no Government member can point to anything that his Government has done for the underprivileged. When one looks at the achievements of the Tonkin Government in respect of this position, one could quite easily refer to 30 or 40 administrative acts that resulted in substantial benefits being enjoyed by people in poor circumstances.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was a revolution; a social change.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people in the metropolitan area are still talking—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Yes, they were so appreciative that they threw you out.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: People are still talking about the terrible tragedy that happened on the 30th March, 1974. The Government, of course, can gain votes in Mr Tozer's province where there are only 7 000 people, but Mr Griffiths would not have a hope of being returned on a popular vote.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Do you mean people or electors?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Electors.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I seem to recall that in Mr Tozer's province a Liberal Party member and a Labor Party member were elected on the same day.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am talking about present circumstances and the image the Tonkin Government had among the people in this State. The members on the other side of the House kid themselves because they think they represent the greatest number of people in this country. However, if the coalition were divided into separate parties neither party would win the popular vote. It is the Australian Labor Party which gets the popular vote in this country. Neither the Country Party, nor the Liberal Party in Federal or State spheres obtains the popular vote at any election. Both parties gain enough seats to govern as a result of malapportionment of seats, but neither party ever gains the popular vote. They always fail and they always will, because I repeat that the members of those parties are unable to recognise the needs of underprivileged people, or those on low or moderate incomes.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I was elected by the majority of the people in my province.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member was elected at a different period; he was not elected as a consequence of the Tonkin administration.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: But he was elected at the same time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He was elected in 1971.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Since then he has had an influx of Liberal voters residing within his new boundaries.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Obviously the Tonkin Government barked up the wrong tree on daylight saving following a popular vote.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know who barked up the wrong tree.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members of the Government act in a way that is completely opposite to what I am talking about and introduce legislation such as the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Which was very well received.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Was it? I can tell the honourable member that about the only people who received it well were the 49 members of the coalition Government who are at present occupying the Treasury benches, and I know full well that not even all of these members were in favour of that legislation.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about all the dire circumstances that were to occur as a result of the introduction of that legislation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There has not been an emergency since it was introduced. What happened in the State of New South Wales when an attempt was made to introduce similar legislation?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The fact that there has been no emergency only goes to show how effective the legislation has been.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: At any time, in any of the ports in the north-west which are covered by my organisation we will give you a demonstration of democratic power.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is not that a vicious sort of threat to make?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not at all. During all the years I was a union official I never made a threat. I said I would give a demonstration.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a threat.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No it is not.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members on the other side of the House encourage demonstrations.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Dans, on the strength of his invitation, makes a threat to the people of this country. That is terrible.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I said I would give a demonstration.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The conservative Government of the State of New South Wales was going to introduce a Bill on similar lines to the Bill that was passed by this Parliament. The Government of New South Wales did not mess around. Unlike members on the other side of the Chamber the Government in that State said it was going to be an attack on the trade unions and that when they stepped out of line it would crack down on them. However, what did the Government of that State do with the Bill it was to introduce?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We said that the Bill we introduced was not to be an attack on the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is what the Government in this State said.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is right.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: But the Government of New South Wales did not mess around.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You said that if the Bill in this State were passed the trade union movement would be smashed forever. You went out among the people and put the fear of God into them. You said that if the Bill were passed it would be the end of the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have never said that in this House.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Your supporters did.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We said that the Bill had the ingredients to do that. However, I do not think we should rehash the contents of the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We still practice the old British square formation down on the wharves just in case.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I wonder what the people in the United Kingdom are saying.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are living in Australia and there is ample evidence in this country to show that legislation such as that introduced by the Government of this State was unnecessary. In New South Wales, Mr Lewis was frightened to introduce similar legislation following the great power strike in that State. What about the Darwin crisis when the whole town was flattened by a cyclone? We could not experience anything worse in Perth in the form of an emergency, but what happened following the Darwin crisis? Was any emergency legislation required in Darwin? Was it necessary to conscript people to repair the damage done to the town? Were any of the people conscripted to enter places and perform work they did not want to do? No, they acted voluntarily. Unionists were the first to go there to take steps to repair the damage. I did not see any of the people who are represented by members opposite doing anything voluntarily in Darwin. It was the members of the trade union movement who went in to take some action. They went there days after the cyclone and they did not have to have their awards taken from them. Such an example shows how futile is the legislation that was introduced in this State.

If, today, a cyclone were to hit Perth there would be no need to conscript people to go to work; there would be no need to take their awards from them, because the members of the work force and other people of this State would come to the fore in an endeavour to take whatever action was necessary to ensure that the emergency was dealt with in a proper manner.

To illustrate to what degree members on the other side of the House are out of touch with what is going on, I would

point out that many events have taken place in Australia since that legislation was introduced which have proved that there was no need for the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: That is infamous poppycock!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not. It is true and members on the other side of the House do not like the truth; they never have and never will.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think members will agree that interjections have gone just about far enough; and I think Mr Cooley is inciting them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sorry if I have incited them. I will accept what you say in that respect, Mr President.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If the truth hurts, you cannot get away from that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We have not heard any truth yet.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Why not ask Mr Heath about the miners' strike?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Where did that come from?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think enough has been said in respect of that so I will now turn to another matter which indicates the hypocrisy of the Government. It went to the trouble of appointing a committee known as the Retail Trades Advisory Committee which comprises people of all sections of the retail trade. Its purpose is to advise the Minister and the Government in respect of certain matters, and almost unanimously it recommended to the Minister that there should be no late trading in this State. However, what did the Minister do? He tore up the recommendation and introduced late trading. If that is not inciting industrial trouble, what is it doing? Not only the trade unions are opposed to late trading; even the people who run the shops do not want it. Because a few isolated people want to open at night the Minister has indicated that they can go ahead and do it in face of all the opposition and the committee's recommendation. I am accused of inciting interjections, but the Government by its actions incites industrial trouble.

The shop assistants' union—I am trying to talk above the interjections, Mr President—is prepared to take action against the Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: All the Minister has said is that if shopkeepers wish to open, they may. He has not said they must open.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is that why food-stuffs have gone up higher in this State than in any other State?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: No.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Thanks, I will take your word for it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is because we looked after the farmers.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: If you want to know the reaction to late shopping, you should come to Kalamunda next Wednesday.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Why does the honourable member not come to the main centres and take a consensus of opinion—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Why don't you come up to Kalamunda and see how the other people live?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —amongst the people who own the shops and see if they want to open?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: So they do not have to open.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government is prepared to allow other shops to open to compete against them and so force them to open.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It is purely voluntary.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This will result in increased prices because the shopkeepers must pay overtime with a consequent increase in prices. The Government is hypocritical enough to say that the Federal Government is creating inflation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You oppose private enterprise in any shape or form.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This Government creates not only industrial trouble, but an inflationary situation.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Why don't you drive up to the hills next Wednesday?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Oh, go back to the hills.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This Government will force people to take action which in itself will be inflationary.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I take it you are opposed to late trading?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I suggest you ask Mr Snedden to stand on that platform tomorrow; that is, late trading.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Many reasons exist for the breakdown in industrial relations in this State and I think another example has occurred in recent times. Since the Government has been in power two political appointments have been made to the Industrial Commission, one from the Employers Federation and, more recently, one from a Government department.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. T. Knight: Hogwash!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member can say "hogwash".

The Hon. T. Knight: That is right. We are listening to some now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Does the honourable member know the reasons these people have been appointed? Has an investigation been made to ascertain whether any extra appointments are required to the Industrial Commission? I have taken out some figures in this connection. I know Mr Knight will say it is hogwash as does the Minister for Education when he cannot win a point, as was the case over the specialist. He said we were talking rot, balderdash, and so on; but certain things in life are factual.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was not the Minister who used the word "rot"; it was your leader.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite should accept those facts without trying to put other members off their addresses to this House because we all have a democratic right to say what we like here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If the President allows us.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right.

The PRESIDENT: Subject to Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is what I meant.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Industrial Commission commenced operations in 1964 or thereabouts and it was not until 1971 that the number on the commission was increased by one. During the years 1967 to 1970 an average of 600 to 700 matters were dealt with by a single commissioner. In 1967 the number was 760; in 1968, the figure was 519; in 1969 it was 865; and in 1970 it dropped to 744. Those figures were for the years ending the 30th June. In the year ending the 30th June, 1971 some 1 326 matters were dealt with by a single commissioner.

On the other hand, the number of matters dealt with in court session varied quite considerably. In case members do not know, I will explain that a commission court session is created when the court sits with a combination of three of the commissioners appointed.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Knight is not even listening to you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If he does listen he will learn something; if he does not, he will remain ignorant.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Whom are you talking about?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you sensitive?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: No, but he is looking straight at me.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Knight says that I am talking hogwash, but he does not trouble to listen to me so that he can learn something.

In 1967 the commission in court session dealt with 373 matters; in 1968 the figure was 65; in 1969 it was 387; in 1970 it fell to 80; and in 1971 the number was 136.

Whereas in 1967 only 760 matters were dealt with by a single commissioner, by 1971 this figure had increased to nearly 1400. Consequently the responsible Government then in power decided that an additional commissioner should be appointed, so on the 6th October, 1971, Mr Collier was appointed. The situation became worse.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: After Mr Collier was appointed the situation became worse?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The situation to which I am referring, and which became worse, concerns the increase in the number of matters dealt with.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I misunderstood you. You said that Mr Collier was appointed and the situation became worse.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: What Government appointed Mr Collier?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: A Labor Government.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: He was not a union representative?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I did not say he was. The honourable member was not listening.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He had no connection with Trades Hall you said.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is right, not one scrap. You know nothing about association rules.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I said that no commissioner appointed by a Labor Government had any affiliation with the TLC or Trades Hall.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: And not connected with the ALP pre-selection.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am talking about who appointed him and saying that he had no TLC or Trades Hall affiliation.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Where did his affiliation lie?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government of the day recognised the considerable increase in the number of matters being dealt with by a single commissioner and so appointed Mr Collier.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: He is a good commissioner, too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He is.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You said the position deteriorated afterwards. I thought it was because he was appointed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr. Clive Griffiths talks so much he does not listen. Deterioration occurred as a consequence of the increased numbers being dealt with

by a single commissioner. At the time of Mr Collier's appointment the number of matters dealt with increased from 1428 to 1813. Again showing a sense of responsibility, the Labor Government appointed Mr Halliwell. This Government has been in office—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: For too long.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, for too long.

The Hon. T. Knight: Was that appointment made on the insistence of the Trades and Labor Council?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: From the 18th June, 1974, to the 3rd February this year the Government has appointed two more commissioners to the Industrial Commission. In the year 1972-73 the number of matters dealt with by a single commissioner dropped by 400, yet the Government went ahead and appointed Mr Martin prior to the chief commissioner's report being brought out. It seems to be unusual that although there was a drop in the number of matters dealt with another commissioner was appointed. The unusual aspect of it is that Mr Martin was an Assistant Director of the Employers Federation. In a question in this House I asked whether anyone in the trade union movement had been approached in respect of the job. Even the Employers Federation claimed it did not know anything about it. This Government—and it must have had a motive for doing so—appointed a person who held a high position in the Employers Federation after there had been a decrease in the amount of business conducted by the Industrial Commission. That seems to be very strange.

I will explain why I consider that was a wrong action. I will not say anything about Geoff Martin; he is a very nice fellow—one of my personal friends—and I like him. But it sounds strange to me.

Furthermore, on the 3rd February this year another appointment was made; namely, Mr Grant Johnson who had held a prominent position on what is now the Public Service Board and was previously in the Department of Labour.

The Hon. J. Heitman: How many commissioners are there now?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Too many.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have the idea these are political appointments, and this is why the arbitration system has failed and the trade union movement has turned away from it. I said last year and I say it again—although it falls on deaf ears—that for 23 years conservative Governments in this country have stacked the benches with political appointees, people who had leanings towards them; and that is what brought about the destruction of the arbitration system. This drove the

unions away from the arbitration system and into direct collective bargaining, and drove the country into a state not of complete industrial chaos but of bad industrial relations.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Would you like to comment on another appointment to another bench?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Tell me of an appointment to the High Court which has not been political.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Every appointment is political.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Every appointment to the High Court, in particular, in this and other countries.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: What were the circumstances of the appointment of the present Chairman of the Licensing Court in this State?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Ferry runs off the track. I do not care who was appointed to the Licensing Court. That does not make one iota of difference to industrial relations in this country and would have very little effect on the economy of the country and the general running of the State. But some appointments that have been made to the Industrial Commission are quite contrary to the best interests of this country.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I can well recall your comments on the last appointment to the Licensing Court.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I said it was a job for the boys.

The Hon. T. Knight: I take it you do not think the appointments made in the days of the Labor Government were political.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I stated the reason for Mr Collier's appointment. The work in the Industrial Commission had almost doubled and there was a great need for another commissioner; even the union movement was asking for it, and two commissioners were appointed. But since that time there has been a drop in the amount of work and two commissioners have been appointed within two months.

The Hon. T. Knight: But they were political appointments and the others were not?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members should think about the matter deeply and appreciate that when political appointments are made in the industrial field, bad industrial relations are created. It is not in the best interests of anybody in this country to have bad industrial relations.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I take it you blame past Governments of all political colours for such appointments?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the Labor Government made political appointments, it is also at fault. The finger cannot be pointed at the Labor Government for doing that; it was justified every time and had a reason for what it did. I will continue to express this view in this House while that attitude is taken. Someone recently accused my leader of "stirring", but members on the Government side are not far from it. Mr Clive Griffiths sits there and grins but if he were involved in these matters he would have nothing to grin about. People should take these matters seriously.

I mentioned the simple matter of the Labour Day holiday. For its own reasons the trade union movement in this State wanted the celebration of Labour Day to be changed from the first Monday in March to the first Monday in May each year—and after all, it is the trade union movement's day. This request was made to the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Was not the original change also made at the trade union movement's request?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes. The Tonkin Government agreed to the change after a certain year, and had it not gone out of office the change would have been effected. We thought the conservative Government in this State would appreciate that the Trades and Labor Council wanted the change, and even the Premier said, "If they want it like their communist friends all over the world, they can have their May Day celebration." May Day is celebrated in 106 countries in the world; but that is not the point. Whether the holiday is held in March or May is not the real point I am trying to make. The point is the Government has now refused the Trades and Labor Council the right to have the holiday on the day it wants.

Action is now being taken by affiliated unions to make applications to their employers to have the awards amended so that the holiday will be held on the first Monday in May. That seems to be a simple process but it does two things. Apart from the population of the State celebrating the holiday on different days, which is irrelevant, it could have industrial implications with people stopping work over it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why was it changed in the first place?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The union movement wanted it. If the RSL said, "We want to change the celebration of Anzac Day from the 25th April to the 11th November", would the Government go along with that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We would ask the people, as we did with your proposition, and the bulk of the workers did not want it changed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is not true. Whether or not they did—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The surf carnival and other sporting fixtures were geared to the date in March, and none of them wanted a change.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Whether or not that is so, it created division in the community.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are out of touch with the world.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not. That is what is wrong with members on the Government side. That is what creates bad industrial relations. A number of unions are now pushing the employers to have Labour Day celebrated in May next year. If they do not get it there are likely to be strikes, which could be avoided if the Government would face up to realities and give the Trades and Labor Council the day it wants. After all it is their day, and their tradition. But the Government by its very action in not changing the date is creating industrial trouble.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why do you think the last Labour Day in March was not terribly successful?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Whether it succeeds or fails is not the point.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think it is very relevant to your point.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It should not matter to the Minister or to his party whether 10 or 10 000 people turn out on Labour Day.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It seems to me that you do not care whether or not it suits these people.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What people?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The trade unionists.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The trade unionists, through the people who represent them on the Trades and Labor Council, have asked for the date to be changed.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The trade unionists I represent have in the main asked me to oppose it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Griffiths does not represent trade unionists.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What did they say?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They said in droves, "Don't allow the TLC to change the date."

The Hon. N. McNeill: They said they would rather have the opportunity to go to the beach, play tennis, or play cricket.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The same thing happened with the progressive legislation in respect of four weeks' annual leave, which members opposite threw out of this Chamber. The Tonkin Government presented that legislation, but members opposite discarded it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And most workers have got it now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is the point; and how did they get it? They fought for it, and in the process some industrial trouble was created. Members opposite should be introducing a Bill to give all those who are not covered by an industrial award the benefit of four weeks' annual leave, because most of those covered by awards have already received that benefit.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Does that do anything for the inflation rate?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not talking about that; I am talking about the facts of life.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Don't talk nonsense.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the Government persists with its attitude to industrial relations and does not keep abreast of what is going on, it will create further inflation because strikes will occur and they are inflationary.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The terrifying thing is that he really believes this.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Yes, he does.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr MacKinnon believes a lot of things. The Tonkin Government endeavoured to equalise the situation in regard to long service leave, but members opposite threw out the Bill. The Minister for Education employs people who receive 13 weeks' annual leave after 10 years of service. The proposition was put that people in private industry should enjoy the same benefit, but members opposite said those people should not have it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Employers Federation said, "No".

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister also employs people who receive 13 weeks' long service leave after seven years of service. Does the Minister believe in that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not believe in that long service leave; I think it is quite wrong.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yet a Bill to give those in private enterprise the benefit of four weeks' annual leave was thrown out; but the unionists fought for it and most of them have received it. The same thing will occur in regard to long service leave. The issue will be fought in the field with the possibility of strikes and unrest. If the Government faces up to its responsibilities and endeavours to understand the workers as the Tonkin Government did, it will avoid a great deal of the industrial dispute which exists at present.

However, there is no suggestion in the Governor's Speech that the Government will try to reach a better understanding with the unionists. Do members opposite agree with the comments of Senator

Greenwood who said, "The unions are acting like hijackers"? Is not that a disgraceful statement for a former Attorney-General to make?

The Hon. T. Knight: You have said things just as bad about employers.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When?

The Hon. T. Knight: You said employers were out to use labour whenever they could.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Is Mr Knight a member of a trade union?

The Hon. T. Knight: I was, and I was quite proud of it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Members opposite are unwittingly supplying ammunition for the silent revolution, so we should not stop them.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Silent revolution?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Oh, yes, it is going on all the time. Haven't you read the book written by Dr Cairns? Probably that is the only book Mr MacKinnon has not read.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.06 p.m.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Before I turn from the industrial relations aspect of my address to the House I would ask again, as I did last year, that the Government give serious consideration to this question because it is one of the most important considerations from all three aspects of our life; namely, our economic life, our social life and, in many respects, our educational life.

Instead of sitting with benign smiles on their faces and doing nothing about it members opposite should have a serious look at the problem. They should investigate the possibilities of complete negotiation with the trade union movement in accordance with what they said they would do prior to the 30th March last year.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mr Cooley, you did not even look at the Government side of the House when you said we were sitting with benign smiles on our faces.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He was referring to the way you were smiling before tea. The tea was cold, and you are not so happy now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, that is it. When I talk to the members of the Government who are responsible for the welfare of the people of this State, I always get the impression that they are saying, "Let him go on about it; he is not saying very much." But I tell Mr Withers that there is a lot to what I am saying. Mr Withers should be concerned about this issue, because he represents a very large area and quite a number of people whose welfare problems need to be kept in mind.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: And he does it very well.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There should be a better understanding between Government and the trade union movement. The Government should recognise the trade union movement as much as it recognises the employers.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Are you saying there is no understanding?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the conservative parties—the Country Party and the Liberal Party—gave the same concern to the trade union movement as they give to the employers and the people who keep them in office in this place, this State would be a far better place in which to live.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It must be the workers and trade union members who keep us in Government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Well, it is not. Members opposite kid themselves that such people are keeping them in office.

The Hon. N. McNeill: We could not be in Government unless they voted for us, or at least a big proportion supported us.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not deny that some workers vote for members opposite; it would be silly for anyone to say they do not. However, I have said before, and it is worthy of repetition, that members opposite do not represent the majority of people in this country; the Australian Labor Party does.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I repeat: We could not be a Government without their support.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members of the Liberal Party can form a coalition with another party and have sufficient seats to form a Government. However, members opposite do not represent the voice of the majority of the people in this State, or indeed in Australia. They never have, and heaven forbid that they should receive such support.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am far from convinced that the trade union movement represents the majority of workers, either.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I hope that situation will never arise.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It applies now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, it does not; the Minister is fooling himself if he thinks that to be the case. Every time members opposite suffer an electoral reverse, they change the name of their party. They have been known as the United Australia Party, the National Party, and the Liberal Party. The Country Party changed its name before the last election, and as sure as the present Federal Opposition gets beaten at the next Federal election—as soon as it changes

its leadership—it will change its name again. It will get a true hiding and it would be one of the best things that could happen to this country if the Australian Labor Party could be perpetuated in office for a decade or so.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You keep saying that and you will convince yourself.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sorry that the Minister for Justice has left the Chamber; I do not want to criticise him while he is not present. He asked my leader when he was making his address whether he was in favour of Federation. My leader said, "Of course I am in favour of Federation." I was left in the air to wonder whether Mr McNeill was in favour of Federation.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Mr McNeill is discussing urgent Government business in the precincts of the Chamber; he has not left.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I did not accuse him of anything; I merely said that he was not present. So many lies have been propagated against the Australian Government that some members opposite are beginning to believe them. I believe that one of the greatest indictments against the Leader of the Liberal Party in this State, the Premier, were the lies and propaganda concocted while the Prime Minister of this country was overseas.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What a great person you are! You cannot see any good in anyone else.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Prime Minister went overseas to promote the interests of Australia.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Yes, and we heard some of the things he said, too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: While he was planning to go away, and while members opposite were criticising him for his plans, their own leader, Mr Snedden, was in America. In fact, the Premier of this State left for overseas before the Prime Minister returned. However, members opposite still criticised the Prime Minister for going away. I think he conducted himself with a great deal of dignity and decorum. He did this country a vast amount of good by doing what Mr Withers did. He went around the world and—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Had a good time!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —went into some of those countries which have a different political philosophy from ours.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought it was the Press and the people who were mainly critical of Mr Whitlam's visit.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite did not give him any credit for what he did overseas. I think they should at least recognise the improved foreign relations now enjoyed by Australia.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought your friend Mr Jack Munday made an appropriate comment about his trip.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Did the Minister say, "My friend, Mr Munday"? I do not know him.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Your colleague.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He is not a colleague; I have never met him and I do not know him.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I will take that back. I think Mr Jack Edgerton made an appropriate comment.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Jack Edgerton is a very good friend of mine, but because one person in the Labor Party agrees with the Minister's point of view, it does not make what he is saying correct. The Prime Minister did an excellent job when he was overseas. The members who represent country areas in this House should be grateful to him for what he did to promote trade while he was overseas. He has put the wheat farmers in a better position today than they have been for several years as a consequence of having better foreign relations with countries which have different political philosophies from our own. Even though they may have different philosophies, they still have to eat, and we can supply their needs.

The Hon. T. Knight: It is an unfortunate thing.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Did Mr Knight say that it was unfortunate that they had to eat?

The Hon. T. Knight: I said, "That is the unfortunate thing about it."

The Hon. N. McNeill: What about Chile?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are not going to sell wheat to Chile. I read the comments of the secretary of the Wheat Board on that matter, and he supported the ban.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not know. He said it was in the best interests of Australia.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We should compare the overseas visit of the Prime Minister and the good relations he fostered with the visit by the Premier of this State. The following are not my comments but are those of an ambassador to Australia. An article published in *The Australian* attributes the following remarks to the ambassador—

And I really feel now—looking back from the extremity of my two years in Australia—that the relationship today with the Labor Government is good.

Maybe it's not as close as it was with preceding governments, but in many ways it's healthier than it was before.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Who said that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: These are the remarks of Mr Marshall Green, American Ambassador to Australia

The Hon. N. McNeill: You must admit that there would have to be a great difference, because our relations with America were pretty low when the Federal Labor Government took office.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The article continues—

"Australia is bound and determined to do its own thing in the world . . ."

To continue—

He went on to criticise the sycophantic attitude to America of preceding Australian governments, citing the late Prime Minister Harold Holt's policy of "All the way with LBJ" as a "downright embarrassment" to Australia and its subsequent governments.

"Now all the parties—Labor, Liberal, Country Party—are in favour of a nationalistic policy for Australia." Mr Green said "We understand that and agree with it."

That is good foreign relations with a friendly nation.

I have said it in the House before and I say it again; one can have friends and still criticise them. One would be a bad friend if one did not criticise someone who had done something wrong. That is what the Labor Party has been doing. It has criticised its friends, and it has told them it will not go all the way with them. That is the way to preserve good relationships. One should not have to be subservient to another.

I think great credit reflects on the present Australian Government for the action it has taken in respect of not only the United States of America, but also other countries of the world. It is good for Australia and its people for this sort of thing to happen.

As compared with what Mr Whitlam did, let us see what Sir Charles had to say when he was overseas. I do not say this boastfully, but I myself have been overseas and spoken to many people in high places in a large number of countries. I was always given to understand that when I was away from Australia—Mr Withers touched on this yesterday—I should not criticise my own country; I was also under the impression that neither should I criticise a host country. I think Mr Whitlam adopted the same policy, and to good effect. He has been able to promote good relations with and obtain the co-operation of other nations.

What did the Premier of Western Australia do when he was in Great Britain? He had this to say when he was in London—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I was there and I heard them both.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In the *Daily News* of the 29th January the following report appeared—

Australia and Britain were sick societies, the WA Premier, Sir Charles Court said last night.

"Our national bodies are sick today—not so much from external wounds but from a poisonous diet.

"We are sick because our governments and our peoples—both with their gaze fixed firmly on the near horizon of the next election—have swung over to the false and comforting beliefs that values come out of our pay packets."

He was criticising his own country when he said that in London. If that is the attitude of the Premier and his reason for the problems which exist in Australia today, then Great Britain was not the country in which he should have said that; neither should he have criticised Great Britain as being a sick country while he was there.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I say it is.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is different from the sort of advice Mr Whitlam gave in certain countries overseas.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Not only that, but the Premier also criticised members of his own party. He implied that his own members were not shaping up too well, because he said if one was not a good businessman one would be no good in Government. What do the farmers think of that sort of statement?

The Hon. N. McNeill: He did not single out the Liberal Party in saying that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sure members opposite did not like that being said about them. The Premier implied that the Government of today was not as good as the Government of 20 years ago.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The Premier made that statement in this Parliament before he went away.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Even if he did, he should not have repeated it while he was abroad.

The Hon. N. McNeill: He acknowledged it was only a repetition of what he had said in Australia. He was referring not only to the Government but to all people in Parliament.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The Premier got the assurance he sought.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Whether that was said in Great Britain, Australia, or anywhere else, it seems to be part of the policy of the State Government to denigrate the Australian Government on every occasion, in order to cover up its own shortcomings.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is that all we do?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What worries me is what happens if the Liberals in the Federal sphere succeed in getting rid of the present Australian Government. What alternative will we have? What have we in the Federal Opposition—a party that is torn asunder? What will happen if Mr Snedden is defeated on Friday?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We used to worry about that in Government and all our worries were absolutely right!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If Mr Snedden is defeated in the leadership contest on Friday the Liberal Party will have had six different leaders in nine years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you suggest that the unfortunate death of Mr Holt was planned?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Labor Party has had only one leader in six years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am criticising you for the funny way you are putting that forward.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Liberal Party will also break the other record I referred to last year of having two former Prime Ministers on the back bench. Surely the Liberal Party does not want a third one there.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Coming from you representing a party which has had such leadership squabbles that is funny.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When has there been a leadership squabble in the Labor Party in the Federal sphere?

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Labor leaders were elected by the choice of the members.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We had Mr Chifley as leader in 1949, and he was the greatest Prime Minister Australia ever had.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is piffle!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: However, he was not a businessman, but an engine driver.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is right!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you reckoned that Whitlam was the greatest.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When was there any challenge to the leadership of Mr Chifley?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: This seems to be a saga of Cassius Clay!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When was there a leadership challenge? We had one leader in the Labor Party during the period when the Liberals had five, and by next Saturday probably six. That is the type of alternative Australian Government that is offered to the people; if it is elected the position in Australia will be chaotic. We would get back to the McMahon type of Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You can give up worrying and sleep soundly!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is a pity when effect is not given to the will of the people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: By Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In this State the Liberal Party is governing only by virtue of its coalition partner; the Liberal Party cannot govern on its own, yet it is trying to get rid of the Country Party.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And with some success.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Let us consider the number of Country Party members in Parliament today. When I was first elected to this Parliament—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I can get you another wooden spoon!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Country Party got a wooden spoon at the last election with its alliance with the DLP. It also got something else, but I would not be permitted to say it here. It disturbs me to see members in this Chamber, like Mr Gayfer who is very genuine and honest, having to bend to the will of the Liberal Party. I have heard him speak strongly in opposition to proposals put up by this Government, but invariably when a division was called he had to vote with his party and the Government. That is a very sad state of affairs. This is brought about only by fear of displeasing the Liberal leadership.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You yourself cannot criticise the ALP.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The ALP does not have any of these problems. We govern in our own right, and we always will; but at no time in this State was the Liberal Party able to govern on its own.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The ALP has the greatest collection of opposing interests of any party in the world.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We can find that in the history of the Liberal Party. They have been free traders, protectionists, and they have been known as the Nationalist Party, the United Australian Party, and the Liberal Party. I shall tell the honourable member when I speak what I think will be its new name.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are so smart!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am, and I agree with you!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Country Party is selling its soul to the Liberals for profit. It is a great shame to see members of the Country Party being used by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What did you say? Do you say you believe that is a great shame?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is a great shame, because the Country Party has been a good friend of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It is a pity to hear you say it is a great shame.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I feel genuine pity for the Country Party members. They represent honest people in the country areas, and they have been elected to represent those who have put them in; but they are not representing those people. They are representing them only through the will and the good offices of the Liberal Party.

I do not want to repeat what my leader has said, but the Premier stated that he had conferred three portfolios on the Country Party and did that party a good turn, so it should not object to what he was doing.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I give you credit for what you are saying. It is certainly at variance with what a good many people in your party are saying.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am pleased to hear the Minister gives me credit. The Liberals will desert the Country Party, the same as they deserted their other allies. The Liberals used the DLP before passing the DLP over to the Country Party with disastrous results. The Liberals cannot be trusted; if they could there would not be the present leadership struggle going on. It was as late as February, 1975, when Mr Fraser repeated his pledge to Mr Snedden—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That he would stab Snedden in the back again!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He had his knife in Mr Snedden's back while he was giving his pledge. While such a situation prevails there cannot be good government in this country from the Liberals. Even during the parliamentary recess there was a continual struggle between the Liberal Party and the Country Party in this State. Mr Anthony has been to Western Australia, and he was critical of the Country Party in the State for the action it had taken.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a complete untruth.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Does the Minister say it is untrue?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Mr Anthony did not criticise.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He criticised the administration of the party in this State.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He did not criticise the Country Party here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was the National Alliance he was criticising.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think Mr Anthony criticised the Country Party for entering into an alliance with the DLP.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He did not criticise us at all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think the Minister had better examine the Press statements of Mr Anthony when he was in Western Australia in February, 1975. Perhaps Mr Baxter was away at the time.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He made some remarks but he did not criticise.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He said there would be an election over Medibank, and that the price of petrol would go up.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Be that as it may, there seems to be this struggle and there cannot be good government while it is going on. I think the Country Party should have a good look at itself, and also have a look at the Liberal Party.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The member opposite is trying to drive a wedge between the parties.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When members opposite come back to this House in the next Parliament they will need to have someone better here. I do not think Mr Baxter, Mr Gayfer, or Mr Perry will be here.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I will take a bet on that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will now turn to the performance of this Government since it has been in office. A good deal of its bad performance has been brought about because of the division within its own ranks. I am now on the eve of the first anniversary of my election to Parliament, which was on the 30th March, last year, and in that time I have been astounded because the State Government has reversed the policy of the Australian Labor Government. I can quote daylight saving as an example where a referendum has been held. The Government has also introduced the fuel, energy and power resources legislation, and has brought the State to the brink of total industrial unrest. The Government has levied unprecedented charges on the public. This State has the doubtful honour of having the highest inflation rate in Australia simply because of the savage charges which have been imposed on the people since the present Government has been in office.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: As a result of instructions from Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We were waiting for that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are pleased to hear that members opposite take some notice of his instructions.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The State had to, in order to survive.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Western Australia has almost the worst unemployment rate in Australia.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do not tell me that is not the result of actions taken by the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Someone said the same thing about Mr McMahon, but that was denied.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think South Australia has the worst unemployment rate. Since the present Government in this State came into office unemployment has more than doubled.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Where are these unemployed people?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am going on figures supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. If that bureau is not right, then I am not right.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The present Government was going to keep the Civil Service down to a 2 per cent increase, but it is now up to 8 per cent.

The Hon. N. McNeill: No, the Public Service.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There seems to be something wrong with the policy of the present Government because it claimed it would cure all ills which cause unemployment, and would create job opportunities. I will not refer to the blue book which is just about worn out. The State Liberal Party claimed it would programme for a strong, well-planned economy and lower the level of unemployment. However, the unemployment has more than doubled since the Government took office. The Government promised a rising standard of living, but that has been reduced by savage charges to the point where we have the highest inflation in Australia. The Government claimed it would provide a range of career opportunities which were lacking in the past. However, the range of career opportunities and job vacancies, when the Tonkin Government went out of office, was more than double what it is today.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Is that right?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right. The situation has deteriorated by 100 per cent.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I do not know that that statement is correct. There are many unfilled vacancies at the moment. Mr Wordsworth gave a typical example of the situation in one country town.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Gnowangerup. The member opposite would depend on a place such as that.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Mr Cooley has no concern for the people of Gnowangerup.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It happened to be a glaring example.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Unfilled vacancies, in March, 1974, were 5 500. The vacancies increased to that figure from 5 147 in January, when the Tonkin Government was in office. Job vacancies have

now declined to 2 846 since the present Government has been in office. Is that how job opportunities have increased?

The Government has failed miserably; it really has, and it does not seem to want to do anything to correct the situation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Does the member opposite think that job vacancies have anything to do with the lack of business?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Liberal Party claimed that if it were elected it would cure all these troubles despite the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I wonder how much worse off we would be if the previous Government was still in office.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We did not anticipate that the Whitlam Government would increase the interest rate by 50 per cent or more. No-one could estimate that increase.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Did not the Reserve Bank Board have anything to do with the increase in interest?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Baxter's statement might prove to be as fallacious as some of the statements by the Premier.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The member opposite does not think that unemployment and inflation which exists in Western Australia has anything to do with the world-wide state of affairs?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Premier does not seem to think so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: World affairs are a contributing factor, but the Government claims it is the fault of the Federal Government. The honourable member opposite should read *Hansard* where he will see I said that the economy of the capitalist system had failed. It is not the fault of the State Government that there is high unemployment in Germany, Japan, or anywhere else in the world.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What does the honourable member think is the fault?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think it is the fault of the State Government because it is a free enterprise Government and it fooled the people of this State into electing it into office, and replacing one of the greatest Governments this State has ever had. No-one can deny that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Even the honourable member does not believe that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When a comparison is made between Mr Tonkin and Sir Charles Court nine out of ten of the people favour Mr Tonkin.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We go beyond the executive of the TLC for our opinions.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not ask that question of people because I do not like to hear bad language.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What Mr Baxter has said could be as fallacious as what was said by the Premier in his last Budget speech. Right through his Budget speech he claimed that all increased charges were the result of the high wage rate and the amount which had to be paid to employees in the Government service. Although those wages may be a contributing factor it surprises me because we have the highest unemployment rate and the highest rate of inflation and yet we have the lowest wage rate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And the highest cost of living.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is not good enough. The Government is not living up to the promises it gave to the people before the 30th March last year. It has failed miserably and members opposite should have agreed to the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply motion by my leader.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What? That censure motion?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why not move another censure motion?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Give us time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not intend to move an amendment, but another member might feel inclined to do so.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I can tell the honourable member that we will not be taken by surprise.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Western Australia is the lowest wage State in Australia, but it has the highest rate of inflation and the greatest number of unemployed. However, the fact that we have the lowest wage is not played up very much.

The Hon. J. Heltman: Why not stick to the truth?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is similar to the argument used back in the 1960s when the Brand Government came into office, but what happened subsequently? In terms of wage levels of the various States Western Australia went from the lowest to almost the highest in Australia during that period.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is nothing remarkable about that. It was simply an economic exercise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was good government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not think Mr McNeill was a member of the Government at that time but he knows very well that the present Premier, who

was then the Minister for Industrial Development, was out of this country attracting big business on the basis that Western Australia was a low wage State. Our wages were dollars behind any other State in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He did not use that argument.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He was able to obtain the iron ore industries, and other industries, in the early part of 1960 on that basis.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, he did not.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I can recall it quite clearly.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was the interpretation you wanted to put on the position. It happened to suit your argument. Tradesmen were coming from all over Australia to obtain work in Western Australia, notwithstanding that we were a low wage State.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: On the basis of working 100 hours a week.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Industry was attracted to this State on that basis.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, it was because of the profitable area here. It had nothing to do with wages.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is documented evidence that wages were lower in this State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I have heard members with far longer experience than the member opposite pay the greatest tribute to the then Minister for Industrial Development for what happened in the 1960s.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It had to happen.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It had to happen because we had a good Government.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It had nothing to do with the Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is really good street corner stuff we are listening to. I would like to hear a return to the standard of speech presented by members such as the Hon. F. J. S. Wise for a change.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We will never get back to those days.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is a great pity. They were common-sense down-to-earth arguments instead of this haranguing we now hear.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What kind of result did it achieve?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not bad results.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have read *Hansard* very well. Mr Wise may have won his arguments, but that is all. I had been

involved in debating in a number of other places before I came into Parliament, but I have never heard stuff put over such as that presented by Mr MacKinnon. I have heard fair comment and criticism, but not from members opposite.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The member opposite should let someone read his speech to him.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There seems to be no genuine criticism in this debate. I will not be browbeaten by the attitude of members opposite.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The honourable member has a terrible ordeal in front of him.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What is that?

The Hon. N. McNeill: Reading your greens after today's exercise.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps I have not had the same opportunity as Mr McNeill might have had. That may be one of my misfortunes.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am simply saying that the honourable member has an ordeal to go through.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It does not matter how I make my speech; I have a right to speak subject to Standing Orders.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No-one denies you that right. We only wish you would make your speech differently.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The honourable member is making statements which members opposite do not want to hear. Keep it up.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not think we should listen to the type of stuff we get from the front bench of the Government. The Ministers should have more responsibility with regard to this matter. The stuff which is given to us seems to indicate to me that this House is failing as a House of Review because it is conducted on party lines.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: History will show the honourable member to be one of the worst offenders.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If we are to take party lines we should be genuine and not claim to be a House of Review.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How can it be a House of Review when we have ministerial representation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Since I have been in this House many Bills have been passed on party lines.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Anybody would think that this House has never rejected a Bill.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What about long service leave and four weeks' annual leave?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This House rejected those all right.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Apple and Pear Industry Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It rejected many Bills when the Labor Party was in control of the Lower House.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It rejected them when the Liberal Party was in power too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not correct to call this Chamber a House of Review.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I can tell you about Liberal Party legislation that has been rejected, and so can the President.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill was before the House, we saw the true colour of this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member is coming very close to reflecting on the House, and that is against Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: At least the House should be consistent. When these measures were before us last year, surely during the Committee debate at least one person on the other side of the House did not totally agree with all the provisions.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Some of the members crossed the floor.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They did not cross the floor on the fuel and energy legislation.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Your party voted in a solid block for the whole year.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I recognise that, but we regard this as a party House.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I did see that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We believe this is a party House, so we must act as members of a party. We do not give rise to the misconception that we are something we are not.

The Hon. N. McNeill: A former Minister for Police in your Government will not bear that out.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not here to justify remarks made by other people before my time. I do not know what Mr Dolan did, if he is the former Minister referred to.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He crossed the floor.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Nor was I here when Mr Wise was a member.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would be interesting to know of any member who has been here for more than two years and who has not crossed the floor against Liberal Party Bills at one time or another.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Suffice it to say that if the Government adopts the same attitude it held last year, it ought to

accept the policy of the Australian Labor Party for unicameral Government in this State. That would remove the inequity I spoke of in regard to the value of votes in Mr Tozer's area as against the value of votes in my area.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are not still on about that, surely.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Whenever I am permitted to do so, I will bring this matter before the House.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: There are twice as many people in my province as there are in the province represented by Mr Dellar.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The same thing applies.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Then you should not be here.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Are you trying to say that the people in the north should not be represented?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When we present the motion to the Governor, he may see our protests about the malapportionment of votes. If an appropriate amendment to the Electoral Act were initiated from this House, it would do the Government a great deal of credit.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You would like to see all the representation coming from the metropolitan area.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, we are seeking unicameral Government and an equality of voting strength.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am beginning to think that what you want is a Labor Government in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That would be the best thing that could happen.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You do not care what method is used to achieve that end.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Despite the fact that the people do not want it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: To conclude, Mr President, I again record my criticism of the Government for the manner in which such a distinguished person as His Excellency, the Governor, has been used for political purposes. I am sure that I speak for the majority of constituents in the North-East Metropolitan Province when I say that I am consoled by the fact that he is a man who is not unused to hardships and adversity and the manner in which they can be overcome.

His Excellency is to be congratulated on his tolerance and forbearance in having to play the role cast for him by the Liberal Party and its coalition partner as a political advocate, and for his fortitude in carrying out this onerous duty with such dignity and decorum, and at the same time bearing the burden of a long and troublesome illness.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: This is a prepared speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, it is prepared; there is nothing wrong with that. Perhaps the honourable member should talk to his own colleagues about prepared speeches.

On behalf of the constituents of the North-East Metropolitan Province, I extend to His Excellency sincere best wishes for a speedy and complete recovery from his illness.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

The university authorities have requested, and the Government has agreed, that legislation be introduced to amend the principal Act in order to clarify the regulation-making powers of the senate and the procedures relating to the making of regulations, and also to allow some flexibility in relation to the time within which the university's annual report has to be submitted. The university also requested that provision be included to enable the separate forwarding of the university's annual report and the Auditor-General's report on the University accounts.

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

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

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

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

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

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 20th March, 1975

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (56): ON NOTICE

1.

RAILWAYS

Kalgoorlie Bar and Refreshment Room

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

- (1) When were the bar, kiosk and the refreshment room at the Kalgoorlie railway station closed?
- (2) Why were these facilities closed?
- (3) Is he aware that the closure has resulted in inconvenience to railway patrons passing through Kalgoorlie, those originating journeys from this centre and those terminating journeys there?
- (4) Will he please consider making these facilities once more available?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) From the 28th December, 1974.
- (2) Because of decline in patronage and financial loss.
- (3) No. Bar, cafe, confectionery, and limited periodicals and magazines are available for sale on interstate passenger trains and also on the *Prospector* prior to arrival at and immediately after departure from Kalgoorlie.
- (4) No. There is no evidence to indicate that the situation which existed at the time of closure would improve.

2.

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Kalgoorlie

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a recent survey conducted by Mrs M. Tonkin of Menzies of parents who would be prepared to have their children attend a school hostel in Kalgoorlie if one existed?
- (2) Why was a submission made to the Minister in 1974 for the purchase of the Christian Brothers College building subsequent to the transfer of the college to a new site for use as a hostel rejected?
- (3) Has the Minister considered an approach to the Australian Schools Commission for necessary finance to purchase the said building for the purpose of a hostel?
- (4) Whilst it is true that on each occasion of a survey as to numbers of children who would attend a Kalgoorlie hostel judged by existing criteria, it has been reported that there have been insufficient children available to make a hostel a viable proposition, is it a fact that the situation is really one of the "chicken and the egg" because due to the lack of a hostel many parents make long range decisions early in a child's life for the education of the child away from Kalgoorlie?
- (5) When was the matter of a Kalgoorlie hostel last considered by the Country High Schools Hostels Authority?
- (6) Why cannot the situation in the eastern and north-eastern gold-fields, because of many factors not the least being due to environment and remoteness, be given special consideration?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The request to purchase the CBC building was carefully considered. It was rejected on the grounds that all the available evidence indicated that there were not sufficient students in the Kalgoorlie area to justify the provision of hostel accommodation. Other factors taken into account were some reservations about the suitability of the building, the availability of finance and the number of vacancies in other country hostels.
- (3) The special needs in regard to hostel accommodation have been included in the submission to the Schools Commission for the coming triennium.