

For the 27½ per cent that private enterprise has to invest, it receives a return of 50 per cent. The Federal Government has made sure that it will receive only 50 per cent and no more, and I do not blame it for doing that. The ambition of all members in this House should be to ensure that our resources remain our own and that these large private combines are prevented from getting their hands on Australian resources which will, I hope, be enjoyed by my grandchildren and the children and grandchildren of members on the other side of the House, because these resources are limited and should be used for the benefit of all Australians, not just Western Australians.

The same principle should apply to the oil and gas deposits that are on our northern shores. I submit that irrespective of the attitude adopted by my learned colleague on my left, those oil and gas deposits belong to Australia and not just to Western Australia. If those deposits existed off the Queensland coast I would say precisely the same. The people in the Eastern States are not foreigners. These deposits are the resources of Australia and I am prepared to share them with the people of Queensland and with the people of other States of Australia, but on our terms and not on the terms of the "Big 10" who have their financial fingers delving into the resources of many nations throughout the world.

I have mentioned in this House previously that in such a situation big financial corporations can dictate not only the economic policy of a Government but also its foreign policy, as evidenced by what occurred in South-East Asia in recent years. Those big financial corporations did dictate to the previous Federal Administration, but because the present Australian Government would not allow them to dictate to it such action is deplored by those on the other side of the House.

In the few minutes remaining to me, despite all the calamity howling from members on the other side of the Chamber, I want to make some quotations taken from the "Business and Investment" page of *The West Australian* of the 25th March, 1975. The first of these reads as follows—

Higher payout, issue by ANI.

Australian National Industries Ltd is treating its shareholders to a big dividend increase and a generous rights issue to celebrate another booming year.

Another extract, taken from *The West Australian* dated the 22nd March, 1975, reads—

J. Gadsden lifts net profit 190 per cent.

J. Gadsden Australia Ltd, the container maker, lifted profit 188.9 per cent from \$893,197 to \$2,580,855 in the December half-year.

That article went on to give some other illuminating figures, but in the two or three minutes I have left let me make a quotation taken from the "Business and Investment" page of *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 22nd March, 1975. It reads as follows—

GMH earnings for 1974 down slightly.

Australia's biggest car maker, General Motors-Holden's Pty Ltd, yesterday reported a slightly lower profit of \$14 million in 1974 after slashing its provision for depreciation and tax by \$10.6 million.

Just imagine! That company had a slightly lower profit—down to \$14 million in 1974! Despite this the Federal Government had to intervene to protect the jobs of the workers of that company which did not want to see its \$14 million profit eroded below that figure. What did that company want to do? It wanted to sack 5 000 workers. So Dr Cairns, the Federal Treasurer, had to appeal to private enterprise—a degrading exercise for him—and to a company which originally was established by the Commonwealth Government. It was set up by the Chifley Government to build motorcars. Australians originally had some equity in that company. However, do the members of this House know that now every dollar profit that is made leaves Australia to go overseas to the USA? Would the Premier condone that sort of action that has been taken by GMH and perhaps other international financial corporations? Would he condone similar action in this State, where every dollar profit leaves this country, merely to achieve his purposes?

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 9th April, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Resignation of Governor: Amendment of Motion

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Justice:

Has the Minister studied the subject matter of my question without notice of yesterday?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Consideration has been given to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I feel that this matter will be dealt with following the adoption of the Address-in-Reply when the usual subsidiary motion can be put to the Council in amended form to the effect that the presentation be made to the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator.

There is a precedent for this procedure when, following the opening of Parliament in 1971, the Governor was away from the State, and the presentation was made to the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator, although the Address-in-Reply was directed to the Governor.

It is my opinion that as the motion is primarily an address of loyalty to the Sovereign, an amendment is not appropriate.

2. ELECTION PROMISES

Implementation

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Premier, last evening, on the ABC programme *This Day Tonight* said that, during the first 12 months his Government has been in office, it has implemented 112 of the 275 policy promises that the Liberal Party put to the people to gain government?
- (2) Would the Minister advise in detail the 112 election promises that the Premier claims have been put into operation?
- (3) On the *State File* programme the same evening the Premier said 88 policy points were in process of implementation. Would the Minister detail these policy points?
- (4) What are the other 75 points in the policy speech that have not been given consideration by the Government at this time?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope the Minister will not read out the full details.

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for giving me some warning of his intention to ask this question. As has been observed in the interjection I do not intend to read the full details in my reply. However, for easy reference, I am arranging for a copy of the Liberal policy document published for the 30th

March, 1974, State general election, to be appropriately marked to identify the different groups of items referred to.

It should be practicable to table this early next week.

QUESTIONS (11): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Norseman

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

With reference to my question of the 28th November, 1974, and the reply which stated that the State Electricity Commission was investigating the future needs of the Town of Norseman electricity supply—

- (a) has any plan as yet been formulated;
- (b) does he know that there is a great voltage loss in the electricity cables causing inefficiency of the electrical equipment; and
- (c) is he aware that Norseman was without power recently for almost 20 hours, and that power requirements of the town may not be guaranteed in the near future?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) The State Electricity Commission advises that it was not aware that Norseman was recently without power for about 20 hours. However, it is planned to reinforce the power station.

3. PANNAWONICA ACCESS ROAD

Expenditure and Realignment

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What funds have been spent during the last five years on minor construction, or major maintenance, on the access road to Pannawonica by—
 - (a) Main Roads Department; and
 - (b) Ashburton and/or West Pilbara Shire Council?
- (2) What is the status of the Pannawonica access road?
- (3) In view of the fact that the heavy vehicular traffic involved in the possible Deepdale iron ore development, and the proposed Fortescue River dam construction project, will probably also use this

road, what proposals are in hand to up-grade it from its present deplorable standard of alignment, formation, drainage and pavement, to avoid its further deterioration to the stage when it becomes completely unusable, particularly after rain?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) Nil—\$50 000 available on current programme.
- (b) \$13 000 specific grants from MRD.
- \$1 930 from programmed half of Statutory Grants.

The Shire may have spent other funds of which the Department has no record.

- (2) Developmental road.
- (3) A field survey is currently in progress to determine a new alignment for the road prior to expenditure of funds allocated in the Department's 1974-75 programme of works.

4. ORD RIVER IRRIGATION SCHEME

Research: Expenditure

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Will the Minister please advise the amount of moneys spent in the last four years applicable to research in agriculture, support facilities, crop subsidies, bounties, concessions, departmental expenses including administration and other agricultural expenditure in the Ord River Irrigation scheme by—

- (a) the Western Australian Government; and
- (b) the Federal Government?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (a) Approximately \$9 277 000.
- (b) Approximately \$2 114 000.

5. NORSEMAN DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Upgrading

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

As it was stated in an answer to me in relation to the Norseman District Hospital on Thursday, the 28th November, 1974, that repairs and renovations to the nurses' quarters would be carried out, and consideration was being given to a reorganisation of some areas of the hospital to improve functional operations, will the Minister advise what progress has been made, and if and when work is likely to commence?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

A schedule of work has been completed in relation to the repairs and renovations to the nurses' quarters and the Public Works Department has been asked to call tenders.

A preliminary sketch for the reorganisation of some areas of the hospital will be discussed with Hospital Board representatives next week when an officer of the Department will visit Norseman.

6.

WATER SUPPLIES

West Pilbara

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

- (1) Apart from Gregory Gorge and Dogger Gorge, has any other location been seriously considered as a possible suitable site for the proposed storage dam on the Fortescue River for the West Pilbara Water Supply?
- (2) Was the feature, commonly known as Woolloomooloo Gorge considered as a possible site for the proposed dam?
- (3) If so, was it discarded for engineering, hydrological, environmental, or other reasons?
- (4) What was the estimated storage capacity of a dam if it could have been constructed at Woolloomooloo Gorge?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There is no suitable dam site at Woolloomooloo Gorge, which is approximately 3 miles upstream from the road bridge crossing.
- (3) Investigations have been carried out for a dam at Bullinnarwa Pool upstream from Woolloomooloo Gorge, including geological mapping and foundation drilling. However, engineering studies indicate that a dam at this site would cost at least twice the cost of a dam at Gregory or Dogger Gorge.

- (4) Answered by (2).

7.

JOHN MARTIN BEST

Assault Charge

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is he aware of Magistrate C. A. Fisher's decision in an assault case—the Police v John Martin Best of J. M. Best Holdings Pty. Ltd.—as reported in *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 3rd April, 1975?

- (2) Is he of the opinion that it should be permissible for an employer to actually physically assault a union representative merely because of things said by such union representative?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" why?
- (4) If the answer to (2) is "No" will he take action, and if so, when, to remedy this position?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) to (4) I believe that the information which I have been asked to give is on a question of law and it is the prerogative of the Court to decide these issues.

8. ABORIGINES *Housing: Broome*

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

- (1) Excluding houses transferred from the former Native Welfare Department, how many homes have been built specifically for Aboriginal families in Broome?
- (2) (a) What are the allotment numbers and street names of these houses; and
(b) what is the type of dwelling constructed in each case?
- (3) How many of these homes were financed by the Commonwealth Aboriginal Affairs Department?
- (4) How many of them were financed by the Western Australian Government?
- (5) As far as is known, in the future house building programme for Aborigines in Broome—
(a) (i) what number; and
(ii) what type of home, is to be built; and
(b) who will provide finance for the home construction programme?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Nine.
- (2) (a) and (b):—
Lot 780 Frewer TF asbestos 3 b/r standard conventional SHC design.
Lot 786 Frewer 3 b/r.
Lot 793 Frewer 4 b/r.
Lot 719 Buck 3 b/r.
Lot 724 Norman 3 b/r.
Lot 763 Streeter 3 b/r.
Lot 772 Streeter 4 b/r.
Lot 775 Streeter 3 b/r.
Lot 711 Owens 3 b/r.

(3) Nine.

- (4) None.
- (5) 1974-75 Aboriginal Building Programme:
(a) (i) 5 houses: 4 3 b/r; 1 4 b/r.
(ii) timber framed asbestos standard Commission designs.
(b) The programme will be financed from Commonwealth Government grants for Aboriginal housing.

9. ORD IRRIGATION SCHEME

Research: Government Assistance

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the insufficient number of departmental officers formally trained for tropical irrigated agriculture research, and the subsequent inability of the Department of Agriculture to offer suitable cotton varieties or other suitable crops for economic marketing from the Ord River scheme, will the Minister consider—

- (a) a saving of 25% on past expenditure by requesting the Federal and State Treasuries to grant 75% of past annual expenditure to the Ord Growers' Organisation to enable them to hire suitable research staff in order to produce workable crops rather than scientific papers, as well as to finance experimental crops;
- (b) request to the CSIRO to make the Kimberley Research Station available to the growers' organisation; and
- (c) the use of the Department of Agriculture building in Kununurra by the growers' organisation and their research staff when the grant is made?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The Hon. Member does not seem to have available to him full information on the current level of research information and effort, and I would be happy to arrange a briefing for him and any other interested Members at a convenient date.

10. NORSEMAN HIGH SCHOOL *Additions and Enrolments*

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

- (1) Has any decision been made by the Education Department to proceed with stages 4 and 5 of the high school at Norseman?

- (2) If so, when is work likely to commence?
- (3) What were the enrolments of the school at Norseman for—
 - (a) 1974; and
 - (b) 1975?
- (4) What is the estimated increase for 1976?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) as at March:—
 - (a) 464.
 - (b) 503.
- (4) 20.

11. MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS *Goldfields Area*

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

- (1) Is there still a shortage of doctors in—
 - (a) Kalgoorlie;
 - (b) Boulder;
 - (c) Kambalda; and
 - (d) Coolgardie?
- (2) If so, how many doctors are needed to fill the requirements?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) No.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) No, serviced from Kalgoorlie.
- (2) (a) See (1) above.
- (b) 2.
- (c) 1.
- (d) See (1) above.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), on behalf of the Hon. H. W. Gayfer, leave of absence for 12 consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. T. O. Perry (Lower Central) due to ill health.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 8th April, on the following motion by the Hon. I. G. Pratt—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

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

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [4.46 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. I. G. Pratt on the 13th March and, in addition, to express my sympathy and regret at the untimely resignation of His Excellency the Governor (Sir Hughie Edwards) because of ill health.

In my opening remarks I want to touch on statements made by two members from the Government side of the House, and also on another point raised by Mr Pratt when he moved for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. Mr Pratt spoke with conviction and sincerity about the need for the establishment of a jumbo steel plant at Kwinana. I have been trying to work out, in my mind, what is really meant by a "jumbo steel plant". Is it a very big plant?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The honourable member knows the difference between a jumbo crayfish and a "cacker".

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Or, is a jumbo steel works a plant shaped like an elephant? I am not sure. However, before we charge into the so-called benefits of a jumbo steel plant in my electorate—and I gather from what Mr Pratt has said he thought it desirable to establish the plant in the South Metropolitan province with all the workers living in the Lower West province—we should look at other matters related to a jumbo plant.

From the political point of view I would not agree with Mr Pratt; I think I would wish to have the plant established at Kwinana and have all the workers living in the South Metropolitan province.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The people are becoming more enlightened now.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not so sure about that. The establishment of a jumbo steel plant has been considered for many years. Its purpose is to produce a grade of steel a couple of processes up the scale from pig iron. The semi-finished steel will be shipped overseas to be rolled into whatever it may be.

From my experience in looking at steel plants—and I presume Mr Lewis would be aware of this fact—modern steel plants of the type envisaged and, indeed, steel plants which are producing more refined products than those envisaged in this case, employ very little labour. In fact, it is the type of plant which could almost be totally automatic.

I want to make the point that we have not seen much automation in Australia up to date for the obvious reason that robots cannot buy Holden cars. We are in the mechanisation process, but for a steel plant of the type envisaged to be successful I should imagine it would have to be almost automatic to compete in world markets today.

I am very interested in the South Metropolitan Province, and I am also interested in providing as much employment as we possibly can. However, we must measure the benefits of a steel plant alongside the environmental problems it could create. I agree there is money in muck—I have said that by way of interjection. However, I had an opportunity not so long ago to accompany the Federal Minister for the Environment and Conservation into Cockburn Sound in the naval craft *Acute*. Although I fish and sail in the sound, I was amazed once they were pointed out to me, to see the problems that exist in the sound itself and at the very protected beaches in the Rockingham and Safety Bay area. It is tragic. With a bit of forethought, we may have been able to establish industry while avoiding some of these problems.

The population will build up in this area, and we must be aware of the importance to our lives of recreational facilities. Sociologists and people who deal with such matters tell us that man needs beauty to survive. If we take away these things, the problem will compound over and over again.

I am aware that probably the best place for the steelworks is Kwinana, but I do not agree with the people who say the works could not be established in the north-west because of the heat. That argument does not make sense to me. Indeed, I believe the north-west is one area in which it could be established. However, if it is not established in the north-west, perhaps the best possible site would be at Albany.

Everyone expects the Government to decentralise, but industry must also bear a responsibility in this regard. If industry needs Government assistance to decentralise, then all necessary encouragement should be given. Kwinana has become attractive as a possible site because the works would be part of a complex. Ships would journey from Port Kembla with coke—a very light cargo—pick up the pre-finished steel and deliver it to Japan or wherever else it is to go. On the return journey the ships could stop at Yampi Sound, Koolan, or Cockatoo Island, and then deliver iron ore to Port Kembla. The cycle would then commence again.

One of the problems with steel production is that we have not yet been able to devise a method of coking Collie coal. As members are aware, despite electric furnaces and other innovations, the open-hearth method of making steel is still considered to be the best in the world, despite the fact that it is dirty. I hope the Government takes some note of this fact, because as much as we would like to see the establishment of the steelworks at Kwinana, we would need assurances that the present problems in Cockburn Sound will not increase, particularly in

regard to the beaches. Many things could be done to alleviate the problem, but the beach at Rockingham is already very discoloured. We cannot afford to take away from the people in this area any more of the protected water playground.

It is well to remember when we sing the praises of our State—as well we should—in comparison with other States, the protected area available to our people for water sports is extremely limited. Certainly we have made some provision at Warnboro Sound, but that is a very windy place. If Cockburn Sound remains as it is, it will be the only protected area for water sports along the coast. I do not think there will be a God-made major catastrophe to carve out another sound.

Whatever we decide to do, it is of the utmost importance that we do nothing to further destroy the sound as a recreational area, not only for the well being of the people living there, but for the entire population of Western Australia.

In speaking to the Address-in-Reply, Mr Masters made some comments to which I would like to refer. On page 307 of *Hansard* of the 25th March, 1975, he said—

... we did, however, make one mistake when we talked about putting things right. We said that we could put things right in a few months. We did not realise, however, that because of the great damage that was done by a previous Labor Government it would now take us about 12 months to put things right.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Right up.

The Hon. D. K. DANC: Mr Masters is entitled to his opinion, but statements of this kind flowing from people in various leadership positions in the community somehow convey to the public at large that inflation and other problems from which we are suffering can be solved very easily. The public is led to believe that somehow or other the State Government—whether it be a Labor Government or a Liberal Government—can adjust to this very serious threat that is apparent not only here but also in all Western democracies. I do not believe we should engage in talk of this kind. We should have a more responsible attitude, and recognise the problems that beset us.

I have no doubt that if the Premier could put things right back in place in 12 months, he would certainly have done so. After all, he is the Premier of the State—my Premier. However, it is not possible for him to do so, nor would it be possible for any Labor Premier—I was going to say put things right but I will alter that—to adjust things in three months, 12 months, or any other period, unless a corresponding reaction occurred in other parts of the world. We all know that. However, when

people read statements such as that made by Mr Masters they are led to believe that this is a passing phase and that something will happen overnight.

Previously in this House I have said that if the Government cannot do the things it said it would, it should tell the people through Parliament why they cannot be done. We must all be understanding, and I have a responsible attitude to the Australian people. I respect their intelligence, and when they are told what is going on they will react accordingly. However, unfortunately people do take notice—or some of them at least do—of what is said in Parliament, and they have a completely wrong impression of the problems that beset the country.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do you think a lot of people read Mr Masters' speech?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am very pleased and flattered.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I do not think the honourable member should make remarks like that. I read his speech and I felt I should comment on it.

The Hon. J. Heltman: It is a very good talking point.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: It is an excellent talking point. I will get down to the nitty gritty shortly, and I might include some remarks about the honourable member.

I wish to refer also to the speech made by Mr Tozer to the Address-in-Reply. He said quite mistakenly that I had misled this House. With your indulgence, Mr President, I would like to correct that misapprehension. On page 406 of *Hansard* of the 26th March, 1975, Mr Tozer said—

This brings me to another point. I think most members in this Chamber have accepted the fact that the Hon. D. K. DAns is possibly our authority on maritime matters.

I never sought that mantle. Mr Tozer then continued—

However, I have to report that when he was speaking to the amendment to the Address-in-Reply recently, he misled the House on the question of the *Ocean Endeavour*, the semi-submersible oil rig now under construction.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: A serious charge!

The Hon. D. K. DAns: The honourable member then said—

The rig now under construction is ideally suited for exploration and evaluation work in medium depth water—water between 400 and 700 feet deep. That depth of water encompasses fairly well all the proven prospects of our north-west shelf.

He went on to say that the *Ocean Endeavour* was a modern unit and was self-propelled. I do not want to go further

than that except to quote what I really did say. My remarks appear at page 57 of *Hansard* No. 2 where, among other things, I said—

It may interest Mr McNeill to know there are now four Australian rigs in Australia and it might also interest him to know that the rig which is now being constructed, the *Ocean Endeavour* may not be suitable in other parts of the world.

At no stage did I say it would not be suitable in Australia; I said it may not be suitable in other parts of the world because at the time, the debate was centered around whether the rig would be exported. I think it was common knowledge on the waterfront that one of the attractions for building the *Ocean Endeavour* here was to receive the subsidy and, before it was even one-quarter completed, arrangements would be made to export the rig.

Mr Tozer also said that the *Ocean Endeavour* was self-propelled. So that we may get the *Hansard* record correct, the *Ocean Endeavour* has the capacity to move itself around. In other words it can manoeuvre from one hole to another by means of a series of jets. But it certainly could not sail forth from Fremantle Harbour to the Sunda Straits; that would be just too much for it. I am sure Mr Tozer did not intend to misquote me, but that is exactly what I said; namely, the rig may not be suitable in other parts of the world.

I would agree there are places the rig could be used; possibly there are places in Australia where it could not be used. The latest information is that the rig will be officially baptized shortly and it may be taken up by the Australian Government. I hope it is, for very obvious reasons.

I want to return to things which are more germane to an Address-in-Reply debate and to refer to some of the issues I raised when speaking to the Address-in-Reply in the first session of this Parliament; namely, that the Government should endeavour to take concrete steps to upgrade transport arrangements to the north-west or give some indication that it is going to do something about transport so that the cost of living of people in the north-west may be reduced, if only slightly. However, to date, despite assurances given by the Premier to numerous meetings in the north-west that action would be taken and that new types of ships were going to be constructed—in fact, he even went as far as to say that the port of Carnarvon would be reopened—nothing has happened.

I am becoming very worried that no official announcement has been made as to what is to happen when the *Wambiri* reaches the stage where it has spent five years on the Australian coast. She has spent over four years now, and our customs regulations demand that she be re-exported after five years. An exemption may be

granted, but normal exemptions are limited to two years and it takes a long time to draw up the plans of a ship, lay it down and complete it. The *Beroona* will soon be in the same category as the *Wambiri*. The two newer ships, the *Nyanda* and the *Boogalla*—previously both German ships—are called “Hitler’s revenge” by the seamen because they must be easily the hardest workers with the most antiquated gear on the Australian coast.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Who purchased those ships?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Tonkin Government purchased them because they were the cheapest ships available at the time, and had to fulfil a need.

The Hon. J. Heitman: I thought they were going to fill the need.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: They were designed to go part of the way; we never said they would solve all the problems. These ships are here now and are doing a reasonable job. However, what should be happening is that the Government should be making some announcement in regard to the type of ship it intends to put on the north-west run. I am of the opinion that if we looked at some specialised type of shipping, which may require some up-grading of ports, somehow or other we may be able to bring down the freight costs.

This is not meant as criticism; I am merely saying that up to date no announcement has been made. However, an announcement may be made in the near future.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Was not something said about the LASH vessels?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What happened to those?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr O’Connor talked about those.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The LASH vessels were a very good concept. I took part in the manning committees and we managed to reduce the manning to about nil. However, unfortunately these ships had never previously been built at a tonnage suitable to the north-west, and by the time the investigations were completed, their cost had risen to something like \$13 million each. The previous Liberal-Country Party Government and the Labor Government both decided not to purchase them.

Perhaps the situation has changed today, but it has been suggested that they were not suitable for our requirements, principally because to date vessels of 45 000 tons only had been built. At one stage, of course, the LASH ships were said to be essential to the north-west if we were going to develop the north-west and somehow reduce the cost of living up there; however, nothing has happened.

The longer we delay, the longer it will be before any serious attempt can be made to do something in this regard. Surely people would have in mind what happened to the trans-Australia railway and what happened up north and in Darwin as a result of the cyclones.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: It is a good thing the road was not washed away, was it not?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Ships have had to be brought in to sustain those areas. If what Mr Tozer is saying is correct, the problems of the north-west can be easily overcome by using road freight; however, I would like to hear the Government make that statement because that must be in the Government’s mind for Mr Tozer to make such an interjection. In other words, the Government has no intention of providing new ships for the north-west run but that road freight operators will operate with neither fear nor favour.

We all know what happened in Port Hedland when the local bakery ran out of flour. It had to be brought up by road, and the freight rate escalated to three times the rate charged by the State Shipping Service.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: You have never heard me advocate road transport.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I thought Mr Tozer just did advocate it. The failure to order ships, of course, affects not only the north-west but also people who work in my electorate at loading and discharging ships, providoring ships, fixing ships and painting ships; it also affects the laundry industry in the area. These people would like to know what is going to happen in the future. They all know the conditions under which the ships were imported into the State and they are now becoming worried because no announcement has been made as to their future. If they know there is to be no future for the ships, their businesses can be scaled down accordingly.

I should like to know what has happened to the joint study undertaken by the State and the Commonwealth on the Cockburn Sound ship repair and docking facilities. The report has been presented, but it has not been tabled. When is it to be tabled? I discovered that I could have received a copy of the report direct from the consultants, but I did not do so because I thought it would have been most unethical.

Is it a good report or a bad report? This is all tied in with the question of the rig which is due for launching and with the 400 men down there wondering what their futures hold for them. They are interested to know what is contained in the report. If it is a bad report, they will have to make other arrangements; if it is a good one there is some future for

them. The report has been available for some time, but it still has not been presented to Parliament.

A drilling programme was instigated on the present slipway at Fremantle to see whether the slip cradle could be strengthened so that the four State Shipping Service vessels could utilise it and be repaired by local Western Australian labour and industries. Through the grapevine—Dame Rumour is a dreadful thing—we hear that the slipway is capable of being strengthened. However, no announcement has been made.

At the moment, every couple of years the State Shipping Service vessels must journey to Brisbane or some other port on the eastern seaboard to be serviced. I should like to know whether that is considered to be the alternative to improving facilities in Cockburn Sound. If the cradle can be strengthened, it should be done immediately in the interests of this State, local engineering firms, ships chandling firms and labour. I am very mindful of those 400 people to whom I referred earlier. They need to know exactly where they are going.

No announcement has been made that the Government intends to continue the practice instituted by the Tonkin Government of making one berth available at Fremantle for ship repair facilities. I am very sure that if one or two berths were made available—naturally, at a reduced wharfage rate—with some workshop facilities on the Wharf, we could effect a number of repairs in Fremantle which would not require docking or slipping.

I hope the Government will examine this possibility. Perhaps I was incorrect in saying that no announcement has been made; let me amend my comment by saying that I hope the Government will examine the possibility and make it known whether these facilities will be available at Fremantle.

Despite the fact that from time to time people say, "Look at the high cost of labour" it is a known fact that manhour for manhour, our tradesmen and workers compare very favourably with those in other parts of the world. I have heard all the stories about how many people overseas will clean out an engine room in such a short time, but of course where we would have 60 people doing the job, they would have 180 men at work, so the argument is not relevant.

It also worries me that a new docking complex has just been opened in Singapore by a consortium of Japanese firms and the Singapore Government. Admittedly, a much greater amount of shipping travels through Singapore than through Fremantle. However, in this State, we have no inducement for either our own ships or for anyone else's, to be repaired here, except in a very minor way.

I remind the House that I am now talking about the people who live and work in my electorate in all categories of employment. It is a fact that with the advent of containerisation and other improvements, the usage of the berths at Fremantle has dropped rapidly. Mr Clive Griffiths would know that the berth usage now is right down; this has caused a lot of heartache in Fremantle.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Would strike action at the port have anything to do with it?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: This is almost a pathological question among Government supporters. If I cared to take members opposite in an exercise in industrial relations, they would find that our turn-around time in Australia and our strike time compares more than favourably with other parts of the world.

It is also handy to know that the very people who pay Harry Bridges and his people all that money on the west coast of America and Mr Gleason and his people on the east coast are the same people who pay our wharfies. I have never heard any of them grizzling lately. Recently, I attended a meeting—

The Hon. J. Heitman: This would be in the last fortnight or so, would it not?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No, it would not. Members can see what I mean when I refer to two members in this place. I do not think people should talk off the top of their heads. I intend later in my remarks to take Mr Wordsworth to task because of something he said which simply was not true relating to our cargo handling costs.

Tonne for tonne, our cargo is handled cheaper than in most other parts of the world. In order to expedite the shipping of cargo from the east to the west, an agreement was reached between unions and the companies involved—without running off to the Industrial Commission—whereby the turn-around time of the container ships was reduced from seven to five days. No-one said, "Look what good boys we are". This type of agreement means that men do not walk off the ship, because they know their responsibility.

The railway system is able to cut freights interstate because it knows that it will have a captive market and be able to carry goods worth millions of dollars to other areas. But I am now talking about the members of the union to which I had the honour to belong. They still live in Fremantle and I am very mindful of their welfare and they are very mindful of their jobs and responsibilities and accordingly they have cut the turn-around time of ships from seven to five days, particularly as this relates to container ships.

As a result of Mr Heitman's interjection I have somehow or other lost the thread of my speech.

The Hon. J. Heltman: I am sorry about that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I bet Mr Heltman is sorry about that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You were saying how very effective the present Government is.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I may have lost my thread but I certainly have not lost my mind! I am mindful of the fact that a great deal could be achieved if the Government were to take some action or show some initiative to resolve the small things that concern the State. Things like the jumbo steel plant, and similar matters will be resolved by the Supreme Court in due course. I accordingly hope the Government will take some action to resolve what I consider to be the bread-and-butter issues that affect the people in my area.

I want now to pass to another matter that worries me greatly. I have been in this Chamber as a member of Parliament for a comparatively short time. There are other members who have been here less time than I have. I daresay these members are getting the same feeling that I have and are wondering what we are here for. I do not say this in relation to any particular Government, because I have felt this way when my own Government was in office.

However when I wander through the corridors of the bureaucracies I often wonder whether we, as members of Parliament, have any views at all; whether we are permitted to have any views. I am fast coming to the conclusion that over the years the rights and privileges of the people as expressed through their democratically elected members of Parliament in this Chamber and in another place have been severely eroded.

I wonder, for example, whether any new member has tried to cut his teeth on matters concerning the State Electricity Commission. One is very lucky if one is able to contact a male member of that department on the phone. The usual thing is that one gets through to a female clerk. So if one has a problem which concerns one's constituents one approaches one of these authorities that operates outside the control of the Minister and makes all the decisions. As a rule one is generally powerless to obtain any relief for the constituents in question.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Powerless is not the right word to use.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is probably the wrong word but it sounds good—incapable might be a better word.

I now come to the position as it relates to the State Housing Commission. I know a number of people have as good a relationship with the State Housing Commission as I do. It is a great puzzle to me, however, when I am constantly told by the Housing Commission that the person about

whom I am inquiring is adequately housed—that is the term that is generally used by the commission. When I ask how they are able to arrive at this definition one is never told what the expression “adequately housed” really means.

I am not condemning the people who work in these departments, because this is the manner in which they have grown up. But one could quote case after case; one could go on *ad infinitum* and refer to such matters and, accordingly, I think it is about time that people were given the right of access to these authorities and given answers quickly. This should be done in the interests of democratic government and of the people who have elected us to this Parliament. It is my opinion—and I now refer to Governments of all political colours—that we have surrendered our authority and right to govern to people outside of Parliament; to those whom the electors have no opportunity to rebuke or remove.

I do not suggest for one moment that we should blow the Civil Service apart, nor do I suggest that the particular departments were wrong on all occasions, but I do say that they certainly make it hard for anyone to obtain information. These things must be taken note of. In this context one can go on and quote the Potato Board, the Milk Board, and the vast array of other people who have somehow cemented themselves into their blockhouses and who defend their actions in their own terrain. Without being at all political in the matter I think we should start having a look at these things, because these are the main causes of most of the dissatisfaction in the community.

It never ceases to amaze me, that when one happens to ring up in connection with a payment that may be due to some person—and has been due for several months—one is told with apologies that the cheque will be in the next post. The officer concerned may say he is sorry, but the person who is owed the money is more than sorry; he is nearly out of his mind. I feel sure that members will agree that these things should not happen. If they happened once or twice one could perhaps forgive the omission, but this sort of thing seems to happen constantly.

It is possible that some members have been here long enough to become used to this type of occurrence, but it does make me feel terribly frustrated when I ring up in connection with a problem and I am told that the file has been lying under a pile of papers and that it will be dealt with immediately and, in the case of a payment that has to be made, that a cheque will be despatched in the next post. This is very little consolation to the people who have been waiting perhaps for several months for the necessary payment. Many of them become thoroughly bamboozled at the way the Government operates. I think we are all aware of the fact

that we have very good civil servants, but I do think that the public should be allowed a little more access into what is going on. "Frustration" has almost become my middle name, particularly as a result of my trying to get through to various people from time to time.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You do not look frustrated.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I heard that interjection and I would point out that I do not imply I am frustrated in the rather risqué manner in which the Minister might suggest; my frustration stems from my dealings with the Government departments.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not know whether we should call you "frusty" or "crusty".

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Perhaps the Minister had better call me crusty! I have yet to be convinced—and I have not been convinced since I have been in Parliament—of the soundness of the manner in which the State Housing Commission plans its estates.

We keep spending millions of dollars on community welfare and various church groups are set up for this purpose, and that without avail. I just cannot understand the manner in which the State Housing Commission plans its estates. I will give credit to the Government which planned the estates of Parmelia and Orelia, because these are integrated estates. I cannot understand why consideration is not given to obtaining the funds from the Commonwealth Government to install a few swimming pools or squash courts.

Despite the efforts of certain well-meaning people in the community who try to help the young by holding rock Masses and rock groups I maintain there is nothing like exercise to work off one's excess energy. In my area there is one swimming pool which serves the needs of the entire province. There is only one such pool, except for that which is in the Applecross High School and one under construction at the Melville High School.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: There is none in Albany.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: As I have said there is only one swimming pool in my province to serve Cockburn, East Fremantle, and Melville.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What is wrong with the river and the sea?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not recommend people to swim in the river; apart from which it is a well-known fact that far better results are obtained when swimming meetings are held in pools. It is a tragedy for people to have to go to a particular pool miles away when a swimming carnival is held. One has heard reference made to swimming in the sea,

and in spite of this facility we find that Rockingham is adequately served by an excellent swimming pool.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Who built it?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Shire Council put it there. We have community recreation and development officers appointed, and we have the Australian Government wanting to make money available for recreation purposes, and we should take advantage of these facilities and plan our new areas from the word go; we should not wait till we have young people running around without anything to do and then try to provide them with this facility.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why cannot you install your pools in the same manner in which pools were installed in the country years ago?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: With a shovel?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: By community effort and subscription with a view to reaching a target. What is wrong with that?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Perhaps the honourable member could recommend that.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I suggest that you do so.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not know of one swimming pool in the metropolitan area that has been built by voluntary labour. I think members will agree that a far greater number of people in the metropolitan area have to be served by swimming pools than is the case in the country areas. For example in my province there is a pool serving about 100 000 people. I do strongly feel that land should be made available in the various suburbs for the installation of swimming pools.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I agree with what you have been saying, but I recall one of your colleagues mentioning that every time he gets the urge to do exercise he lies down.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There is also the other comment to the effect that he has no corns on his hands—they are on his brains.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: How do you know that?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: After reading the newspaper I am not at all sure whether he has corns on his brains. I do seriously suggest that when we are planning new areas, particularly where people are generally disadvantaged, we should give some thought in the initial stages to the provision of such facilities as swimming pools, whether they be installed by voluntary labour or by local government effort. I hope this satisfies Mr Gayfer.

I now want to touch on a subject which was introduced by Mr Wordsworth when he referred to the question of unions. This

matter is, of course, a popular whipping horse. Mr Wordsworth produced certain evidence concerning the action of the WWF, and he did this as though he were taking a rabbit out of a hat. I would say that throughout my long association with the waterside workers I have always found them to be a most responsible body; accordingly the letter Mr Wordsworth quoted is certainly not anything new as far as I am concerned.

There is, however, one important thing in connection with Mr Wordsworth's use of the term "union". When he used the expression "union" I wonder to whom he was referring. Was he referring to the Australian Medical Association? Was he referring to the air hostesses? Or perhaps he was referring to the fat cats to whom Mr Cameron is always referring. He could have been referring to the Qantas pilots, to the bank officers, to the wharfies, to the builders' labourers, or the transport workers, because all these people go to make up our community.

Despite what Mr Wordsworth had to say, I make the point that we get ourselves into all sorts of trouble because one section of the community does not understand the other, and because the one section will not communicate with the other.

Members opposite spit out the word "union" as though Lucretia Borgia had been reincarnated on this side of the House. Those on this side sometimes use "boss", "capitalist", and similar words. We are an integrated society and we will not resolve the problems in this way.

It is common knowledge today that we grow further and further apart, each person "doing his own thing". I hate that term, but it is exactly what is happening. We live in little cubes and the result is desperation as is the case in connection with the swimming pools I have mentioned because those involved normally become the powerless sector of the community.

No-one does any good by referring to unions in this manner because before this country starts to make progress under any Government there must be some kind of national unity. There is simply no other way.

There are powerful unions today and it is a fact of life that unions have arrived and they are powerful, as was stated by one industrial writer recently. Big unions do business with big combines, and both the unions and the combines are powerful.

I hope this kind of nonsense of using the term "union" is considered very carefully, because it does not do any good, but merely gives rise to more suspicion and more hatred—if that is the term—in some areas. It is just not good enough to toss off these words without considering the underlying problems created as a result, because these problems are important.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Who is responsible for the fact that you cannot send livestock away unless it is okayed by a brand from the unions.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I thought I was trying to explain that.

The Hon. J. Heitman: I hope you do.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Perhaps with a little more talking we can decide who is responsible. I will tell the honourable member. It is the desire of the meat worker to maintain his earning capacity, it is the desire of the beef farmer to maintain his earning capacity; and the same applies to the wheat farmer, the man at the lathe, the seaman, the wharfie, and the doctor. I thought I had explained that we live in cubes and see ourselves as a separate entity. Until we have national unity this problem will remain with us.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Have you ever seen the farming community hold anyone to ransom?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Not so long ago the farmers tried, but they were not successful. I did say facetiously that I would not mind being the secretary of their union for a while. The farmers decided to withhold the stock.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They did for a week.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes, and they did so because of their desperation. I do not blame them. They are doing—to use that horrible expression—"their own thing". The result of this kind of behaviour is an undisciplined society which does not do any good for anyone in the long run.

While we toss words around so lightly the gaps grow and grow. If anyone had told me five years ago that bank officers or air hostesses would go on strike, to say nothing of many other people, I would have thought such a person was crazy.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Or that others would adopt guerilla tactics.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I find it very hard to get through to people. I am doing something no-one else has done. I am agreeing with what the honourable member says, but the tossing around of words does not solve a thing. We can achieve national unity. We did so when Darwin was devastated, and we are united by national emergencies such as wars. I do hope we do not have to face another war before we get together again. No-one will convince me that unless some minute step is made in this direction we are not in for a rough time. We do not solve anything by referring to guerilla tactics being used to protect earning capacity.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Read *Hansard* and see the text in which I mentioned guerilla tactics. You did not hear me correctly.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The honourable member may have a cold; I am not sure. However, I will give him the benefit of the doubt.

I hope that notice will be taken of what I have said, because anyone at all with some conscious regard for this country would know full well that we are not going to get anywhere on the path we are travelling.

I do not wish to speak for very much longer, but I have become increasingly worried about the role of the Legislative Council. I am not going to speak on the issue of boundaries or who votes for whom or what for what, but I am referring to the very role of the Legislative Council. I have been thinking about it. When anyone thinks about it all he can come up with for an answer is zero because we are a political House. If we were not there would be some justification for a House of Review. The idea is attractive to me, but we cannot have a House of Review when its members are elected from different political parties. The moment that is done the Chamber ceases to be a House of Review.

The second point is that this cannot be a House of Review when it contains three Ministers. I hope no-one will be foolish enough to tell me that those Ministers will review their own legislation, because such a suggestion would be too crazy for words.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It has been done.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes, I know. Seven Ministers voted against daylight saving.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It was done last year.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: But it is not done very often. If members would consider the situation in an unbiased manner they would realise that we are living a lie. For the purpose of the exercise let us say that a House of Review would be good providing it comprised no Ministers and providing its members did not represent any particular political opinion. The last idea would be difficult to achieve.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Any of them would be.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It is difficult for a party who takes an oath to abide by Caucus.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have never taken any oath to my party and I hope the honourable member is not trying to perpetuate that myth exploded in dozens of books in libraries that the Liberal Party does not have a Caucus, because it does.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: We are not pledged.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Liberal Party has a very democratic system with its leader as secretary, chairman, and everything else.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am the secretary.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Not up there.

I hope that the Government will take notice of what I have said, particularly about the South Metropolitan Province and table the report in respect of the joint study of Cockburn Sound. There are 400 people waiting on it in order to ascertain what the future might hold for them. I hope the Government will make known the result of the drilling if it has been done and, if successful, take speedy action to make sure that State ships can be slipped and serviced here. I hope that some repair facilities will be available at Fremantle and when slipping or docking is available I hope this fact will be made known to the shipping world. As I said I hope the Government will expedite the report on Cockburn Sound, and if it is favourable, it should leave no stone unturned to put the recommendations into operation.

I do not know whether the report will be favourable. From my own observations I would say it might not be, but at least we should know one way or the other. I trust it will not be one of the reports the Government puts under the counter. Perhaps it is still under study by both the Commonwealth and State Governments. However, as soon as possible in the interests of the peace of mind of some people, the results should be made known so that some action can be taken one way or another and the people concerned can be taken off the hook.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.40 p.m.]: I wish to support the motion moved by Mr Pratt on Opening Day, and in doing so I take the opportunity to congratulate him on the very competent manner in which he presented his address on that occasion.

I have never moved the Address-in-Reply motion on Opening Day, but it is a situation I have considered during the years I have been here. I believe it would be one of the most terrifying experiences for a member of Parliament, particularly a relatively new member, to stand up and make a speech on Opening Day when the Chamber was full of all the visiting dignitaries and other people who come along. The manner in which Mr Pratt made his contribution on that day was excellent and, I repeat, I offer him my congratulations.

Before proceeding with other topics, I wish to express my sincere regret that the Governor (Sir Hughie Edwards) has found it necessary to tender his resignation prematurely because of his ill-health, and I would like to take the opportunity to wish him a speedy recovery. I trust that, having resigned, his health will improve.

There has been some speculation as to who is likely to be his successor and certain names have been suggested by various people. It is a subject which is exercising the minds of many in the community. I, too, am curious to know who will be the successor to Sir Hughie.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Could you manage it, do you think?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: My invitation in regard to the position has obviously been delayed in the mail because I have not received it as yet! What my decision would be if I were approached—

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Do you want him to be an Australian?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would be delighted if he were an Australian. I was simply going to say that I am not in a position to know whether anyone has been singled out as a likely successor. The Government may or may not have made some progress in regard to the matter.

I would like to say that from my own point of view, from the observations I have made, and in the opinion of the numerous people who have spoken to me about the subject, the Government could do a lot worse than offer the position to Commodore Ramsay who has acted in the position on the occasions when Sir Hughie Edwards has been sick. I make that comment because it has been made to me on many occasions since the announcement of Sir Hughie Edwards' resignation.

You, Mr President, have participated in more Address-in-Reply debates than you can remember and, over the years, you have witnessed various members doing likewise. During the time I have been here I have done the same. Some members use the debate for one reason, and others use it for another purpose. Each member takes the opportunity to expound on pet subjects or matters which affect him and his electorate as well as the State in general. Most speeches follow the same form and when we have been here for a while, we can just about guarantee the sort of trend a member's speech will take. In case members have any doubts about the trend my speech will take tonight, I will immediately put their minds at rest and indicate that my speech will be in exactly the same vein as it has been over the years. In other words, there is a multitude of things I wish to speak about—indeed, many more than time will probably permit me to deal with properly.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Would you start off on power lines and Gullford Grammar School?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They are not necessarily the same subjects, although I may have mentioned some of them previously.

I think some members have touched on one subject about which I think we should talk. Certainly the Hon. Des Dans touched on one aspect of it when he was speaking a short while ago. I refer to the attitudes adopted today, by people in various walks of life, towards each other, towards their responsibilities as citizens in

the community, towards their responsibilities to their families and their jobs, and so on. It seems to me a rather frightening tendency is developing. I am not sure how we can overcome it or what is the actual solution. I am not really sure why it is happening. Perhaps other members can give us expert views on the reason for this change in the attitudes of people.

I will give one or two examples. On the Thursday before Easter I called in to see some people in my electorate. When I arrived there, three or four young people in the yard were fixing up motor cars, putting gear into vehicles, and generally keeping themselves busy in the back yard of these premises. There were about four young people; one of them was a young girl and the others were young boys. Their ages would have ranged between 19 and 23. I asked them, "Have you got the day off?" The girl said, "Well, it is three or four weeks since I had a day off", and I got the impression that she was certainly of the opinion that anybody who worked for three or four weeks without taking a day off needed medical attention or something of that kind. One of the boys said, "We took the day off to get our gear ready so that we can effectively use the four days' holiday we have starting tomorrow."

I began to think about this. We were to have a four-day holiday break and these young people, who were quite intelligent, considered they were justified and there was no harm in taking the day off on the Thursday in order to get ready for the holiday.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You agreed to the adjournment of this House for three days after Easter. What is the difference?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There is a big difference. While Mr Cooley may do no work other than when he is sitting in the Chamber, my work in looking after my constituents carries on whether or not this House is in session. Participating in the Parliament is only one facet of the job the people are paying me to do.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A very small facet for some of you, but it should not be.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It is relative. It is the major part of Mr Cooley's activities on behalf of the people.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Well, what was the reason for your agreeing to the adjournment of the House for that week?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It was not practicable for the House to continue to sit and effectively deal with the subjects under consideration at the time.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Why? Because it was Easter?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: In any case, it was a decision of the House.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What Mr Cooley is doing is condoning a breach of contract.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I am making a comparison.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Cooley is saying in effect that it is perfectly legitimate for that girl, or anybody else, if she has not had a day off for three or four weeks, to take the day off prior to a four-day holiday for no other reason than to prepare for the holiday. If that is not what he is saying, his comment by way of interjection was completely uncalled for.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I was drawing comparisons between you and the person you were speaking about.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not want to pursue that matter. As I said earlier, there are many subjects about which I wish to speak.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Did they have a good weekend?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I can assure the honourable member that at the weekend I will be doing as much work as he will be doing.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I asked whether they had a good weekend.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I thoroughly enjoy the work I do.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What yardstick did you use in making that last statement?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Those young people probably took a day off after the holiday in order to unpack.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It all depends how much gear one takes away.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not saying everything I did was correct, but I can remember working on the waterfront at Fremantle until midnight on the eve of a holiday and going home to gather up my gear and start packing at 12.30 a.m. so that I could get away.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are a paragon of virtue.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, I am not. I am saying the attitudes of people are changing dramatically. Perhaps they are correct attitudes. Mr Cooley is apparently of the opinion that they are perfectly correct attitudes. I am saying I believe this trend is an extension of what Mr Dans was speaking about in regard to people's attitudes towards each other and towards the other side of the House, and the attitude between unions and bosses. I do not think it is in the best interests of the community, generally.

Furthermore, unfortunately I see this change creeping into Parliament. I have not been here a long time. I have been here longer than some members and not as long as others. But I can remember a time when members of Parliament could speak to each other in the corridor, in their offices, and

outside Parliament, in the absolute knowledge that what they said would be accepted as being off the record. Whatever one said—whether one was critical of his party's policy or whether one said, "I think you have a point"—one had the absolute knowledge that the member to whom he was speaking would respect his confidence. I am sure you would agree, Mr President, that state of affairs always existed over the years in this Parliament. I am sure members who have been here for a number of years would also agree with me.

Over the last few years I have noticed this situation deteriorating. I am not saying it applies to any one political party; members of all parties are probably at fault to some extent. I think it is a sad state of affairs. In a moment I will deal with what Mr Dans had to say about the House of Review.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you going to agree with me?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No. I will give an illustration which came from a quarter from which I did not expect it to come. It came from a member who I believe was probably very sorry after he made the comment. In any case, I consider it to have been a breach of the code which existed whereby a member would not come into the Parliament and repeat what another member had said outside. I refer to what the Hon. Ron Thompson, the Leader of the Opposition, said during the Address-in-Reply debate when speaking about the attacks made on the Federal Government by the State Government through the Governor. He said—

It is easy to understand why such an attack should be made. The reason is that it is the work of one man—Sir Charles Court—who is now known sarcastically among the members of his own party—and particularly among the members of the Liberal Party—as their grand and glorious leader.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is right.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It may be right, but for him to say he has heard members refer sarcastically—

The Hon. R. Thompson: I did not say "Liberal members of Parliament"; I said "members of the Liberal Party".

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Anyway, the Leader of the Opposition is indicating that he is indeed sorry for what he said because he is qualifying his statement by saying he was not necessarily referring to members of Parliament.

I do not know whether our members refer to their leader as their "grand and glorious leader". I certainly do not. The point I make, however, is that if I were walking down the corridors and spoke to a member of the Hon. Ron Thompson's party who, in the confines of this place, made a comment about his leader, there is no way in

the world—except perhaps by putting matches under my finger nails and setting them alight—that anyone would induce me to repeat in this Parliament a derogatory statement I had heard a member of the Opposition make about his leader.

The Hon. R. Thompson: All the members of the Liberal Party are making derogatory statements about the present Premier.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I entirely disagree with that comment.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He makes derogatory statements about you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Perhaps he does.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is our privilege. We can say things if we wish.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not your privilege. He is my Premier, too.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: In the heat of debate the Leader of the Opposition was endeavouring to place some emphasis on the point that Sir Charles Court was wrong in criticising the Federal Government. I believe he adopted a tactic which is foreign to the nature of the man I have known over the years, and I am extremely sorry he did so.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am not sorry I said it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should be; it makes it worse if you are not sorry.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sure he really is sorry. I repeat: This is a tendency which is creeping into this place, and I believe we would be better off without it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you should qualify your statement. You are accusing me of betraying a confidence. Did I betray a confidence?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am saying that Mr Thompson repeated in the Parliament something that he apparently heard in the corridors.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Prove that.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why are you making so much fuss if you are not guilty?

The Hon. R. Thompson: I would get onto another subject if I were you because you are in deep water.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not in deep water.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Well, you are in heavy mud.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The only reason I hesitate is that I am trying to explain once more something which everyone except the culprit has understood; but in an endeavour to justify his actions and to take the spotlight away from himself he is embarking on a campaign to get me to change the subject. However, *Hansard* will record quite adequately the point

I made, and if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to have a look at my speech I will certainly not object to him receiving the first copy off the press.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I don't worry about any of your speeches.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Dans referred to this Chamber being called a House of Review, and said it could not possibly be a House of Review while members—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I said, "In my opinion"; I was not speaking generally.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Well, whose opinion would it be if it were not that of Mr Dans? He said that in his opinion this House could not be called a House of Review while members are elected under the banners of political parties.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Don't you think he should be allowed to express his opinion?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What sort of interjection is that?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A good one.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am one of those people who believe that every member has the right to express his opinion; and I am also one who has announced his objection to any attempt to amend Standing Orders to curtail the time available to members to express their opinions. I say that for the information of Mr Claughton. I would even go so far as to extend to him the right to speak on the subjects of his desire whenever he wishes to do so.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The rest of us might not approve of that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would always support the right of Mr Clive Griffiths to make a grave mistake!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am certainly not suggesting that to Mr Dans, because strangely enough while I do not agree with many of the things he says I am always delighted to listen to his contributions. If nothing else, he speaks very fluently, knowledgeably, and very much to the point on the subjects he speaks about. However, I do not always agree with him and, naturally, he would not expect me to.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you were going to say he speaks in a loud, clear voice.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He does, and he speaks most competently. It is certainly not unpleasant to listen to him. I hope I have emphasised sufficiently to Mr Claughton that I am not suggesting that Mr Dans be precluded from expressing his opinion.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If I did not know Mr Griffiths I would think he is trying to assassinate me by flattery.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Prior to the tea suspension I was about to comment on the opinion expressed by Mr Dans of the inability of the Legislative Council to act as a House of Review in those circumstances where members are elected as representatives of various political parties. I said that I disagreed with that point of view. Indeed, over the years I have mentioned the point I am about to raise again now. That is, I believe it is perfectly legitimate for members of this House to go to the people and say to them, "I seek your support to elect me, whether I be a member of the Liberal Party, the Country Party, or the Labor Party, to the Legislative Council of Western Australia, bearing in mind that the Legislative Council is a House of Review."

I have never compiled the actual figures, but I repeat what I have said before; namely, it is my belief that if I said 10 per cent of the legislation dealt with by this House had anything whatsoever to do with my political philosophy I would be generous. I think that 90 per cent of the legislation I have reviewed in this Chamber has had nothing to do with my political philosophy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In those circumstances would you not agree that the Barristers' Board could review the legislation just as easily?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I go to the people and I say, "I review the legislation that comes before the Legislative Council, looking at it from the point of view of a person who believes in either this philosophy or that philosophy." The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and in the 10 years I have been here there have been only two occasions in which a situation has ever arisen where a member of the party to which Mr Dans belongs did not vote in the same manner as the remainder of his colleagues.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I do not believe your election signs asked support for "Clive Griffiths—Candidate for the House of Review." They stated that you were a candidate for the Liberal Party.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not mind Mr Claughton interjecting, but if he must interject I wish he would do so in an intelligible manner. First of all I cannot understand what he is saying and, secondly, I am finding it extremely difficult to hear him. What I was saying is that on two occasions—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I cannot understand you because you keep changing the subject.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not changing the subject. I am the one, at the moment, who is deciding what subject I shall talk upon. If I say to my people, "I will review the legislation—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I bet you never say that to your electors.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: In fact, an honourable member may not say it, but I believe he says it in effect. In effect, a member of this House says to his electors that he will review legislation, bearing in mind that he supports this or that philosophy.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Your election signs do not indicate that you are a member of a House of Review.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They are very good signs. In fact, I will have something to say about signs now that the honourable member has reminded me. What I am saying is that there are numerous occasions when members of the party to which I belong have indicated by actual practice that they are prepared to review or judge the legislation based on the way they view it at the time in question, without necessarily adhering to what the Government of the day thinks; that is, if they are Government members, or, if they are members of a party that is in opposition. Generally, there is ample evidence of this.

I will now refresh the memories of members by citing two examples. One was the example set by Mr Claude Stubbs in respect of—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Fireworks.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, it had to do with the fluoridation of water, if my memory serves me correctly. The other example was set by Mr Dolan in respect of a Bill we were debating and which dealt with—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Parliamentary Commissioner.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes, the Parliamentary Commissioner, or the Ombudsman, and we all know what happened to Mr Dolan.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What happened to him?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He retired gracefully.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: But he changed his mind very swiftly the following day.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not arguing the merits or the demerits; I simply think that in these inflationary times this House is a luxury we cannot afford.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I disagree. That is demonstrated by the number of decisions that have been made by this House which have resulted in considerable amendments to pieces of legislation or an absolute rejection of Government legislation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What about daylight saving?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will talk about that later. That is another subject I have not on my list but I will add

it now. There are many examples of where this House has made a decision that is contrary to what the—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Labor Government wants.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, what every Government has decided should be the situation. I am sure that if members of the Labor Party would accept the fact that if occasionally they demonstrated they were interested in making this a House of Review, it would become a much better House of Review.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If we take any notice of the remarks made by the Premier, he says that we do not get any money and that we cannot do anything because of the Federal Government. Surely this is a ground for disbanding this House.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I cannot agree with that point of view. That is crazy! Mr Dans is far more intelligent than that. That is the sort of interjection I would expect Mr Claughton to make. It is certainly not the sort of comment I would expect from Mr Dans.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you saying that the Police Force is not necessary?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say that.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr Dans did not say it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Claughton probably said it. I simply say to Mr Dans that when I see some semblance of inclination on the part of members of the Labor Party to express a free point of view on a subject, then I will be more inclined to believe that they are genuinely pursuing the philosophy that this is a House of Review.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say anything about malapportionment; I simply think it is superfluous.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say that the honourable member said anything about malapportionment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Well, maladjustment.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There are many maladjusted people about the place as will be ascertained in the future by those who read the interjections made during my speech.

I now want to deal with the State Housing Commission.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I take it you do not agree with my point of view, Mr Griffiths?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Fair enough; you took a long time to tell me.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Members have come to look jocularly at situations such as those in which we are placed this evening where I am speaking in the

Address-in-Reply debate on the State Housing Commission. For a number of years I have pursued a point of view which subsequently has been borne out absolutely, and if the Government had listened to me at that time we would not be confronted with some of the social problems we are currently facing.

In respect of the State Housing Commission, the present State Government has performed many acts for the benefit of the people of Western Australia, but as far as I am concerned the one that stands out as being among the best the Government has performed is the action it took immediately it became the Government. I am speaking of the promotion of the General Manager of the State Housing Commission.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Sideways.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: On assuming office not only did the Government promote the General Manager, but also the Deputy Manager, so we now have an Acting Manager of the State Housing Commission. The difference between the previous manager and the present manager is like chalk and cheese. The promotion of course was, hopefully, into obscurity.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was one of those English-type promotions.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We now have an Acting Manager of the State Housing Commission who shows some signs of acknowledging the fact that there are people who deserve some kindness, consideration, and sympathy; a situation which was absolutely lacking in previous years. I want to say how pleasing it is these days to contact the Acting Manager of the State Housing Commission and how much more rewarding it is to put forward a case to Mr McKenna in contrast to the situation that prevailed previously.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I find myself agreeing with you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member must, of necessity, because the change is similar to switching on a light in a tomb. That is how different the present situation is. It is a completely new approach altogether with the human touch to the fore so far as Mr McKenna is concerned.

I congratulate the Government on taking the initiative to appoint him as general manager. I am not sure that its motives are the same as my reasons for supporting the appointment. By the same token the new appointment has produced results which benefited many of the poor unfortunate people who were condemned to misery under the regime of the previous management and the policies it espoused.

This is not to say that I am happy with all that is taking place in the State Housing Commission. I am still concerned with

the delays that occur when members make representations to the Parliamentary Liaison Officer. I should add that I have the greatest respect for this officer (Mr Harvey) and I commend him for the magnificent job he is doing. However, there has been lack of staff, and this officer has worked under difficulties in endeavouring to cope with the representations by members of Parliament.

I have said it before, and I repeat it now: even in the days when housing was difficult—some members in this Chamber will be aware of the difficult conditions which existed in the period from 1966 to 1968 when housing was in a critical situation—a member of Parliament could receive word back from the housing commission within two or three days, indicating whether or not the case put forward would be given consideration.

Last year I made a similar complaint about the representations made by members of Parliament. If I myself do not constantly keep on the wheel of the Housing Commission I would not get an answer to my representations. If one keeps constantly at the wheel of the commission then one might get an answer after two or three months. This is an appalling state of affairs. When a member of Parliament makes representations on behalf of someone who is in urgent need of accommodation, a period of two weeks could be a lifetime and a period of two days could be critical.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You admit the Housing Commission is better than the Town Planning Department; we never seem to get replies from the latter.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Fortunately I do not make many representations to the Town Planning Department but in a moment I will have something to say about that department. If I have to make many approaches to the Town Planning Department I will need to be placed in a padded cell!

Turning back to the State Housing Commission we should recognise the fact that more assistance and staff should be provided to the Parliamentary Liaison Officer's section. This is a section where extreme emergency cases are put forward and considered.

I have obtained a great deal of success in my approaches to the Housing Commission, but I am concerned with the length of time that the commission takes to meet the requests. Whilst I congratulate the general manager (Mr McKenna) on the new approach of the commission and its policies, as well as this officer's humanitarian approach to representations, I recommend that he give very serious consideration to ensuring that such humanitarianism is allowed to be exploited to its fullest, so as to make sure that cases put forward to the Parliamentary Liaison Officer by members of Parliament are dealt with speedily.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In other words you want the bureaucratic bottleneck to be cleared.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is so. I shall have something to say about that aspect later. I now turn to the question of daylight saving. Over the years Bills have been introduced to adopt daylight saving, to have trials of daylight saving, to hold referendums on the adoption of daylight saving, to have trials and then referendums, and so on. Over all those years I expressed the point of view that daylight saving would be rejected by the people of Western Australia, and personally I opposed its introduction. I gave the reasons for my opposition. I know that you, Mr Deputy President, were of the opinion—and this was shared by a huge majority of your electors—that daylight saving should be rejected; and that was borne out in the recent referendum. You were very firm in the view that you took, and it is one with which I have always agreed.

For that reason I became very conscious of the old fashioned look you gave me when you discovered that, notwithstanding my opposition to the measure, I had come to the conclusion that I ought to vote for the introduction of daylight saving so as to give the people an opportunity to have a trial before a referendum was taken.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You followed the party line.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No matter what I say, according to Mr Cooley I am not right. I remember the way you, Mr Deputy President, and other members who shared your view, looked at me. Notwithstanding all that I believed that the people should be given a trial period of daylight saving before they voted at a referendum. I put forward that point of view, because I was very confident that the people of Western Australia would vote in the referendum in such a manner that the question would be disposed of for all time. I am not one of those who gets a great deal of joy in standing up and saying, "I told you so."

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Tell us how the people in your electorate voted at the referendum.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: However, I do wish to say, "I told you so."

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: How did the people in your electorate vote?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I know how they voted.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That was the only area which had a majority in favour of daylight saving.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Not at all. The point is that the people of the State made a decision, and it was one which I was confident they would make in view of the approaches that had been made to me over the years on the question

of daylight saving. I work not only when the Chamber is sitting, as Mr Cooley seems to do. At all times I mix with my electors and with the people. I was absolutely convinced that when the referendum was conducted, the proposal for the introduction of daylight saving would be rejected.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have an idea that God is a Liberal, in view of the way He turned the weather on for you!

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Tell us whether the rentals are going up 30 per cent!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Much has been said on the question of unemployment in Western Australia. In this respect I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the local authorities—in particular the Shire of Belmont—for the work they have done.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: With funds provided by the Australian Government.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Just a minute, I am trying to make a speech.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The Belmont Shire is a very efficient shire.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I want to congratulate it for the work it is doing for the benefit of its ratepayers. However, I am not in favour of the manner in which the funds are made available to the shires.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: But they are.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The shires are receiving the funds, and they are making good use of the money. They are able to undertake projects for the benefit of the people. This work is done under the RED Scheme. This scheme has been introduced by the Commonwealth Government, and under it funds are made available to local authorities for the purpose of providing work for the unemployed. One particular incident has been brought to my notice: a business organisation which has been established in the city for a long time carried out and is still carrying out work for certain local authorities. In these difficult days of unemployment this organisation has made every endeavour to retain its staff and permanent employees.

Recently a member of that organisation whom I know very well telephoned me and said that conditions were becoming very critical, and the organisation would have to put off some very valuable members of its staff unless it could obtain more work. He asked me what I could do to assist. I told him that other firms were in the same boat, and he knew the reasons for the downturn in business. He pointed out that his organisation did not want to put off its employees, because they were very loyal and competent. He said he was frightened that if those employees were

put off the organisation would not be able to re-employ them when conditions improved.

This week I spoke to that person again. He said, "You will not believe it, we had to put off the three employees I mentioned to you, but do you know where they will be employed?" I said that I did not have the slightest idea. He said those employees would be employed by one of the local authorities for which his organisation had carried out work for some years. That local authority is now doing work financed under the RED Scheme. This meant that those employees, instead of having a permanent job in the organisation, were retrenched and then employed by a local authority for which the organisation has been carrying out work. This is an extraordinary situation—to cause the employees of an organisation to be retrenched, and placed in employment in a local authority for which that organisation has been doing work. If that is not a crazy situation I do not know what is. That is one example which has been brought to my attention and I think we ought to take some notice of it.

Talking about local authorities, I want to get on to the Little Athletics Club. I will take advantage of this opportunity to mention the wonderful work which the Little Athletics Club is doing for the young people in the State of Western Australia. I have been conscious of the existence of the club and several have been set up in my province. They are run by dedicated people, and they cater for a large number of young people.

I was privileged to receive an invitation to attend the State championship a couple of weeks ago at Perry Lakes Stadium, and I believe that those people who give up their time to help the young people in this State should be encouraged at every opportunity. Many people are doing a lot of work for our youngsters.

I now get back to the Belmont Shire which has recently constructed an arena for the Little Athletics Club. It is a fantastic structure for which the Belmont Shire is to be congratulated for its initiative and foresight. Perhaps other local authorities can take a leaf out of its book.

The arena at Belmont has been designed specifically for use by young people who want to participate in athletics in their own district. In most instances children have to go to local football ovals for sporting events, and these ovals have not been constructed specifically for the purpose of athletics. The Belmont Shire is to be commended on the action it has taken. I do not intend to confine my congratulations to the Belmont Shire only. I have other local authorities within my province: The

Canning Town Council, the Gosnells Town Council, the South Perth City Council, and part of the Perth City Council. All these authorities are doing a great deal of work for the young people which they represent.

Another matter which concerns me is a requirement which some local authorities place on the issue of a permit when people seek to develop a property. I refer particularly to the ghastly—if I may use that term—state of affairs whereby a local authority, on receiving an application from a ratepayer for a building permit, presents the ratepayer with an ultimatum to the effect that he shall give a certain area from the frontage of the property to the shire before the permit will be issued. The local authority claims that the road in front of the property will be widened at some time in the future. If the land is not handed over as a gift, at the time of the issue of the permit, negotiations will have to take place at some time in the future. The local authority takes advantage of the opportunity to get the land for nothing when a person applies for a building permit.

One would think that was bad enough, but the matter goes further. Not only does the local authority want the piece of land for nothing, but it expects the person applying for the permit to pay for survey and other costs associated with excising the piece of land from the property.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Which shire imposes this condition?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Several shires.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know a city which is doing it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am talking about local authorities: I did not mean shires. What a startling state of affairs! A person who has paid for a block of land and who desires to develop it is confronted with what is nothing less than blackmail because unless he hands over a portion of the frontage of his block, and pays the associated costs, he will not receive a building permit. Thank you very much.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Has anybody complied?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course they have. If they do not, they do not get a building permit. It is high time some of these requirements were looked into and we amended whatever Act grants this power to make sure that people are not held to ransom when they want to develop their land on which they have paid rates enabling the local authority to exist. I bring this matter to the attention of the House.

I have here another diabolical matter I want to bring forward.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Now he is settling down.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Members will be aware that when anybody applies for a liquor license, of any description, one can just about bet one's last dollar that some objections will be raised from one direction or another. If members cast their minds back over the last year or two they will recall the publicity given to people who have applied for tavern licenses. It is usually found that petitions are presented, and all the objections in the world are raised. If all else fails either the local authority or the AHA objects. As I say, one can bet one's bottom dollar that somebody will object to the application for a tavern license.

I will mention a situation which occurred in the Melville City Council where an application was made for a tavern license. Firstly, approval was sought from the local authority and granted. All the statutory advertising was carried out and not one objection was raised. If that is not unique, it must just about be unique. Not one objection was raised to this particular application for a tavern license.

Because not one objection was raised it would be reasonable to assume that nobody was opposed to the tavern, and everybody seemed to think it was not a bad idea and the site was a reasonable sort of place for the establishment of a tavern. In order to give members some idea of what has occurred I have condensed the events down to two pages of very brief notes. Were I to give the whole story we would be here for some time.

The council agreed that the site applied for was the best position for a tavern within the Melville City Council area. In 1968 the council set about drawing up a revised town planning scheme for the then City of Melville to replace scheme No. 1 gazetted on the 30th November, 1936. The procedures as set out in the town planning regulations of 1967 were carried out precisely, including gazettal of intent to prepare.

On the 8th December, 1969, the MRPA was advised that an extension of time was required for a final submission. Its approval was issued on the 8th December, 1969; the same day. A further extension was requested on the 11th May, 1970, and was granted.

The Minister for Town Planning granted preliminary approval by letter of their No. 2 scheme on the 23rd September, 1970, and congratulated the council on the high standard of the application which was presented. Incidentally, I have all the letters.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do not read them.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As I have said, I have condensed all the transactions down to two pages. The Town Planning Board, by letter dated the 25th September, 1970, confirmed the Minister's

preliminary approval and forwarded four foolscap pages of amendments which had to be carried out prior to advertising.

Of the 22 amendments specified—and this is important—six related to amendments required to bring the proposed scheme into line with the region scheme. These amendments did not refer to this particular lot I am talking about.

The scheme was duly advertised, objections were received and dealt with, and finally it was gazetted on the 30th June, 1972. At that date the site I am speaking of was zoned SR3, which is residential. At a subsequent meeting, as a result of an approach made by the owners of the land, the council agreed to and submitted to the Town Planning Department a proposal to rezone the lot from SR3 to "special zone, tavern only". That application was accompanied by an application on MRPA form No. 1 to commence development.

By letter dated the 28th June, 1974, the MRPA advised that the application for development was refused because the lot was set aside as a regional reserve under the metropolitan region scheme of 1963.

To give members some idea of the law in respect of the town planning scheme I must supply the relevant information. Section 7 of the Town Planning Act, 1928, authorises a council to prepare a town planning scheme. Section 7AA, Act 34 of 1973, permits the Minister to direct a council to amend a local scheme. Town planning regulations of 1967, section 7, also cross-refers to section 18 of the Town Planning Act which enables an applicant to request the Minister to direct a local authority to carry out an amendment to its scheme.

Section 34 of the metropolitan region town planning scheme directs the Minister not to approve a local authority scheme, within the Perth metropolitan region, unless that scheme is in accordance with the regional scheme.

Section 35 of the metropolitan region town planning scheme directs a local authority, within the Perth region, to prepare and submit a town planning scheme within a certain time, and stipulates that the scheme so prepared, and quoting from the Act, "is in accordance and consistent with" the metropolitan region town planning scheme, or amend an existing scheme, "so that it shall conform with the provisions of the metropolitan region town planning scheme".

Section 25 (e) of the metropolitan region town planning scheme gives authority to the Minister to order a review of the metropolitan region town planning scheme and subsequently for the MRPA to submit, for approval, any variations, amplifications, or revocations of the scheme, such amendments must, of course, be advertised and be subject to objections.

Now an amendment to a scheme to change this particular lot from regional reserve to urban would not preclude public

access to the foreshore. What has happened is that this particular land which was zoned as SR3 in the Melville City Council town planning scheme was approved by the Town Planning Board and the MRPA, by virtue of the signature of the Minister who accepted it and gazetted it. It was not accepted and gazetted until 22 amendments were sought of the local authority, including six which were said to contravene the region scheme. Not until these people submitted an application to build the tavern, and after the local authority had agreed to it, did the MRPA discover suddenly that inadvertently it had approved of the zoning of this piece of land as residential land when in fact it was shown as regional open space in the region scheme.

Here was a clear indication that the person in the department who had inspected that town planning scheme No. 2 presented by the Melville City Council, and who had picked out 22 necessary amendments, including six that contravened the scheme, had neglected to pick up the fact that this one block of land in the whole of this area was marked as regional open space in the region scheme. The department allowed it, the Minister approved of it with his signature, it was published in the *Government Gazette*, and it became the law. Everything went along swimmingly. No objections were received from any source when advertisements were inserted in the Press to the effect that it was proposed to use this land for a tavern. Certainly no objections were received from the MRPA, nor from the Minister's office. The Main Roads Department was asked to give approval, which it did. The Licensing Court granted a provisional license for the sum of \$25 000 which the developers had to submit. Indeed, the Licensing Court still holds this money.

The developers had plans and specifications drawn up by an architect. When all this preparation has been completed, the MRPA then says, "Hang on a minute, we should never have allowed that piece of land to be zoned residential in the first place. We are sorry, there has been a mistake made, so the project cannot go on." In the meantime the developers had committed themselves for hundreds of thousands of dollars. They had paid interest on the money, they serviced the loan, they paid for the work and effort of the architect, the designers, and the project administrators. They paid for the legal work necessary to make an application to the Licensing Court, as well as the \$25 000 to the court, and a fee of \$13 000-odd to the local authority for the betterment of the use—as it is called—to make provision for upgrading of roads and footpaths around the tavern.

We then find that because the department and the Minister made a mistake, nothing can be done about it. I suggest that if ever a group of people is entitled

to be compensated by a Government, this particular group is. I have suggested to them that they seek compensation to cover all the costs, because this mistake was no fault of theirs. The local authority had an approved scheme, and this is how the problem had developed.

I then went on to make inquiries as to how many other local authorities had gazetted schemes that conflicted with the metropolitan scheme. I have here a list covering two foolscap pages of schemes that were approved by the Minister but which were in fact illegal schemes.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are they all in the City of Melville?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, they are in the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott, the Town of Canning, the Town of Cockburn, the Shire of Gosnells, the Shire of Kwinana, the Shire of Mundaring, the Town of Mosman Park, the City of Perth, and the City of Stirling—of course, that one would have to be in it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There are probably more if you search around.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There are probably more. I must point out there are several in each area, and not just one. People buy land because their local government town planning scheme has been approved by the Government and gazetted as being zoned for some particular purpose, so how the devil can they feel confident that they will be able to subsequently use the land for that purpose if the MRPA can come forward with the information out of the blue that it had made another mistake? The Minister said he was very sorry—strike me pink!

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Strike you dumb!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister said—

Dear Mr Griffiths,

I refer to your letter of the 13th January concerning this particular block in Melville. It is of course unfortunate that this lot was zoned differently on council's town planning scheme from that on the metropolitan regional scheme.

And he was content with that—it is of course unfortunate! I wrote back to him and said—

I would agree it is indeed unfortunate. However, if the enclosed list of instances where town planning schemes differ from the metropolitan region scheme which accompanied my previous letter had been carefully examined, you would agree that it is due to the gross negligence of the authority in its apparent cursory perusal of the plan prior to the approval. In short I am concerned in the case under discussion that people have been put to considerable financial loss due to this

negligence, and I am therefore awaiting your comments in regard to the compensation proposed to be granted in the event of the rezoning being disallowed.

I received back a long letter with a few more details. The Minister agrees that the error had occurred but he says, "Too bad", or words to that effect.

This is pretty rough. The system of approving plans should be looked at. I have indicated that similar instances have occurred many times. If these departments feel it is just unfortunate that people in the community are placed at enormous financial loss and that is the end of it, then they have to be given a rude awakening. You and I, Mr Deputy President, know that people do not have money to throw around. At the moment little investment money is available, and it should not be squandered and wasted because of the negligence of an approving authority. I could say a great deal more about this matter because I have many documents relating to it. However, I have given members the crux of it. Needless to say my constituents who are involved have not seen the humorous side of it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Can you tell me when the provisional certificate was granted by the Licensing Court?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would have to go through all these documents.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Or more particularly, when the \$25 000 was paid?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It had to be paid before the provisional license was given, and I think it would have been 12 or 18 months ago. This matter has been under consideration for a long time. I am not worrying about the \$25 000 paid to the Licensing Court, because I am sure that will be returned to the developers. However, the court has held this money for a long time, and the developers have had to pay interest on it. There were no objections to the granting of the license and the Licensing Court very quickly granted a provisional license. It was one of the cases to which nobody objected.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A very rare case.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Evidently it is an ideal site for a tavern. Mr Dans spoke of this type of thing. The community has to stand by while some bureaucrat in an office says that a particular project which is approved by everybody cannot proceed because in his opinion the piece of land is wanted for public open space. This is one block on the edge of hundreds of acres, and a glaring example of the matter raised by Mr Dans in respect of the powers of Parliament and its members. Contrary to what people say most people think about members of Parliament, some people happen to think that we are of some consequence.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Mighty glad to have them sometimes.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the public knew half the frustrations and difficulties that confront a member of Parliament who endeavours to seek some justice or action on behalf of his constituents, they would surely agree with my comments. Mr Dans said he has been here for some years now, and he mentioned that some new members to this Chamber may not have yet reached the stage of frustration he spoke about.

I hope they have not. However, I can assure him that I got there before he did. I certainly share the view espoused by Mr Dans; however I go even further than that, and that is why I will continue to disagree with anybody who advocates that the opportunity a member of this Chamber has to speak for as long as he likes should be interfered with. While we retain that right, if I can obtain no other satisfaction on some of the issues which are frustrating me, at least I can have the satisfaction of standing here knowing somebody else must hear about it.

I am not trying to inflict these matters on members. Parliament is the only place where a member of Parliament can properly voice his opinion and endeavour to get rid of some of the frustrations brought about by some of the bureaucratic decisions which are made in this land.

I believe it does not even finish there. I will frame my following remarks in such a way as not to implicate any particular individual. In many instances, a matter will reach the Minister and the Minister in attempting to resolve the issue goes and talks to the very person who is holding the member up and the Minister comes back with exactly the same answer. He might as well give the member a carbon copy of the reply originally received by the member.

So, apart from the avenue which I am taking now of talking in this place, in many instances the ordinary member of Parliament has no other avenue by which he may obtain satisfaction. I am not saying I do not have an opportunity to talk on legislation and vote the way I want to; I do and I will maintain and continue that right, provided that is what I feel I should do. However, if I believe the way we are being treated is not proper, I retain the right to voice my disapproval, as I am doing tonight.

Members talk about the waterside workers being protected by a union, medical practitioners belonging to the Australian Medical Association, postmen belonging to their union, the brewery workers belonging to the union with which Mr Cooley has been associated and many other unions and associations. I have come to the conclusion that there should be an association or union for members of Parliament to

which members can take their grievances when they cannot get any satisfaction.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You might have to take your grievance to the very civil servant who is giving decisions against you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That may be so; however, I say that facetiously. This is the stage members reach at times because there seems to be no end to some of the problems we face.

Another problem with which I will not bore members started in 1968 when I appealed to the then Minister for Lands (Mr Bovell); three Ministers and seven years later, the problem is still unresolved. I will not go into the matter now because it would take too long; one wonders whether there is any point in making representations in some of these cases.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are not suggesting you do not get satisfaction in a large number of these cases, are you? They are not all frustrations, are they?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say that.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: When are you going to start telling us about these 122 great social advances which have taken place over the last 12 months?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I could do that—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I hope you can, because the Premier cannot.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —except I have used up an hour and five minutes since resuming after dinner and I have not properly discussed my own subjects, never mind getting on to the issues about which Mr Cooley spoke. Somebody asked a question in the House relating to this matter and an answer was provided. Surely to goodness that should be sufficient. If the honourable member is patient, he will see the answer and it probably will be a little more accurate than the answer I could give him. I do not have the material at my fingertips, and probably I could not remember the 122 points. I might even name 132 points, but even that would not satisfy Mr Cooley.

I wish to conclude simply by saying I believe this House has a place in the community. How the House operates is in the hands of the members themselves and if the members themselves demonstrate the way they want the House to operate, that is the way it will operate. If it takes on one sort of context, it is because that is the way the members have let it develop.

I would dearly love to see members of the Labor Party demonstrating that they are prepared occasionally to disagree with their colleagues, if they feel they have a different point of view. My right to take the time I have taken tonight to tell members these things is unchallengeable, and I will retain it in the future. I feel

that my contribution in bringing to members' notice all these little things may be of no interest to them; but to me, it is the only method I have in many instances of making public the frustrations that confront me from time to time. I support the motion.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [8.37 p.m.]: I rise to demonstrate my unchallengeable right to speak within the precincts of this Chamber, as has been amply demonstrated by the Hon. Clive Griffiths, and to support the motion moved by the Hon. I. G. Pratt in reply to the address delivered to the opening of Parliament by the then Governor, Sir Hughie Edwards VC.

I take this opportunity to join with other members in expressing my deep regret at the resignation of Sir Hughie Edwards on the grounds of ill-health and support their sentiments that he recovers from his illness and is able to continue his leisure life in years to come.

There have been a number of speakers to this debate from both sides of the Chamber; I believe I am the last of the Opposition speakers. I must say, of course, that I do not think the contributions of Government supporters were of the same standard as speeches delivered by members of the Opposition. Be that as it may, that is my opinion.

The Hon. N. McNeill: They were far better.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: However, some of the remarks made by members opposite deserve a reply. Although as I say they were not very inspiring, they did provoke some thought and require answering.

I refer first to the comments of the Hon. J. C. Tozer, who was rather critical of some members of the Opposition. The first point on which I would like to take issue is the comment he made when discussing that part of the Governor's Speech which referred to the Darwin disaster. He mentioned he took the trouble to visit Darwin to inspect the damage which had occurred and to gain some knowledge which would assist him in his future representation of the North Province and other areas of this State which are prone to cyclone damage. At page 401, *Hansard* No. 3 of the 26th March, Mr Tozer had this to say—

I visited Darwin for the simple reason that I thought it was terribly important, in the interests of the people of the North Province, that someone should visit that town to ascertain what lessons could be learned.

I commend the honourable member for his action; I think it was rather worthy that he should take the time to visit Darwin for those reasons. However, I was not very impressed by his following words—

Strangely enough I have not heard of anyone from the Opposition side

of the House or from another place who has made a similar visit to Darwin.

He may be right—

I certainly did not see the member for Ascot there despite the fact that he styles himself as the shadow minister for the North-West, but perhaps he did not have the same interest as I did in visiting this devastated city.

I think Mr Tozer should be reminded that the member for Ascot is the shadow Minister for the North-West, and was appointed to that position by the State Parliamentary Labor Party.

If Mr Tozer wants to be critical, perhaps we could ask him how he travelled to Darwin; I suppose he flew. The member for Ascot, as the shadow Minister for the North-West, had no means of travelling through that particular electorate or, indeed, through any other part of the State at a concessional rate of travel.

We all know that Mr Tozer represents the North Province, which is very close to Darwin. With the generous concessions in regard to air fares which apply to members representing the north-west, I suppose it was quite a simple matter for Mr Tozer to fly from Kununurra to Darwin to inspect the damage which had occurred.

I suppose it also could have been argued that I could have flown to Darwin. However, I would have had to fly from Learmonth, the northern most point in my electorate, at my own expense. Mr Bryce would have had to fly from Perth, at a personal expense of \$351.60, the return air fare from Perth to Darwin. I am entitled to fly to Learmonth, but the return air fare from Learmonth to Darwin is \$273. But Mr Tozer would have travelled to Kununurra, in his electorate and paid the return air fare from Kununurra to Darwin, which is only \$68.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer It is not that much.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: These are today's air fares, which I obtained from MMA. Perhaps the honourable member obtained special dispensation because of his former role in the north-west. His criticism was unwarranted, unjust, and, to say the least, slightly out of place.

As I have said, Mr Tozer criticised other members. That is his right, just as it is my right to reply to his criticisms, because the members he criticised do not have the opportunity to answer him in this debate. The next point to which I take offence was his statement that Mr Dans had misled the House. I believe Mr Dans answered that accusation and perhaps at some appropriate time in the future, Mr Tozer might be able to indicate to the House that he accepts the fact that Mr Dans did not mislead the House. Perhaps

at some time, Mr Tozer could also tell us whether in fact he himself misled the House.

During his speech, he made a lengthy reference to the previous administrative arrangements established in the north-west. He referred to the position of administrator and the consultative councils which were set up to assist the administrator who, in turn, reported to the Government.

Mr Tozer gave us the history of how the set-up was eventually disbanded under the Court Government, how it revolved back, as it were, to the point that we were getting something that existed in the first place. On page 410 of *Hansard* of the 26th March Mr Tozer said—

In 1971, a change of Government occurred. Labor had returned to the Treasury benches, and the history of Geoffrey Drake-Brockman of nearly half a century before was repeated; within 12 months the axe had fallen and the Administrator was out of work.

I query the statement that the administrator was out of work.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: It is a correct statement.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I think it is for the honourable member to prove it is. Whether he is dealing with the administrator or a person occupying the position at that time is irrelevant, because the administrator at that time was brought back to Perth and given a position with the Department of Development and Decentralisation. Accordingly it cannot be claimed in any shape or form that he was out of work.

The degree that Mr Tozer has misled the House depends on two things. I cannot give the exact information but on certain implications there can be two aspects in which the House has been misled by the honourable member. The administrator was certainly not out of work and certainly not out of pocket, if when he returned to Perth he received the same amount of payment as that which he would have received as administrator; or, in fact, if he received some payment, because the administrator was appointed under contract of service for a certain period of time at a certain rate. Accordingly if he was returned at that rate for the balance of the current contract he would certainly not have been out of work or out of pocket. If that is the case we now find a different degree of misleading by the honourable member. If the administrator received a lesser rate of pay the degree to which the House has been misled is lessened, but whichever way we may look at it, for Mr Tozer to say that that person was out of work is, in my opinion, misleading the House; although, of course, this opinion may not be shared by other members.

I will have no more to say on that point, but it is my firm belief that in uttering the words he did Mr Tozer is guilty of misleading the House.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: If I bring in proof will you support me in getting the permission of the House to make a personal explanation?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Certainly, but the administrator was certainly not out of work.

During his comments Mr Tozer made particular reference to certain projects and developments which were taking place in the North Province which he represents in conjunction with Mr Withers. I took note of what Mr Tozer said, and what he has said is quite correct.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Thank you.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I also took time off to have a look at some of the projects to which Mr Tozer referred and what he was mainly concerned about refers to the education facilities which have been provided, and this can be found on page 404 of the *Hansard* of the 26th March.

We must bear in mind that Mr Tozer made rather broad statements as to whether the schools had been built, whether they had been upgraded or were in the process of being upgraded. I have had to combine some of these projects and I might add that my figures have been compiled from details of the Estimates of the General Loan Fund for a few years past. One criticism I might make of the Tonkin Government is that it took two years to change the format of the Estimates; whereas the Estimates for 1974-75 gave a great deal more detail, this was not the case in the Estimates for 1971-72.

I have a few figures with me but it will be necessary for me to go through them to demonstrate my point. I would first comment on the figures mentioned by Mr Tozer in connection with certain schools and educational institutions after which I will proceed with the other figures which were not mentioned by him, but which perhaps should have been mentioned because they would have given credit for what is still occurring.

In 1972-73 the Tonkin Government spent \$357 683 on the South Hedland Primary School; for the year 1973-74 it was proposed to spend \$505 000; and in 1974-75 the Court Government intends to spend \$554 000. So we can see that this is not something of great importance that has suddenly appeared within the last 12 months; it is a continuation programme which was carried on from the Tonkin Government to the Court Government and which is still flowing. Nevertheless the projects in question were planned at the time the Court Government took office.

So that Government cannot take credit for the things which have been mentioned by Mr Tozer.

The Karratha Primary School was also referred to by Mr Tozer and in this case we find the Tonkin Government spent \$191 353 in 1972-73; it proposed to spend \$83 000 in 1973-74; and the Court Government expects to spend \$20 000 in 1974-75. From this we can assume the project is virtually completed.

The figures I have also show that the Court Government proposes to spend \$70 000 on the One Arm Point Primary School in 1974-75. I wonder where this money comes from. Perhaps Mr Baxter could tell us; perhaps it is money made available by the Australian Government and I would rather think that this is so.

The Tonkin Government spent \$309 318 in 1972-73 on major extensions to the Port Hedland High School. In 1973-74 that Government proposed to spend \$423 000 on these extensions, and for 1974-75 the Court Government proposes to spend \$573 000. So that project appears to be continuing to meet the demand. Nobody can say this would not have taken place had the Labor Government been in office.

In the case of major extensions to the Karratha High School a sum of \$766 647 was spent by the Tonkin Government in 1972-73 and it proposed to spend a further \$184 000 in 1973-74. We find, however, that in 1974-75 the Court Government proposes to spend \$13 000. So it would seem that this completes the Tonkin Government's programme for that school.

Mr Tozer said that this year it is proposed to spend \$306 000 on extensions to the Derby District High School. He also mentioned Paraburdoo District High School and Cook Point Primary School. I will not comment on these as I have not been able to find an allocation of funds for this purpose.

Mr Tozer also did not say what was happening at the Wyndham Primary School where \$111 250 was spent in 1972-73, and where nothing has been proposed since. In 1972-73 an amount of \$50 377 was spent on the Roebourne Primary School and it was proposed to spend \$80 000 in 1973-74. The Court Government proposes to spend \$32 000 in 1974-75. We did not spend money on the Wyndham High School in 1972-73 but in 1973-74 there was a proposed expenditure of \$200 000. For this year the Court Government expects to expend \$111 000. This is a continuation programme.

In the case of the Broome High School the Tonkin Government spent \$98 450 in 1972-73 and in 1973-74 we proposed to spend \$41 000. We find there is no allocation by the Court Government for the present financial year, so we can presume that the matter has been attended to. In the case of the Wickham Primary School there was no expenditure for 1972-73 or

1973-74, but the Court Government expects to spend \$400 000 in the present financial year.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: That was my omission.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The honourable member could have done credit to himself had he known his electorate a bit better. There was no expenditure in the case of the South Hedland Vocational Centre for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74, but there is a proposed expenditure of \$65 000 by the Court Government for this year.

So there was certainly no lack of activity in the North Province on the part of the Tonkin Government, particularly as this relates to educational facilities. We can see that the Court Government is continuing this splendid programme which was instituted by the Tonkin Government and for this the present Government should be commended.

I wonder where all this money would have come from had not the Australian Government adopted the findings contained in the Karmel committee's report and if additional financial support were not given to the States for the improvement and upgrading of educational facilities. I doubt whether even the Tonkin Government could have spent the money it did in that particular area, or whether the Court Government could have continued the programme had not these finances been made available. A few other figures I have bear out the point I am making.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: From where does the Commonwealth Government get its finance?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I know that Mr Tozer restricted his comments to educational facilities, but there are certain other points relating to the North Province which were not mentioned by him.

In this connection I would refer to the Wyndham jetty upgrading which cost \$290 101 in 1972-73 and for which \$200 000 was to be set aside in 1973-74. There is no allocation made by the Court Government for this purpose for 1974-75. We presume, therefore, that the upgrading has been completed. In the case of extensions to the Wyndham jetty the Tonkin Government proposed to set aside \$80 000 in 1973-74 while the Court Government intends to make \$100 000 available for this purpose in 1974-75. This is another continuation programme. In connection with the Broome jetty \$50 000 was proposed in 1973-74 by the Tonkin Government, but no allocation has been made in this financial year by the Court Government, which indicates that the programme has been completed or dropped.

We now come to the expenditure that was set aside for water supplies, and we find that in 1972-73 a sum of \$98 955 was

spent by the Tonkin Government for water supplies at Cape Lambert. Nothing, however, was proposed in 1973-74 and nor is there any expenditure set aside for 1974-75. While the Tonkin Government did not spend anything on water supplies for Broome in 1972-73 it proposed to set aside \$70 000 for this purpose in 1973-74; while in 1974-75 the Court Government is to make available \$25 000 for these supplies.

In the case of water supplies for Fitzroy Crossing, no provision was made for expenditure either in 1972-73 or the following year; though \$60 000 has been set aside by the Court Government for this purpose in this financial year. The Tonkin Government did, however, spend \$491 183 on the Karratha water supply in 1972-73 and it proposed to set aside \$90 000 for 1973-74. The Court Government intends to spend \$59 000 for this purpose in 1974-75.

I am pleased to say that in the case of the Port Hedland-Yule River water supply the Tonkin Government spent \$97 881 in 1972-73 and in the following year it proposed to spend \$1 532 000. In this financial year the Court Government has set aside \$2 395 000, which is most commendable.

In the case of water supplies for South Hedland, Wickham, and Wyndham, the Tonkin Government spent a total of \$182 000 in 1972-73 and it proposed to spend a further \$167 000 in 1973-74. There is no allocation for this purpose in 1974-75.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: What do all these figures prove?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: They prove that all that has happened up north has not occurred as a result of Sir Charles Court being at the helm.

On sewerage in 1973-74 we proposed to spend \$270 000 in Karratha, nothing in Kununurra, \$150 000 in Roebourne, \$420 000 in South Hedland, and \$252 000 in Wyndham. The allocation for this year under the Court Government is \$248 000 in Karratha, \$145 000 in Kununurra, \$234 000 in Roebourne, \$102 000 in South Hedland, and \$352 000 in Wyndham. This is very commendable, but it means merely that the Court Government is continuing the work instituted by the Tonkin Government.

I now come to the Ord River, a subject on which Mr Withers speaks with great authority. On stage I we spent \$275 146 and proposed another \$200 000. I do not know whether that was spent, but it is proposed that the same amount will be spent this financial year.

On stage II we spent \$911 275 and proposed another \$968 000. The Court Government intends to spend \$1.062 million. That is very commendable, but I wonder whether the amount spent by the Tonkin Government and the amount which it proposed to spend in the financial year in which the Government changed hands, indicates the attitude of a political party in

power which supposedly is anti-rural and anti-primary producer. I doubt it very much.

In Port Hedland itself on the No. 1 berth, we spent \$1 117 320 and we proposed to spend another \$1.2 million. This year the allocation is down to \$503 000. It appears that that project is also nearing completion.

On drainage in Karratha townsite we spent \$57 317 and proposed an additional \$129 000. Another \$137 000 is proposed by the present Government, so this project is continuing. On drainage in South Hedland in 1972-73 we spent \$108 737 and proposed to spend another \$100 000 last financial year. No allocation has been made this financial year.

Now I come to a subject covered by Mr Dans; that is, the north-west shipping. As Mr Tozer, Mr Withers, and any other member who represents the north would know this service has played a big part in the development and maintenance of the north-west of the State.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: And helped to keep down the cost of living.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is quite true. In 1972-73 on the *Nyanda* we spent \$3 253 919, and in 1973-74 we proposed another \$581 000. Similarly with the *Boogalla*, we spent \$2 492 385 in 1972-73 and proposed another \$123 000. No allocation has been made in either case for this financial year.

Mr Dans raised a very pertinent point; that is, that perhaps in 12 months' time these ships will have to be replaced and it appears we will reach the same fiasco we reached under the Brand Government when for 12 years it continued to let the State Shipping Service run down, so much so that when the Tonkin Government was elected it had to look around very rapidly for a method to upgrade the service to the north-west in order that the north might be developed as planned.

Mr Dans has adequately covered the 30 per cent increase in freight rates so there is no need for me to do so again.

I forgot to mention one point concerning Mr Tozer's speech on the subject of whether he misled the House. I am not being facetious because I have been in the north-west and I am quite familiar with the functioning of the consultative councils and the office of the administrator. Mr Tozer claimed that the administrator was out of work for many years; but many people in the north-west believe that even when the position was occupied, the administrator was out of work!

The figures I have just revealed to the House—I know figures are very tiresome—indicate that the people of the north-west—and the same applies to the Lower North Province—were well off under the Tonkin

Government and that therefore that Government should not be criticised for its performance in the north during the three years it was in office. Certainly the present Government can take very little credit for having instituted new projects.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Did the Tonkin Government institute any new projects?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We have heard the comment that a certain percentage of promises made by the Government have been carried out. The Premier says that he gave 275 undertakings of which he has implemented 112 and 88 are in the process of being implemented, which will leave only 75 promises not honoured, when the 88 in the process of being completed have been completed.

That is a very remarkable performance in 12 months if it can be believed, but I certainly do not believe it. It will be interesting to receive the little policy book again with the ticks in certain places. Presumably only one copy will be handed to the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and perhaps it will become another secret document about which we have heard a great deal in recent times.

All we hear is a lot of words. The Premier made certain statements.

The Hon. T. Knight: That is the truest statement we have heard tonight.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I know he made them because I heard him.

The Hon. T. Knight: You were talking in the present tense.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am talking about the present Premier who gave 275 undertakings. Yesterday morning on the radio and yesterday afternoon in the *Daily News* the Premier gave the information about the undertakings which had been honoured. Last night on television a replay of the morning's hotline programme with Leslie Anderson was shown. Surely if the Premier could make the statements over the radio to people ringing him up for information, and he was prepared to allow the show to be televised last night, he should have had the information at his fingertips. Yet today in reply to a question without notice by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber—notice of the question was given to the appropriate department about midday today, over 24 hours after the Premier had made his statement—we were told that for easy reference the Premier was arranging for a copy of the Liberal Party policy document published for the 30th March, 1974 State election, to be properly marked to indicate the different items implemented. We were told that this would be supplied next week.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: And it will provide a completely accurate answer for you.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I think if the Premier has made these statements—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: He will supply the answer.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: —he should have had the information at hand. Surely to goodness he would have the information. We all know how meticulous our Premier is—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You are getting very hot under the collar.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: —as far as paper work is concerned.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I am glad you agree.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: There are reams of it because I have seen some of it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Probably it needs to be documented very fully for someone like you to understand it.

The Hon. T. Knight: You are often quoting the Liberal Party policy. Why don't you—

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am not talking to Mr Knight at the moment. As the Premier is so meticulous and is such a magnificent businessman—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Which he is.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Which he claims to be. After all he developed the north! No-one else did, or could! That is a lot of baloney!

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You said that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I did say it and I will say it again.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: What are you getting upset about?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am not getting upset.

The Hon. T. Knight: I know you are not anxious to talk to me, but why not mark the policy yourself and prove the Premier wrong?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Premier is the one telling the State what he has done and what he is doing, but he cannot produce the goods. He will mark it in his little propaganda booklet. One would think that if the Premier thought it worth while telling the people what he had done, he would have had some information readily available to back up his statements.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are complaining about the delay are you?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am complaining about this meticulous man with the business acumen.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: When has he said that?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: He said it in London. He said that the honourable member was not a businessman so he should not be in Parliament.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about you?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I should be out of it, too. I come back to the point that we are unable to obtain the information which was so readily available that it could be given to the people of this State yesterday morning.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Tell us about the 42 per cent increase in electricity charges.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: All we hear from the Premier is, "I cannot do this because of that stinking mob in Canberra."

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I could not agree more.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: He blames other people for his fall or failures.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He was not the one who fell.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We will see about that. This is the person who does nothing but tell the world, the State, and the people, "I cannot do what I promised you because of the Australian Government in Canberra and a lack of co-operation from that Government and a lack of everything else." Yet, all of a sudden, the Premier has implemented, or damn near implemented, 72 per cent of his undertakings—if we can believe that percentage which I did not bother to check—within 12 months. Therefore what is the Premier squealing about? Why does he not tell us what he has done? Why does he not get off his tail and tell us, instead of blaming someone else?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You will speak on the adjournment and tell us he has done a very good job?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Not likely! He told us he would solve unemployment and inflation. He even told us that he could fix Australia in six months. That became too big for him, so he decided to come back and fix Western Australia in six months; but he has not done so. He will blame the Australian Government, naturally—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Quite rightly.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: —but we all know this situation is not confined to Australia. This is the chap who built the north. How did the north develop? I think Mr Tozer would probably be aware of this. The Brand-Court Government was elected and took over from the Hawke Labor Government in April, 1959.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Which Government?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I referred to it as the "Brand-Court" Government. Let us call it the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government. It took office in about April, 1959. We all know that the development of the north, and particularly

the major and very important development in the Pilbara, is based on iron ore. It is interesting to note that the embargo on the export of iron ore was lifted on the 2nd December, 1960. We also know that we had in Canberra at that time a Liberal-Country Party Government.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Who achieved that?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Brand Government achieved it, but for several years prior to that the Hawke Government was not permitted to export iron ore. It was not even permitted to obtain a license to export 1 million tons of iron ore.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Who were the first people to mine iron ore in the north?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Those on Cockatoo Island.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Under what Government? The McLarty Government. Let us be fair.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We do not hear about that now. All we hear about is the great and glorious development in the 1960s.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Is it the first time you have heard of it?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: No. The honourable member has not visited Cockatoo Island and Koolan Island as often as I have. We do not hear about that era now. All we hear about is the era of the '60s when Western Australia exploded under the guidance of the present Premier. That is a lot of baloney because, as I have said before, and I have been pulled up for doing so, anyone off the street or the back bench could have been the Minister for Industrial Development at that time; he would not have needed an ounce of business knowledge. We must bear in mind that the Premier said when he came back from Japan that he only paves the way and the officers do the fiddly bits. No matter who had been appointed to that position at the time, the north had to go. There was no reason that it could not go once the embargo was lifted, and which was denied to the Hawke Government. But when there was a change of Government in Western Australia—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Was not the Hawke Government going to put in a socialised steel scheme up there?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We might still do that.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I hope not because the State could not afford the money it would lose.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: It would not take the Premier long to get rid of it, as he has got rid of many other projects. He seems to be going to get rid of State ships. This man can say things yesterday—

The Hon. N. McNeill: You criticise someone for lack of business ability while

your Commonwealth Government is running at a \$3 300 million deficit today.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Any Government in the world today which wants to maintain production runs at a deficit. I am prepared to debate that with you.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was not the point of the interjection at all.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We hear about open government and getting government back to the people. Now we are going to get an answer in a little book which has ticks in it. I will not go into the question of Royal Commissions and so on because I believe that matter has been adequately covered and I do not want to add fuel to the fire.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Would you rather have the answers on a tape recorder?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I picked up some of the Premier's comments as he was talking on the television programme. He blamed the Australian Government at least 14 times in half an hour. What is more—and Ministers opposite should be proud of this statement—he said he has a dynamic, progressive, and purposeful Cabinet.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Too right he has.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am pleased the Minister for Health agrees with that. He might have a nice group of chaps and they might be dynamic but we have not seen that demonstrated. The Premier said, "The year ahead will be the toughest but in the tough year we have gone through I have done all these things and we have all these tremendous projects ready to go if only the Federal Government would get off our backs and let us get on with the job." He also said, "There is no need to have unemployment in Australia." Nobody wants it but unfortunately we have it.

The Premier is very concerned about the life style of the people—with secret inquiries and reports not being published. He would not publish the report about Laverton but on television, for everyone to hear, he said, "We had an explosive situation with the liquor problem at Laverton. The police were in a danger spot. It was a dangerous situation." After hearing those few statements, the need for a Royal Commission is even more apparent. It is coming through now and the Government has probably changed its mind and realised the importance of making the public aware of what occurred.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Did those statements conflict in any way with what was public knowledge in the Press? You are talking about secrecy.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am saying the Government would not release a report because it was confidential.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You said that was secrecy. Then you mentioned what the Premier said on television. Does that conflict with what was public knowledge in the Press at that time?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is what he said yesterday.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Does that conflict with what was in the Press?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Probably not, but many people do not read what is in the Press. I know what the situation probably was at Laverton, and the public are entitled to know.

I come back to the heading which appeared in the *Daily News* yesterday—"We're a success, says Sir Charles". Had the heading read, "I am the greatest, says Sir Charles", and the article had gone on to say what he has done and what he is going to do, more people might have read it. But when he says he is a success and he is going to do all these things, I do not believe he will. I would like to see them ticked off in the book.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [9.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn

John Martin Best: Assault Charge

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [9.25 p.m.]: I am reluctant to delay the House at this stage to speak to the motion for the adjournment, but by way of a question today to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police I endeavoured to draw the attention of the House and the public, generally, to a very serious matter which is concerning me and the trade union movement and which I think should concern this House. The question I asked was—

- (1) Is he aware of Magistrate C. A. Fisher's decision in an assault case—the Police v John Martin Best of J. M. Best Holdings Pty. Ltd. as reported in *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 3rd April, 1975?
- (2) Is he of the opinion that it should be permissible for an employer to actually physically assault a union representative merely because of things said by such union representative?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" why?
- (4) If the answer to (2) is "No" will he take action, and if so, when, to remedy this position?

The Minister's reply was—

(1) Yes.

(2) to (4) I believe that the information which I have been asked to give is on a question of law and it is the prerogative of the Court to decide these issues.

I submit the Minister's opinion is not a matter of law. Be that as it may, I do not criticise the Minister in this House because no doubt the question was submitted by him to the Minister for Police, to whom it was directed.

The matter I wish to draw to the attention of the House concerns the decision of a magistrate in Bunbury. I will read to the House a report from *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 3rd April, 1975, which is the only information I have about the matter. The headline is, "Man found not guilty of assault" and the report reads—

The managing director of a Bunbury building company was acquitted yesterday on a charge of assaulting a union official.

Magistrate C. A. Fisher said in the Court of Petty Sessions that John Martin Best, of J. M. Best Holdings Pty Ltd, had assaulted a representative of the Builders Labourers' Federation, but the assault was not disproportionate to the provocations.

Best was alleged to have assaulted Harold Robert Olsen, of Marmion Street, Melville, on February 11.

Mr Fisher said Best had admitted an assault on Olsen, saying he had "done his block."

But he found Olsen evasive in the witness box and he believed that threats had been made to the company that its supplies of concrete products might be stopped if it did not arrange back pay for a builder's labourer.

The magistrate awarded \$150 costs against the police for instituting proceedings against Best.

This matter was earlier reported to me because of my association with the Trades and Labor Council and it was my responsibility to contact the police. It was an obvious assault. I contacted Police Commissioner Wedd, who referred me to Superintendent Parker who advised me the Bunbury police would be told of this incident and if in their opinion an assault had taken place they would prosecute Best by way of summons. That was the last I heard of the matter until I read this newspaper report of the 3rd April.

An important principle is involved here, and I am very concerned that a person who is going about his normal job as a union organiser can go onto a job to

implement a union policy decision which may have been made in another place, and as a result of conveying that policy to the employer, who becomes offended, he can be assaulted by that employer. According to this magistrate's decision, he can be assaulted and the assault can be justified. I am not an authority in law but I do not think verbal provocation justifies physical assault.

I am not saying that the union organiser might not have been provocative; he may have been provocative. But this is a very dangerous situation, and I hope that the Minister for Justice will take action and perhaps appeal against the decision of the court, particularly in view of the fact that costs were awarded against the Police Department. It seems to me that if no appeal is lodged and the decision is allowed to stand the police will be reluctant to act on any other occasion on which a union organiser is assaulted on the job.

It may be that it is not an individual talking; it could well be that a properly constituted meeting of 500 or perhaps 1 000 workers may be called for the purpose of taking a certain decision. If that decision is conveyed to an employer by an employee of the union—whether it be a man or a woman—and the union representative is hit in the mouth by the employer, and the employer can be acquitted of an assault charge and costs be awarded against the complainant, then I submit that some action should be taken to change that situation.

It may or may not be relevant, but I would like to convey to the House a description of the incident as related by the person who was assaulted.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy President, I say in the kindest way that the question Mr Cooley is now raising possibly will be *sub judice* in view of the fact that he has asked the Minister for Justice if he will investigate the matter. Mr Cooley is now going to read a statement which might prejudice an appeal.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think the answer is that it is a matter of law.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I have not as yet asked the Minister for Justice to appeal.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think Mr Cooley may read the statement.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is a report by Harold Robert Olsen, ABLF organiser, and is headed, "Assault by Jack Best on

Tuesday, 11th February, 1975 at the work site of Jack Best and Sons, Bunbury." It reads as follows—

Tuesday, 11/2/75, 1.00 p.m., Jack Best and Sons main office.

Notified the accountant, Frank Teed, of my intentions, under B.T.A. Award 31, Clause 33.

I point out for the benefit of the House that he asked permission to go onto the site. The statement continues—

Requested list of names and places of work. These were given.

I entered J. Best and Sons land-backed harbour works site, and found:—

1. A non member.
2. Carpenters doing labourers award coverage (steel fixing and labouring).
3. Greg McMahon complained of:
 - (a) Carpenters doing steel fixing and concrete pouring.
 - (b) From the commencement of his employment he was being underpaid on No. 3 Rate, steel-fixing rate and concrete finishing rate.

Proceeding to J. Best and Sons office.

Frank Teed and Stan Best received the mentioned complaints.

Stan Best—Union officials did not have to come into this. He had only received the complaint this morning by Greg McMahon and had agreed to upgrade his rate from today, 11/2/75.

Organiser—Requested payment from the time started.

Stan Best—Refused to and would get opinion from J. Best.

Stan Best—(during discussions):

1. We guarantee our work force full employment throughout the year.
2. Give a lot of work to local workers.
3. Labourers employed are not building workers and we have to teach them.
4. That is why we pay them a low rate: call it a training programme.
5. Country conditions are different down here.
6. And we don't want Union stirrers coming down from Perth upsetting our workers.

7. We all muck in and help each other.

Stan Best left the meeting.

A.B.L.F. Organiser's reply.

1. Would not allow workers to be robbed of award conditions and would notify client or main contractor of any infringement of Award 31.
2. Award covered the whole State of Western Australia.
3. If underpayments were not made, J. Best and Sons would have the costs of three times as much in expenses.
4. I requested that the time and wages be made available.
5. I will return to the site and explain to Greg McMahon their reply.
6. Any further action would be up to the Secretary.
7. We would prevent our members from doing future work until proper rates were received.

I then left the main office and whilst in the car park, I was approached by Stan Best and Frank Teed.

Stan Best—Accused the Organiser of making threats.

Organiser—I repeated myself: 1 to 7.

Stan Best—I'll pass it on to Jack.

I entered the building site and proceeded to where a foreman was directing a Crane.

Complaint—

1. Doing Dogman's work, Group No. 1 Pate.
2. No licensed Dogman on site.

When the crane stopped, I requested his attention.

A worker was slinging steel. I asked if he was a labourer or a carpenter.

A person in a white helmet approached (what does he want?).

On being informed, he walked up to me as if to speak.

Without warning, he struck a blow, which split my lip and he continued punching about my head and shoulders, as I protected my face and ducked my head down. My T-shirt and singlet were pulled over my head, along with sunglasses and helmet and were ripped off.

Mystified as to who my attacker was, I broke free, and stated that I was charging him with assault. I then requested that he hand back my T-shirt.

This was thrown to the ground in front of me. Name tag of Jack Best identified on white helmet.

Jack Best screaming out—"Don't want Union stirrers on my jobs. Now get back to Perth where you belong and don't come back here or I'll do you again".

Point of Order

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: On a point of order, I maintain that the honourable member is not dealing with the subject matter he raised; that is, the request he made to the Minister for Police for an opinion. He is now dealing with details concerning the court case, which have nothing to do with the question he originally raised. I ask you, Sir, to rule that he is out of order.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He is speaking on the adjournment.

Deputy President's Ruling

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I rule that Mr Cooley is explaining why there is a need to ask the question. I think he should be heard.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Thank you, Sir. The statement continues—

My mouth was full of blood and I was having difficulty in seeing. I started walking away and was again attacked.

I was tumbled about the head and swung by the hair.

The foreman and other workers stood watching. I yelled to the foreman, who was only nine feet away, to pull the "madman" off. He seemed reluctant to do so and I did finally break free with his assistance.

Jack Best had two handfuls of hair in his grip.

He screamed: "That's what Union stirrers will get if you come back".

Greg McMahon was asked to come over and get his reply from J. Best.

J. Best ordered myself off the site: accusing the Union of turning his men against him.

Organiser—This is the result of trying to recover your underpayments of wages (pointing to my mouth).

J. Best—Get back in your car or I'll fill you in again. He then made another attack on myself, through the driver's window and grabbed my hair again, some of which was falling on the seat.

It might sound funny to Mr Lewis, but I can assure him it is not very funny when one receives that sort of treatment while carrying out one's normal duty.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think Mr Cooley should finish reading the statement, and not attack any member of the House.

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

Leaving the site, I was handed my sunglasses and helmet by James McDonald, foreman. Requested him as a witness. He replied: "I didn't see a thing".

I left the site.

On the following day, Wednesday, 12/2/75 at 2.00 p.m., Jack Best approached me. Greg McMahon had been paid all underpayments.

Complaints were noted:

- (1) Dogman's license.
- (2) Tradesmen be replaced on labourers work.
- (3) Wages to correct award rates in future.

He wanted to discuss yesterday's incident of assaulting the Organiser. This I refused to do.

I have been notified by the Bunbury C.I.B. that the case is to be heard on the 2nd April, 1975, in Bunbury.

I want to conclude by pointing out that is the union organiser's version of what happened to him while he was carrying out his duty. The police took action on his behalf, because they believed an assault had occurred. However, the magistrate in his decision said that the union organiser's action was provocative; in other words, that his actions were sufficiently provocative to justify his being assaulted. I draw the attention of the House to the following portion of the newspaper report—

Mr Fisher said Best had admitted an assault on Olsen, saying he had "done his block."

Best admitted the assault, but was acquitted. The thing that causes me most concern is that costs were awarded against the Police Department. I feel it is incumbent upon someone in authority to make some investigation of the matter. I plead with the Minister for Justice to endeavour to institute an appeal proceeding on behalf of the Police Department against the decision of the magistrate.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [9.40 p.m.]: I feel the proper action for the union organiser to take was to appeal to the Minister for Justice if he felt the magistrate had not made the right decision. I do not think it is right for a member of this House to question the decision of a magistrate, nor do I think it is right and proper for a member to ask a Minister of the Crown for his opinion as to whether a person has the right to assault another person, irrespective of whether the other person is an employer, a union representative, or someone else. The Minister for Police was quite right in the manner in which he answered the question, for the reasons I have given.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.