

agreed to by the local authorities affected should be subject either to previous consent of the inhabitants or to review in some proper manner. On this point, various suggestions have been made from time to time.

In the last session of Parliament we had before us a Bill to require the Minister to table the order so that it would be subject to disallowance by either House. The Bill was passed by the Council but failed to pass through the Assembly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think the Bill was defeated in the Assembly.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I believe it was. It has also been suggested from time to time—and is now being suggested again—that a referendum of municipal electors be held when any such proposals are put forward, in order to ensure that they have the majority approval. In fact, today I received a letter from the Town of East Fremantle in which this very suggestion is made.

The Minister has now indicated that a Royal Commissioner will be appointed in the present case. Clearly, all cases would not justify the holding of a Royal Commission and this method has three serious defects—

- (a) The cost is only justified in a minority of cases;
- (b) the Royal Commissioner will be limited by the terms of reference which the Minister lays down; and
- (c) the worth of his recommendations will depend on his independence of judgment and grasp of the subject.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I do not know where you will find him.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: This could be a difficult problem.

It would seem to me that a better solution and one which would overcome some of the practical difficulties in the other courses recommended, would be to allow boundary decisions to be the subject of appeals to an administrative appeals tribunal or other tribunal having a somewhat similar constitution to the Land and Valuation Court of New South Wales. It must be borne in mind that decisions on boundaries are administrative and not judicial decisions and therefore a properly constituted administrative appeals tribunal would be the right forum.

We do not have such a tribunal here but they can be found in other places and it would seem to me that such a tribunal should provide local authorities and groups of ratepayers with a fair and adequate method of obtaining an independent hearing of their case whilst allowing for such changes as may be found to be necessary as a result of the passage of time or other

considerations. Until the time such a tribunal is established here, however, I believe that in the interests of democracy we must have some effective consultation in greater degree than exists at present with the opinions of the inhabitants of any particular municipal district.

There is one final point which I should like to make and which perhaps rests on a deeper principle than any I have yet touched upon.

The lust for power and the urge to ride over others lie just under the human surface. In recent memory are the dictatorships of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy; and there are many examples of dictatorial Governments in our present world ranging from Africa to China.

A bastion of democracy is the division and diversion of responsibility at various levels and in different degrees. Local government is an important—indeed essential—element in the preservation of the democratic way of life by spreading the power and responsibility and by keeping many domestic aspects of government close to the people who are served by it.

In so far as we resist the tendency to centralise power, whether in excessively large local authorities or in an all-powerful Government in Canberra, we are helping to nourish the fragile flower of democracy.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. V. J. Ferry.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [7.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

I wish to direct the attention of members who were not present when the House adjourned last Thursday to page 205 of *Hansard* No. 2, so that they have cognizance of the remarks I made on that occasion.

House adjourned at 7.49 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 27th March, 1973

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

QUESTIONS (39): ON NOTICE

1. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Cockburn Sound: Sea Grass

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) What has been the extent of the deterioration and loss of the sea-grass during the last 12 months in Cockburn Sound and the outer harbour?

- (2) Is this deterioration causing concern for the stability of these areas?
- (3) Has the loss been greatest in the vicinity of the effluent outlet from the Woodman's Point sewerage treatment depot?
- (4) What action has been taken to arrest the deterioration and protect the stability of the sound and harbour?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Not as yet clearly determined pending the second phase of monitoring.
- (2) The overall deterioration detected by research is of real concern.
- (3) No.
- (4) Industries in the Kwinana area have improved effluent standards and are continuing to invest in systems to bring about further improvement.

2. TAXI DRIVERS' LICENSES

Withdrawal and Renewal

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many taxi drivers have had their conductor's license withdrawn in the last five years for—
 - (a) assault;
 - (b) sex offences;
 - (c) other offences?
- (2) How many of these mentioned in each of (a), (b) and (c) above are now driving cabs in Western Australia or have had their conductor's licenses renewed?
- (3) Are all of these who have had conductor's licenses renewed from one company?
- (4) If not, will the Minister advise numbers for each company without necessarily naming the company?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) Nil.
(b) Two.
(c) Six.
- (2) One.
- (3) and (4) Answered by (2).

3. PUBLIC SERVICE

Percentage Increase of Officers

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Will he inform the House of the percentage increase in the public service for each of the last eight years?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Details of public service staff are set out on page 17 of the Public Service Board's annual report for 1971-72.

The percentage increases are:—
Year ended 30th June:

1965—	4.36%
1966—	8.02%
1967—	6.38%
1968—	6.17%
1969—	7.56%
1970—	9.96%
1971—	8.58%
1972—	5.90%

4. HEALTH

Mental Defectives

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

- (1) Who are the members of the committee inquiring into anti-social high grade mental defectives and which is presided over by Dr. Csillag, and what agencies do they represent?
- (2) How many meetings has the committee had?
- (3) Has it presented a report?
- (4) If "Yes" is the report available to members of the House?
- (5) If (3) is "No" when is it expected that a report will be presented?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) It is thought that the committee referred to is an *ad hoc* committee which was convened by the Director, Mental Health Services to consider the problem of a group of young people who are "social misfits", with inadequate community support who may be of low intelligence, who are not mentally ill and who engage in anti-social acts.

The committee is considering how the problem might be approached, e.g. by some form of inter-departmental co-operation followed by recommendations, if necessary, for appropriate legislation.

Members of the committee are:—

Chairman—Dr. R. Csillag, University Department of Psychiatry;

Dr. H. Blackmore, Psychiatrist Superintendent, Graylands Hospital, Mental Health Services;

Dr. R. M. Ellison, Psychiatrist Superintendent, Heathcote Hospital, Mental Health Services;

Dr. G. J. L. Hamilton, Physician Superintendent, Mental Deficiency Division, Mental Health Services;

Dr. G. L. Rollo, Psychiatrist
Superintendent, Department
of Corrections;

Dr. D. Greenhill, Community Wel-
fare Department.

- (2) The committee has met on four occasions.
- (3) No.
- (4) See answer to (5).
- (5) The committee is of an ongoing nature and it is anticipated that suggestions, which may be of value, will be made available periodically in the future.

5. EDUCATION

School Councils

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

- (1) Is he in a position to indicate how many—
 - (a) primary; and
 - (b) secondary,Government schools have established school councils consisting of students and teachers?
- (2) Is the Education Department giving overt encouragement to the establishment of such councils?
- (3) Does the department desire to encourage the establishment of school councils consisting not only of students and teachers but also of parents?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) The Education Department is arranging for schools to consider the discipline report as a whole before making decisions about particular recommendations such as the composition of a school council.
The Education Department will delay formulation of its policy on implementation of the report's recommendations until schools, parents' associations and other interested parties have had time to examine the report and determine their attitude.

6. RAILWAYS

Central City Land: Classification

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the classification of the central city railway land?
- (2) Is it necessary to obtain Parliamentary or other approval before—
 - (a) building on;
 - (b) leasing;
 - (c) selling,this land?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) If the question is intended to cover that land bounded by Wellington Street, Roe Street, Melbourne Road, and Pier Street, portion is held under Certificate of Title by resumption and the balance is held under reservation.
- (2) (a) No, providing building and/or zoning by-laws are observed,
(b) No, the authority to lease is provided in section 63 of the Government Railways Act.
(c) Land held under Certificate of Title would only require clearance under section 29 of the Public Works Act.

Disposal of land on which the section of railway described in the first schedule of the Perth Regional Railway Act is located, would be subject to further Parliamentary approval as provided in subsection (2) of section 5 of that Act.

Land held under reserve and no longer required for railway purposes reverts to the Crown for further disposition by the Lands Department.

7. CENTRAL BUS STATION

Cost, Builder, and Permanency

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the estimated cost of the recently completed central bus station?
- (2) What was the final cost?
- (3) Who built the station?
- (4) Is it still considered these are temporary premises only?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) \$532,900.
- (2) Cost is not yet finalised but it is expected to be approximately \$540,000.
- (3) The Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust.
- (4) It is not considered these are temporary premises.

8. CENTRAL BUS STATION

Location and Purpose

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will he advise the exact location on the Perth regional railway plan of the bus station situated in Wellington Street near William Street?

- (2) Will he also advise the detail of purposes for this bus station and other facilities?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Perth Regional Railway Act and associated plans have no legal connection with the location of the bus station. Drawing No. 2 which was displayed in Parliament House for the information of Members, shows the location of the bus station on railway land north of Wellington Street.
- (2) The bus station was built to provide the new terminal for all buses previously terminating in Murray Street.

I would seek leave to table drawing No. 2 referred to in the answer.

The drawing was tabled (see paper No. 77).

9. CHANNEL 7 STADIUM

Construction on Railway Land

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Will he give complete details (including location on the Perth regional railway plan) of the proposed stadium to be erected by Channel 7 on railway land in the centre of Perth, including details of lease or purchase agreement, cost of building, proposed area involved, parking to be supplied, etc.?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

As I have already stated, the final details of this project are still being examined. However, a plan

indicating the location of the stadium is available, and I ask leave to table it.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 76).

10. RAILWAYS

Land at Bridge Street

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

What is to happen to the land that contained the railway accounts buildings in Bridge Street, Perth?

Mr. MAY replied:

At an appropriate time the land will be disposed of; meanwhile it is being made revenue producing for car parking purposes for a period of three years.

11. RAILWAYS

Deficit: Concessions

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Apart from losses by the railways as shown in the answer to question 49 on 21st March, 1973 will the Minister advise all other amounts not shown, such as—

- (a) school children's concessions;
- (b) pensioners concessions;
- (c) staff concessions;
- (d) concessions to industries, etc. for the years, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972?

Mr. MAY replied:

Year ended 31st December

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
(a) School children's concessions	76,615	75,606	76,255	87,542	92,638
(b) Pensioners concessions	180,970	184,069	231,017	279,269	411,048
(c) Staff concessions	This information is not available and accordingly no allowance is made in the earnings, for concessions of this nature.				
(d) Concessions to industries etc. (estimated calendar year totals based on actuals for the financial years concerned)	424,070	403,770	363,830	350,670	342,720
Other freight and fare concessions (including Parliamentary services)	179,542	173,858	176,863	167,698	183,021
Total	\$861,197	\$837,303	\$847,965	\$885,179	\$1,029,427

12. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

Losses: Concessions

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Apart from losses by the M.T.T. as shown in the answer to question 50 on 21st March, 1973, will the Minister advise other amounts not shown but written off to Treasury or other departments, such as—

- (a) school children concessions;
 - (b) pensioners concessions;
 - (c) staff concessions,
- for the years 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (a) School children concessions—
 - 1968—442,465
 - 1969—460,607
 - 1970—375,070
 - 1971—339,860
 - 1972—335,170
- (b) Pensioner concessions—
 - 1968—571,075
 - 1969—576,590
 - 1970—671,435
 - 1971—714,730
 - 1972—1,314,785
- (c) Staff concessions—
 - 1968—Nil
 - 1969—Nil
 - 1970—Nil
 - 1971—Nil
 - 1972—Nil

The above amounts were included in figures given in the answer to question 50 on 21st March, 1973.

13. RAILWAYS

Freights: Increase

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

In view of the alarming increase in the railway deficit will the Minister advise whether or not rail freights will be increased in 1973?

Mr. MAY replied:

There is no current intention to increase rail freights.

14. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

Fares: Increase

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

In view of the large deficit being incurred by the M.T.T., will the Minister advise whether or not there will be a fare increase in 1973?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

There is no current intention to increase M.T.T. fares.

Bus fares, in company with other charges, will naturally be reviewed when the estimates are next under consideration.

15. SUPERPHOSPHATE WORKS AT MERREDIN

Effect on Price

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Will the proposed superphosphate works at Merredin result in a reduction in the price of superphosphate to primary producers in—
 - (a) the Merredin district;
 - (b) the rest of the State?
- (2) If so, what is the estimated reduction and what will bring this about?
- (3) If it will result in an increase in the price of superphosphate to the Merredin district or other part of the State, will he give details?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) (a) The selling price of superphosphate from the proposed inland works will be established by the management of the co-operative. Based on current in-season prices, the Davy Ashmore study indicates the farmer would pay approximately the same as at present, but would gain the convenience of obtaining superphosphate on demand on his own vehicle, and at the end of the financial year could expect a rebate commencing the second year of production and rising to \$7.50 per ton after the fifteenth year of operation.
- (b) This remains to be seen.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The abovementioned study estimated an increase in price of superphosphate from the existing producer to farmers not participating in the co-operative, approaching \$1 per ton.

16. HOUSING

Rental and Purchase Homes: Outstanding Applications

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Housing:

How many applicants remain unsatisfied for—

- (a) single unit aged;
- (b) single unit working women's rental and purchase accommodation?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(a) Outstanding rental applications male and female, at 28th February, 1973	1,495
Less estimated wastage (withdrawal of applications)	69
Estimated real demand	1,426
(b) Outstanding rental applications at 28th February, 1973	121
Less estimated wastage (withdrawal of applications)	9
Estimated real demand	112

The commission does not accept purchase applications from applicants in these categories.

17. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Next Phase

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) If the estimated cost of proposed phase 3 of the comprehensive water supply scheme is \$7 million and the plan to be followed is that contained in the 1968 submission to the Commonwealth Government, will he explain in some detail why it is necessary, as advised in reply to question 4 on Tuesday, 20th March, that the joint view on a new approach by the Department of Agriculture and the Public Works Department is likely to take several months from the present date?
- (2) Is a commencement to be made on phase 3 immediately following the completion of phase 2 in May 1973—the date being that advised in *The West Australian* of 9th February?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) If so, what is the estimated expenditure and programme of works?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) If the Commonwealth Government reconsiders its decision in respect to the 1968 submission this work could proceed as phase 3 of the comprehensive water supply scheme at short notice.
However, in the light of the existing rejection of the proposed phase 3 a review of future priorities in terms likely to be acceptable to

the Commonwealth Government is necessary. The assembling and assessment of the necessary information by the Agriculture Department to determine the priorities of districts in terms of their needs together with the appraising of these priorities in terms of practical engineering difficulties can be brought to a satisfactory conclusion only if carried out carefully and without undue haste. In any case, as the last remaining work in phase 2 is not to be carried out until the 1973-74 financial year, the timing of investigations of future alternatives is acceptable.

- (2) The article in *The West Australian* was slightly misleading. The farmlands reticulation only will be complete in May. The upgrading of the Katanning main, which will be the last stage of the phase 2, will not be complete until December 1973. The commencement of the proposed phase 3, or any alternatives, are subject to the necessary finance being made available.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) \$7,000,000 for the 1968 submission. Not yet known for alternatives.

18.

CHILD WELFARE

"Latch-key" Children

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

- (1) Whilst it gives some little satisfaction to know that "the Department is aware of, and concerned with" the problem posed by the latch-key children, will the Minister advise if the extent of the Government's interest in this matter is limited by its assistance to—
 - (a) advice and financial assistance for the employment of play leaders at a local primary school; and
 - (b) the offer of \$500 to the Mosman Park Council when play leaders are found for the implementation of the Council's project?
- (2) What is the local primary school mentioned by him in reply to question 9 on Wednesday, 21st March?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The Government expresses concern because as yet there is no definite solution to the problem posed by latch-key children.

This problem derives from the working mother, but is not entirely limited to her. The number of mothers taking employment outside the home is increasing rapidly.

The role of the State at this point is experimental. Support for the early developments at Millen and Mosman Park has been given to test the effectiveness of different types of physical care.

State Government finances are limited and at this stage assistance has been confined to experimentation.

As further knowledge is gained regarding the effectiveness of various programmes, greater Government involvement is anticipated.

- (2) The school mentioned on 21/3/73 was the Millen Primary School, East Victoria Park.

19. ABORIGINES

Facilities and Benefits

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Can he say what facilities or benefits apply to Aborigines in Western Australia that do not apply to non-coloured people?
- (2) Can he say what facilities or benefits apply to non-coloured people in Western Australia that do not apply to Aborigines?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) By and large Aborigines in Western Australia are entitled to the same facilities and benefits which apply to the community generally. However it is accepted by both the Federal and State Governments that because of the legal, economic and social deprivation which Aborigines have experienced in the past, special assistance is required at this time if they are ever to overcome these disadvantages. Such special benefits are:—

STATE

Housing:

Transitional type housing; concessional rentals at a reducing scale for some conventional type houses, terminating as the economic rental is reached in each case.

Special Legislative provisions:

Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act provides for the economic, social and cultural advancement of persons of Aboriginal descent in Western Australia.

Aboriginal Heritage Act provides for the preservation of places and objects customarily used by or traditional to the original inhabitants of Australia or their descendants.

Electoral Act exempts Aborigines from compulsory enrolment, though once enrolled compulsory voting provisions apply.

Fauna Conservation Act includes a provision enabling Aborigines to take fauna for food in certain circumstances. A decision has also been made to restrict to Aborigines for a period of five years the issue of licenses to farm turtles and crocodiles.

Fisheries Act permits Aborigines to obtain, in their accustomed manner, fish for food.

FEDERAL

Financial grants to State Government:

The Commonwealth Government makes financial grants to supplement normal State expenditure on housing, health and education.

Community group work:

Special grants to voluntary organisations.

Education:

Secondary education grants; study grants; hostel accommodation; pre-school education facilities and services; research grants; community development facilities.

Employment and industry:

Financial grants and loans to promote individual and group economic enterprises; alleviation of unemployment through finance for special work projects administered by government and semi-government agencies; vocational training facilities.

Preservation of Aboriginal culture:

Special grants to the Western Australian Museum; finance applied through the Aboriginal Theatre Foundation.

- (2) It is now a statutory requirement in Western Australia that any facilities or services provided from State Funds must be provided to persons of Aboriginal descent in like manner as they are to persons generally. Thus there are no State facilities or services available to non-Aborigines which are not available to Aborigines.

20. ABORIGINES

Number in Western Australia

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) How many Aborigines live in Western Australia?
- (2) How many of these live in remote areas?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) It is estimated that there are some 30,000 persons in Western Australia wholly or partly of Aboriginal descent.
- (2) If the following localities are accepted as those generally classified as remote areas the approximate Aboriginal populations are:—

Kalumburu Mission	180
Balgo Mission	280
Warburton Ranges Mission	350
Cundeelee Mission	250
Wingellina	50
Desert areas	40

As interpretations of remote areas can differ, however, attention is invited to appendix No. 2 at page 39 of the annual report of the Commissioner of Native Welfare for the year ended 30th June, 1972, a copy of which is tabled herewith.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 78).

21. ABORIGINES

Facilities and Benefits

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) How much was expended on facilities and benefits for Aborigines in Western Australia in 1972?
- (2) What is the expected expenditure in 1973?
- (3) Will he give a break-up of the above figures?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Expenditure processed through the Department of Native Welfare during the year ended 30th June, 1972 totalled:—

State Government funds \$3,922,500.
Commonwealth Government funds \$2,500,000.

- (2) Following the devolution of functions to the appropriate State departments and the discontinuance of the Department of Native Welfare as from 30th June, 1972, the precise corresponding estimate of expenditure of State Government funds for the year ending 30th June, 1973 is not available,

but it would be of the order of \$4,000,000, of which the approved estimate of expenditure by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority is \$575,000.

The corresponding total from the Commonwealth Government is \$6,886,000.

- (3) The break-up of the expenditure by the Department of Native Welfare to 30th June, 1972 is shown in appendices 9 and 11 at pages 46 and 47 of the annual report for that year of the Commissioner of Native Welfare, a copy of which has already been tabled in connection with question 20.

For the reasons indicated in item 2, it is not possible to give a break-up of expenditure processed through other State departments, as comprehensive separate records of expenditure in respect of Aborigines are not maintained. So far as the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority is concerned the anticipated expenditure of \$575,000 in the year ending 30th June, 1973 is made up as follows:—

Head office administration (responsible for the overall management, accounting and recording of the functional activities of the authority)	149,900
Anthropology section (responsible for cultural matters and professional functions)	203,100
Community liaison section (responsible for the Aboriginal consultative process and community development and educational programmes)	56,000
Economic liaison section (responsible for the promotion of Aboriginal group and individual economic enterprises and special projects)	117,000
Lands and reserves section (responsible for servicing the Aboriginal Lands Trust and administration of reserved lands vested in the Authority)	27,000
Regional extension section (responsible for the decentralised application of the Authority's functions)	203,100
Total	575,000

The break-up of Commonwealth funds made available to the State Government for the benefit of Aborigines is:—

	1971/72	1972/73 (estimated)
	\$	\$
Housing	1,245,000	4,000,000
Health	285,000	930,000
Education	316,000	536,000
Employment	550,000	175,000
Special work projects	27,000	691,000
Regional projects	77,000	554,000
	<u>2,500,000</u>	<u>6,886,000</u>

In addition to the above detailed figures the Commonwealth Government makes financial contributions in the fields of education, employment and community group activities which are not processed through State Government authorities and details of such expenditure are therefore not available.

22. BUNBURY TOWN

*Government Expenditure,
1966 to 1972*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Does he know and, if so, will he advise how much Government expenditure has been placed in the Town of Bunbury for the following years—

- (a) 1966;
- (b) 1967;
- (c) 1968;
- (d) 1969;
- (e) 1970;
- (f) 1971;
- (g) 1972?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

This information is not available as Government expenditure is not classified according to local government areas.

23. PRISONS

Number of Inmates

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many people are being detained in Western Australian prisons?
- (2) Of these how many are—
 - (a) men;
 - (b) women?
- (3) What number of the people mentioned in each of 2 (a) and (b) are Aborigines?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) 1,312.
 - (2) (a) 1,238.
(b) 74.
 - (3) Separate statistics for Aborigines have not been kept since 1st July, 1971.
- Additionally, there are approximately 200 sentenced prisoners in Police Lock-ups throughout the State awaiting transfer to Department of Corrections' institutions (sex not specified).

24. HOUSING

Lockridge Area: Open Drains

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Are any plans being made to enable sumps and open drains in Lockridge housing area to be filled in or piped?
- (2) At what stage are negotiations (if any)?
- (3) Is the commission aware of the great concern of many parents with young children at the danger from open drains at Lockridge?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) and (2) The main drainage channels and the compensatory basins were provided at commission cost and to the design and construction requirements of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board, and the local authority in which authorities they are now vested in accordance with the Town Planning Board approval to this project. The intent is to maintain the compensatory basins as ornamental unfenced lakes within the public open space.
- (3) The commission was made aware of the earlier concern of some tenants and in instances where enquiry has been made of the commission, the enquirer has been referred to the above authorities. However, since his appointment to Lockridge in May, 1972, the estates officer has not received any complaints of this nature.

25. GOVERNOR STIRLING HIGH SCHOOL *Land-fill Scheme*

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) At what stage is the planning at Governor Stirling high school, West Midland, on the landfill scheme near the river?
- (2) Is the Swan shire assisting in the landfill scheme?
- (3) Will the landfill scheme be finalised before the 1974 school year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Stage I, i.e. the north eastern section is being filled at present.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. Present indications are that this will be a three to five year project.

26. LOCKRIDGE SCHOOL

Sports Ground

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any discussion taken place between the M.W.S.S. & D. Board and the Education Department regarding the piping of open drains adjoining Lockridge school to allow additional playgrounds?
- (2) (a) If so, at what stage are plans;
(b) if not, will early action be taken to close open drains to provide extra playground area?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) There are no plans.
(b) No. It is understood the Education Department has been unable to give this proposed work priority for financial reasons.

27. HOUSEBOATS

Licenses and Use

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) How many houseboats are licensed at present to use the waterways of the Peel Inlet, Harvey Estuary, Murray and Serpentine Rivers?
- (2) Is it anticipated to license more houseboats?
- (3) Is he aware that houseboats being hired by various people without knowledge of regulations and skill often constitute grave hazards, especially on narrow river branches?
- (4) Is he aware that the mooring of houseboats at river banks results in the breaking of trees, ruining reeds and other flora, interferes with bird nesting, and also constitutes a health hazard and causes litter to proliferate?
- (5) If so, will he consider allowing houseboats only to moor at private jetties, and not to license more houseboats?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) There is a license for six houseboats in the area referred to. At the present time there are four in operation.

(2) At this time, no.

(3) No. The regulations and survey governing the licensing of houseboats restricts the possible speed of these vessels to 8 knots.

They are large, easily seen and do not constitute a danger to other boat traffic or special hazard to swimmers.

There have been no complaints in this regard.

(4) There is no awareness of interference with trees and reed growth at this time. An inspection of the area over a period 12th-17th March, 1973, revealed that there is abundant bird life in the area and a great deal of nesting in the reeds was in evidence.

(5) Without the permission of the licensee, vessels may not moor at private jetties. The issue of any license in addition to the six already authorised would be the subject of an investigation and recommendation by the Houseboat Committee.

28.

BOATS

Speed Restrictions

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that ever increasing motor boat traffic is a serious danger to natural flora and fauna at the Murray and Serpentine Rivers, especially through the wash caused by some boats even within the eight knots speed limit?
- (2) If so, would he consider reducing the speed limit on these rivers to four knots (as it has been done on the upper reaches of the two rivers) which would somewhat lessen the danger and keep away boats which are hard to manoeuvre under the speed of eight knots?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) In all restricted waterways there is danger of the wash from boat traffic interfering with the natural vegetation of river banks. There is very minor evidence of this in the Murray and Serpentine Rivers at this time, with the exception of a few isolated places in the narrower channels in the delta area of the Murray.

(2) The suggested restriction of speed is receiving consideration by the Peel Inlet Conservation Advisory Committee in conjunction with the Harbour and Light Department.

29. CHILD WELFARE

State Wards: Weekly Cost

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

- (1) What is the cost (other than capital expenditure) to the State to maintain a ward per week in Government institutions, such as Longmore, Bridgewater and others?
- (2) Would he elaborate on the factors included in the cost queried in (1)?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

For the sake of clarity the answers to questions (1) and (2) need to be combined.

The department does not keep separate costs for wards and non-wards in institutions. The figures given are for total populations, exclusive of salaries.

The cost to maintain a child per week in a Government institution such as Longmore, Bridgewater and others is approximately \$18, e.g. Longmore \$18; Riverbank \$17.50; Bridgewater \$18.

The cost per child for salaries varies with the type of institution. Maximum security treatment centres are the most expensive.

Nyandi costs \$122 per week.

Riverbank costs \$112 per week.

Longmore costs \$104 per week.

Open assessment and treatment centres average \$70 per week per child.

The above costs per inmate for salaries do not reflect the true costs because they include the cost of supervising the children on after-care and on trial leave.

For instance, Riverbank has 46 inmates but also supports 110 wards in the community.

On this basis the salary cost per week per child is \$33 and for Nyandi it is \$35.

The costs include transport expenses, medical, dental and optical examinations and treatment fees; also clothing and other incidental expenses.

They also include the costs of community projects and research projects undertaken by the Institutions.

30. SPORTING COMPLEX

Duncraig

Mr. LAPHAM, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Is the land east of the junction of the southern side of Warwick Road and Marmion Avenue, Duncraig, undergoing planning for development?
- (2) If so, is an area of 60 acres or thereabouts to be set aside for development as a sporting complex?
- (3) If "Yes" what stage has been reached in the planning?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes. A plan for the subdivision and development of this land is being prepared.
- (2) An area of approximately 62 acres for recreation and municipal purposes has been suggested in the preliminary design.
- (3) The planning of this area is still at a preliminary stage.

31. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Tower Bases: Guildford Grammar School

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Further to the reply given to question 13 on 21st March, will he state the reason why tower bases for the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line have been constructed on Guildford Grammar School property when no similar work has been done within a 20-mile radius of the school?
- (2) Was the obviously premature construction of the bases in the school grounds prompted by a desire to effect a *jait accompli* when it was known that the school council intended taking legal action?
- (3) What is the approximate cost of the construction work so far done by the State Electricity Commission on Guildford Grammar School property?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) and (2) The State Electricity Commission has informed Guildford Grammar School that as far as was practicable, construction work would be performed at times which would cause least inconvenience. To that end, this work was programmed for and performed during the school long vacation.
- (3) Approximately \$17,000.

32. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

E.P.T. Contract

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What was the negotiated contract price of work being done by E.P.T. on the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line?
- (2) Was the contract negotiated on a fixed price basis or are there rise and fall provisions?
- (3) If rise and fall conditions apply, what are the conditions and by how much has the original price varied?
- (4) Has the negotiated contract price varied for any other reason; if so, by how much and for what reasons?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) The negotiated contract is a schedule of rates contract for types of towers and foundations and for stringing of the conductor.
At the time of negotiation the numbers and types of towers and foundations and the amount of stringing disclosed by the preliminary surveys gave a basic tender figure of \$7,689,897.04. This was and is subject to variation, for the work actually to be performed, in accordance with the specified and agreed schedules of rates.
- (2) On a "rise and fall" basis.
- (3) (a) In accordance with the standard practice of the commission in all cases where contracts provide for increased costs of labour and materials. The details are completed and will be explained at the office of the commission if required.
(b) No claim has been submitted to date.
- (4) See (1) above.

33. TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL BUILDING

R. & I. Bank Guarantee

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) With reference to the answers given to question 20, 20th March, 1973, does the Government intend and expect to give a guarantee and/or a loan by the Rural and Industries Bank (or other lender) for the construction of an office block building for the Trades and Labor Council (or the appropriate associated body)?
- (2) (a) Has the project proceeded or is it expected to proceed;
(b) if so, when?

- (3) If it has proceeded or is intended to proceed, is it still anticipated that the Government will be a major tenant?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) A guarantee is to be given.
- (2) (a) Yes.
(b) The old building was removed in January, 1973 in preparation for new construction.
- (3) Yes.

34. AVERAGE WAGE

Statement by Premier

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

What is the reason for his statement in his letter to the Editor of *The West Australian* of 10th March, 1973 in which he says "... the average wage in Western Australia is the second lowest in the Commonwealth ..." and quotes the *Australian Financial Review* of 6th March, 1973 as his authority when that publication lists Western Australia as third highest and higher than Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I have to inform the House I was misinformed in respect of the wages situation in Western Australia relating to other Australian States.

Western Australia was placed second-last on a list of the States, giving respective wage levels, although, in amount, it was two levels higher.

Nevertheless, the wage increase in Western Australia in that quarter, as reported in *The Financial Review*, was the lowest in the Commonwealth, which even more dramatically underlines the point I wish to make regarding wages and prices ... the wage rise being the lowest in Australia, and the rise in prices being the highest.

35. INLAND SUPERPHOSPHATE WORKS

Conditions of Government Guarantee

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

With reference to the Government's announced willingness to guarantee a substantial part of the funds required for an inland superphosphate works, will he advise the conditions which have been laid down by the Government as prerequisites to the issue of the guarantee?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Conditions are:—

- (1) Adequate guaranteed support of farmers.
- (2) Evidence of potential markets.
- (3) Confirmation of the Davy Ashmore report of capital and operating costs.

36. TRANSPORT

Vehicle Standards Committee

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

- (1) What was the date of formation of the committee which has been charged with investigating the desirability of an amendment to the Vehicle Standards Regulations limit of 14 feet in height, as referred to in answer to question 22 on 21st March, 1973?
- (2) Who are the members of the committee?
- (3) Who has been selected to represent the interests of Western Australian cattle road train operators?
- (4) Who is the Western Australian based owner with a vehicle which does not comply with existing State traffic regulations?
- (5) In what respects does the vehicle not conform?
- (6) In what area is the vehicle operated?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 19th March, 1973.
- (2) The Director-General of Transport as chairman, and representatives of the Main Roads Department, Police Department, Pastoralists and Graziers Association.
- (3) No one at present but the committee has the right to co-opt any member it finds necessary and it will no doubt select a representative of the Western Australian cattle road train operators.
- (4) O.D. transport.
- (5) Height only. (Two units which are 14' 8" at the front, reducing to 13' 9" at the rear are in use by O.D. transport. These are to be reduced to 14' 6" by removal of part of the catwalk.)
- (6) Carting cattle from northern areas to Esperance.

37. SCHOOLS

Kimberley: Showering Facilities

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What showering facilities have been provided in the Government schools at—
(a) Kimberley Downs;

(b) Camballin;

(c) Gogo;

(d) Fitzroy Crossing;

(e) Christmas Creek?

- (2) In instances where facilities are inadequate will he authorise early installation in order that teaching staff at the schools can assist Aboriginal children by encouraging health and cleanliness habits?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) Kimberley Downs school was closed at the end of 1969.
(b) Camballin—nil.
(c) Gogo—2 boys and 2 girls' showers.
(d) Fitzroy Crossing—nil.
(e) Christmas Creek—2 boys and 2 girls' showers.
- (2) The provision of showering facilities at Camballin and Fitzroy Crossing will be considered in the 1973-74 building programme, but provision of the above facilities must be considered in the light of other urgent accommodation needs and the extent of funds available.

38.

EDUCATION

Correspondence Courses

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it permissible for children of European descent to undertake their education by correspondence in lieu of attending a "special Aboriginal school"?

- (2) If "No" will he indicate why not?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Only if special extenuating circumstances prevail.
- (2) These schools are properly constituted under the Education Act, they are staffed by trained teachers under the professional guidance of the district superintendent and are required to make proper provision for the educational needs of all pupils enrolled.

Correspondence education is made available to pupils who are not within daily reach of a school or who may be studying special subjects at secondary level.

39. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Financial Operations

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What has been the scale of charges applying to water usage within the bounds of the comprehensive water scheme since its inception?

- (2) What was the revenue from the sale of water last year within the bounds of the comprehensive water scheme?
- (3) What has been the cost of upkeep of the comprehensive water scheme regarding—
 - (a) labour component;
 - (b) material;
 - (c) pumping,
 for the last three years?
- (4) What is the estimated finance needed to complete the whole of the area as yet unserved within the bounds of the original comprehensive water scheme?
- (5) What finance is immediately needed to repair and upgrade pipelines within the bounds of the comprehensive water scheme (original scheme) that are being deferred because of the lack of finance?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) On 1st January 1965, uniform charges were introduced for water consumed under the various classifications and these are:

Domestic purposes—

First 60,000 gallons, 20 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Next 40,000 gallons, 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Over 100,000 gallons, 30 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Commercial purposes—

First 60,000 gallons, 20 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Next 40,000 gallons, 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Over 100,000 gallons, 30 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Over 200,000 gallons, 40 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Industrial purposes—

All water consumed 40 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Mining and stock-watering purposes—

All water consumed 55 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Land used by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd for the purpose of the storage of grain—

All water consumed 55 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Farmland purposes—

First 60,000 gallons, 20 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Next 40,000 gallons, 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Over 100,000 gallons, 55 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Irrigation purposes—Vegetable and fruit growing for market—

First 60,000 gallons, 20 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Next 40,000 gallons, 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Over 100,000 gallons, 27.5 cents per 1,000 gallons.

All water in excess of agreed annual quota—

55 cents per 1,000 gallons.

General purposes—all water consumed, 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Prior to 1st January, 1965, there were differential charges for excess water and differential water allowances in return for rates paid for individual rating zones and the range of excess water charges and water allowances for the various classifications were—

Domestic purposes—

Excess water charges—From 20 cents to 35 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Water allowance—1,000 gallons for from each 25 cents to 45 cents of rates paid.

Trading purposes—

Excess water charges—From 20 cents to 60 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Water allowance—1,000 gallons for from each 25 cents to 45 cents of rates paid.

Farmland purposes—

Excess water charges—From 20 cents to 40 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Water allowance—1,000 gallons for from each 20 cents to 40 cents of rates paid.

Market gardens and irrigation purposes—

Excess water charges—From 13 cents to 20 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Water allowance—1,000 gallons for from each 38 cents to 45 cents of rates paid.

- (2) Revenue from water sales for the 12 months ended 30th June, 1972, was \$702,692.
- (3) Information not available from accounting records currently being maintained.
- (4) Of the order of \$50,000,000.
- (5) Finance is available for immediate repairs from the annual vote. Up-grading of sub-standard mains is progressing subject to priorities and available funds. On the loan proposals for 1973-74 a total sum of \$785,000 has been requested for this work.

QUESTIONS (11): WITHOUT NOTICE**1. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR***Reinstatement of Former Employees*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

I wish to direct a question without notice to the Premier.

Mr. Graham: Not about Ustasha, I hope.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr. Speaker, I hope you are taking note of some of the comments made on the other side of the Chamber. They are very undesirable. If they persist, we will do something about it. My question is as follows—

- (1) (a) Were representations made to him, or his ministerial colleagues, from the Trades and Labor Council, or any other quarter, for the reinstatement at the Midland abattoir of two former employees of the Midland abattoir who were previously prominent in strike activity;
- (b) If so, from what source were the representations made?
- (2) (a) What action was taken by him, or his Government, following such representation;
- (b) did he, or any other Minister, make a request or give a direction to the Midland abattoir that the two former employees be reinstated;
- (c) if so, what was the form of this request, or direction, and was it in the form of a request or a direction?
- (3) (a) Did he, or any of his ministerial colleagues, interview the management and/or board (or representatives of the management and/or board), with senior representatives of the Trades and Labor Council present, for the purpose of either requesting or directing the management and/or board to reinstate the two former employees;
- (b) if so, when did such a meeting take place, and where?

(4) When were the two former employees dismissed from the Midland abattoir and/or any other employer, and for what reasons?

(5) Was their case for reinstatement considered by the Industrial Commission and rejected by the commission?

(6) If, in fact, the Premier and/or any of his ministerial colleagues made direct representations in this matter, why were such representations made?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) T.L.C.
- (2) (a) Two discussions were held in my office with the chairman of the abattoir board and the manager of the Midland abattoir, in the presence of the Minister for Agriculture. On the first occasion, the President and Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council were also present.
- (b) A request was made by me that consideration be given to the re-employment of the two men concerned but at neither meeting was there any suggestion that a direction was being given.
- (c) The request was that the situation be explored to ascertain the possibilities of re-employing the men.
- (3) (a) Yes, for the purpose of discussing the possibility of re-employing the two men.
- (b) In the Premier's office on the 1st March.
- (4) Mr. Poulsen was dismissed in December, 1970, following a disturbance in his section of the works when, without authority, he called for an unlawful cessation of work by employees. With regard to Mr. Skipworth's dismissal, see answer to part (5) of this question.
- (5) An inquiry was held by the Industrial Commission into the circumstances of Mr. Poulsen's dismissal, and the board's action was upheld. Mr. Skipworth was one of 173 workers dismissed in November, 1969, for refusing

to accept a supervisor's direction to work. The case was considered by the Industrial Commission, which directed that the workers be allowed to return to work without loss of benefits, provided they returned within a prescribed period. Mr. Skipworth did not return within the prescribed period, and verbally advised a senior management official that he would not be returning to the Midland abattoir.

- (6) I do not consider that punishment for a misdemeanour, or failure to conform, should follow a person to the grave, and it is not out of place to apply, at times, a little of the milk of human kindness.

2. TRADE UNIONS

Blackmail and Intimidation: Allegations

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Labour:

On Friday, the 23rd March, *The West Australian* carried as the first story on page 1 allegations made in this House of trade union blackmail and intimidation.

On Saturday, the 24th March, in the same position but at greater length on page 1, *The West Australian* published a union denial that blackmail and intimidation had been used.

Does the Minister think that the reporting of this matter was biased?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:

The Minister for Labour has asked me to request the honourable member to place the question on the notice paper.

Mr. O'Connor: He had notice of it.

3. COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

Conference of Ministers

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) As the Minister has recently returned from a Housing Ministers' conference, can he tell us the main points in dispute in respect of the attitude of the States to the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement and the attitude taken by this State in the matter?
- (2) For the benefit of the member for Mt. Hawthorn, what was the attitude of the Victorian Government in respect of entering into this agreement?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Briefly, there were some points of difference. Mainly, some States felt the funds made available for housing might be taken into consideration too much when it came to the allocation of loan funds to the States. They require clarification on this point. The other main point at issue was that of eligibility. The States could not agree on an eligibility wage. The general outcome of the discussions—which I might mention were really quite amicable—was that a working committee would look into the specific matters and discuss them in more detail at a conference to be held in Adelaide on the 5th and 6th April.
- (2) The attitude of the Victorian Minister was his usual attitude.

4.

EDUCATION

Boarding-away-from-home Allowance

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

Pursuant to the Commonwealth assuming the responsibility for boarding allowances for school children, what is the approximate saving to this State—

- (a) for the second half of the current financial year;
- (b) for 1973-74?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (a) \$165,000.
- (b) \$923,000.

5.

CROATIAN EXTREMIST GROUP

Evidence of Existence

Mr. BURKE, to the Premier: Referring to the statement of the Federal Attorney-General in the Senate today—

- (1) Will he ascertain if any Croatian extremist group is active in Western Australia?
- (2) If there is evidence of the existence of such an element, will he assure the House action will be taken to curb their activities to protect the interests of all Western Australians, and particularly those good citizens of Yugoslav and Croatian descent living in Western Australia?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) I have no reason to believe that such a group exists here, but in view of the disclosures made in the Senate today by Senator Murphy, it is proposed to have inquiries made.
- (2) Yes.

6. TRANSPORT WORKERS' UNION

Members: Preference and Protection

Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is he aware the Secretary of the Transport Workers' Union (Mr. Cowles) when attending a meeting of owner-drivers last September in a hall in Shepparton Road, Victoria Park, offered those present preference and protection on payment of the union's membership fee?
- (2) Is he aware Mr. Cowles explained his union's protection was to be implemented by drivers carrying evidence of union membership to be loaded and others picketed and refused?
- (3) As Mr. Cowles is reported to have acknowledged acting in this way, will he and his Government condemn this strong-arm tactic as objectionable and repugnant to the democratic Australian way of life and contrary to the rights of the individual?
- (4) Does he consider the T.W.U.'s blackmailing tactic a form of compulsory unionism?
- (5) Because persons, other than unions, found by the police to be intimidating members of the public by blackmail would be charged with extortion, will he and his Government have this growing sinister practice vigorously stamped out before it effectively spreads to control the media and curtail other basic freedoms?
- (6) As this forced unionism is of direct benefit to the Labor Party, will he act to remove this vested interest?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:

- (1) to (6) I suggest that the honourable member, having obtained such publicity as he can at this stage, will get a double issue by placing the question on the notice paper.

7. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

Reinstatement of Former Employees

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

I refer to my earlier question without notice. The answer given makes it clear, and is emphatic on the point, that no direction was given; but in *The West Australian* on the 21st February, 1973, Mr. Coleman, of the T.L.C., is reported as saying, amongst other things: "He also told the meeting that the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, had said the Midland

abattoir would be directed to re-employ two men who were prominent in the 1970 meat strike. The men had been blacklisted in the meat industry since then." Does this mean Mr. Coleman's statement to the T.L.C. was inaccurate?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I point out that I accept no responsibility for newspaper reports of what other people say. If the newspapers report me incorrectly, I have the opportunity to make a correction. I am not obliged to check on the newspaper reports of what other people say in order to establish whether what has been reported is true or false.

8. TRANSPORT WORKERS' UNION

Compulsory Unionism

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is compulsory unionism applicable to T.W.U. awards?
 - (2) If so, does this apply to owner-drivers?
 - (3) Are owner-drivers legally permitted to be members of the T.W.U.?
- Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:
- (1) to (3) I suggest the question be placed on the notice paper.

9. TRADE UNIONS

Blackmail and Intimidation: Allegations

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Labour:

I wish to ask a question without notice of the Minister for Labour.

Point of Order

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it competent for a member to address a question without notice to a Minister who is not here?

Mr. Rushton: Why is he not here?

Sir Charles Court: You can address it to the Premier, if you like.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Housing is representing the Minister for Labour tonight, and if a question which he cannot answer is directed to him he can ask for it to be put on the notice paper.

Questions without notice resumed

Mr. O'CONNOR: My question is as follows—

Will he investigate and report to this House on allegations of blackmail or intimidation by unions to the following—

Mr. Graham: Ustasha!

Mr. O'CONNOR: Here we go again—the Deputy Premier cannot help himself.

Mr. Graham: You do not like the sound of the word.

Mr. O'CONNOR: To continue—

Mr. Vic Clements, Neptune agent at Bunbury, Mr. M. E. Myles, Shell agent at Bunbury, Mr. R. Hart, fuel agent at Karridale, L. J. Wellard and Co., Caltex agent at Bindoon, Mr. Leonardi, fuel distributor at Collie, C. J. & A. L. Ferris, BP agent at Busselton.

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:

In fairness to the honourable member, I should have mentioned earlier that the Minister for Labour informed me he had been given some notice of these questions. However, as he requires more time to investigate the issue, he requests that the questions be placed on the notice paper.

Mr. O'Connor: I asked him to look at it.

10. AVERAGE WAGE

Statement by Premier

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier: Question 34 today referred to a statement made by the Premier in a letter to the editor of *The West Australian*. The Premier replied to my question, and I now wish to refer to the last paragraph of his reply which reads as follows—

Nevertheless, the wage increase in Western Australia in that quarter, as reported in *The Financial Review*, was the lowest in the Commonwealth, which even more dramatically underlines the point I wish to make regarding wages and prices . . . the wage rise being the lowest in Australia, and the rise in prices being the highest.

Does not the Premier know that during the year 1972, the percentage price rise in Western Australia was the lowest in all the Australian States, and .4 per cent. lower than the price controlled State of South Australia? Prices rose by 4 per cent. in Western Australia and by 4.4 per cent. in South Australia.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

For the sake of accuracy, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to put the question on the notice paper.

11. MINISTER FOR LABOUR

Absence from the House

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that notice was given to the Minister for Labour of three questions which are of great importance to the House and to the public, will the Premier advise what important business has drawn the Minister for Labour away from the House and caused neglect and delay in answering important questions?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I am most anxious to satisfy the honourable member's curiosity. However, in order that he may be given an accurate answer, I ask him to put the question on the notice paper.

Mr. O'Connor: Don't you know where he is?

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [5.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to amend three sections of the Education Act. Indeed, the Bill was introduced by the Premier on opening night to preserve the privilege of the Legislative Assembly to initiate legislation.

The relevant sections of the Education Act as mentioned in this Bill concern, in brief, aid to non-Government schools, representation on the board of secondary education, and the existing system of bonded allowances for students at teachers' colleges. I will deal with each of these items in detail and in that order.

Members will no doubt be aware that as from the beginning of this year the Commonwealth Government has undertaken to pay to non-Government schools, grants equal to 20 per cent. of the national average cost of educating a student in a Government school. The assessed average costs were \$308 per primary student and \$519 per secondary student. This State has also agreed to match the Commonwealth grant progressively.

On the basis of paying grants equal to 20 per cent. of the national average, the Commonwealth and State Governments are each required to make annual *per capita* payments of \$62 per primary student and \$104 per secondary student.

In assessing the State's commitment in this regard, it must be recognised that some forms of existing assistance already being given to non-Government schools should be offset against the new rates.

As a result it has been decided that existing *per capita* grants of \$30 per primary student and \$40 per secondary student, as well as the cost of free text books, school stocks, and other subsidy payments, should be taken into account. These items, with the exception of the *per capita* grants, are equally available to Government and to all non-Government schools and were also accepted by the Commonwealth in the determination of the national average cost.

Other forms of assistance such as bursaries, boarding allowances, transport costs, and existing interest payments on loans for boarding accommodation will not be included in the determination of the level of future State assistance to non-Government schools. In other words, schools in receipt of these particular forms of assistance will not be penalised when their levels of *per capita* grants are being assessed.

The actual additional cost of implementing the increased assistance has been calculated at \$1,360,000. The decision to apply the increase progressively does not conflict with announcements made by the Commonwealth and is in line with action proposed by the Victorian Government.

After allowing for assessed costs for items of existing assistance as previously mentioned, the balance of the *per capita* grant will be paid in two moieties of \$11.50 per primary student and \$25.50 per secondary student, commencing from the beginning of this year and the beginning of 1974.

It is well to point out that movements in the national average base cost could undoubtedly result in the impact in 1973-74 being considerably greater than that shown in figures now quoted.

With this in mind and to avoid the necessity of repeated amendments to this section of the Act, it is considered most desirable to provide in section 9B for payments as shall be prescribed to facilitate variations which will occur and be necessary for the purpose of matching Commonwealth grants in this particular instance and in the future.

The proposed amendment to subsection (2) of section 21E has been necessitated by recent changes to the structure of the senior administrative positions in the Education Department. The position of deputy director-general has been abolished and replaced by two positions of assistant directors-general. This subsection currently provides for the Deputy Director-General of Education to preside at any meetings of the board of secondary education from which the director-general is absent.

It is therefore necessary to delete reference to the deputy director-general and to allow for an assistant director-general to preside as required.

The third amendment has been brought about following a review of the present system of bonded allowances for students at teachers' colleges. This will result in an alternative loan scheme being available.

The object is to give students entering any of the State teachers' colleges the option of receiving financial assistance in one of the following ways—

- (a) Bonded studentships, which is the equivalent of the present system of bonded allowances and has the same rates of payment, bonded conditions, and allowances.

A student electing to accept this studentship will be bonded to the Education Department for a specific period upon completion of training.

- (b) Unbonded studentships whereby a student is not required to enter into a bond.

Assistance under this scheme will be given in the form of loans which are repayable without interest from the day of graduation from teachers' college.

To implement these proposals it has been recommended that the repeal and re-enactment of section 37A is desirable. The terms and conditions upon which loans can be offered and also the prescribed form of loan agreement would be covered by way of regulation.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: At the present time do you have any idea of the amounts available?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes.

The details of the unbonded studentship scheme covered by the required regulation are as follows—

Students electing to enter teachers' college without bonding will have all compulsory tuition fees paid and will receive a basic allowance of \$140 per year which will not be subject to repayment. No other allowances, for example, for travel, or books, will be paid.

In addition to the above non-repayable allowances, students will be eligible to receive in any one year, by agreement with the Education Department, a loan, without means test, to a maximum amount of \$700. This is equal to the living allowance set by the Commonwealth for its university scholarship scheme. Students may elect to vary the amount of the loan they wish to make in multiples of \$50 up to the specified maximum.

Sir Charles Court: Is this an annual loan?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: To continue—

Students electing to take out loans must nominate at the beginning of each year the number of \$50 loan units they wish to borrow up to the specified maximum. The amount of money so nominated will be made available in three equal instalments payable at the beginning of each term. A student who elects to take less than his annual loan entitlement, and who through changed conditions finds himself in necessitous circumstances, may make application to the Director-General of Education to be granted a supplementary loan to bring the level of his borrowings for the year to the specified maximum annual amount.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: What interest rate will be applicable?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The loans will be granted without interest. To continue—

In the case of married male students and students who are over the age of 25 years, the annual loan maximum will be increased to the amount of \$1,000, the level of the independent rate set for Commonwealth university scholarships.

Loans will be repayable without interest from the day of graduation from teachers' college. The maximum time for repayment of loans will be a period equal to one year more than the period in which the loans are received.

Only those male and single female persons who have resided in Western Australia for two years immediately prior to entry into teachers' college, who are not in receipt of any other scholarship, and who are under no contractual obligation or agreement to any other employer will be eligible to receive loans under this scheme, unless otherwise determined by the Minister.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. E. H. M. Lewis.

Message: Appropriations

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd March, on the following motion by Mr. Bateman—

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

May it please Your Excellency: We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty

to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [5.30 p.m.]: In supporting the Address-in Reply to His Excellency thanking him for the excellent Speech he was pleased to deliver here a few nights ago, I wish, in the first instance, to extend my compliments to the new member for Blackwood, both on his maiden speech, and on the rather stirring, if vociferous, contribution he made to the debate on the following day. He may not be with us for long, but so long as he is he will certainly make his impression on the House.

I also congratulate the member for Merredin-Yilgarn on his very able outline and exposition of the need, the practicability, and the inevitability of the establishment of a new industry in the Merredin-Yilgarn district. I am pleased to think that he, with the co-operation of the many admirable persons whom he named, will be able to achieve that objective despite the efforts of certain vested interests to persuade people it is impossible to have an industry in Western Australia unless it is situated on the seaboard and controlled by capitalist interests in Perth.

I pass on to consider the legislative programme which His Excellency has been pleased to outline for us. I am particularly pleased to note that several matters which are close to my heart will be dealt with in this session and I hope they will achieve legislative confirmation in the very near future. I refer first of all, as the Speech itself does, to the repeal of the Inspection of Machinery Act and the bringing forward of a new Statute to be known as the machinery safety Act.

I take it, of course, that the most valuable portion of that measure will be the regulations made pursuant to its authority. Members no doubt are cognisant of the fact that acts of this kind have statutory regulations contained within them, or they have been framed to enforce the regulations. Also it is established law that if a statutory regulation made for the protection of a worker in an industry is breached either by the employer himself or by any person for whose acts or omissions the employer is responsible, and that breach results in an injury to a worker, the worker, if he lives, is entitled automatically to damages to compensate him for the injury he has suffered. If the injury is a fatal one, his dependants within the meaning of the Fatal Accidents Act will, automatically, be paid damages to compensate them for the loss of their breadwinner.

Thence much will depend upon the nature of the regulations made by virtue of the proposed new machinery safety Act, and, of course, much will depend upon the necessary provision in that Act that such

regulations shall be statutory in the sense I have already explained. A breach of these regulations shall automatically accrue damages to the worker by reason of that breach.

That brings me to another Act which already exists and where that situation is not as clear as I would have it; not by any means. I refer to the most important safety Act relating to mineworkers; that, of course, is the Mines Regulation Act. I would certainly like to see a section of that Act deleted. At the best it is ambiguous, and at the worst, obnoxious. Section 59 (2) reads—

Nothing in this Act contained shall confer on any person a right of action which would not have accrued to him if this Act had not been passed.

This is as good as saying that this Act has been passed for the protection of workers, but no worker will get any protection under it as far as we are concerned. This Act, of course, does seek to give protection for the worker but then, deliberately, a section has been inserted which provides that the Act shall be nugatory and of no value. Therefore I hope that when the new machinery safety legislation is introduced, the Minister for Mines will also move an amendment to the Mines Regulation Act to remove this obnoxious section which would appear, at first sight, anyway, to nullify that Statute.

So much for the safety of workers. It is a question of vital interest to me, to gold-fields constituents, and to all people who work, particularly in the more hazardous and dangerous occupations throughout the State—and the number of those employees is rapidly growing—and it is one which, although it is a matter for congratulation that the number of such employees is increasing, imposes, all the more, an obligation and responsibility upon us, the law-makers in this State, to ensure greater protection to such employees by law, by precaution, and by every other device that can be provided for their safety.

Members will now be asked to consider the provision of improved long service leave conditions to the members of the Western Australian work force which, of course, is somewhat overdue. We are lagging behind with our Industrial Arbitration Act; we are lagging behind the industrial conditions of other States, and it is time we took a step forward. I therefore hope and trust a step forward will be taken this session and that we will have the co-operation of members opposite who, after all, represent as many wage earners as we do and who are, I understand, just as concerned for their safety and their welfare as the members on this side of the House. As the member for Mirrabooka has suggested by way of an aside, that may cause some hilarity, but I will give those

members on the other side of the House the benefit of the doubt and invite their co-operation to pass such legislation for the benefit of the workers.

I now come to the question of workers' compensation. It is a matter for regret, as far as I am concerned, that this matter has not been dealt with in the life of this Parliament.

Mr. O'Neil: You know that we are getting the same nonsense as we had last session dished up again.

Mr. HARTREY: I regret to hear the member for East Melville say that because I was about to pay him a compliment.

Mr. O'Neil: We had a similar amending Bill brought forward last session which was not worth 20c.

Mr. HARTREY: I cannot agree with the honourable member, but I was about to say that workers' compensation was not a subject that members of the Opposition neglected whilst they were in office, and as the member who interjected was the Minister in charge of such legislation, I compliment him for having, in the last six years of the previous Government's term of office introduced about six amending Bills and in being successful in getting them through both Houses. All of those measures were advantageous to the workers in the mining industry, so surely he will not spoil his good record by endeavouring to frustrate similar efforts by the Government during this session.

Mr. O'Neil: Similar efforts will be all right, but that is not what we will get.

Mr. HARTREY: All we got when the last amending Bill was introduced by this Government was obstruction by the then member for Bunbury. He simply intended to try to strike out everything, so the legislation would remain as it is. That was as a result of the collective wisdom of members of the Opposition parties.

Mr. O'Neil: Because the Minister clearly indicated that during this session we would get a revised workers' compensation Act. The Bill last session was purely a stop gap measure foisted on him by someone—I know not whom.

Mr. HARTREY: All I can say is that the honourable member will not persuade this House that what he has just said is so. If there is one subject with which I am reasonably familiar it is workers' compensation. I have studied such legislation for 35 years, and I have practised it in an atmosphere and within a community where the Act is of vital importance, because it has great bearing on one of the dangerous occupations in this State; namely, mining, to which I referred a few moments ago.

I can assure the member for East Melbourne that the Bill about to be introduced is a very sound measure. It will be an improvement on the old Statute, but of course it will not depart from the general framework of workers' compensation. I do not want it to depart from that framework, because that would prove to be disadvantageous to both workers and employers, and would create chaos for the next 10 or 15 years. It took a long time for the courts to appreciate the true significance of the law relating to workers' compensation which the judges, from time to time, have interpreted right up to the highest court of the British Commonwealth—that is, the House of Lords—and to the highest tribunal in the Australian Commonwealth, the High Court of Australia.

I therefore congratulate the Government on being about to introduce what I know to be a sound measure, because it proposes to make a very salutary series of improvements to a vital Statute which, I frankly confess, the Opposition parties themselves did improve from time to time whilst they held the reins of office.

I now wish to raise a new matter. This is a question that is causing considerable concern to my constituents in Norseman and in Boulder.

The SPEAKER: There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. HARTREY: It is a fact that no matter how much we improve the workers' compensation legislation from time to time it is of no value unless the workers can obtain their legal rights under the Statute. At the present time it is a matter of great discontent among the miners at Norseman and at Boulder, and also at Kalgoorlie—which is not in my electorate, but I am more directly concerned with the subject in Kalgoorlie than I am in Boulder—and the trouble is we cannot get past the barrier formed by a group of "quiz kids" apparently established in the Crown Law Department for the specific purpose of frustrating the intentions of the Act and depriving the workers of their money. This is particularly true of miners and especially those who suffer industrial diseases. It is with the silicotic miners that we get the worst pretexts for depriving men of their money.

Every time I make a claim on behalf of a silicotic miner—because I am the lawyer representing the workers' union—I receive a letter in reply stating that the matter is being referred to "our own legal advisers", and eventually these legal advisers will put up all sorts of piffling excuses for not paying the money to which the worker is entitled, even under the existing law. For example, I am often told that the worker has suffered no economic loss, because he is getting the old age pension. If he had suffered no economic loss he would not be able to get the old age pension because he

would still be a well paid worker. The same argument is put forward in regard to the dependants of a worker. The reply is made that the widow is in receipt of the old age pension and therefore she was not dependent upon the deceased worker.

Of course, that is nonsense because under the Act the definition of "dependant" is a person who is "wholly or in part dependent on, or wholly or in part supported by, the earnings of the worker at the time of his death or would but for the incapacity due to the accident have been so dependent". So, if a man has been suffering from silicosis and has had to give up work and he and his wife are both on an age pension and he then dies from silicosis, the widow is still his dependant because but for the accident—that is, the contraction of the disease and the resultant disablement—she would have been wholly maintained by him.

We also have the theory that in the case of a particular worker there is no proof that he is disabled from earning full wages.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. HARTREY: The Act itself specifically states in plain terms that the disablement of the worker shall be treated in the same way as personal injury by accident, and the Act expressly states that the determination of disablement, vital to this matter, shall be made by the Pneumoconiosis Medical Board, which must have referred to it, not six questions or five questions, but one question. That question is stated clearly enough in section 8 (iv) which provides that if a worker claims compensation for silicosis alone, or for chronic bronchitis in association with silicosis, there must be referred to the Pneumoconiosis Medical Board the question of the worker's condition and fitness for employment, and the decision of such question by the board, or by a majority of the board, "shall be final, conclusive and binding on the worker, on his employer and on any tribunal hearing a matter in which any such determination is relevant".

The quiz kids still have the nerve to say that if the medical board says a worker is not suffering from pneumoconiosis that is final and conclusive, and certainly for the time being it is final and conclusive. The man may get pneumoconiosis later, but he does not have it at the time. If it is said that he does have pneumoconiosis, that is also final and conclusive, the quiz kids say. But if the board says that the worker is unfit for work, that is not final and conclusive!

There is only one question. There are three possible answers to the second part of it, but only two possible answers to the first. Does he have the disease or not? Well, he has. Now then, what is his fitness for employment? The board can answer that he is fit for full employment,

in which case he gets no compensation at all. It can say that he is fit for some sort of employment and specify the sort, in which case he may get compensation or he may not, dependent on whether he can earn as much in the modified form of employment as he can in mining. In most instances he cannot earn the same.

If the board says he is "unfit for work", the quiz kids say that is not final and conclusive. Is it any wonder that my constituents are getting angry? The A.W.U., a very moderate union which is industrially active, but not agitating—

Mr. O'Neil: Who tenders this advice?

Mr. HARTREY: The quiz kids—"the special branch". They existed in the time of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as he knows very well. The smile on his face signifies this. They are still there and I am sick of them. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition probably was too; but something must be done about the situation. My union and my constituents tell me that it is time I rose in this place and said something about it; and that is precisely what I am doing tonight.

I will leave the matter there for the time being although it is one which causes me grave concern as, I am sure, it does the Government and Parliament as a whole. I am positive that something will be done to evolve a different arrangement and that an opinion will be obtained from a more reliable source, a source less activated by the sole desire to protect Government revenue and to deprive workers of compensation which this House and another place have both ratified and made the law of this State.

Leaving that subject for the time being, I am pleased to see that, according to the Speech on which I am commenting, provision will be made for a minimum amount of sick leave for everyone. That provision will appeal to the Opposition as well as to my party because the Opposition is always very concerned about nonunionists, and many nonunionists do not have the opportunity to join a union and therefore they do not come under any award at all and do not have the benefit of sick pay. Many industrial awards provide for a certain amount of sick leave, but those people not under an industrial award get nothing. The move to alter the situation will bring a measure of justice to all men and it is certainly one I heartily commend.

The Government also proposes to introduce legislation to provide for four weeks annual leave for State public servants who qualify now for three weeks only. This is a provision which has been introduced by the Federal Government and it is only just and right that this State should do likewise.

In addition, the Government proposes to introduce legislation to provide for payment by the Crown of legal costs of persons acquitted of summary offences by Courts of Petty Sessions. This is an overdue reform

and is one for which I agitated on the goldfields 20 years ago when a Labor Government was in power and then later when a non-Labor Government was in power. This reform has not been achieved as yet, but I hope it will be during this session of Parliament.

I come now to another promise in the Speech—one which gives me a great deal of satisfaction, and I believe a great deal of satisfaction to certain members opposite including one honourable member who is not paying a great deal of attention. I do not blame him for this because I am not a very good speaker. I am referring to the promise that certain proposals of the Royal Commission on the Hire-Purchase Act will be implemented. The chairman of that Royal Commission would perhaps be inclined to support me and also be glad to know the Government has this intention.

I am happy to say that that report was unanimous. The commission consisted of a Liberal Party representative, a Country Party representative, and three Labor Party representatives, these last three being the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, the member for Mirrabooka, and myself. We were unanimous in our recommendations and the report was very well received by all sections of the community. I am rather disappointed nothing has been done about the report as yet but I am happy to know that certain proposals will be implemented, and I congratulate the Government on its decision in this regard.

I notice also that legislation will be introduced to authorise TAA to establish in Western Australia the two air-line policy now in force in other States. Of course, as I pointed out the other night, we are told in a letter addressed to us by MMA that competition is a good thing when in the right place and at the right time; in other words, it is good when it suits MMA, but is not good when it does not suit that organisation. I could not possibly accept that proposition and I do not think any fair-minded person could. The idea that it will be worse for the people in the outback parts of Western Australia—and in the north-west particularly—to have the choice of two services with two different timetables and two different sized aircraft, providing more space for any cargo they desire to be carried, than under the present system, is so stupid that it does not require any serious consideration.

Legislation is to be introduced to protect used-car buyers and if they do not need protection, I would like to know why. The only protection to be given some buyers is medical protection. They could be placed in institutions where they could do themselves no harm. Some people will buy anything and they cannot be protected except by detention in an institution.

However, the average man is not as stupid as that, but he is often easily taken in by high-pressure salesmen who are

one of the greatest menaces to civilisation. I am referring to the hypnotic type of approach to people of normal intelligence, good nature, and honest principles, by high-pressure salesmen who have neither good natures nor honest principles, but who have a good deal more than normal intelligence with which to overpower the minds of ordinary citizens. The more we do to prevent the slick conman operating, the better. The quicker pyramid selling—which is scandalous to the highest degree—is stopped by Statute the better it will be for the community.

I think that just about covers what I desire to say concerning the Governor's Speech. Of course, on a motion of this type one has the privilege, which was so admirably availed of by the Leader of the Opposition, of talking about a variety of subjects not relevant to the Speech. I cannot remember anything about which the Leader of the Opposition spoke which was really relevant to the Speech.

In the middle of the 18th century there flourished in England a doctor of letters known as Samuel Johnson who was a man of many parts. He compiled a dictionary; he was a great conversationalist, and he also wrote a poem. The poem was intended as an imitation of *Juvenal's Tenth Satire*, which starts with the words "Gadibus usque ad Gangem"—"From Cadiz to the Ganges." That was the known span of the Roman Empire in those days. However Johnson's poem commences with a much wider scope—Columbus had made his discoveries in the meantime. Dr. Johnson's poem commences—

Let observation with extensive view,

Survey mankind from China to Peru;

That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition did in his address to the Governor's Speech. He surveyed the world from China to Peru. He surveyed the United States, Korea, and Vietnam, and dealt with Soekarno and Suharto.

Sir Charles Court: Are we not allowed to?

Mr. HARTREY: Yes, as I pointed out a few moments ago. However, certain statements of the Leader of the Opposition merit some caustic comment and I propose to avail myself of the same privileges he did, in order that I may make those caustic comments. The Leader of the Opposition said—

We are able to rest easy today because Korea was fought, because Vietnam was fought, because Malaya was fought

Sir Charles Court: That is quite true.

Mr. O'Connor: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTREY: Korea was fought at the cost of many lives and much treasure and now the great victory we won on the pretence that we desired to preserve the

south from the north has reached the stage where the north and the south will combine and—

Sir Charles Court: It is good that they should combine.

Mr. HARTREY: We have achieved absolutely nothing in Vietnam except humiliation of one of the greatest military powers the world has ever known. The United States of America set itself out—and dragged us along like a tin can on the back of a motorcar—to crush; to annihilate, to destroy, to overwhelm, and to set itself up above a small group of jungle dwellers, illiterate, and by no means robust people.

Mr. Rushton: With their arms tied behind their backs!

Mr. HARTREY: All those pilots of the bombers had their arms tied behind their backs! Millions of tons of explosives were dropped on that country from low altitudes.

Mr. Rushton: You cannot take it.

Mr. HARTREY: I can take anything which is sincere, even the bleating of a Billy goat.

Mr. Grayden: You could have ended the war in one day.

Mr. Rushton: Why did the member for Boulder-Dundas object to that remark?

Mr. HARTREY: I have said it before and I say again that I can take almost anything, including the bleating of a Billy goat, which I prefer to the honourable member's. However, to address myself to the subject under discussion—

The SPEAKER: And to the Chair!

Mr. HARTREY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Sir Charles Court: Do you believe that North Vietnam had the right to overrun the south?

Mr. HARTREY: Good God, that was not what started it. What started it was that, when the French moved out, the Yanks rushed in and divided the country into two purely imaginary areas. There was no North and South Vietnam under French administration. The United States invented the division. For that matter, there was no North and South Korea under Japanese administration. The United States was spurred on by the domino theory, but the Yanks were the only ones to be "dominoed".

Sir Charles Court: Why are you hostile towards your allies and not towards the communists?

Mr. HARTREY: I am not hostile towards our allies.

Sir Charles Court: You have said shocking things about them.

Mr. HARTREY: I am hostile towards the tyrannical and corrupt Governments which have persecuted our allies for the last 20 years. We have only to look at the sorry procession of substitutes for statesmen in the White House over the last 20 years.

Sir Charles Court: What are you doing?

Mr. HARTREY: I am trying to vindicate the honour of the Australian people and to apologise on our behalf and on behalf of the United States for the position which has occurred. I am not afraid to do it and, what is more, I am fully competent to do it.

Sir Charles Court: We are waiting to hear something which does not constitute vilification of our allies.

Mr. Rushton: It is communist talk.

Mr. HARTREY: Is the member for Dale calling me a communist? I would be delighted to hear him say this, because I value his opinion so highly.

Mr. Rushton: There is no need to.

Mr. HARTREY: Even when we imitate—as a satellite is supposed to do—the example of the mighty capitalist Government which has crashed so horribly in Vietnam, we are still wrong in the eyes of the Opposition party. The Labor Party is wrong, in the eyes of members opposite, because of its action of going to China in the manner in which it did in order to recognise that country. Heavens above, President Nixon made Dr. Kissinger race over and beat us to it; he scooped the market. When Australia elected a Government which had the courage to ignore Nixon and Kissinger and to arrange its own terms, alliances, and settlements, it did the wrong thing.

Sir Charles Court: Sold us down the drain!

Mr. HARTREY: Perhaps it sold the Leader of the Opposition down the drain.

Sir Charles Court: Taiwan is now a province of China.

Mr. HARTREY: I would not be sorry to see the Leader of the Opposition going down the drain.

Sir Charles Court: It sold out Taiwan as a province of China instead of a separate country.

Mr. HARTREY: Taiwan is a province of China.

Sir Charles Court: No other country has acknowledged it as such.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Boulder-Dundas will address the Chair.

Mr. HARTREY: Whether or not a person acknowledges something is not a test of reality. If a man puts his head out of a window of a hotel in Katmandu and re-

fuses to recognise the Himalayas, do they cease to exist or is he a fool? Anyone, in international politics, who refuses to recognise a nation of 800,000,000 people is just as stupid as any man who says that the Himalayas do not exist.

Sir Charles Court: Why did they have to sell Taiwan down the drain?

Mr. HARTREY: Anyone who thinks we have done a great stroke for our country by shedding our blood and wasting our treasure—in the only war we have lost in history—is not entitled to consideration.

Mr. Rushton: That is your judgment.

Mr. Coyne: Did the other side win?

Mr. HARTREY: Of course it did.

Sir Charles Court: Pro-communist stuff!

Mr. HARTREY: The most powerful nation in the world, economically, and the one best equipped scientifically and technically tried—

Mr. Rushton: With scruples!

Mr. HARTREY: Scruples, be damned! The member for Dale mentions scruples. Napalm, and defoliation, and canal-busting? The Americans were pounding hell out of the civilians on the very last day of the war. Do not talk to me about scruples. The honourable member would not know one if he saw it; he has none himself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr. RUSHTON: I find objectionable the remark made by the member for Boulder-Dundas that I have no scruples. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. HARTREY: If the honourable member is feeling scrupulous, I withdraw my remark and congratulate him on having scruples.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Sir Charles Court: Give us some more of this pro-communist stuff.

Mr. McPharlin: Let us hear the member for Boulder-Dundas on Taiwan.

Mr. HARTREY: Taiwan was a province of Old China. Some French, Russians, Japanese, and others went there and dismembered the empire as far as they could. The British gained territory in India and through the so-called "Treaty Ports". In a war called "The War of the Arrow"—or the opium war—the Chinese were forced to permit Indian manufacturers of opium products—heroin, laudanum, and so forth—to sell them those products. Hence many of the people in that great empire were destroyed. All of this went on and on until it became very difficult to say whether China had any provinces which were not overlorded by western civilisation. Taiwan was no more and no less a province of China than any other part of the flowery

kingdom. Nor is it now. We are dealing with China, a nation of 800,000,000 people strong—indeed, very strong in the scientific ways of murdering each other which we have conferred upon the world. We now have to recognise where China's provinces are. We must keep out of them and treat China with respect.

Mr. Grayden: We have been dealing with them for years.

Mr. HARTREY: Not because the Liberal Party liked it. The McMahon-ites did their best to prevent it.

Mr. McPharlin: What about Taiwan?

Sir Charles Court: What about the 25,000,000 people mainland communist China eliminated?

Mr. McPharlin: You have turned your back on Taiwan along with the Federal Government.

Mr. HARTREY: I have not turned my back on anyone. I have said that historically, economically, and ethnologically Taiwan is a province of China just as much as Tasmania is a part of Australia.

Sir Charles Court: I thought your history and geography were better.

Mr. HARTREY: Suppose, for argument's sake, Tasmania decided to establish a Government independent of the Federal Government. Suppose it felt it could maintain itself better than it would be maintained under the Federal Government. If somebody booted out that Government, would members opposite say that Tasmania had been deserted or that it had been restored to the country to which it belonged? I feel Mr. Speaker, it must be close to dinner time.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has six minutes.

Mr. HARTREY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the six minutes, but I will shortly conclude as I do not think I need them. However, one aspect of the problems which confront my constituents may be more relevant for action than Taiwan.

Mr. Bertram: The member for Boulder-Dundas is a full bottle on Taiwan. I am indebted to him.

Mr. HARTREY: I am obliged to the member for Mt. Hawthorn. The problem in Norseman is quite serious. Norseman depends on the goldmining industry alone and, fortunately, this industry is looking up as a result of some of the actions which the United States has taken recently—and which, of course, their great friends and allies on the other side of the House deplore. The United States has twice devalued its currency. This has had the effect of increasing the value of gold. It does not increase the value of any other mineral in Western Australia; on the contrary, it diminishes it.

To some extent, Norseman can battle along for longer than it otherwise would have done. Most of the mines are situated in Boulder which will continue to do better than we had hoped. Nevertheless, Norseman can look to nothing else except one mine which cannot last forever. There is consternation over what may happen when it closes down—if it does—and the men are forced to leave the community even though they may be middle aged or beyond middle age. They will not be able to take their houses with them and they will not be able to sell them. They will be in a bad way. Good and responsible people in that town have said to me that Parliament should come to their aid if it is good enough for Parliament to come to the aid of the distressed pastoralists and farmers when they are victims of economic downturns, drought, and other afflictions.

Mr. Coyne: The Government has not yet come to the aid of pastoralists and farmers.

Mr. HARTREY: It has been put to me that it would be just and reasonable for the Government to come to the rescue of the people in Norseman if they are forced to abandon their homes and seek employment in the metropolitan area or elsewhere.

Mr. Coyne: They did not come to the rescue of the pastoralists.

Mr. HARTREY: In many cases, farmers are harder workers than wage earners, but farmers do not see themselves that way. They see themselves as capitalists. Farmers often have worse living conditions and longer hours of work than wage earners.

I suggest that Parliament as a whole—and I address my remarks to all, but primarily to the Government because it has the responsibility—should give sympathetic consideration to amelioration of the conditions at Norseman and to a guarantee that the people there will not suffer as badly from any extinction of the goldmining industry as they otherwise might.

Mr. W. G. Young: They will get the same guarantee which the farmers received; that no farmer would have to leave.

Mr. HARTREY: If they receive the same financial assistance as farmers I will be happy.

Mr. W. G. Young: The farmers did not receive any.

Mr. HARTREY: I am not prepared to say that. The economic conditions of farmers improved so rapidly that they did not need it.

Mr. W. G. Young: Tell that to those who walked off their farms.

Mr. HARTREY: The same thing happened in 1929 when the Federal Parliament passed the Gold Bounty Act. We in

Kalgoorlie and Boulder thought we were made. Not even \$10 has been paid out to anyone under the Gold Bounty Act. By the time it became operative the price of gold had gone up in relation to everything else. We did not need a gold bounty. The depression was the richest period the gold-fields ever had.

I think I can now conclude, Mr. Speaker, and thank you kindly for presiding over this rather turbulent gathering. I sincerely support the Address-in-Reply to the Speech made by His Excellency.

Sitting suspended from 6.13 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [7.30 p.m.]: At the outset may I take the opportunity to congratulate the new member for Blackwood on his election to this House. I do express regret that the seat he occupies at the moment will go out of existence at the next election, but I hope he will find another seat which he can represent as ably as he is obviously representing the seat of Blackwood.

Prior to the tea suspension the member for Boulder-Dundas was expressing some opinions in respect of Vietnam. I cannot for the life of me imagine what this has to do with the debate in this House at the moment.

Mr. Hartrey: Ask the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Leader of the Opposition referred to this aspect in passing, but the member for Boulder-Dundas made it the central theme of his speech.

Mr. Graham: We are very confident about it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It would appear from the comments and the interjections made by the honourable member and other members opposite that he and they are obsessed with the question of Vietnam.

Mr. Graham: And the Ustasha.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Boulder-Dundas is certainly obsessed with this aspect. I hesitate to say anything unkind about the member for Boulder-Dundas, because I am sure that the speech he made prior to the tea suspension is completely out of character.

But while I hesitate to say anything unkind about the honourable member I can only describe his speech as a diatribe, because it was a speech made by a person who is obsessed with a particular question.

The member for Boulder-Dundas referred to the people of North Vietnam in a manner which I am sure will not please those people. He said they were Aboriginal people; that they were underprivileged and that they were jungle dwellers who were fighting the United States with their bare hands.

I am sure the North Vietnamese will not be very happy about this if they happen to read what was said by the member for

Boulder-Dundas; particularly when they know he put them in the same category as the Aborigines of Australia—except of course that in this case they are in the jungles of Vietnam. The North Vietnamese will be very displeased indeed if they happen to read these sentiments, because they are not that sort of people.

I suggest that members of this House should go overseas at various times to see what the situation is in places like Vietnam. I am sure that if the member for Boulder-Dundas paid a visit to North Vietnam he would find great difficulty in relating the sentiments he expressed to the people and the conditions obtaining in that country. They certainly do not fit the description he gave of them to this House prior to the tea suspension.

I will not dwell further on that aspect because there are a number of matters I wish to raise. In about 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, it was a common thing in the various islands such as Borneo and the Celebes to see a bamboo dwelling with a thatched roof which inside contained the most sophisticated manufacturing equipment.

This was the case 28 or 29 years ago. When the Japanese captured such islands they would immediately take businessmen overseas and set up in the jungles these highly sophisticated factories containing the latest manufacturing equipment. Anything that could be manufactured, for example, in Western Australia, could be manufactured in those bamboo huts. That was the situation that obtained in the years I have mentioned. As I have said, that was 28 or 29 years ago.

We can imagine what the situation is today in North Vietnam. The people of that country would, of course, possess all the sophisticated machinery to which I have already referred and perhaps a great deal more. The plain truth is that these people are not simple jungle people fighting the United States with their bare hands, as was indicated by the member for Boulder-Dundas. They are highly developed people who have at their disposal the most sophisticated weapons that Russia and China can provide. Apart from the ground-to-air missiles they possessed the people of North Vietnam had every armament in the book.

That was the situation that obtained in North Vietnam, not the one described by the member for Boulder-Dundas. Notwithstanding this, however, and quite contrary to what the member for Boulder-Dundas has said, the Americans could in one day have liquidated all opposition in North Vietnam had they so desired. The Americans, however, did not desire to do this. They did not do what the Nazis would have done and what the Nazis did during the last World War. They did not line up the entire people of a village and

shoot them because one American had been killed. That was the Nazi way of dealing with situations of this kind.

The Americans and their allies were in a country where it was difficult to distinguish the enemy from the indigenous people of the area. The Americans, however, did not adopt these drastic methods.

Mr. Graham: Tommy rot!

Mr. GRAYDEN: They did not adopt the methods used by the Russians in Hungary.

Mr. Graham: Reds under the bed.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Russians would have stamped out any such opposition overnight. The Americans, however, were not prepared to throw in their bombers and use the types of weapons they could have used had they wished to destroy the area and bring the people to heel. They did not use these methods because of their regard for the sanctity of human life.

Mr. Graham: What hypocrisy! They blasted hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese to pieces and you know it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In 1942 when Mr. Curtin, who was the Labor Prime Minister of Australia, thought the country was defenceless he made an impassioned appeal to the United States Government and screamed to high heaven for assistance.

Mr. Graham: What business did the Americans have in that country?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Today, however, we find the very people who belong to the party led by Mr. Curtin forgetting everything that was said in 1942; they seem to forget the appeal that was made for assistance. They are virtually biting the hand that befriended them.

Mr. Graham: It is what they did 25 years later that we are protesting about.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Is the Deputy Premier proud of the sentiments expressed by the members of his party?

Mr. Graham: The Americans should be ashamed of what they have done in Vietnam.

Mr. O'Connor: You should be ashamed.

Sir Charles Court: What about your friends in North Vietnam?

Mr. Graham: You stick to the Ustasha.

Sir Charles Court: Don't you start talking like that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will keep order.

Sir Charles Court: I trust that you will ask the Deputy Premier to keep order.

The SPEAKER: The member for South Perth will address the Chair.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am addressing the Chair, Sir. I want to reiterate very briefly that I cannot understand how anybody can

be proud of the sentiments that have been expressed by members opposite; nor can I understand how a gentleman like the member for Boulder-Dundas can be obsessed with the Americans to the extent he is.

In 1942 the members of his own party screamed to high heaven for American assistance but because there is no threat to Australia today he adopts the attitude that the Americans should never have been in Vietnam; that we have nothing for which to thank the Americans.

Mr. Graham: Nobody said that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is all very difficult to understand and I do not believe that the member for Boulder-Dundas can honestly hold these views.

Mr. Hartrey: He does.

Mr. GRAYDEN: As I have said, his speech was completely out of character.

What about the minorities? Is the Labor Party in this country prepared to leave the minorities to their fate, irrespective of where they are? Do members opposite suggest that the North Vietnamese can walk into South Vietnam and liquidate the South Vietnamese? Are they suggesting that the North Koreans can do the same in South Korea? We must not forget that the Americans did not want to fight these wars; they went in at the request of the minorities in those areas.

Mr. Graham: That is nonsense.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The statements made by members opposite would not stand up to any kind of investigation. That is the situation. Out of the kindness of their hearts the Americans scoured the world giving succour to those who needed it; they did all they could to help the people concerned become self supporting, and all they get for their efforts is abuse.

Mr. Graham: They are entitled to receive abuse from the whole world. They are condemned by the whole world.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The wives and husbands in that country had their own problems and worries and could be excused for saying, "What is the point in the whole thing? Let us get back to isolation and look after ourselves and enjoy the fruits of our own labour." That is what they are saying in the United States; they are not saying what is being said by the Opposition—they are not saying, "Let the minorities be damned."

We had a recent illustration of this kind of thinking in the Federal sphere where the present Commonwealth Government said, "We will introduce first-past-the-post voting and again wipe out the minorities."

Mr. Graham: First-past-the-post voting applies in nearly every country in the world except Australia.

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is to be no consideration for the minorities or the individuals in this country; but that is all beside the point.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I mean it is beside the point to the extent that it had nothing to do with the debate for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, and I am only mentioning the matter because the member for Boulder-Dundas made it the central point of his speech.

Mr. Hartrey: That is not true.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The honourable member certainly did, and this can be established by anyone who cares to read the relevant *Hansard*.

Mr. O'Neil: I do not think there was any point at all in the honourable member's speech.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We all know that members of the Government make some loose statements in this House. There is no doubt about that. The speech made by the member for Boulder-Dundas is in that category.

Mr. Bertram: Nonsense.

Mr. GRAYDEN: What the honourable member has said cannot be substantiated; it would not stand up to any sort of examination—it certainly would not stand up to an exhaustive examination. The honourable member has made a number of statements that could not possibly stand up to investigation.

I will not go right through the speeches made by members opposite because obviously I have not the time, but I would like the House to listen to the following remark of the member for Boulder-Dundas—

Aboriginal affairs were expressly transferred by the people of Australia to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hartrey: There was a referendum on it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That statement made by the member for Boulder-Dundas is an example of the nonsense to which we are subjected from time to time when he speaks.

Mr. Hartrey: I thought you were not going to quote my speech.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I want everyone to know what the honourable member said. Obviously one cannot disprove everything the honourable member said; one can talk only in general terms as I have been doing. But now I have turned to a specific example of the remarks of the member for Boulder-Dundas, and he cannot deny it. Indeed, he has just confirmed that he said Aboriginal affairs were expressly transferred by the people of Australia to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hartrey: Did I say that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, the following is the *Hansard* report of that section of the honourable member's speech—

The State has that power, but the State Government is not offering to hand over anything.

Mr. Grayden: Oh, rubbish!

Mr. HARTREY: Would the member for South Perth quote an instance of where the State Government has done this?

Mr. Grayden: Aboriginal affairs.

Mr. HARTREY: Aboriginal affairs were expressly transferred by the people of Australia to the Commonwealth Government.

Those are the words of the member for Boulder-Dundas. His Premier made rather a similar comment. He said—

In view of the fact that the people of the Commonwealth have indicated in no unmistakable way that they are in favour of the Commonwealth entering this field, what ground would I have to complain about the Commonwealth intrusion on State rights in regard to Aborigines? Without exception in every State of Australia the people have said this is the right thing to do.

Mr. R. L. Young: That is not taking over the management of all Aboriginal affairs in the State which is completely different.

Sir Charles Court: Wiping your hands completely of the matter and sharing the responsibility are two different matters.

That was the point made by the Premier. Over and over again the member for Boulder-Dundas, his leader, and other members of the Government made statements which are not factual. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. Hartrey: You are not doing too well.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I hope the honourable member will accept my remarks without requiring me to go further in an endeavour to prove my point to him. I want members to know precisely where they stand in respect of the statements they make.

A great deal of controversy has arisen in Western Australia within the last few days over the question of constitutional rights. The Opposition has criticised the State Government for handing over to the Federal Government matters which have been the right of the State for many years.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You have not named one yet.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We are talking about them now.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes, you are talking about them now, but you have not named one.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I repeat that the member for Boulder-Dundas said—

Aboriginal affairs were expressly transferred by the people of Australia to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hartrey: That is correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Right. Then in order to prove how fallacious are the statements of the honourable member I will read portion of the case which was submitted in respect of the referendum to which the member for Boulder-Dundas referred. I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 8th May, 1967.

The SPEAKER: I hope it is not too long.

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, it is not very long. I will read only the relevant portions. To prove my point to the member for Boulder-Dundas I will quote the following remarks, which come from an impeccable source—

The official Yes case for the proposed amendment of the Constitution to include Aborigines in the census and to let the Federal government make special laws for Aborigines, has been prepared by Prime Minister Holt, Country Party leader McEwen and opposition leader Whitlam.

The legislation proposing these amendments was adopted unanimously in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Consequently there is no official No case.

I will not read much further in deference to what you have had to say, Mr. Speaker. However, I would like to read the relevant portions of the official case approved by the three parties, as follows—

These amendments are proposed to remove any ground for the belief that, as at present worded, the Constitution discriminates in some ways against people of the Aboriginal race, and, at the same time, to make it possible for parliament to make special laws for Aborigines, wherever they may live, if parliament considers this desirable or necessary.

To achieve this purpose, we propose that two provisions of the Constitution be altered which make explicit references to people of the Aboriginal race.

The first proposed alteration is to remove the words "other than the Aboriginal race in any State" from a paragraph in section 51. This paragraph reads:

The parliament shall subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to the

people of any race, other than the Aboriginal race in any State, for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws.

The proposed alteration of this section will do two things. First, it will remove words from our Constitution that many people think are discriminatory against the Aboriginal people.

Second, it will make it possible for the Commonwealth parliament to make special laws for the people of the Aboriginal race, wherever they may live, if parliament considers it necessary.

Just as the Commonwealth may make special laws for any other race.

Mr. Hartrey: That is what I said.

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, it is not; it is the exact opposite. The second part of the Constitution proposed to be altered is mentioned in the following portion of the same article—

The second proposed alteration is the repeal of section 127 of the Constitution. That section reads:

In reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or of a State or other part of the Commonwealth, Aboriginal natives shall not be counted.

The article continues in respect of the first proposed alteration—

This cannot be done at present because, as the Constitution stands, parliament has no power, except in the territories, to make laws relating to Aborigines as such.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member does not intend to read much more.

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, Mr. Speaker, just a final, all-important paragraph, which states—

This would not mean that the States would automatically lose their existing powers. What is intended is that the national parliament could make laws, if it thought fit, relating to Aborigines—as it can about many other matters on which the States also have power to legislate. The Commonwealth's object will be to co-operate with the States to ensure that together we act in the best interests of the Aboriginal people of Australia.

Let members note the words "to co-operate". This is the official "Yes" case approved by the leaders of the three parties in the Commonwealth Parliament. Here they have spoken in terms of co-operation. We know what has happened of course since the new Labor Government has taken office. I will not read all the statements that have been published in the

Press, because we have many, including one from Mr. Whitlam and also another from our own Minister for Community Welfare. However, let me read what the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Bryant) had to say in respect of this co-operation, because it will give members a fair idea as to how much reliance we can place on the statements made by Labor members, whether in the Commonwealth Parliament or in the State Parliament. The following statement was published in *The West Australian* of the 22nd February, 1973—

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not going to read too much from the newspaper.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Bryant) made it obvious that his Government would not allow any State to block moves for Aboriginal advancement. I will skip some paragraphs of the article, but here is one that I will quote—

If some people don't agree we will take action all the same. If we can persuade them, all the better.

The "them" refers to the States. Continuing—

This would apply to one or two areas of State Government in Australia.

He has said that, irrespective of what the States say, his Government is going to take over the States' rights if necessary. Yet authors of the official "Yes" case gave the assurance I have outlined. I will not pursue that issue because it is a matter we have already debated in this House.

On page 3 of this morning's issue of *The West Australian* I was amazed to see an article headed—

Lab. claims bias in 'The West'

The words in quotation marks are referring to *The West Australian*. The article went on to report—

The State secretary of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. F. E. Chamberlain, agreed last night that there was a suggestion of censorship through industrial action—

The SPEAKER: Again I remind the honourable member that quoting long extracts from a newspaper is not allowed.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Chamberlain was referring to *The West Australian*. In this article he went on to talk in terms of bias shown in *The West Australian*. He said that the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party was painfully aware of the strong bias shown against that party in *The West Australian*.

Mr. Bertram: That is right, is it not?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Mt. Hawthorn says that is right, but I will tell him what I think of the statement made by the State secretary of the Australian Labor

Party (Mr. F. E. Chamberlain). In my opinion the statement is drivel and eye-wash.

Mr. O'Neil: Bunkum and balderdash!

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Labor Party in both the State and the Commonwealth spheres has performed some atrocious acts since it took office and has attracted a great deal of publicity as a consequence. I will mention only a few of the things the Commonwealth Government has done. Just consider the midnight raid by Senator Murphy on the A.S.I.O.!

Several Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is only one of the terrible things that the Commonwealth Government has done. One would expect that Government to be the subject of a little publicity as a consequence of that. Here we have a Federal Minister creeping out in the stealth of night leading some individuals whom he had instructed to go with him, and I would certainly say that he would not be creeping out in the stealth of night unless he had them behind him.

This Federal Minister crept into the offices of the A.S.I.O. and raided its files. That is something to be proud of! Does the Government feel that that is something to be glossed over; that the Press would not even mention that? As a consequence of Machiavellian deeds of that kind, what do they do? Blatantly and unashamedly the members of the Labor Party seek to excuse the consequences of their actions and they attribute the unfavourable publicity to the bias shown by the Press.

Mr. Jamieson: You would get a part in Macbeth any day!

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is only one of the actions taken by the Commonwealth Government. After a change of Government in the Federal sphere, for two or three weeks we had a two-man Government. I will correct that. Actually it was only a one-man Government, because the man assisting Mr. Whitlam was simply there at the whim of the Prime Minister and he had to do everything he was told. Therefore, at that time, we virtually had the nearest approach to a dictatorship in Australia that we have ever had.

Mr. Graham: That is at the other end of this building.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will try to enumerate a few more of the atrocious acts committed by the Commonwealth Government. What about all the plums that were handed out to all the relatives of members of the Commonwealth Government as soon as they took office? What about their taking members of their families and their relatives for a sojourn around Australia in V.I.P. planes? Then there was the issue of

the failure of the Commonwealth Government to devalue the dollar, which action is costing the mining industry and other industries in this State \$200,000,000. Would not that attract some sort of publicity? Then we had the amnesty that was granted to draft-dodgers, and the return of passports to people who were branded as traitors.

As for this State Government, let me run briefly through some of the things it has done. I hesitate to mention all of them, because the list could go on *ad infinitum*. If I mentioned all of them I would certainly be here all evening.

Let me give a few instances. The first concerns the Government guarantee given in respect of the Yundurup Canals development. However, has any guarantee been given by this Government to assist the drought-stricken pastoralists in the eastern goldfields? Another is the action of the Government in respect of paying the fines of the shop stewards. Notwithstanding all the Government has said in respect of environmental protection let us take into account what it did in respect of the power line in the Guildford area and what it has done in respect of the cancellation of regional emphasis in the north.

Mr. Bertram: What did you think about the Steele Hall affair?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I could mention the Government guarantee given in respect of the Trades Hall project. I could go on speaking on this subject for a great deal of time.

Mr. Graham: What do you think of Billy McMahon?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I could mention the Government's proposed central laundry, and its action in cancelling the tour by a South African cricket team.

Mr. Graham: What do you think about ex-Attorney-General Bowen?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I could go on mentioning these instances *ad infinitum*, and I am sure the Government will not be able to refute any criticism of these. It is as simple and as silly as that.

Mr. Jamieson: This is silly all right!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have to pass on to other matters and to more important things.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Don't forget the amendment!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I want to get back to the assertion made by the Labor Party that it has attracted unfavourable comment because of bias on the part of the Press. In saying this the State Executive of the A.L.P. very conveniently overlooks the fact that every other newspaper in Australia has also published versions of the State and Federal Governments' misdeemeanours; every television station in Australia, and therefore every television

station in Western Australia, has also published accounts of the Labor Party's misdeemeanours; and every radio station in this State and throughout Australia has done the same. Why then should the Labor Party single out *The West Australian* for this sort of criticism?

As far as I am concerned, the huge amount of favourable publicity which the Labor Party received in the Federal and State spheres, prior to the last State and Federal elections, was largely responsible for their being elected to office.

Mr. Bertram: What has happened since then?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Since then this Government and the Federal Government have had a veritable honeymoon at the hands of the Press. I think Opposition members could be pardoned for wondering what has been going on, and why there has not been infinitely more criticism of the actions of the Labor Governments. That is what members are wondering about. Wherever I attend public functions I hear this criticism: What is the Federal Opposition doing about this matter? What do we see when we pick up *The West Australian*? We see very little of what the Federal Opposition has been doing, but it is doing plenty although this is not publicised.

Mr. Bertram: What are they doing?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I hear the criticism over and over again from our own members that during the last State and Federal elections, and since then, they had given statements to the Press, but these were not published. We all realise that not all statements made to the Press can be published. Let us not forget that we have a free Press in Australia, and in Western Australia. We should keep it that way.

There are several other aspects to which I wish to refer, but I want to mention this one first. In the last few days, particularly in Western Australia, we have been inundated with a spate of reports from people who have been subjected to intimidation and blackmail by trade unions. This question of intimidation and blackmail was exhaustively debated in this House last week. Since then, however, we have received reports from all sorts of people throughout Western Australia about the intimidation from which they have suffered. In this regard I refer to a letter dated the 22nd March written to the member for Mt. Lawley (Mr. O'Connor). It is as follows—

Dear Mr. O'Connor,

On the 14th March 1973, my son Kevin Wellard took a load of empty fuel drums on his semi-trailer, CH. 194—CH. 0159, to the Caltex Drum Depot and then went round to the Caltex Terminal Office, to pick up a load of fuel, but a Union man was picketing the terminal and my son could not pick up any fuel, even though he is

an Owner-Driver. He was told by the Union man that we would have to join the Union if we wanted to pick up our fuel. There were other trucks there at the time, some belonging to farmers, and they all had to go back empty!

Mr. O'Connor: Empty all the way back to Bindoon.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I shall not read the rest of the letter, but this person had to go back to Bindoon with an empty truck, even though he had obtained a permit from the Transport Board to cart those drums. He did everything that was required of him. The person concerned was told that he had to join the union.

The same thing has happened to farmers throughout Western Australia. This is a sordid and a shocking state of affairs in a country which we have always regarded as free.

Let me now refer to a report which appeared in today's issue of the *South Western Times*, under the heading of "Pickets out at local fuel depots." In it the following appears—

THE Transport Workers' Union blitz against non-union fuel distributors in the South-West continued yesterday with local union officials enforcing the union ban and refusing to supply non-union drivers at bulk supply depots.

There has been widespread, indignant reaction to the blitz, and it is understood that several owner-drivers are considering taking out injunctions against the TWU.

Mad

Fuel distributors in Bunbury and surrounding districts are hopping mad about what they allege to be black-mailing and intimidatory tactics employed by TWU officials in Bunbury, and there have been reports of hostile confrontations between drivers and union officials.

Here is virtually a full page report in that newspaper dealing with intimidation. I find this to be a deplorable state of affairs in a State like Western Australia. At present this is happening only in respect of fuel, but just imagine what will happen before very long.

Farmers are struggling to keep costs down. Just imagine a farmer bringing a load of produce to Perth and wanting to backload with stores or superphosphate. He will be told that he cannot. Whilst in this way the trade unions in Western Australia, with the connivance of the Labor Party, are forcing prices up, at the same time they threaten primary producers. They threaten they will not load cargoes of meat or other primary produce onto ships at Fremantle unless the prices of those commodities in Perth are reduced.

This is an incredible situation, and the Government goes along with it. Again I have to gloss over this issue. I want to continue with the matter I referred to earlier, and I am getting to the end of my time limit. In the last few weeks we have seen numerous instances of the stranglehold which unions are attempting to obtain on the commercial and the political life of this country. Intoxicated with their success in strengthening their iron grip—

Mr. Graham: You say some silly things, don't you?

Mr. GRAYDEN: —the Executive of the A.L.P. now turns its attention to the Australian Press, and it has singled out *The West Australian*. In this morning's issue of *The West Australian* appears a report that the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party has instructed its officers to confer with the management committee of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union on the matter of bias on the part of *The West Australian*. This in itself is a clear threat to the Press.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This action is a clear threat to the Press. The Executive of the Australian Labor Party in this State has virtually told the Press—and in particular, *The West Australian*—that, if it publishes news which is not favourable to the Labor Party, it will face the threat of industrial action through the Printing and Kindred Industries Union. That is what the Press has been told. If *The West Australian* desires to continue in business in Western Australia the news it publishes must be favourable to the Labor Party.

In the couple of minutes left to me let me tell members something of the hypocrisy of the Labor Party; let me indicate what the Labor Party has told the Australian people concerning censorship. The following appeared in *The West Australian* on the 22nd February, 1972—

Murphy: Labor will Reduce Censorship Canberra, Mon.—The Labor leader in the Senate, Senator Murphy, said tonight that a Labor government would reduce censorship so that in general people could read, hear and write what they wished.

But the A.L.P. would legislate so that people would not be exposed against their wish to material offensive to them. . . .

He said he would introduce a Bill and then he said—

The Bill would be designed to safeguard traditional civil liberties. . . . I cannot read any more because I am pressed for time. In many statements made by members of the Labor Party we have

evidence of their hypocrisy. Other statements were made on the same subject by Senator Wheeldon. The Constitution of the Labor Party lays down what—

Mr. Bickerton: Why don't you lay down?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Will you read it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: —it thinks of censorship and it is diametrically opposed to what was done by the State Executive of the A.L.P. last night.

I feel so strongly about this issue and I am so perturbed about what is taking place that I propose to move an amendment.

Mr. Jamieson: It took you a long time to get there.

Mr. Graham: You should have a curtain call, too.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: Full moon again!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Amendment to Motion

Mr. GRAYDEN: I move the following amendment to the motion—

That the following words be added to the motion—

: but we regret to have to inform Your Excellency that we deplore the failure of the Government to denounce and disassociate itself from the implied threats by the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party to impose press censorship by industrial action which is, in effect, an extension of the industrial intimidation now being practised by the Transport Workers Union (T.W.U.) and brought to the notice of the Legislative Assembly 22nd March, 1973.

Mr. Graham: Tripe!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.14 p.m.]: I formally second the amendment to the motion.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [8.15 p.m.]: I wholeheartedly support the amendment because the Premier and his Ministers have refused to condemn the extortion rackets operating at this time. If an ordinary citizen were involved in these rackets he would be placed behind bars.

Mr. Graham: A rehash of last week.

Mr. Bickerton: Tedious repetition.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Secretary of the Labor Party and others involved make these attacks with the very intention of shutting people up. The desire is to

intimidate the Press so that it will not print the facts, so it will couch its stories in such a way that they will not disclose the truth. The Labor Party desires preference and consideration above other people. This is typical of its policies and its tactics.

The hypocrisy of the Government and the Labor Party is evident from their actions. From time to time, from the Premier down, members of the Labor Party have spoken of the wonderful treatment they have received from the media. This was certainly the case before the Labor Party was elected to office. In those days no-one raised any objection about what appeared in the media. The Labor Party certainly does not object on Sunday mornings when statements, heavily loaded against the Liberal Party and Country Party, are published. We heard nothing from them when statements by certain journalists were published claiming bankruptcy at the takeover by the Labor Government. Those claims, of course, are totally untrue and that can be proved at any time.

As I said, no objection was raised then and this is what is so aggravating and worrying to the people of this State. This indicates the degeneration which is occurring step by step and we wonder just when we will reach the point of no return. We wonder when these people with strong-arm tactics will become so intimidatory that even the person who has tremendous courage can no longer carry on and will have his livelihood taken from him. When that stage is reached the only thing the person involved can do is to pay the union fees. Of course, the Labor Party gains a certain portion of the union fees so it has a vested interest in the very action taking place today.

We have evidence of what has been occurring for a long time—certainly before I entered Parliament—including evidence of the tactics of the T.W.U. in September. I referred this matter to the Minister today hoping he would come forward forthrightly to condemn the actions which have been planned for a long time. The statements of the Secretary of the T.W.U. show the position, and it is worth recording some of the incidents involved in the dispute.

Last September I attended a meeting of owner-drivers at a venue in Shepparton Road, Victoria Park. As a matter of fact, I was the only member of Parliament there. The owner-drivers were particularly concerned about the inconsistencies in the Government's administration, and the meeting had been called to ascertain what could be done to relieve some of the pressures then upon them. When I arrived at the meeting the secretary of the union was present and during the evening he spoke very openly, not just to the drivers

of oil tankers or members of that industry, but also to owner-drivers representing many other industries.

I ask: How can the Minister for Labour disclaim responsibility for this tactic applied against ordinary decent citizens of Western Australia? How can he say, with any justification, that he cannot do anything about the situation because a Federal union happens to be involved? The situation makes his statements very weak indeed.

It was very interesting to hear the offers which were made. As a matter of fact, many of the drivers concerned were people who have earned their livelihood by making tremendous contributions to the well-being of this State. They are people of integrity and people who certainly would not want to be involved in sinister actions.

The secretary of the Transport Workers' Union was asked how he would be able to look after the owner-drivers. The offer was made that if the union fee was paid—which I thought was \$18 but it now seems to be \$23—a sticker would be placed on the truck involved and it would be loaded at the depots. Other people—those who did not join the union—would be picketed and would not be able to load. That offer was made in this free country of ours! That is the sort of tactic being adopted!

Mr. Cowles acknowledged this in the Press but claimed that the action was to protect the membership. Goodness gracious me; how could one accept that for one moment? The tactics used, of course, are closely allied to compulsory unionism. The action is so closely linked that it is a case of becoming a unionist, or else! The connotation is certainly depressing, and is of great concern to anybody with a free and open mind.

Mr. Hartrey: Yours is open at both ends.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is the sort of remark we get from that side of the House. It comes down to the fact that Mr. Cowles was offering privileges and protection to people by using strong arm tactics. He was using blackmailing tactics and depriving people of their livelihood. It is clear to see. I was present at the meeting and heard the words spoken by him. Fortunately for our country, many of the drivers—a large proportion—would not have a bar of the offer.

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the member that the amendment deals with the implied threats by the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party to impose Press censorship by industrial action.

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is the basis of my remarks because the motion goes on to align that action with other tactics now being used. It is therefore necessary for me to be able to refer to the false tactics being used by the Secretary of the Labor Party when making his

statements. It is necessary for everybody to know the facts and that is the purpose of the amendment moved by the member for South Perth. We have a clear indication of what has taken place, and what has led up to the remarks by Mr. Chamberlain.

Allegations of union blackmail were made in this House last week, and we now have a reaction to those remarks. The union has claimed that blackmail has not been used. This is all part of the present situation, and it has resulted in Mr. Chamberlain's remarks.

I will quote from *The West Australian* of the 24th March, as follows—

Oil company employees and trade union officials agreed yesterday that the Transport Workers' Union has mounted a campaign in W.A. to stop non-union drivers carrying oil supplies.

The SPEAKER: That article does not have anything to do with this particular amendment.

Mr. RUSHTON: Let us look at the last part of the amendment, if I may quote it again.

The SPEAKER: The member will have to read it in total.

Mr. RUSHTON: I cannot speak to one word of the amendment, but to all the words of the amendment, and those words include reference to the Transport Workers' Union. I am linking those actions to the actions of Mr. Chamberlain. He has referred to the statements in the Press as being unfair, and I am claiming that they are factual. Surely that is reasonable.

The SPEAKER: The Transport Workers' Union is only referred to as having been brought to the notice of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. RUSHTON: The fact is that the Press statement is under challenge by the Secretary of the Labor Party, and that is clear to see. I am attempting to link the two actions and show how hypocritical they are. I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I will endeavour to do so with every respect to you.

The fact is that statements are being made alleging bias. The Transport Workers' Union has denied any claims of blackmail. The Press article to which I have already referred continues—

But the union denied allegations made by Opposition speakers in the Legislative Assembly on Thursday that it was using blackmail to achieve its objects.

Union leaders claimed that its campaign was made necessary because oil companies were using more and more sub-contract drivers to circumvent transport awards.

I was particularly interested in a later part of the report which stated that Mr. Cowles, who is mixed up in this business, denied the union's action was aimed at increasing membership. It was claimed that the aim was to prevent membership from falling. Goodness gracious me! What is the difference between retaining membership and gaining membership? The article continues—

Mr. Taylor said yesterday that it would be futile for him to intervene in the controversy because it was an area in which he had no jurisdiction.

He has a right as a Minister, and a duty, to uphold the Constitution of Western Australia, and to protect the people of Western Australia from intimidation and blackmail; certainly against extortion. That is what is occurring now. It is interesting to note the reasoning of Mr. Chamberlain regarding what has been taking place in this State.

The SPEAKER: You will link this up to censorship?

Mr. RUSHTON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Censorship is the main point in this amendment.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am talking about censorship, and I ask to be allowed to read the amendment again.

Mr. O'Neil: Let the Speaker have a copy of it.

Mr. RUSHTON: The amendment is as follows—

But we regret to have to inform Your Excellency that we deplore the failure of the Government to denounce and disassociate itself from the implied threats by the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party to impose press censorship by industrial action—

I am talking about industrial action, and about the implied threats by the State Executive of the Labor Party. That is what I wish to speak about; I do not want to go off the rails.

Mr. Hartrey: You are off them.

Mr. RUSHTON: To continue the amendment—

—which is, in effect, an extension of the industrial intimidation now being practised by the Transport Workers' Union (T.W.U.) and brought to the notice of the Legislative Assembly 22nd March, 1973.

Surely this allows me to speak about intimidation by the Government and the involvement of the Australian Labor Party. I only wish to speak about these subjects.

For this reason, I refer to the action on the part of the Trades and Labor Council when a situation of industrial strife existed. At that time the T.L.C.

launched an attack upon the police. This is all a part of the subject of industrial disputes and intimidation. This causes real fear in the minds of people in Western Australia.

At the same time the Secretary of State of the United States of America visited Western Australia. He was intimidated but did not receive much protection; in fact, he received the minimum. This kind of thing is unfair and unreasonable. I will not pursue that subject further but I could continue for hours talking about the inconsistencies which have occurred in this State.

I refer to strong-arm tactics which have been used and, indeed, are being used now. One of the Bills on the notice paper aims to extend this practice. The Government intends to force teachers to join a union on the ground that union members will be considered ahead of teachers who are not members of the union. In making such a statement the Government ignores the qualifications of the teachers concerned. Surely compulsory unionism is a real threat to teachers. Recently, the Federal Government planned to give union members extra holidays. This is another example of blackmail.

Mr. O'Neil: The Federal Government could not get away with it.

Mr. RUSHTON: Fortunately, Canberra has a Senate as we have an Upper House.

Mr. Graham: You are always backing the scabs, aren't you?

Mr. RUSHTON: How can that remark apply to decent people?

Mr. Graham: Decent people are unionists.

Mr. RUSHTON: Those are the most objectionable words anybody could apply to honest people who earn their living in this State.

Mr. Graham: They are living on the backs of their fellow workers.

Mr. O'Neil: Soapbox oratory!

Mr. O'Connor: Others are taking their money for nothing.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have made out a clear case.

Mr. Graham: The funds are put to good use.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have attended meetings and know, from my own experience, what the unions intend. I have clearly shown that unions are trying to make membership compulsory by resorting to extortion, threats, and depriving people of their livelihood.

One of the most objectionable features is that the Labor Party has a vested interest in the whole exercise. For every affiliated member the Australian Labor Party receives at least 25c, if he is an adult, and

a little less if he is not. This is shown in the Constitution of the rules of the A.L.P. This is a racket of the worst order.

I close on this note: we must be extremely jealous of our way of life. Even though we are in Opposition and have one vote less than the Government we certainly must air our beliefs and protect, with everything we have, the livelihood we have enjoyed. We must give people, who are now being intimidated, the courage to carry on until such time as they can be sure they will be undisturbed in their homes and in earning their livelihood. This will only happen when there is a change of Government.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [8.35 p.m.]: My contribution to this debate will be brief but I hope it will be telling.

Mr. Graham: All the lightweights in!

Sir Charles Court: We expected the Government to deal with something.

Mr. Graham: On tripe like this?

Sir Charles Court: It is a question of the freedom of the individual.

Mr. Graham: It is contempt of Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON: I expected a member of the Government to follow either the mover of the motion or the member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: On rubbish like this, the purpose of which is to waste the time of the House?

Mr. O'Neil: We do not have a Government.

Mr. THOMPSON: Apparently members of the Government are not sufficiently interested in this matter because the ministerial benches are far from full.

Mr. Graham: They have gone away out of self-respect.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Premier calls the amendment rubbish but it is a matter of real importance because of the principle involved.

Mr. Graham: Its purpose is to try to stop the Parliament from functioning.

Mr. THOMPSON: As a member of Parliament I have a responsibility to speak to this issue. When suggestions are made that union action should be taken to curb the Press from reporting facts, I believe we ought to be doing something about it.

A spate of events involving intimidation and industrial action have taken place in recent times through the instigation of militant unions. I find it hard to imagine how the Labor Party expects this not to appear in the Press. An example of such intimidation was well covered by a cartoon which appeared in the paper on Saturday, the 24th March. Obviously the comment is directed towards the lift employees' strike during which loads of sand were ordered for delivery to the executives of Otis

Elevator Company. The sand was dumped on lawns or in some other inconvenient place. The cartoon depicts a company director standing with the Minister for Labour adjacent to a heap of sand. The caption reads, "Look at that! A dirty great load of sand dumped on my front lawn! That's union intimidation and what are you gonna do about . . .?"

The caption does not go further because, by that time, the Minister for Labour has his head buried deep in the sand.

When the Government and the unions carry on as they are at the moment they must expect this sort of comment in the Press. When it is handed out to them they ought to be able to present their point of view for the people to accept or reject, as they see it.

One of the actions of the Federal Government was to set up a Department of the Media under the guise, I suggest, that it intended to reduce censorship and allow the Press to have more to say. I suggest to members of this House that the Labor Government wants quite the reverse; it wants to ensure that the Press does not say what it ought to say. So much for the so-called open Government or reduction in censorship.

I would like to quote a portion of the article in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* which has given rise to the debate this evening. One paragraph reads—

The executive said last night that it was painfully aware of a strong bias against the party in *The West Australian*.

The executive instructed its officers to confer with the management committee of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union on the matter.

In view of what has occurred with the Transport Workers' Union and other unions in this State in recent times, it is quite clear that the intention of that portion of the article is to say to people who work in the printing industry, "If your employers want to print articles which are not acceptable to us, you must stop work." We have an obligation to ensure that such tactics are exposed. We must do everything in our power to ensure that they do not continue. Another paragraph of the same article reads—

The agenda sheet on which the branch's adopted suggestions and proposals were printed gave no example of the alleged bias.

The executive of the A.L.P. considered a motion which contained no example of the alleged bias and came to the decision to report it to the Printing and Kindred Industries Union for the union to take action.

Mr. Hartrey: Something like that cartoon of yours!

Mr. THOMPSON: The article quotes the State Secretary of the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party (Mr. Chamberlain) as follows—

He said that the behaviour of the newspaper in the reporting of T.W.U. blackmail allegations was typical.

I will refer to that in depth in a moment but, in the meantime, I wish to quote the balance of the article—

Nowhere in the report from Parliament was there one vestige of evidence in support of the submissions being made.

Bias in the newspaper's editorials was both constant and unfair, he said.

Once again, the "he" mentioned in the article is Mr. Chamberlain. I draw the attention of the House to the example which Mr. Chamberlain himself has quoted as an illustration of the bias which is supposed to appear in *The West Australian*.

The article covering the debate in this House on the 22nd March appears in *The West Australian* of the 23rd March, under the headline, "Allegations of union blackmail". Without going into detail, it goes on to outline very accurately the debate that took place in this House. On the next day—the 24th March—the headline, "Union says blackmail not used", appeared in the same position in the newspaper. Just contrast the two headlines. The first one was, "Allegations of union blackmail". That was fairly clearly what we had to say. Then the union receives an equally good cover, I think, and the headline says, "Union says blackmail not used".

I believe the newspaper could not have been fairer, and that the two articles present very clearly and fairly the two sides of the story, leaving the people of the State to make up their minds and interpret the situation as they will.

It is diabolical for the Labor Party to suggest it will put the screws on the management of *The West Australian* newspaper through the Printing and Kindred Industries Union. I will oppose the actions of the union in this matter as strenuously as I possibly can. I am vitally concerned about it and I am also frightened at the lack of action by the Government. The Government does not appear to take this matter seriously but it is a very serious situation when the Executive of the Labor Party—which controls the puppets who sit opposite—suggests it will bring pressure to bear on the Press and try to curb it. I believe the reporting is very accurate and that the Press does a sterling job.

Mr. Hartrey: For your side.

Mr. THOMPSON: There are times when we on this side of the House do not necessarily like what appears in the Press, but I believe we get a fair and accurate report of the proceedings in this

House and that the Press reports everything as fairly and accurately as possible. I support the amendment.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.43 p.m.]: I rise mainly because the Deputy Premier said all the comments from this side of the House so far had come from the lightweights, so I thought I would give him a heavyweight.

One important point about this motion is that it relates to an action which is, to say the least, unusual, and it could be said to be refreshing. For the first time in my memory, at any rate, the Australian Labor Party is trying to dictate terms to the unions. It is very refreshing, but there is no doubt about why it proposes to do so.

The article that has been referred to in the House clearly indicates that the State Executive of the Labor Party will discuss with the printing trade unions what sort of action can be taken against *The West Australian* newspaper if the proprietors of the newspaper do not, in the view of the Australian Labor Party, play the game a little more fairly and show less bias.

I want to indicate gently, Mr. Speaker, that I was very pleased to see you did not press the point with respect to the speech made by the member for Dale relative to the subject matter of his speech and the degree to which it tied up with the amendment. I am sure once you read the amendment carefully you could see it was not possible to be specific. The amendment is wide enough to cover any matters which could be regarded as industrial intimidation.

It put me in mind of something I read in the paper today, I think, about the intrusion of the Trades and Labor Council—the industrial wing of the Labor movement—into management and labour affairs. I refer particularly to the situation which developed at Exmouth. I heard on the news tonight that 159 Western Australian union members working at Exmouth had expressed in writing their concern that Jim Coleman had been critical of the action taken by the United States commander at the Exmouth base in respect of their employment. They were not happy about it. They said as far as they were concerned the commander had always kept an open door and the conditions at that base were the best in Australia.

In contradistinction to that, Mr. Coleman was reported a little while ago as saying the industrial agreement negotiated in respect of wages and conditions at that base should be renegotiated so that the Americans at the base—who are the employers—would be subject to the industrial arbitration laws in this State. Let me make

it quite clear that there was extreme difficulty in negotiating the industrial agreement in respect of that base, as there always is in a situation where the Government of a country is a party to such an agreement. The armed forces of America or any other nation cannot be made subject to the industrial laws of a country in which they set up an establishment; so the terms and conditions upon which men will be employed are a matter of mutual arrangement.

Mr. Coleman, the American Navy, and the State Government were the three parties who negotiated between themselves as to how these matters could be resolved so that they would be acceptable. We now have the men themselves criticising Mr. Coleman's intervention and saying the conditions at the base are the best in Australia.

Mr. Hartrey: Did you verify the accuracy of the report?

Mr. O'NEIL: I did not. One must be very careful about that. It seems one must put one's own verification stamp on everything from which one quotes. I said, "It is reported". In most cases I qualify my statements. To the best of my knowledge, this is so. Every day I am becoming more and more like a legal practitioner. However, I am very concerned about the matter, and I am sure every honest-minded man on the other side of the House—and there are some—

Mr. Lapham: Thanks!

Mr. O'NEIL: —would not approve of this sort of action; namely, censorship of news by means of industrial action.

This type of action is not new. For some time now we have experienced in this country industrial action motivated by political considerations; not for a long time but for some time. I think all members will recall the action taken by the waterside workers in Darwin who went on strike because one of their number who was on holidays in Greece had been imprisoned in that country. I cannot for the life of me see how the employer was to blame. I cannot for the life of me see how the Government of a country can do anything about such a matter.

Mr. Lapham: What has this to do with the present position?

Mr. O'NEIL: I am talking about the events which have occasioned the motion which is before us. Simply put, the unions should look after unionists—that is their function—and not become involved in the political scene. It may well be that the Labor Party is the voice of the unions in government but its franchise—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Should that apply to doctors, too?

Mr. O'NEIL: If the Premier desires us to discuss the matter of doctors in the same context, I appreciate that he has the right to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply so that we can do so.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What about answering the question. I would like to have your opinion.

Mr. O'NEIL: I do not think it does apply to doctors because in the case of the man in Greece I ask what could employers or the Government in Australia do about the imprisonment of a waterside worker who happened to be on holidays in Greece or any other country.

We had similar threats, which were mentioned before, in respect of refusing to load farmers' produce onto ships—not because the watersiders had an argument with the farmers but because they thought the price of lamb in Western Australia was too high.

The example was given that if the waterside workers imagined the live sheep they were loading at Fremantle would eventually be sold as meat on the Australian market, it is no wonder they are still waterside workers. Anyone with any intelligence knows that the sale of sheep on the hoof overseas would not have any effect on prices here. This was industrial action as a result of political motivation. The political movement threatens industrial action for political reasons. The Australian Labor Party will consult with the Printing and Kindred Industries Union to see what action can be taken to censor the Press in this State. What will the Government do if the Press does not do what the Government thinks it should?

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [8.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now divide.

Mr. O'Connor: A gag!

Sir Charles Court: This is a matter of civil liberties.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'Neil: This is the first time that a Premier has moved a gag in the history of the State.

Several members interjected.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: And just as well I did.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will keep order. Is there a seconder?

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [8.52 p.m.]: I second the motion.

Mr. O'Connor: He does not care about the people.

Motion put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks during Division

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are wasting the time of Parliament—that is what you are doing.

Mr. R. L. Young: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Several members interjected.

Mr. Graham: Just a pack of larrikins.

Mr. O'Connor: Gestapo!

Mr. Graham: Good mates for the Ustasha!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: You are not worried about cut-throats—you are aiding and abetting them, covering up for them.

Mr. O'Connor: Helping the commos.

Mr. Graham: Real Liberals!

Mr. O'Connor: Suppress the Press. Make them do what you want. That is what you are after.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Three amendments in three days. If that is not wasting time, I do not know what is.

Sir Charles Court: We are only in the second week of the session, and well advanced in the Address-in-Reply debate. It usually goes on for weeks.

Mr. O'Connor: You are afraid. That is your trouble.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am not going to tolerate it.

Mr. Graham: Take your tongue out of your cheek.

Mr. O'Connor: You come and take it out—any of you!

Sir Charles Court: Why don't you at least answer the arguments we put forward?

Mr. Graham: Not an ounce of sincerity in any of them.

Mr. O'Neill: The Deputy Premier talks about lightweights!

Mr. Graham: None of you were game to stand up until you were taunted into it.

Mr. O'Neill: Nobody from your side has spoken.

Mr. Graham: It is tripe. Why should we waste time on it.

Mr. O'Neill: The Premier gags the debate.

Mr. Graham: Only after four of you have blown off your spleen.

The SPEAKER: Lock the doors.

Mr. Graham: Lock them up too!

The SPEAKER: The Premier has moved that the House do now divide.

Sir Charles Court: Democracy is going out the window tonight.

Mr. Graham: Democracy! It was thrown out of the Legislative Council many years ago.

Sir Charles Court: The Premier has not even replied to the amendment. What about civil liberties?

Result of Division

Division resulted as follows—

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Moller
Mr. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Harman
Mr. Fletcher	

Noes—20

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rushton
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Noes

Mr. May	Sir David Brand
Mr. Davies	Dr. Dadour
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Taylor	Mr. R. L. Young

Motion thus passed.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks during Division

Mr. Graham: The Bunbury by-election has a lot to answer for.

Mr. Thompson: The Press is going to censor Parliament.

Mr. Bickerton: What comes out of the bucket tomorrow?

Mr. Thompson: That depends what happens tonight.

Mr. Graham: You must be getting very low tonight.

Result of Division

Division resulted as follows—

Ayes—20

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rushton
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Moller
Mr. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Harman
Mr. Fletcher	

Pairs

Noes

Sir David Brand	Mr. May
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Davies
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. R. L. Young	Mr. Taylor

(Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MIR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [9.00 p.m.]: I would like to comment on a pernicious practice which has developed regarding the sale of secondhand motor vehicles. This practice is one in which a person takes his motor vehicle to a car yard and leaves it there whilst he takes another vehicle from the yard for a drive or, perhaps, for an R.A.C. test, and when he returns to the yard he is told that he will have to take a car from the yard because his own vehicle has been sold. I have received four complaints along those lines and three of them concerned one company.

Mr. O'Connor: We have had many complaints, but the Government will not take any notice.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I believe this is a shocking practice. As it has occurred three times in respect of one company I believe it is a deliberate practice and not merely an oversight.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Did the person concerned sign any paper?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: It is true that if people stick up for their rights and stand fast against such practices they will have some redress; but we all know many people are not businesslike and can be talked into signing papers. One chap went to the police and was told that the best thing to do under the circumstances was to take a car from the yard. It is a pity that the consumer protection organisation was not able to help him once he had signed the papers. This kind of practice is shocking.

Mr. Coyne: They must be terribly naive.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Yes, such people are but that does not make the practice any better. Perhaps the honourable member is suggesting that it is quite in order for people to take advantage of others who are naive. All of us are naive in certain respects, but I do not think that suggests we should take advantage of others who are not so well endowed in certain respects as we are.

I would like now to discuss the concept of an open university. The 1970 enrolment figures for tertiary education institutions in this State indicate that only 18 per cent. of students come from country areas; yet people in the country areas represent approximately 33 per cent. of the population of the State. Therefore, country people are clearly disadvantaged and are outnumbered something like two to one with regard to tertiary education enrolments.

One of the reasons for this is the fact that it is not easy for those who live in the country to enrol on campus. A second reason is that the facilities for extension work are very poor. I think this raises the whole question of the desirability of an open university.

I am very interested in the Western Australian Institute of Technology pilot scheme in Bunbury, where the institute is attempting to do something extra for country people. As an aside I would mention that that comment was included in my notes before I knew of the proposed by-election in Bunbury!

Perhaps some people might say that the University of Western Australia is in a sense an open university because it does have external students, and so on; but it does not really fill the bill. The courses available to external students at the university are very limited. In addition, there is an entrance barrier which is directed against those who, for example, have not yet matriculated. Matriculation, of course, is obtained by successfully completing a secondary education, and studies are available which show that secondary education success is a very poor predictor of success at the tertiary level.

I would suggest that the University of Western Australia is not really interested in external students. It does not really go out of its way to encourage them, and it is not possible to study externally in many courses at the university.

On the other hand, I believe the W.A.I.T. is endeavouring to a much greater extent to encourage external studies. Indeed, some Queensland students of accountancy are enrolled externally there, and students who are resident in New South Wales are taking a course in education administration. The W.A.I.T. has about 800 external students, compared with the 300 or so at the university. This indicates that the W.A.I.T. is taking its responsibility in this respect much more seriously than is the university.

If the University of Western Australia, or another university, were to take its responsibility to country people more seriously, it would need to liberalise its entrance qualifications. It would need to take into account experience in vocational fields. It is almost unheard of for students to be admitted to tertiary institutions on the basis of their vocational experience. I think that is a big mistake because many people have had first-class vocational experience in the field in the course of their employment. They may, in fact, have been very successful in doing a job for 15 years; yet when they want to enrol at a tertiary education institution that experience is not taken into account.

I would like to quote some of the studies which show that attainment in secondary education is not a good predictor of success in tertiary education. I refer, for example, to the work of Professor Partridge of the A.N.U.; the University of New South Wales Interim Report of the Tertiary Education Research Centre; the Queensland Public Examinations Board's Report for Secondary Students; and the work of Professor

C. A. Gibb who is the Chairman of the Matriculation Committee of the A.N.U. All of those studies indicate that secondary attainment is not necessarily a good predictor of eventual success at the tertiary level.

In addition to liberalising entrance qualifications, a genuine open university would need to use extensively techniques of radio, television, telephone hook-up, and cassettes. For example, a special television channel could be established such as the one at Kilkenny in South Australia.

A new and largely untapped resource could be tapped. I refer to the resources of people in the community. Any community has large numbers of people who are skilled in some facet; and yet most of our educational institutions do not draw upon the expertise of those people. Regional study centres could be established, supported by tertiary institutions which send staff into the country for intensive courses; and technical schools could be used in country areas. There would need to be considerable collaboration with the Library Board.

It would be necessary for open university courses to be individualised and highly flexible. At present most courses are highly inflexible. It should be possible to study all subjects externally. Home kits have been developed in many countries of the world for use in the study of subjects that require practical work, such as physics and chemistry.

A good open university would need to provide courses at all levels, and to award degrees and diplomas or allow study without certification.

If we consider the facilities at the University of Western Australia we find they are used, by and large, for about 26 weeks of the year. The facilities of the W.A.I.T. are in use for about 35 weeks of the year. This, of course, is a great waste of capital expenditure. These facilities could be used to provide intensive courses at various times of the year when they are not being used by the university or the Institute of Technology.

We would need to have a central co-ordinating and administrative centre. The quality of the staff would have to be of a very high calibre. The open university in Britain faced the problem of non-recognition until it proved itself by the high standard of its academic staff and its students. It is now accepted in the United Kingdom along with the more traditional universities.

The large number of housewives who take sedatives and who visit psychiatrists is indicative of the boredom suffered by those in suburbia which could be alleviated for at least some people by their studying at an open university which would cater for the needs of men as well as women.

Professional people residing in the outback areas of the State who have become "rusty" in their occupation may need the benefit of refresher courses. They would benefit greatly from an open university.

Job retraining could also be undertaken. A great deal of the unemployment in Australia at present, which will continue unless we do something about it, is structural unemployment rather than cyclical, and is a reflection of the lack of training of people who need retraining for other occupations as certain of these occupations become less necessary. The result of the neglect of such retraining is an over-supply of labour in certain vocational fields, and the provision of retraining courses would be one way in which an open university could contribute towards higher productivity throughout the nation by making redundant workers employable.

I refer to a very interesting and exciting experiment that has been made in the United States of America. That is the establishment of a university without walls. The results of the development of an open university would mean that higher education would be more accessible to those in rural areas; to those who had had a raw deal as far as tertiary education was concerned, in particular, and, of course, to those people in the country who suffer many disadvantages. Another advantage of an open university would be the concept of continuous re-education. I have already mentioned the problems of structural unemployment.

The concept that once a person is trained for a particular job he is trained for evermore is quite inadequate. There is a need for continual in-service training, and an open university could assist considerably towards this end. In some countries of the world professional people lose their licenses to practice in their own field unless they attend refresher courses at certain set periods. This is a most desirable requirement if professional men are to keep up to date with the latest techniques and concepts.

Another advantage of an open university would be the avoidance of high operating costs. I feel certain that this idea of an open university will develop. If it were established it would reach out into the country, for education presents a great problem especially in a State such as Western Australia with an area of 1,000,000 square miles. An open university would also introduce flexibility so that any person who wanted to study only one subject, and who did not want to work towards certification, would be able to educate himself in that particular subject. I believe that such a concept will develop in the future, but I hope it will be in the not-too-distant future. I hope the Government will start to tackle this problem and investigate the

possibility of establishing an open university so that its development will come a little nearer.

I will now touch upon another serious matter of education. To my knowledge this question has not been really tackled by any Government. This is the question of the inefficient teacher. There are some teachers in schools who are receiving a teacher's salary but who are not permitted to enter a classroom because they are not fit and proper persons to take a class.

Mr. Nalder: Are you referring to those teachers who have had proper training?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Yes, I am. They are not allowed to teach in a classroom and yet they are permitted to receive their pay. Members can imagine the effect on young people who come out of a teachers' college, who work long hours and are enthusiastic. They look across a staffroom to see a teacher reading a novel and still getting paid for it.

Mr. Nalder: What would be the reason for his not being permitted to teach?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: The teacher is quite incompetent. We have to face the fact that no matter what occupation we may select, we will find certain people who are not fitted for that occupation and who would be better out of it. If a farmer is inefficient, despite heavy subsidies, he will become bankrupt and so have to walk off his farm.

Mr. O'Connor: There would be only a limited number of such teachers, though, would there not?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: There are too many.

Mr. O'Connor: I realise that one is too many.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Yes, but there is more than one. The system of the efficiency mark has been abandoned by the Education Department, which is a sound idea. When the efficiency mark was in vogue it was common for a superintendent to go to a teacher and to say, "Do you think you might get promotion next year? If so, I will give you a one or a two-mark rise." However, if a teacher were efficient and he approached the superintendent and said, "I think I am entitled to a two-mark rise", the superintendent may say, "No, I will not give you a two-mark rise, because you will not get promotion anyway." In such circumstances the system of the efficiency mark was a very poor one. In any occupation inefficient individuals will be found, and they must be weeded out. Therefore, in the field of education the Teachers' Union must accept that responsibility; that is, it must endeavour to develop some sound system to get rid of the inefficient teacher.

I have heard the analogy made that no-one looks over the shoulder of a doctor or a lawyer to evaluate his proficiency or

to award him so many marks out of 100. However, I do not think that such a comparison can be made, because if a doctor buries many of his patients he will soon find that the supply of patients runs out. The same applies to an inefficient lawyer. If he loses many of his cases he will soon build up a bad reputation and will not attract many clients.

However, a child who is put into a classroom under an inefficient teacher cannot remove himself from that class. He is placed in that classroom and he realises that his future is going down the drain because his teacher is incompetent. But what can he do to rectify such a situation? What he usually does, of course, is to become insolent and disobedient and usually he gets a whacking for it. I believe that this is one of the difficult discipline problems that is being faced in the schools today. One of the difficulties, of course, is that inefficiency in teaching is not easily measured.

Mr. Rushton: If he were a member of the union he would be all right.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I do not intend to take any notice of the honourable member's interjections, because he would not even know how to spell the word "education". I am dealing with a serious problem, and the member for Dale merely wants to score cheap and nasty political points.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: The problem is that it is most difficult to be able to measure the efficiency of a teacher, but just because it is difficult is no reason that it should be ignored. I believe that a system should be developed. I am going to stick my neck out to make a tentative suggestion, realising that I could be shot down fairly easily.

I think a system could be developed under which the headmaster makes a report on the teacher. If three successive headmasters made an adverse report on a teacher, and it was verified by a superintendent, it would be sufficient. We need some system like that. I realise that mistakes will be made and injustices will be perpetrated, but at present there are injustices occurring because the people concerned seem to have forgotten that education is for the children, and is not meant as a pensioning off place for incompetents.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Do you think that suggestion of yours can be proof against personalities entering into it?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: There is no proof against personalities entering into it; that is the problem. However, when a person goes into the Army or into the Navy, is given an examination to qualify as a lawyer, or is employed at Boans, personalities

come into it. We cannot say to those concerned, "You have to employ these people. You have to pay their salaries, even if they are incompetent." I agree there are serious problems and injustices, but greater injustices are occurring with the problem not being tackled.

Why should teachers be singled out? Once a person goes through a teachers' college he remains a teacher for the rest of his life. This is largely true. I know that some teachers have been dispensed with, but I also know that a large number have not.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Do you not think that the headmasters should make the judgment?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: The headmaster is a person who is close to the scene and who sees the teacher day after day. The headmaster is in as good a position to do this as any other person, but safeguards will have to be provided. Provision can be made for an appeal tribunal, as long as that is realistic. I am not minimising the difficulties, but I do not agree that just because the problem is difficult we should not solve it. With the dispensing of the efficiency marking system we find this to be one of the problems of the promotional system: once a teacher gets onto the escalator as a senior master he will become a deputy principal, and no power can stop him.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: He has to have qualifications when he comes before the tribunal.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: What qualifications, if he already has a degree?

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: He has to prove that he is better qualified than another.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: He may have a higher degree, but even if he has not he has only to wait. Once a teacher has been a senior master at a senior high school for seven years he will be guaranteed an appointment as a deputy principal if he is prepared to go teaching in the bush.

Mr. Rushton: There is merit in what you are saying. What does the Teachers' Union think?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: The union must face up to its responsibilities, and I will leave it to the union to decide. The problem of discipline has been raised, and in this connection an excellent report has been presented. One of the problems of discipline is that children are being taught matters irrelevant to their needs. I believe that education must become more relevant. I believe that school councils comprising students, teachers, and parents are desirable. We should get away from the authoritarian system whereby the headmaster controls the school completely.

I realise that progressive headmasters believe they need to get away from this authoritarian, undemocratic system, and

adopt a system under which the students, the teachers, and the parents have some say in the development of education. We have to remember that education is 90 per cent. a product of the home; and if we refuse parents the right to take part in the education system then we are emasculating the system, making it irrelevant, and taking away the main educational dynamo—the home.

I now wish to refer briefly to the very small percentage of children—perhaps 1 per cent.—who are not fit to be at school. I realise that in the long term these children will have psychiatric problems, and we need social workers in the schools to help them. However, until that help is forthcoming I believe some of these children should be removed from school, because they are making it very difficult for the remaining 99 per cent. of the children. There is evidence to show that suspension from school is not a deterrent. I am not interested in retribution, and I do not think any civilised nation should be interested in retribution. The main result of suspension is that it will protect the great majority of the children from a small minority.

Mr. O'Neil: What level of education are you referring to—primary or secondary?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I shall now leave the educational field and turn very briefly to a subject which I think is absolutely vital. Last week the member for Mt. Marshall suggested that the Australian Labor Party and the communists were on parallel lines. I am not sure what he meant exactly in saying that, but I would suggest that it was either a deliberate untruth or else it was an indication of crass ignorance. I cannot see any alternative to those two assertions.

This kind of statement has been very commonly made by the Conservative parties of Australia for a long time, and Sir Robert Menzies won many elections on the communist bogey. I would like to develop two theses or beliefs which can be demonstrated by looking at history. The two theses are these—

(1) Extremism begets extremism.

If one group of people take extreme measures to attain their aim, then the other group of people opposed to them are forced to take extreme measures in opposition. In other words, extremism is counter productive. The next point is this—

(2) Those who erect a society based on privilege and injustice encourage extremists, such as the communists, to take extreme action.

In actual fact those people are agents of the communists, because they encourage extremist effort in order to remove these injustices.

I refer to three examples from Australian society of what I consider to be injustices. Firstly, there is the abundance of restrictive trade practices. Restrictive trade practices have been allowed to flourish under successive Liberal-Country Party Governments. Secondly, I would cite the perverted and dishonest electoral system which allows five members in another place to represent fewer people than one other member, and thereby distort completely the wishes of the people. Thirdly, I refer to a system that does nothing at all to protect Australian resources and land from foreign ownership.

Sir Charles Court: Your Government is chasing overseas investments.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: These are the types of instances which breed the extremism of the extreme left. I would like to quote what the great German poet, Goethe, said—

Those who do not understand the past are doomed to relive it.

It is well to look at history briefly, and here I would cite the French Revolution during which King Louis XVI was assailed by demands for reform.

He was at the head of a rotten and corrupt state. One of his advisers, Mirabeau, suggested that the way to save the monarchy was for the king to put himself at the head of the revolution and ally himself with the people, to embrace the revolution, and to effect the reforms. He said this would save the monarchy. Being a stupid man Louis XVI preferred to take the advice of his brother, Artois, and the Austrians. The result was that he followed reactionary policies; and we know what happened to the monarchy.

Lafayette, who was nicknamed by Napoleon as "The Simpleton", took the extreme step of marching on Paris to suppress the Clubs. We know what happened. The reaction became so strong and the Clubs became so violent that we had the terror of Danton and Robespierre. That arose through the need to defend the revolution against reactionary people like Lafayette.

Then in turn we see Danton and Robespierre falling from power and the white terror of the Thermidorean reaction. So once again we see the result of extremist action by first one side and then the other.

The situation in Germany in this century is one of the classic cases. We see the conservative and wealthy classes becoming very worried about communism which had 6,000,000 supporters at various elections. The communists were a real threat, so the conservative classes decided to destroy communism by becoming extremists themselves and supporting the Nazis. An extreme right wing movement was set up to defeat an extreme left wing movement.

I will name a few of the wealthy class who gave their support to the Nazis in order to defeat communism. There were Baron Kurt Von Schroeder who was an enormously wealthy banker; Rostberg and Diehn in the potash industry; the Hamburg-Amerika shipping line; Fritz Thyssen, the steel manufacturer; I. G. Farben, the giant chemical manufacturer; Voegler, of United Steel; Emil Kirdorf, the union-hating coal baron; Hugo Bruckman, a wealthy publisher from Munich; Carl Beckstein, a piano manufacturer; the Deutsch Bank; the Commerz und Privat Bank; the Dresdener Bank; the Deutsche Kredit Gesellschaft; and the Allianz, Germany's largest insurance concern.

These big wealthy concerns backed Hitler to the hilt because they believed he would save them from communism.

Hitler's first cabinet contained only three Nazis; that is, Hitler, Goering, and Frick. Who were the others? They were Neurath, a conservative; General Blomberg, representing the Army; Hugenberg, the leader of the Nationalists, Germany's major Conservative Party; Von Seldte, leader of Stahlhelm, the ex-servicemen's organisation; and Von Papen, the aristocratic conservative.

It makes me smile when I hear the member for Floreat talk about the Nazis and demonstrations in the streets because the only party which was game enough to vote against the enabling law in 1933 which riveted a hideous dictatorship upon Germany—and that took a great deal of courage with the Sturmabteilungen and the Schutzstaffeln 10 deep outside the temporary Reichstag shouting, "We want the Bill or fire and murder"—was the social democrats which party, in Germany at that time, was the closest in the political spectrum to the Australian Labor Party.

So Germany had a choice between the extreme right wing and the extreme left wing. It could have chosen the middle path which was represented by the social democrats, but it chose the extreme right; and where did the extreme right lead the people? It led them into world war; it led East Germany to have riveted upon it that extreme left wing organisation, the Communist Party. The very thing Hitler was supposed to destroy was brought into power because of him.

This is my thesis: that extremism begets extremism.

Let me give one more example from history. In July, 1917, a very conservative gentleman named Kornilov, who was an Army general, said, "By gad! You know, we will show this socialist Kerensky and his mob who is boss—the real rulers of Russia!" He then marched his army towards Petrograd to destroy the moderate government of Kerensky. The only thing Kerensky could do to save his Government was to release the Bolsheviks from gaol and Lenin returned from abroad. The result was that

Lenin saved the revolution because of the stupidity of Kornilov and the right wing who thought they would destroy these moderates and who by destroying the moderates allowed the Bolsheviks to take over—an extreme left wing organisation which we know still rules the Soviet Union today.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Do you believe in a one party or a multi-party system?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I believe in the multi-party system. I believe in people and I believe they should have as many parties as they wish, but that does not mean to say that I do not recognise the fact that a two-party system is more stable. The people have the right to a 12-party system if they want it, but if they adopt such a system they may have to pay the price; that is, instability. Surely members know enough about the post-war Government of France to realise the extreme instability which can occur as a result of a multiplicity of parties.

I believe in people and I am happy to allow the people to judge us. If the people want many parties, let them have them. However, for the sake of stability it is agreed that two or three parties are preferable to a multiplicity.

I would conclude by saying that I have heard in this very Chamber the same right wing extremist nonsense which was spoken in Hitler's Germany, and many times since; and I have heard talk about the moderate Australian Labor Party being identical with the Communist Party. This is evidence of sheer ignorance, in most cases, and if it is not ignorance it is certainly not truthful. I suggest that if we do not want communism to take root in this country we must base our policies on honesty and decency and we must introduce, for example, a decent electoral system which will result in the will of the people being implemented. This will overcome the great perversions of justice which occur every time an election for the Legislative Council takes place. We must get rid of restrictive trade practices and prevent our resources being taken over by foreign policy. We have had a disgraceful example of extremist right wing organisations—terrorist organisations in fact—being protected by the late McMahon Government. It is disgraceful that Senator Murphy had to conduct a midnight raid in order to uncover the scandal. How disgraceful is it that such action must be taken in order to uncover extremist terrorist organisations which were being protected by Senator Greenwood and the previous Government.

I suggest that we, the Australian Labor Party, will continue to eschew the extremism of the right and left wings and give to the Australian people a sane, balanced middle path.

MR. COYNE (Murchison-Eyre) [9.38 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to deal with a few matters which affect my electorate. However, before doing so I would like to add my congratulations to those of others to the member for Blackwood on his recent election to the Chamber. I would like also to congratulate him on his very forceful participation in the debate last Thursday.

The most important topic about which I wish to speak tonight is the drought in the north-eastern goldfields. Because many members are not certain of the situation in the north-eastern goldfields I would like to bring some of the facts to their notice. Many people have said that efforts on behalf of the pastoral industry seem to be of no avail because the Government is evidently intent upon abandoning the pastoralists to their fate.

As my electorate embraces the greater part of the pastoral areas in this State, I would like to take up the cudgels on behalf of the group involved. I take up the cudgels not only as the member for Murchison-Eyre, but also as a person with a considerable background in the pastoral industry. I was more or less reared in the Murchison and north-eastern goldfields, and I have spent the greater portion of my life there. I feel I have an affinity with the people who are affected by the drought. I do not claim to know a great deal about the technical aspects of wool production, but I have had a lot to do with the people concerned, particularly in the years prior to my being elected to this House.

I was previously employed by an organisation which allowed me to roam fairly actively right throughout what is predominantly the Murchison-Eyre electorate. During that time I travelled approximately 250,000 miles and wore out two motorcars in the process. I would say without fear of contradiction that very few people in this State would have a greater knowledge than I have of the pastoral industry. I know the people who work in the industry, their families, and others connected with that industry. Generally, the people involved in the wool industry are a very industrious group, indeed.

To put members into the picture I will recapitulate the situation as it exists today. The area in question is still in the grip of the most disastrous drought experienced since the country was inhabited in the mid-1890s. Despite the fact that rain has now fallen in the area, and that wool prices have risen, the situation of the people living in this area has not been enhanced in any way. The rain which fell as a result of cyclone Kerry completely missed the area to which I am referring. The cyclone proceeded south from the northern areas until it reached Wiluna, and then it veered east and brought heavy rain to the remote area east of Wiluna.

The cyclone then headed for South Australia and finished up in Victoria. It did not greatly improve the situation in the Murchison and north-eastern goldfields.

The drought came at a time when wool prices were depressed and when there was a great upheaval in the industry in that area. Mining companies and careless prospectors, geologists, and pegging teams which invaded the area caused tremendous and irreparable damage to many station properties. As a result of those setbacks sheep numbers dropped alarmingly from 649,000 in 1969 to less than 200,000 at the present time. I will not go into great detail on this particular aspect because it has been stated many times previously. We have already set out the amount of wool produced per sheep, but I want to bring the situation up to date before I get on to the main topic of my speech.

My main topic, of course, is the report presented by the Drought Finance Committee. In my opinion, it is out of date already. More thought should have been given to its presentation and to the tabling of it at this particular time.

The eastern goldfields is regarded as the best area for the production of high-grade wool. The clips from this area have a wide acceptance because they compare very favourably with the clips from other high production areas, such as Manjimup.

To give members some idea of the tremendous asset which exists in the area—as far as export income is concerned—if the present day clip equalled that of 1967 to 1969, prior to the onset of the drought, it would be worth \$6,000,000.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That was an overstocking situation though, was it not?

Mr. COYNE: I am referring to the period just prior to the onset of the drought, and also to present day prices. I want to develop my argument a little further and demonstrate to members that this is an industry which is worth saving.

Financial relief for those affected by serious drought is readily available in the Eastern States. States such as New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria have received approximately \$130,000,000 in drought relief from the Commonwealth since 1965. Western Australia has not received any drought relief funds. Despite representations made by various committees from the area, from the Executive of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, and from myself in this House, nothing has been done except the formation of the Drought Finance Committee. It was obvious to everybody that the Government was not enthusiastic about setting up the committee, and the result was that it took a long time for the report to be tabled in this House.

The report on the drought areas was tabled last week, and the findings and recommendations of the committee were greeted with incredulity by those engaged in the pastoral industry. I believe a more sensible action on the part of the Government would have been to withhold the report, or present it with a proviso pertaining to the present price of wool because a completely different situation now applies to the viability of pastoral properties.

The members of the Drought Finance Committee were Mr. G. H. Chessell, Chairman of the Rural & Industries Bank; the Under Treasurer (Mr. K. Townsing), and the Director of Agriculture (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The members of the Working Party were Mr. B. G. Jennings, Senior Adviser, the Rural & Industries Bank of W.A.; Mr. R. F. Johnson, Chief Pastoral Inspector, Department of Lands and Surveys; Mr. D. G. Halleen, Pastoral Supervisor, Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Ltd.; Mr. D. J. Halleen, Pastoral Supervisor, Dalgety (Australia) Ltd.; and Mr. D. G. Wilcox, B.Sc. (Agric.) (Hons.), Agricultural Adviser, Department of Agriculture.

First of all, I will deal with the report which states, in part—

The Working Party found that drought is a feature of the pastoral environment and concluded that it was a pastoralist's responsibility to make adequate provision for this eventuality which, in the subject area, was likely to occur in 19 years out of 40. Rainfall records go back far enough for pastoralists to know the risks of their industry.

It is fair to say that drought is a feature of the pastoral environment in that area. However, the statement that drought is likely to occur in 19 years out of 40 gives the wrong impression. I have the rainfall figures over the last 75 years, from 1898 to 1972 inclusive. These are—

Inches	Rainfall Period Years	Occurrence over 75 years
2-3	2	1 in 37
3-4	5	1 in 15
4-5	10	1 in 7.5
5-6	9	1 in 8
6-7	8	1 in 9
7-8	8	1 in 9
8-9	7	1 in 10
9-10	6	1 in 12
10 and over	20	1 in 4

I would say a bad season is one with a rainfall of less than 5 inches; a reasonable season, one with a rainfall of 7 to 9 inches; and a good season, one with a rainfall from 9 to 20 inches.

During the period I have mentioned the bad years amount to 23 per cent.; the reasonable years, when there was a rainfall of 5 to 9 inches, amount to 43 per

cent.; and the good years amount to 34 per cent. Consequently there is a 77 per cent. chance of a good year. During the period since 1898, excluding the last four consecutive years, the rainfall was under the 4-inch mark for only one six-year period.

I am making the point that a drought situation does not occur in this area at frequent intervals. In effect, it has occurred only once since 1898. I have with me a graph indicating the rainfall since 1898.

Currently we are facing a drought which has continued for four years and is going into the fifth year. The Government has let these people down badly by abandoning them and not giving them financial assistance. The situation has changed a great deal in the few months since the investigation was undertaken.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The drought programme is back-dated to last year. Does the honourable member realise that?

Mr. COYNE: I realise this, but the important point is that the Drought Finance Committee has not recommended any worth-while assistance for the pastoral industry in general. Now it is more evident than ever that the committee should do this.

The stock firms were the first to turn pastoralists down, despite the high interest rates they had charged to lend money to the pastoralists. Surely the fact that the stock firms are now prepared to come back into the field indicates that the pastoral industry is viable again.

The report states that something like 70 stations out of 116 are not viable. The picture has changed completely and every station would now be viable. Certainly a property with 3,000 sheep would be a viable one.

Mr. H. D. Evans: In that case, they would be entitled to rural reconstruction assistance. The rates of interest here are far better than those charged by stock companies or, for that matter, the loans provided on a short-term basis by the previous Government.

Mr. COYNE: I hope that is the position.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is.

Mr. COYNE: Pastoralists will be glad to hear that. The report later states—

The Drought Finance Committee agreed with the philosophy that the area must be self-sufficient and not expect Government assistance to survive the normal risks of their environment. They considered that the industry must give sufficient attention to the necessity for financial reserves to meet drought conditions.

That is a reasonable statement. The fact that pastoralists have developed their properties, educated their children, and

met other commitments would surely indicate that the pastoral properties are self-sufficient. They have done all this from their reserves and have not leaned on the Government in any way except for a brief period in 1933 or 1934.

The wording in the report seems to imply that the industry has forever been on the Government's back looking for hand-outs. This is not the position, because this is the first time it has occurred. The situation is abnormal because nearly five years of drought have left the industry defenceless. Pastoralists must receive some assistance.

Drought bonds were not introduced until 1968. It was really too late for the pastoralists to take any action to conserve any funds from the introduction of drought bonds. Even though the pastoral industry had been advocating the bonds since 1948 they were introduced only in 1968.

People in the pastoral industry, including myself, are mystified; we want to know why some form of long-term loan cannot be made available. I think it is suggested somewhere in the report that many companies are engaged in the pastoral industry and that they have not made proper provision for long-term reserves but have leached from their businesses dividends which have left the properties bereft of reserve finance.

I have a fair knowledge of the area and would say that 70 per cent. of pastoral leases are run by the sons and grandsons of the original pioneers. This applies not only to the north-eastern goldfields but right throughout the Murchison-Eyre electorate. I am sure my statement could be substantiated. These people inherited the properties and they are the ones who should be assisted. Over the years the pastoral industry has paid a tremendous amount in taxation. Surely help should be given to pastoralists now.

Recently the ex-member for Blackwood (Mr. David Reid) suggested that some form of wool bonds would be the answer. He thought that wool bonds would have a better application than drought bonds which can only be used when a drought is declared. It was suggested that wool bonds would enable pastoralists to bear with the ups and downs. Indeed, it was suggested that pastoralists would know a smoother period overall and that this would allow the industry to establish itself better. The suggestion was to consolidate the profitable years and allow for the bad years as well. I believe an approach along these lines has been made to the Federal Government, and I certainly wish Mr. Reid success with it.

Inadequate provision of reserves seems to be a recurring charge against the industry. Prior to 1968 no real attempt was made by any Government to supply pastoralists with a means of providing the

reserves. The State Government has offered to meet shire rates and pastoral rents owed by those who can prove hardship. However, up to date very few decisions have been made and as far as I know no relief at all has been granted to the applicants.

Mr. H. D. Evans: How many of the applicants were rejected, and why?

Mr. COYNE: I do not know. I appreciate that shire rates must be met. Shire councils have difficulty in trying to run their affairs. In the Murchison-Eyre electorate something like \$110,000 is owed in shire rates, and \$63,000 is the total annual amount, so these are matters which should be given attention. I can understand the reluctance of the Government to pay the shire rates. It has already given an indication that relief from shire rates will be provided under a means test. I think it is only fair that some sort of means test should be applied to establish eligibility for relief from shire rates.

It is felt that defined guidelines should be set down for drought relief in Western Australia so that people will know how they stand in the event of a drought. The advantages they usually receive are free cartage of cattle and sheep in and out for agistment, subsidies on fodder in, relief from rent and shire rates, and so on. Anything above that should be subject to a means test.

I recently saw a booklet published by the Victorian Government which set out the guidelines adopted by that Government for drought relief in Victoria. The guidelines are set out in such a way that everybody knows where he stands. The Victorian Government provides relief for water carting, stock out on agistment, stock in on agistment, and fodder inwards and outwards. The most valuable assistance that could be offered in Western Australia would be something similar to the drought relief offered in Victoria, which is cash at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum.

The Drought Finance Committee made the following recommendation in its report—

The Government make up to \$200,000 available as required finance on 20 year terms at 6½ per cent. for the assimilation of non-viable stations by their viable neighbours;

The sum of \$200,000 will not go very far in regard to assimilation and the takeover of other stations, and the interest rate of 6½ per cent. is rather steep.

A contribution of \$1,000,000 by this State has been suggested. I do not know whether that is a fact, but it is rumoured to be \$1,000,000. Is it really \$1,000,000? And why should it be \$1,000,000? Why not \$500,000? A sum of \$500,000 would considerably alleviate the situation. I think \$1,000,000 would be too much at the present time, although it would not be too

much in the long run, particularly when the drought breaks. At that time all the properties which are at present suffering a drought will need to be restocked. Restocking will not be required immediately. It will take 18 months or two years to restock, but the properties will have to be restocked and the funds will have to be provided.

In Kalgoorlie last weekend I met some of the people who are affected by the drought. In particular, I met the owner of Edjudina Station, which is one of the larger, prize properties in the pastoral areas of this State. In 1967, prior to the drought, 27,000 sheep were shorn on that property and it sold 1,026 bales of wool. This year, 7,000 sheep were shorn and the property produced 220 bales of wool. The operations for this year cost \$20,000, in round figures, despite the increase in the price of wool.

Over the years, the owners of Edjudina Station have spent something like \$400,000 on development of the property since they took it up. They still have collateral because they are responsible people who have been thrifty and wise, but they would be rather severely disadvantaged in trying to find the kind of money needed to replenish their stock at today's prices.

This is just one example of the amount of money that will be needed when the drought breaks—and the drought will break eventually. I read in the stop press tonight that 150 points of rain had been received at Laverton Downs. The member for Swan brought that to my attention by way of indicating that the drought had broken. However, it was only a local thunderstorm; it was not general.

I could cite numbers of cases where large amounts of capital will be needed to get people back on their feet again. It is obvious to everybody that this industry is worth saving. About lunch time yesterday I heard on the country news that the Japanese are buying wool forward 12 months at today's prices. They must be fairly certain that the industry will survive for another 12 months. So I would say the industry itself should be fairly optimistic about the future.

Mr. Gayler: Especially if the Wool Commission is prepared to prop the prices.

Mr. COYNE: Yes. I give another example of how the pastoralists, generally, have been caught in a vice. Yesterday, I was talking to a man who told me that when the prices started to go up pastoralists were approached by the stock firms which suggested they should sell their wool forward; in other words, sell on the future.

These woolgrowers took the advice of the particular firm in question. Two family properties were involved. One woolgrower was in a particularly serious

predicament because he was denied carry-on finance. The only way he could obtain finance was to enter into a commitment to sell his wool forward on the prevailing prices in Sydney. He entered into an agreement with the firm and he is now receiving about one-third of the present-day value of his wool clip, and will lose somewhere between \$15,000 and \$20,000.

The brother of the man concerned owns a nearby property. This man initially sold half his wool clip forward on the same conditions as his brother. The stock firm in question approached him again, and he sold a further amount in the same way. These two woolgrowers are not viewing the present situation with any great degree of happiness.

My real purpose in rising tonight is to put in a plug for the farmers. Further in this report the Government states that it is anxious to assist pastoralists to leave the industry, and it will advance money to this end. The report reads—

The Drought Finance Committee noted that the Working Party recommended that the Government sponsor the reconstruction of the pastoral industry in two ways:

- (a) The provision of long term loans to encourage assimilation of non-viable units by adjoining viable units;

I have already discussed that point briefly. The next paragraph reads as follows—

- (b) The payment of severance grants to pastoralists on non-viable leases to leave the industry by way of advanced payments of the proceeds of possible future sales of surrendered leases. It was estimated that the total cost of this measure would be \$240,000 of which a significant proportion would be returnable to the Government.

The Government is prepared to assist people to leave the industry to the tune of \$240,000. I want to know where we will find the people to replace those who will leave their farms. In most cases the farmers are industrious people who are quite happy to live in the country.

I believe it would be far wiser to use the \$240,000 to keep these people on the land. What a great exercise in decentralisation this would be!

I have covered the general situation as well as I am able. I hope I have drawn the attention of members to the difficulties being experienced on the land at present. This particular group of people have put in their capital and worked hard, but their properties are no longer viable because of the drought. Expenses are far too high. I stress particularly the hardships facing

the women in remote areas. The upbringing and educating of children in the country is far more difficult than the educating and upbringing of children in the city. These people deserve help. I wish I had the expertise to present their case in a more articulate and positive manner.

I hope my comments tonight will show the Government how we feel about these people. The assistance presently offered to pastoralists is really only a guideline for the next drought. The problems of the woolgrowers will not be alleviated by the present assistance offered. Even the subsidy on fodder cartage was discontinued. Sheep about to be shorn or transported out of the country have to be strengthened to withstand the rigours of shearing or travelling. Shearing is now being carried out under great difficulties because the woolgrowers cannot afford the best possible treatment for their sheep. They cannot afford to dip the sheep. The sheep must be carted to the sheds in trucks and treated very carefully to ensure their survival.

The working party advanced the argument that subsidies on fodder cartage merely encourage pastoralists to keep stock on their properties. This is quite incorrect, and I am certain members will realise the expense involved in feeding 5,000 or 6,000 sheep with hay. No sane pastoralist would attempt to do this when another course is possible. Of course, sometimes a farmer does not arrange the agistment of his stock in sufficient time, but members will be aware that very few areas are capable of carrying additional stock this year.

We must remember that the woolgrower still has to pay for the fodder and hay, even when the freight is subsidised. I do not feel the Government has a valid reason to remove this subsidy.

I would like to refer briefly to the serious situation which is developing in the Meekatharra area at the moment. This area is presently experiencing the onset of what could be a drought. It may be a little premature to refer to it as a drought, but I assure the House that in the next few weeks some very serious stock losses will occur in this part of my electorate. I realise it is too early to seek to have it declared a drought area; such an application would not be treated sympathetically at the moment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr. COYNE: In the few minutes which I have left to me I would like to refer to the desert farms project, about which I have spoken before. I have approached the Minister for Community Welfare as well as the Minister for Agriculture to seek assistance for the continuance of this project at Wiluna. Members will be aware that the promoter, Mr. Jack Parr, is in a desperate

situation. He is endeavouring to sell the property to someone who will continue the project. I strongly advocate the continuance of the project, not only for the benefit of the Aborigines—although I believe it will be beneficial in that regard—but also for the eventual benefit of our State.

At the present time 7,000 fruit trees have been planted, and they are expected to bear over the next few years. The estimated production figures are as follows—

	Cases
1973	300
1974	7,000
1975	14,000
1976	20,000

It is anticipated the harvest will increase until the trees are about 10 years old.

There is an abundance of water in the Wiluna area. I know that one of the large aquifers relatively close to the area in question is at Paroo. The Government, for reasons of its own—I suppose it was the result of Department of Agriculture advice or possibly due to anticipated mineral activities—has decided to keep that water in reserve. However, I envisage that with proper exploration and investigation of other areas we will find greater reserves of underground water. If it is found that the reserves of underground water at Wiluna are greater than presently estimated—and I am sure they are, and so are a number of knowledgeable people—I hope the citrus industry can be extended to a size five or six times greater than its present one, and that it will produce a grade of fruit that will be in great demand.

At present we import something like 70 per cent. of the oranges consumed in this State from South Australia and Victoria. The Riverland people have the strongest grip on the market. I have no hesitation in saying I believe that citrus fruit from Wiluna will leave Riverland fruit for dead. Riverland fruit is acceptable only because it has a better overall grade; but I feel the Wiluna industry should be persevered with for the purpose of providing the total requirements of the Western Australian market for high-class citrus fruit. There will not only be opportunities to develop the orange market, but also—

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [10.23 p.m.]: Before I make some remarks regarding two specific situations to which I wish to refer tonight, I would like to refer back to the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply earlier this evening, and the manner in which it was handled by the Government. I have not been here long enough to know what has happened in this place over a long period, but I think

probably the Premier has been here long enough to know better than to do what he did tonight.

Mr. Nalder: There has been nothing of the like of tonight.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I have no doubt in my mind that the Premier would at least have sufficient courtesy to carry out a little research on the matter, having some knowledge of the fact that someone would surely challenge him. So I have no doubt he is well prepared regarding what has happened in the past.

Sir Charles Court: He has made history tonight.

Mr. Graham: Ask your deputy leader whether he has made history.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I doubt very much whether in the history of this State a Premier has ever moved the gag in regard to an amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Graham: But Liberals in the Legislative Council vote against Bills without one speech having been made.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The Deputy Premier is waking up everybody.

Sir Charles Court: Tonight was a scandalous thing.

Mr. Graham: Without a speech having been made.

Sir Charles Court: We are only in the second week of the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Graham: You say the first thing that comes into your mind.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I have heard the Deputy Premier refer to members on this side as the Ustasha at least four times this evening. I am sure even the Ustasha would not treat Parliament as it has been treated tonight—with, of course, the exception of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Graham: You were the supporters of them.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: There is no doubt in my mind that the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply tonight was valid and had basis for argument in this House. It was a valid criticism of a body which has at least some control over the Government. Rather than answer the criticism levelled in the amendment, the Premier chose to stand up and simply gag the debate. I do not care whether or not that has happened before; as a new member I would simply like to say that I am ashamed to be a member of a House which is treated with such disregard by the Premier.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I know another Premier who got his Whip to do that.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: No other Premier has had sufficient lack of respect for the Parliament to stand up and gag the debate on a valid amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Graham: No other Opposition has got the office boy to move an amendment.

Mr. O'Neil: That is the Whip's job, and the Minister for Education knows it.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I understand that at the meeting of the State Executive of the A.L.P. last night somebody mentioned that there should be a Ben Chifley medal.

Mr. Bertram: Are you going to let the Press into your conferences soon?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Let me say that Ben Chifley would turn in his grave had he seen the performance of the Premier tonight.

Mr. Jamieson: Oh!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: And he would have turned in his grave a long time ago had he seen the past performances of the Minister for Works.

Mr. Bertram: All Labor men have to be dead before they are any good.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: At least Ben Chifley had the guts to stand up before Parliaments of this country and to fight for terms and conditions according to what was reasonable. The State Executive of the A.L.P. last night, and Mr. Chamberlain in particular—

Mr. Bertram: Was this in the Press?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: —said there was bias in the reporting of *The West Australian* newspaper. He went on to mention matters which have been quoted already during the debate on the amendment, and I do not intend to bore the House with repetition.

Mr. Bertram: Are the Liberals going to open their doors to the Press, too?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: However, it is quite valid to say that the General Secretary of the A.L.P. hinted that industrial action could be taken against *The West Australian* if it did not start to treat the Labor Party with a little more respect. If that is a valid statement I would like to refer the Government back to what happened a couple of nights ago when the first amendment to the Address-in-Reply was moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and for about two hours members on this side of the House hit the Government fairly and squarely between the eyes. We heard one or two fairly insignificant replies from the Government side, and the most insignificant was that of the Premier. However, in the newspaper of the following morning we saw the headline, "Commonwealth warned on State rights". The article stated—

The State Government has warned the Federal Government not to intrude on State rights.

The article continued on for about a column stating all the wonderful things the Premier has supposedly said to the Commonwealth in regard to the matters about which we challenged him. The fact that the Premier was replying to an amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply was not mentioned until almost the bottom of the column.

Mr. Bryce: That one must have slipped through the editor's guard.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I hope the Press heard that interjection. However, did the State Executive of the Liberal Party stand up and say that was biased reporting? Of course it did not, because we can take it on the chin. If the memory of Government members is so short, let me remind them of the three years before they became the Government.

During that time the Press in this State, rightly or wrongly, took it upon itself to decide that the then Opposition—and this is fair comment—was not an Opposition at all, and the only opposition that could be offered was *via* the Press. If members of the present Government say that we as the previous Government did not get a thumping from the Press during those three years, I can only say they must have been blind. If we on this side ever reach the stage where, as a Government, we are foolish enough to carry on as the Government has carried on tonight, then we should resign, just as the Premier should resign as a result of his scant regard for Parliament tonight.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It may be news to you when I tell you that your leader has complained to *The West Australian* more than once about its failure to publish statements he has submitted to it.

Sir Charles Court: If you had let us speak tonight we would have told you something about that.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The Premier had plenty of opportunities to say that in debate this evening but he would not because he knew it would be easy for someone to come back at him about it. The State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party in this State is one of the greatest allies the Liberal Party has ever had. The three best things that have ever happened to the Liberal Party are represented in the persons of Dr. Evatt, Mr. Calwell, and Mr. F. E. Chamberlain who, last night, proved conclusively that he came within this category and he was well supported by the Premier this evening.

Mr. Jones: We will be onto the commos next.

Mr. Bertram: Fear again!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The day that any member on this side of the House accuses any member on that side of being a commo, I will be the first to tell him to come back into line, but the Deputy Premier

can get away with almost anything. So let us keep things in proper perspective and at least be honest. Do not let us talk about fear and filth; let us leave that sort of talk to the Deputy Premier because he has a monopoly on it.

Mr. Bertram: He would be battling to keep pace with the Opposition.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I know that the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley must have pricked the conscience of many people on the other side of the House, especially when they saw the Press report of his speech the following day, but if they had the decency to read that report together with the one published on the day prior to that they would realise that the Press does not have an easy task when reporting some of the inanities that are uttered in this House. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that it has to keep some sort of balance. If members on the other side of the House say that the Press is not balanced in its reporting they could be blamed for being more biased than Mr. F. E. Chamberlain accuses the Press of being.

Mr. Bickerton: When are you going to let the Press in?

Mr. Grayden: Who are you to comment? You have not been in your electorate for 18 months.

Mr. Bickerton: I have been in yours.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I do not think there is any country in the world that has a Press of any value unless the Press has the right to report news as it sees fit. On many occasions in this House I and other members have been reasonably offended by the fact that our speeches have not been recorded in the Press the following day, which is only pure ego on our part because we thought we had made good speeches. There are many occasions, too, when we say that the Press has done a lousy job because it has not reported all that we think it should have reported. The day the Press reports only what we want it to report is the day the Press will be of no value and we will finish up having no Press at all.

Mr. Bryce: I wait to see the day when the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party is able to intimidate the Press barons who own the Press.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Would the member for Ascot like to refer to the beer barons and to the other barons as well?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Bickerton: I know one person who is barren.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If the member for Ascot would care to follow me in this debate, let him get up and talk about what no member on that side of the House wants to talk about. They do not want to speak on this subject at all. It has

been a time-honoured tradition among all the democracies in the world that the Press has the right to report upon any event in the way it views it. Whenever the day arrives when unions, beer barons, or anybody else intimidates the Press and overrules it that will be the day I will say that the Press has reached its lowest level, because at the moment it has everything going for it. It has the right to report on any subject as it sees fit.

It will not have that right if its reporting is questioned in the manner of the A.L.P. threats. Whenever the day comes when the Press is subject to trade union intimidation, I only hope that the decent trade union members will say, "That is it; I am prepared to go no further with the union on this move." I would mention that that day is fast approaching, and the Government of the day does not realise how close it is to its being reached. It has gone too far. The fact that the Government did not debate this amendment in any way and, what is worse, that the Premier gagged the debate on the amendment suggests to the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party that the parliamentary wing of that party is agreeing with him and is confirming the intimidation to which we object. This is something which nobody on the other side of the House seems to be able to answer.

Sir Charles Court: Wait until the Commonwealth Minister for the Media hits his straps!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The fact that members on the other side of the House, including the Ministers, do not have the courage to defend themselves against anything that has been stated, and the fact that the gag was moved by the Premier to prevent any other member contributing to the debate on the amendment is sufficient answer to the charges that have been made. The Premier has no answer whatsoever to the debate and we can take it as read that it has been accepted by the Government that it is too frightened to say anything about it.

I now want to leave that point and mention some matters that affect my own electorate.

Sir Charles Court: That is a pity! They are just breathing a sigh of relief at the moment.

Mr. Graham: Parliament's comedian—the Leader of the Opposition!

Sir Charles Court: You are not happy about what happened tonight. That will be remembered here for a long, long time.

Mr. Graham: I hope so. I hope you have learnt your lesson. Do you think you have a license to waste the time of the House?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: The second week of the debate on the Address-in-Reply, and it is gagged!

Mr. Jamieson: It was not the debate on the Address-in-Reply that was gagged, but the amendment.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I would like to speak on some matters affecting the district of Scarborough. During the past few months there has been a great deal of consternation in Scarborough over the plan produced by the City of Stirling which deals with three particular aspects of Scarborough. The first is the beachfront which will be the subject of a report by Professor Webb, who is the Professor of Geography at the Western Australian University.

As the report has not been submitted to the City of Stirling, not much can be said by me or by anybody else about it. Nevertheless, I do wish to say that whatever the decision on the Scarborough beachfront is it has to be borne in mind that everyone connected with it—in particular the City of Stirling—can give the assurance that the people living in the area of Scarborough do not begrudge the people of this State the use of the beach in any way.

Mr. Graham: That is jolly generous of them, is it not?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If the Deputy Premier could not make sense of what I had to say a while ago, perhaps he will listen to what I am saying now.

Mr. Graham: It is a compliment to you that we listen to your drivel.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I do not think any member of this Chamber would accept that interjection by the Deputy Premier in a serious vein. I repeat that nobody in the Scarborough district begrudges the people of Western Australia the right to visit Scarborough beach and enjoy all the facilities that are offering there.

Mr. Graham: Bravo!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: They do not begrudge visitors and tourists the use of these facilities, but like everybody else in Western Australia they have a vested interest in the manner in which the beach front is developed. Obviously more facilities are required than are provided at present. I hope that the report of Professor Webb will recommend the sort of development this State needs, rather than the American version of beachfront development which unfortunately is starting to spread in the Eastern States at such beaches as Bondi where at certain times of the day long shadows from the high buildings are cast on the beach.

I am particularly interested in the people of Scarborough and those who reside in the dormitory area, and their right to deter-

mine the development not only of the beachfront but also of the residential areas. In this regard I refer to certain new areas that have been recommended to be rezoned as GR 6 and GR 4 under the plan of the City of Stirling.

It has been said by the City of Stirling and by leading members of that council that it does not necessarily follow that just because an area has been rezoned GR 6 there will be high-rise buildings. However, I would like to point out, and it naturally follows, that if there is a GR 6 zone the developers will aim as much as possible at ocean views, and any development will apply as much height to the buildings as is permissible under the plot-ratio requirement. The inevitable result will be the development of high-rise buildings, and these will affect all the people in Scarborough and particularly those in Doubleview. What will happen is that there will be a great number of high-rise buildings blocking out the view from the residences immediately behind and from those at Doubleview.

In addition to the problem created by the high-rise buildings, that particular area which has been rezoned GR 6 is to be subject to a tremendous increase in population if the plan is followed through in accordance with the dictates of the council. Already in that area there are too many people and too many cars, and there are, also, inadequate facilities. If a great number of people were to descend on the immediate hinterland of the Scarborough beachfront the traffic problems along Scarborough Beach Road and West Coast Highway would be colossal. With the existing traffic along those roads it is now almost impossible for people to get across the road in the summer. If a huge dormitory population were to descend on that area the problem would worsen.

The GR 4 zone further up the hill towards Doubleview is one of the most incredible proposals I have seen. I am aware that the city planner of the City of Stirling has pointed out on a number of occasions to meetings of ratepayers that this area has already been zoned GR 4. If we accept the fact that just because an area is so zoned it must remain so zoned tomorrow and for evermore, then conditions cannot get better; they must get worse.

Anybody who drives out to the grid area bounded by Deanmore Road, Sackville Terrace, Huntriss Road, and Moorland Road will come across the greatest grid pattern to be found in the city. In that area are some 48 blocks of houses, one on top of the other, and row after row of them, with not a school, a park or a shop. In this area there are something like 48 intersections, and unless a motorist stopped at every intersection along Moorland Road he would reduce his chances of living.

The City of Stirling has proposed that that area be a GR 4 zone. I realise that economic considerations do not justify developers building flats at the moment. As the value of the houses deteriorates in years to come—and not too many years ahead—and land values increase it will be more advantageous to develop that area for flats.

To add one more resident to that grid area would be a tragedy, because already there are too many people living one on top of the other. It is no wonder that the people of Scarborough complain about the way in which the town is being planned under the new town planning scheme. A couple of months ago there was a meeting of ratepayers at which over 250 people were present. These ratepayers of Scarborough made it quite clear that they were not in favour of the plan; they wanted the City of Stirling to reconsider it and draw up another plan which provided for buildings of no more than two storeys.

Certain reports appeared in the Press which indicated that the mayor was not particularly happy with that suggestion. Another meeting of ratepayers was held at the offices of the City of Stirling, and this meeting was attended by 400 to 500 people. The room was filled, and many could not get in. There was no sitting room left. The ratepayers once again told the City of Stirling that there was no way in which they could accept the plan unless some amendment was made.

I hope the City of Stirling has taken heed of the views of those people at the meetings referred to; and I hope the development of Scarborough will not be along the lines of the development at Bondi. I hope the City of Stirling does not impose GR 6 and GR 4 zones at Scarborough just because it is convenient to do so. The City of Stirling should reconsider its plan and should take heed of the views of the people who have to live in that area. It should try to establish Scarborough as a type of community which we as members of Parliament and the people of Scarborough consider suitable as an area in which to live.

The last subject I want to mention is in regard to the Indecent Publications Act which passed through Parliament last year. The reason I do so is that the Minister in charge of this Act, which was proclaimed very belatedly as a result of the possibility of the Commonwealth introducing legislation along similar lines, made certain statements.

I was particularly perturbed to hear the Chief Secretary mention on television the recent raids on sex shops and certain news agencies. I will mention what he said on television. He was asked what functions the committee was charged with, and he replied—

This committee will be there to advise me.

That was a correct answer. However, the Chief Secretary went on to say—

Anything I refer to them will be referred, so that they can say whether this is stuff which in their opinion is indecent.

The answer is only half correct, because the job of the committee is not to determine whether or not any publication is indecent. Its job is to determine whether any publication referred by the Minister is or is not suitable for reading by people under the age of 18 years.

The committee can also recommend proceedings under the old section 2 of the Act, but it was not intended that the committee would advise the Minister whether any particular publication was indecent. The Chief Secretary went on to say—

I do not come into it at all.

I have the Bill before me, and I can see many references to the Minister. It repeatedly states, "The Minister may". However, on television the Chief Secretary said, "I do not come into it." The Chief Secretary said further—

I do not see it until the police have seized this stuff.

The whole idea of members passing the Bill through this House and members of another place passing it through that House, was that the police did not seize "this stuff"; the whole idea was that this committee could have referred to it certain publications. If necessary the Minister could send an office boy, provided he was over 18 years of age, to pick up these publications. He could bring the publications back to the Minister, and the Minister could refer them to the committee. The committee could determine whether or not they were suitable for reading by children under 18 years of age.

He says that he does not see it at all until the police have seized it. I thought we had gone past the Keystone Cops era and had enacted legislation in both Houses to prevent the necessity for police to enter these premises, seize the "stuff", as the Minister calls it, and bring it back for examination in order that someone might go before a magistrate who, in most cases, is no less confused than anyone else.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You would agree that most of it was hot stuff?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I imagine it would have been. In reply to a question concerning what the newsagents or the vendors of this material should do, Mr. Stubbs said, "I think they can read the Act as well as anyone else." If they read the Act the way the Minister in charge of it reads it, we will be in diabolical trouble because he does not know what is in it.

The Minister went on to say that he thought the onus was on them to be their own censors in the first place.

I thought we had passed the cavemen days when men had to make their own laws. I do not mind if the Minister is so dull or does not know what is in his Act. However, I do mind having to spend countless hours in this place moving amendments, shuffling messages backwards and forwards, having corridor conferences, waiting on the Minister to consult with his advisers, coming back here and moving further amendments, and sending messages backwards and forwards between the two Houses, if the Minister does not even use the Act. What is the sense in all that work? Why bother to go through all that rigmarole if he does not use the Act we have given him?

Under the Act he could refer the material to the committee. He does not have to send the police to seize tons of it. The only result of that action is to give the sellers all the publicity they want. If I were selling the material I would love the police to come to seize it because no better publicity could be achieved. I would know the newspapers would spread the news all over the front page and that next day the shop would be filled with people seeking the publication in question. Of course I would have to tell them that all the material was down at the police station, but that if they came back in a few days I could give them a copy because in the meantime I would have obtained further copies from the suppliers.

That is not what we want and it is not what Parliament intended. The idea was to devise a system by which ordinary people could have referred to them publications of which we do not have any knowledge. We do not know, any more than anyone else, what is and what is not indecent. However, if a publication were referred to 12 ordinary people they could set some standard. They might say that under normal circumstances a publication may offend certain people, but that they do not believe it is indecent or so offensive that no-one should read it. However, they might decide that in the interests of not making our children completely cynical or making them believe that sex is pornographic filth, the publication should not be sold to those under 18 years of age.

I would be the first to accept such a decision; but that is apparently not what the Minister intends to do. He intends that people should continue to be prosecuted under a 1902 provision. We passed a law 12 months ago and the Minister has had every opportunity to act under it in order to introduce a little sanity in regard to indecent publications. Instead he has fallen back on a 71-year-old piece of legislation. This is rather incredible.

Before I conclude on that particular aspect of my speech I would like to make a few comments about the committee set

up under the Act because I do not think the Government has done itself any good at all in this regard.

From time to time we have heard a great deal of criticism about the Liberal Party, but obviously the Government cannot take the same sort of criticism. We have heard criticism of the Federal Labor Government in respect of "jobs for the boys". This criticism has been levelled at the Government as a result of Ministers' sons being appointed to different posts. It is rather amazing that the particular committee under discussion should have been an avenue through which to provide "jobs for the girls". The private secretaries of two senators—Senators Wheeldon and Wilkinson—have been appointed to the committee.

These secretaries may be perfectly qualified to sit on the committee. They may be perfectly normal every-day women who have every right to be on the committee; but the question is: can the public honestly assume that the Government is being reasonable in its appointment of people to the committee when, of the three women on it, two are private secretaries of Labor senators? I think it would be rather hard for the most broad-minded person in the community to believe that the Government was trying to be reasonable in its selection of personnel. I said before that they may be perfectly qualified—

Mr. Graham: Where did the Governor-General of Australia come from? Where did the High Commissioner in Japan come from? Where did Fred Chaney in the Northern Territory come from?

Mr. O'Neil: Where did the High Commissioner in London come from?

Mr. Graham: We are not arguing that point; you are. In other words, it is a common practice. It was practised well and truly by the Liberal Party.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: But surely in respect of a matter like indecent publications the situation is different. In Committee I argued about some little part of the qualifications of a member of the committee. I said that I was sick and tired of insolvency being a bar to a person being appointed to a committee because I believe many insolvent people in the community are just as qualified as solvent people. I wanted everyone to have a reasonable opportunity to be on the committee, and I include secretaries of Labor senators if we like.

However, when we have two secretaries of Labor Party senators appointed I do not think that in the wildest flight of the imagination we could say that justice can be seen to be done.

Mr. Graham: Do you think that working for a Labor senator should disqualify a person?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: No.

Mr. O'Neill: He does not understand.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: In his usual tight-minded attitude the Deputy Premier has failed to understand what someone on this side is saying. I said there was no bar at all to such an appointment. I said the secretaries could well be qualified. They could, in fact, be the two best people who could be appointed. However, when secretaries from two Labor senators' offices are appointed, the Government should not expect the people of the State or members of the Opposition to believe justice can be seen to be done because it would be completely impossible for anyone to believe this. In a State of several hundred thousand mature women there must be at least one who could replace one of those secretaries.

Mr. Graham: Just quibbling.

Mr. O'Neill: Just a case of jobs for the girls.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I point out to the Deputy Premier that those involved must do a little more thinking about this matter in the future.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 28th March, 1973

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

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Dress in Chamber: Statement by President

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I have arranged for four additional electric fans to be installed in the Chamber, and I am hoping that this will be done in the near future.

In connection with the resolution regarding members' dress, I consider the conditions in the House today do not warrant the removal of coats.

For future sittings we shall arrange for a notice or other suitable indicator to be placed on the notice board or other prominent place to show when coats may be removed.

When this is done, I trust members will make use of the hanging pegs which are provided in the corridors surrounding the Chamber.

QUESTIONS (16): ON NOTICE

1. CHARGES IN COUNTRY AREAS

Statement by Deputy Premier

The Hon. V. J. Ferry for the Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Was the Deputy Premier, the Hon. H. E. Graham, correctly reported in *The West Australian* dated the 27th March, 1973, where he is quoted as saying "Despite pressures, the Government had refused to increase charges to offset losses in the country areas on railways, shipping, water, sewerage and electricity"?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", if the increased charges in shipping, water and electricity, were not imposed to offset losses in country areas by this Government, why were the charges increased?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "No", what did the Deputy Premier say?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) The report is generally correct. The Deputy Premier was pointing to the fact that the losses on these services represented substantial indirect benefits totalling some \$40 million to country industries and residents.
- (2) Were action taken to equate, even approximately, the costs and charges of these services, it would involve substantially increased charges on people living in country areas.
- (3) Answered by (1) and (2).

2.

SEWERAGE

Commonwealth Funds

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Since November, 1972 has the State Government been allocated any funds by the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of extending sewerage works?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) how much money has been provided;
 - (b) has all of the money been allocated to particular projects; and
 - (c) where are the particular projects located?
- (3) Is it intended that any special assistance will be provided to ensure an early commencement to the sewerage works in the Queens Park/East Cannington areas?
- (4) If the answer to (3) is "No", why not?