

- (d) No alteration to existing Act.
- (e) A repairer's license and
- (f) a manufacturer's license are provided for in the existing Act as one license. This Bill enables a separate license for a repairer and another for a manufacturer.
- (g) No alteration to the current Act.

Clause 17 is an entirely new provision and the issue of temporary licenses under this section covers various needs which include licenses for guided hunting tours, a tourist attraction now becoming popular in the north of this State.

Clause 18 covers licensing procedures.

Clause 19: The licensing offences are under section 12 of the existing Act but this proposed section more clearly defines the penalties.

Clause 20: Revocations are more clearly defined in this Bill.

Clause 21, dealing with restrictions, limitations, and conditions, is new and is not contained in the current Act. Restrictions, limitations, and conditions are considered essential in present-day control of firearms and the penalties for breaching this type of license are considered realistic.

Clause 22: Appeals are contained in subsection (3) of section 10 of the current Act and in regulation 34. No major alterations have been made, but this Bill limits time for an appeal and specifies that the decision of the magistrate is final and not subject to a further appeal and shall be given effect to according to its tenor.

Clause 23: This proposed clause, dealing with offences, is currently provided for under section 12 of the existing Act. However, it is more clearly defined in this clause, with additional information. Drugs are not included in the existing Act, and a new addition in this Bill is the provision for a penalty against a person permitting another person who is intoxicated or under the influence of drugs to have possession of a firearm. Also, penalties have been increased in some instances and are more realistic for present-day conditions.

Clause 24: This clause is contained in section 11 of the existing Act. However, powers of police are more lenient in this Bill, particularly with regard to a member of the force, without a warrant, seizing a firearm from a person, if in his opinion that person, at the time, is not a fit and proper person to be in possession of it, notwithstanding that the firearm is licensed and the person possesses a license. This covers those instances where police are called to domestic disturbances and the person is intoxicated or in a temporary fit of temper, bordering on insanity, and is in possession of a firearm and likely to cause injury at the time.

Clause 25: This clause is contained in section 12A of the existing Act and there are no major changes. However, the provisions are more clearly defined in the Bill.

Clause 26: This clause is identical with section 13 of the existing Act.

Clause 27: This clause is identical with section 17 of the existing Act.

Clause 28: This clause is similar to section 16 of the existing Act except for minor adjustment in the wording. However, the intent is the same.

Clause 29: This clause is similar to section 15 of the existing Act but is more clearly defined.

Clause 30: This clause regulates sales of ammunition.

Clause 31: This clause regulates the keeping of records.

Clause 32: This clause provides for the safe-keeping of firearms and ammunition by traders.

Clause 33: This clause is identical with section 11A of the present Act.

Clause 34: This clause is similar to section 18 of the existing Act but with wider coverage.

An overhaul of the present Act was needed and it is expected that this Bill will fulfil that need.

The Opposition has asked whether this Bill could be postponed for some days to enable members to have a close look at it, in view of the fact that it will almost amount to a new Act. I am agreeable to that course of action being taken. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 10th April, on motion by The Hon. F. D. Willmott.

*House adjourned at 10.02 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 3rd April, 1973

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

### QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

#### 1. MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

##### *Overseas and Interstate Visits*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Will he advise the number of times his ministers have been—

(a) overseas;

(b) interstate,

since his Government took office, and the number of days each has spent both overseas and interstate?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Minister	Over-seas visits	No. of days	Inter-state visits	No. of days
Hon. Premier	1	16	10	24
Hon. Graham	3	55	5	17
Hon. T. D. Evans	1	7	13	33
Hon. Willesee	NH	NH	4	10
Hon. Thompson	NH	NH	1	2
Hon. Dolan	NH	NH	3	18
Hon. May	3	62	9	25
Hon. Janieson	1	19	9	38
Hon. H. D. Evans	1	7	15	32
Hon. Davies	1	36	10	29
Hon. Bickerton	NH	NH	6	25
Hon. Taylor	4	97	9	32
Hon. Stubbs	2	40	4	11

If this information is required to form a basis for criticism of my Government, the Member would be well advised to make a comparison with similar information regarding visits overseas and interstate of Ministers during the life of the previous Government, before he proceeds.

## 2. HEALTH

### "At Risk" Register

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

Will he cause to be established an "at risk" register so that exceptional children may be listed thereby providing the Government with valuable data for forward planning?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The department has no proposals along these lines.

## 3. HOUSING

### Narrogin and Bunbury: Applicants

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) As in reply to question 39 on 26th March it is stated that in Narrogin there are three vacant houses all under maintenance and there are no suitable applicants for houses, will he check the figure regarding applicants?

(2) As the figures for Bunbury show 62 vacant houses with 55 applicants, what brought about the large number of vacant houses if the "vacancy rate" test is applied as in other areas?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

By way of explanation, the heading of column 4 of the answer given to question 39, item 4, of the 28th March, 1973, should read:—"Surplus vacant houses".

(1) At Narrogin, there are three vacant houses under maintenance and there are twenty-six outstanding applicants.

(2) At Bunbury, the commission has sixty-two vacant residential units of which three units are under offer to applicants, and four units are under maintenance, and these will be offered to applicants.

The remaining fifty-five units are also available for offer to the two hundred and three outstanding applicants. In this context, I must point out that in Bunbury there is a high rate of decline by applicants who do not wish to be accommodated in apartments and duplex houses.

## 4. CITY BEACH AND SWANBOURNE HIGH SCHOOLS

### Enrolments

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

What is the number of students enrolled at the—

- (a) City Beach high school;
- (b) Swanbourne high school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(a) 844.

(b) 752.

## 5. LAW REFORM COMMITTEE

### Matters under Consideration

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

Would he please list the subject matters which are currently considered by the Law Reform Committee?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Projects on hand as at 30th March, 1973 are tabled for the information of the member. The honourable member is reminded that the Law Reform Committee has now been converted to a commission.

The list of projects was tabled (see paper No. 89).

## 6. IMMIGRATION

### Bricklayers

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Immigration:

(1) Is it a fact that upon request of the Clay Brick Manufacturers Association it was agreed to endeavour to bring ten bricklayer tradesmen immigrants to Western Australia each month from the United Kingdom?

(2) How many bricklayers arrived from the United Kingdom each month since September, 1972?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Submissions regarding the shortage of bricklayers were received from the Housing Industry Association, Master Builders Association, Claybrick Manufacturers' Association and several building companies.

On 31st October, 1972, it was agreed to endeavour to bring ten bricklayer tradesmen immigrants to Western Australia from the United Kingdom each month.

- (2) Bricklayer arrivals from the United Kingdom are as follows—1972:

September—1  
October—1  
November—1  
December—2

1973:

January—1  
February—2  
March—4

## 7. ANGLICAN CHILDREN'S HOME

### *Prisoner Accommodation*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he now replied to the Coogee Beach progress association submission expressing objections to housing prisoners in the former Anglican children's home?
- (2) What action has he taken to assuage the Coogee residents' concern?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) There have been a number of letters referred to the Department of Corrections and a number received direct by the same department regarding this matter. The department had this work release scheme under constant review during this period and has been consulting with the Public Works Department regarding the site.

The department is currently reconsidering the feasibility of utilising the Coogee site, and all letters will be replied to when this report is available. Consideration is being given to the points of objection raised by the Coogee Beach Progress Association.

## 8. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

### *Sound Equipment Installation*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Speaker:

- (1) Since making the statement in the House on Tuesday, 21st March, 1972 that he would ask the Minister for Works to install an amplifier system in the Chamber, has there been any further development?

- (2) (a) If so, with what result;
- (b) if not, will he say when some action will be taken?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) See answer to (1).
- (b) The Minister has advised that he has requested a study to be made of the feasibility and cost of providing an amplifying system to the Chamber. The information will be passed on to me immediately it is available.

## 9.

## SEWERAGE

### *Mandurah*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) To what extent is the Government involved in assisting the Mandurah Shire Council in its deep sewerage scheme?
- (2) Can he give details of this assistance?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The State Government is actually carrying out the construction of the Mandurah sewerage scheme under the provisions of the Country Towns Sewerage Act.
- (2) The funds for this work are being raised by the local authority by virtue of its borrowing powers. However, in line with other country towns elsewhere in the State, the State Government will service the loans and on the completion of the scheme, will be responsible for its operation and maintenance.

## 10. GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

### *Grants*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Would he please list the items (other than the cash grants based on section 9B of the Education Act) and their yearly estimated (or established, if available) cost for 1973 of all State Government assistance to—
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools,

which are included in the total of State grant being 20% of the national average cost of educating a student in a Government school?

- (2) Would he advise the estimated (or established if available) number of students in non-Government—

- (a) primary schools;  
(b) secondary schools,

being the basis of calculating the total and *per capita* grants within the 20%-20% aid scheme?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1)

	Primary	Secondary
	\$	\$
Text book supply or grants	99,000	130,000
School stocks	128,000	84,000
Subsidies	2,000	4,000
Total	227,000	218,000

- (2) Primary—25,561.  
Secondary—16,949.

## 11. DEVELOPMENT

### *British Steel Industry: Representations*

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

- (1) Is he aware of the United Kingdom decision to modernise and revamp its steel industry with a £UK3,000 million programme?
- (2) (a) What representations have been made, and when, by him or his ministerial colleagues to influence British Steel Corporation to undertake part of their modernising operations in Western Australia either alone, or as a joint venturer with parties interested in joining together to produce large tonnages of semi-finished steel in Western Australia mainly for export to northern hemisphere countries;
- (b) what has been the result of any such representations;
- (c) if representations have not been made to British Steel Corporation, why were they not made in view of the importance of endeavouring to retain British Steel Corporation as a joint venturer in any major semi-finished steel export project?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Purposeful discussions are proceeding with joint venturers interested in producing large quantities of semi-finished steel in Western Australia for export to northern hemisphere countries.

Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. has stated its interest in participating in such a venture and is in constant communication with the British Steel Corporation and steel companies in Europe, North America and Japan.

- (b) We anticipate a decision will be made very shortly by a very strong joint venture group to proceed with a full scale feasibility study of a jumbo steel plant to be built in Western Australia.
- (c) Answered by (a).

## 12. OIL AND NATURAL GAS

### *Farm-in and Farm-out Areas*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What are the procedures under current Commonwealth and State legislation or dealing with applications for and approval of farm-ins and farm-outs for petroleum areas (including natural gas) both onshore and offshore?
- (2) Is it possible for the Commonwealth Government to approve a farm-in or farm-out in other than Commonwealth territory, without prior State recommendation and approval?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Agreements affecting off-shore petroleum titles come within the ambit of section 81 of the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Acts of the State and the Commonwealth.

When an application for the registration of an agreement is made to the Department of Mines, a copy of the agreement is referred, pursuant to clause 11 of the Commonwealth/State Agreement dated the 16th October, 1967, to the Commonwealth Department of Minerals and Energy for consideration.

When making a final decision on the application the designated authority takes into account the requirements of the Commonwealth in respect of its responsibilities under the Constitution.

Agreements affecting on-shore petroleum titles come within the ambit of section 75 of the State Petroleum Act, 1967.

An application for the registration of an agreement is dealt with by the Minister without any reference to the Commonwealth, because the Commonwealth is not involved.

- (2) The authority to approve or refuse an application for registration of an agreement rests with the designated authority, but except insofar as the Commonwealth has informed the State that it is not necessary to do so, the State has an obligation to first consult with the Commonwealth, and to accept and give effect to any requirement of the Commonwealth on any matter that comes within the expressed "responsibilities" (clause 11 of the Commonwealth/State agreement refers) of the Commonwealth.

Used here:

"Agreement(s)" means farm-in and farm-out agreements.

"Petroleum" includes oil and gas.

13.

### TRANSPORT

#### *Livestock: Overloading*

Mr. I. W. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What number of carriers transporting livestock have been prosecuted for overloading during the periods—
  - (a) 31st March, 1972 to 30th September, 1972;
  - (b) 30th September, 1972 to 31st March, 1973?
- (2) Because of the difficulty of accurately assessing the weight of a load of livestock, is there a degree of tolerance shown and, if so, to what extent?
- (3) Have any approaches been made to the Government to extend the degree of tolerance and, if so, with what result?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) 10.  
(b) 34, plus 17 pending.
- (2) Yes. 5% of "Loadometer" reading plus a reasonable administrative tolerance where weighing facilities are not available to the operator. It is not desirable to publicise the extent of administrative tolerances as these then tend to become the norm.
- (3) A deputation representative of farmers and stock carriers discussed the question with the Commissioner of Main Roads on 4th January, 1973, and an assurance was given that an examination would be made. This examination, which is expected to extend over a period of months, is continuing.

14.

### SEX SHOP

#### *Closure*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the sex shop closed as promised?
- (2) If so, on what date?
- (3) If not, why has he not kept his promise seeing Parliament passed the Indecent Publications Bill in the last session?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) A number of prosecutions have been undertaken under the Indecent Publications Act. However, many articles for sale in the shop are not covered by this Act.

15.

### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES PHARMACIES

#### *Expansion*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he completed negotiations on the question of expansion of friendly societies pharmacies?
- (2) If "No" in what year does he hope to do so?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), does he still intend to introduce legislation to expand friendly societies pharmacies?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (3) Unfortunately I doubt if "negotiations" on this question could ever be considered completed. I get regular approaches from interested parties. At a convenient time I will be considering the representations made and referring same to Cabinet. If necessary, legislation will follow.

### 16. TECHNICAL AND TERTIARY EDUCATION

#### *Commonwealth Grants and Allowances*

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the field of technical education what is the basis of distribution of finance between States for the proposed unmatched capital grants from the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) What is the amount available to Western Australia?
- (3) What is the allocation by the Commonwealth Government for the training of dental therapists in Western Australia?

- (4) What is the amount provided by the Commonwealth Government to assist needy students in tertiary institutions?
  - (5) What are the terms under which needy students at the Western Australian Institute of Technology and the University will be able to obtain loans or grants from the funds provided?
  - (6) Are these funds to be allocated to State Governments for distribution, or direct to the institutions for administration and management?
- I might add that I assume the same situation will apply to the Murdoch University when it is opened.
- (7) How much money is it expected will be spent in Western Australia as payment of allowances to students and of fees to institutions?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The States Grants (Technical Training) Act 1971 does not specify the basis of allocation. The schedule lists actual grants to each State and these amounts indicate a relationship to population.
- (2) \$2,870,000.
- (3) The allocation by the Commonwealth Government in the 1973/75 triennium for the training of dental therapists in Western Australia is approximately \$132,750 for recurrent expenditure. A submission for additional recurrent funds of \$315,300 and capital funds of \$106,400 to enable the intake of students in the Western Australian Institute of Technology's dental therapy course to be increased in the present triennium has been made to the Commonwealth.
- (4) The Commonwealth Government has announced that \$3 million will be made available in the form of loans or grants to assist needy students in tertiary education institutions in Australia.
- (5) Assistance in the form of grants or loans to students is determined by the respective University or college of advanced education on the basis of individual circumstances, taking into account personal and family income, and may be used to pay fees, living allowance or other approved educational expenses.
- (6) Administration and management of the scheme in Western Australia is the responsibility of the

respective institutions—the University of Western Australia, Western Australian Institute of Technology—and funds are transmitted to the institutions by the State Treasury.

- (7) The amount of money made available in Western Australia for the needy students' scheme is \$243,000 (University of Western Australia \$147,000; Western Australian Institute of Technology \$96,000).

More than half this sum has been allocated already as grants and loans to students. However, it is expected that some funds will need to be retained by the institutions concerned in order to meet requests for assistance from needy students during the remainder of 1973 and in future years.

## 17. TEACHING HOSPITALS

### *Expenditure of Loan Funds*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Would he please itemise how each of the teaching hospitals disposed of their loan funds in the past 12 months and proposed in the ensuing 12 months, showing each item and cost thereof?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

It appears the Member may misunderstand the arrangements for loan fund expenditure.

Loan funds are not paid to various hospitals for them to use as they think fit. These funds are controlled by the Public Works Department and the Medical Department and all payments are made by those departments on works which are in the approved capital works programme.

Attached are figures showing the expenditure for the year 1971/72 and that expected in 1972/73 for the Perth Medical Centre, the Royal Perth Hospital and the Fremantle Hospital. These are the only teaching hospitals upon which loan funds have been expended or are currently being expended.

It is not possible to give information on the proposed expenditures in 1973/74 because the loan fund programme for the State has not been determined.

## Teaching hospitals loan fund expenditure

Details	1971/72	1972/73
<b>Perth medical centre</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>
Central plant	1,056,884	2,174,400
Earthworks	135,024	8,500
Geriatric unit	873,083	
Kitchen, dining and stores	3,408	
Long term treatment unit	1,650	
Medical school	257,835	373,500
Nurses quarters	57,444	
Psychiatric unit	16,151	555,150
S.C.G.H.—3rd and 4th floor extensions	357,380	70,000
Public Health Department laboratories south—		
Erection	321,350	1,284,000
Furniture and equipment	200,118	157,000
Car park No. 3, nurses car park and storm water disposal		159,300
Car parks 2 and 3—lighting		40,000
Central sterile supply Department		235,000
Landscaping and reticulation		60,000
P.A.R.X. and Intercom system		197,500
S.E.C. stepdown station		57,800
Upgrading operating theatre		62,000
Radiology Department extensions		94,000
Car park No. 2—connecting road		28,700
Staff quarters		116,000
Auxiliary power plant		20,000
Public Health laboratories—north		610,502
<b>Fremantle Hospital</b>		
Children's ward	16,258	
Nurses quarters	33,700	
Casualty extensions	2,040	164,700
Central mechanical block		141,000
Kitchen and cafeteria		228,600
60 bed ward block		60,000
<b>Royal Perth Hospital</b>		
South-east wing	41,313	
Emergency centre preparatory work	170,560	
Remodelling lifts	48,000	6,800
Emergency centre	540,910	
Boiler house		7,500
Preparatory work		8,350
Emergency wing erection		2,650,000
Upgrading north wing		202,500

## 18. LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

*Metropolitan Municipalities: Investigation*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

By his answer to question 18 of Wednesday, 28th March, 1973 re terms of reference for the recent local government boundaries commission investigations of the metropolitan municipalities, am I correct in my interpretation that there were no terms of reference?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

This question is not understood. The basis of the reference was described in the answer on Wednesday, 28th March. If the above question is designed to ascertain if the Local Government Boundaries Commission was limited in the scope of its investigation, the answer is no.

## 19. PRICES CONTROL

*Increases, and Commodities Affected*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

(1) Expressed as a percentage, using 30th June, 1971 as a base, what

has been the increase for the 20 months following—

- in price of groceries;
  - in cost of water;
  - in cost of electricity;
  - in cost of other service due to increases of fees introduced by the Government?
- Which commodities are presently price controlled, in full, or partially, by the Government?
  - Is he, or the Minister for Agriculture, presently controlling the price of eggs?
  - What consideration is at present being given to the egg producers claim or a price change?
  - Will he have the Consumer Protection Authority research and report to Parliament upon the effectiveness, advantages and disadvantages of—
    - selective price control;
    - price control by freeze of prices, wages and Government charges;
    - alternative ways and means and ensuring adequate supply to match demand, at best possible prices?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (a) Percentage price change in twenty-two grocery items in the period June 1971 to March 1973. (Source *The Grocers' and Storekeepers' Journal*.) The journal prices used are based on manufacturers' prices plus mark-ups, and normally supermarket prices are below these, although I believe the percentage increases are probably of a similar order in supermarkets.

ITEM	% Change (+ or -)
16 oz. Rosella baked beans	+ 9.1
8 oz. Milo	+19.4
16 oz. Corn flakes	+ 1.9
Butter	+ 9.1
5 oz. Spray fresh deodorant	+ 3.6
10 oz. Birds eye fish fingers	+31.7
15 oz. IXL fruit salad	+ 7.7
6½ oz. Mortein press pack	+ 0.9
6 oz. Bushells instant coffee	+ 0
8 oz. Peters frozen peas	+ 5.5
1 pkt. Milk arrowroot biscuits	+10.5
1 pkt. 5 Gillette stainless steel razor blades	+ 0
1 Economy tube ipana toothpaste	+ 0.8
16 oz. Saxa iodised salt	+ 9.1
13 oz. Rosella tomato sauce	+13.3
1 cake Lux soap	+10.0
1 Continental chicken noodle soup	+ 6.3
1 Sorbent toilet roll	+10.6
32 oz. Cold power washing powder	+ 9.4
8 oz. Lion Ceylon tea	+ 2.2
2½ lb. Walfords natural cheese	+17.5
8 oz. Rib raslers, Dorsetina	+ 3.0

- (b) The concession rate rose 12% (i.e. rates paid before 30th November)  
The normal rate rose 9.1% (i.e. rates not paid before 30th November).
- (c) Metropolitan domestic charges rose 20%. This rise occurred on 1st November, 1971.
- (d) This information is not available.
- (2) Some lines of bread prices are fully controlled. Milk and egg prices are fully controlled by marketing boards. Lamb, potatoes, barley, oats and linseed prices are partially controlled by marketing boards.
- (3) Neither. Full statutory authority for varying egg prices rests with the Egg Marketing Board.
- (4) To be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.
- (5) (a) to (c) Such research and investigation is not considered to be a function of the Consumer Protection Bureau. Additionally from a staffing point of view it would not be possible for them to do it.

#### QUESTIONS (12): WITHOUT NOTICE

##### 1. GOVERNOR OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

*Successor*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government made a decision on whether—
  - (a) a new Governor will be appointed to follow on when Sir Douglas Kendrew's term of office expires?
  - (b) a Lieutenant-Governor will fulfil the duties instead of a Governor and, if so, is a new Lieutenant-Governor to be appointed?
- (2) Is the Government contemplating a changed use for Government House—including ballroom—and its grounds?
- (3) If decisions have not been made about (1) and (2), when is finality expected?
- (4) Will he give an assurance that, before any decision on the future use of Government House—including ballroom—and its grounds, is made, Parliament will be given ample opportunity to express itself on a specific motion or Bill?
- (5) What procedures—both administrative and legislative—are necessary before the future and use of Government House—including ballroom—and its grounds, can be changed?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) No.
- (b) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) At the appropriate time.
- (4) See answer to (5).
- (5) The land concerned is a Class "A" reserve, more than half of which is vested in the Minister for Lands. The sanction of Parliament would be required before the purpose of the present grant could be changed.

##### 2. TRADE UNIONS

*Blackmail and Intimidation: Allegations*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Has he read in *The West Australian* of the 31st March, 1973, the statement by the Federal Minister for Labour of his intention to allow State branches of Federal unions to be registered in State industrial courts?
- (2) Will this allow an extension of the present extensive union pressures on employers and employees?
- (3) As many members of the public are very apprehensive of disclosing threats received from unions because of the real fear of retaliation—
  - (a) when is the inquiry into allegations of unions' blackmail to be held?
  - (b) who will hold the inquiry?
  - (c) will provision be made to protect the public from further intimidation should they report to the inquiry?
  - (d) if "Yes" to (c), how will the inquiry be constituted to ensure no further victimisation takes place?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I thank the member for Dale for some notice of this question. He was the only one who did give me sufficient notice of questions without notice that have been asked of me. The answer is—

- (1) Yes. The Federal Minister has referred to proposals by the Commonwealth Government to amend the Commonwealth Act to overcome problems raised by the case of *Moore versus Doyle*. Regardless of the result of these proposals it is of interest to note that in respect of the most celebrated case in this State over recent years—that of the Transport Workers' Union—no difference will occur to the existing practical situation as the



union would continue to be a branch of the Federal union.

- (2) Patterns of industrial behaviour either of employers or of unions are unlikely to alter significantly by such a move except that problems involving Federal-State coverage are likely to be considerably eased.

- (3) (a) Processes have already begun and letters are being prepared to all people named either in Parliament or who have written direct to my office.

- (b) Preliminary inquiries are being carried out by my office but it has yet to be decided whether future work will be undertaken by the Crown Law Department or the office of the Minister for Labour.

- (c) and (d) It is believed that present legislation both civil and industrial is adequate.

### 3. SEAMEN'S UNION

*Fund for North Vietnam; Levy*

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

- (1) Has he seen the report of further alleged union blackmail disclosed by two members of the Seamen's Union and relating to a forced contribution of \$20 to a fund to go to North Vietnam?
- (2) Does he consider the imposition of such a compulsory levy to be a legitimate function of unions?
- (3) If, in his view, this is yet another union activity outside his competence or jurisdiction, will he take early action to appeal to his Federal counterpart to take appropriate steps to thwart this activity which appears to be an extension of blackmailing and intimidatory tactics currently rampant on the State industrial scene?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for some notice of this question which was passed through to my office at 3.10 p.m. and did not reach me until 4.00 p.m. I have therefore endeavoured to prepare the answer since I have been sitting in the Chamber, and it is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The powers of unions to manage their own affairs are set out in their constitutions and

rules which are registered with the appropriate industrial courts. I do not intend to give an opinion on actions apparently taken under the provisions of such documents.

- (3) I will acquaint my Federal counterpart with the newspaper article.

### 4. JOHN FORREST NATIONAL PARK

*Tearooms and Dining Room: Tenders*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Did he see an article in the *Week-end News* of Saturday, the 31st March, regarding the John Forrest National Park tearooms?
- (2) Does he agree that a new facility of this kind is required?
- (3) Is it proposed to rebuild the tearooms at John Forrest National Park?
- (4) If so, when will tenders for proposals be called?
- (5) Will tenders be for tearooms only?
- (6) When will a new building be required to be completed and ready for use?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) At the last meeting of the National Parks Board a decision to call tenders forthwith was taken. The appropriate documents are being prepared.
- (5) Tenders for tearooms as well as a licensed dining room will be called separately. A decision on the type of facility to be built will be made on receipt of tenders.
- (6) It will be required that the proposed new building be ready for use at the expiration of the current lease of the existing tearooms.

### 5. LAPORTE TITANIUM

*Effluent Disposal*

Mr. I. W. MANNING, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the ponding method of handling Laporte effluent working effectively?
- (2) (a) Can he estimate when available land suitable for ponding will be used to its limit?
- (b) Does this include re-use of some of the pond areas—if they are re-usable after remaining unused for a period?

- (3) (a) What effluent treatment and disposal studies are being undertaken and how are they progressing?
- (b) When is finality expected on current studies?
- (c) Are these studies being undertaken jointly by the company and the Government, or are there separate Government and company studies and/or studies by additional parties?
- (d) Is there any market prospect for substances in the effluent if they can be extracted in a practical way and, if so, what are the products, the likely markets, and economics?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) to (3) I did have some notice of this question, but unfortunately, because some of the information requested is not readily available to my department, I will have to ask the honourable member to put his question on the notice paper.

6.

## ELEVATORS

### *Safe Operation*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is he aware of the problem being experienced with regard to the safe operation of elevators in city buildings?
- (2) If so, for how long has he been aware?
- (3) Is the dispute subject to the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Commission?
- (4) If "Yes", what action is being taken to effect a solution?
- (5) If not, has he taken any action to bring to the notice of the appropriate authority the dangerous situation which has developed?
- (6) Have officers of the Inspection of Machinery Branch taken any action to ensure safety of the public in respect of lack of maintenance on elevators? If so, what action has been taken?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I received some notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Approximately 10 days or so.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Some compulsory conferences have already been held.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) Officers of the Inspection of Machinery Branch are taking normal action to order work to be done on elevators which

are unsafe or are likely to become unsafe. Such order is issued on the owner.

## 7. CROWN LAW DEPARTMENT

### *Temporary Officers: Termination of Employment*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that some temporary staff in the Crown Law Department have been given one week's notice of termination of employment?
- (2) How many are involved?
- (3) What are the reasons for the action, and also for the unseemly haste?
- (4) Is there any specific plan for re-replacing those dismissed?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) In the Crown Law Department's subdepartment of Land Titles one temporary officer has been given one month's notice of termination of employment. Action has also been taken in some other departments.
- (3) The object of the Public Service Board is to reduce the number of officers in temporary employment by having those officers complete the Public Service requirements regarding qualifications and efficiency. Action in this regard commenced in October, 1971, and warnings have been issued since that date.
- (4) Yes, with personnel qualified for appointment to permanent office in the Public Service.

## 8. MEAT INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

### *Establishment*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he correctly reported on the A.B.C. news today which report was as follows—

Legislation is being considered to set up a Meat Industry Authority in W.A.

The Minister for Agriculture, Mr. H. D. Evans, revealed a recently formed Meat Industry Advisory Committee was assessing the need for a Statutory Authority.

Mr. Evans said a Meat Industry Authority could be formed to plan and implement an efficient Abattoir Industry in W.A.

He said the Meat Industry Authority Committee could be changed to a Statutory Authority. The Minister for Agriculture said that instead of the

Advisory Committee making recommendations, it could make decisions?

The SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary to read any more.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is the end of the quotation. My question continues—

(2) If so, will he please reconcile this to the answer he gave to question 30, on the 21st March, 1973, when he said—

(1) No such legislation is under consideration at this time.

In answer to the question—

(1) Is legislation under consideration which would have a bearing on meat marketing?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The answer given to the question from the honourable member on the 21st March was correct. The legislation which is under consideration does not at this stage envisage the authority becoming directly involved in meat marketing.

Sir Charles Court: Oh, fair go!

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Of course it does not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Of course it doesn't. What are you talking about?

The SPEAKER: Order!

9.

## WOOL

### Acquisition Scheme

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the State Government made any approaches to the Minister for Primary Industry to expedite the implementation of a proposed wool acquisition scheme?

(2) Has he had any indications from the Minister as to his attitude towards the proposed scheme?

(3) Does he anticipate that the Minister is prepared to go ahead with a scheme?

(4) If the Minister has indicated that he is not prepared to go ahead, will he ascertain the reasons?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) and (4) It is anticipated that the Minister will make a statement on wool acquisition when he has given consideration to recommendations which may be made in this respect by the Australian Wool Corporation.

## 10. NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

### Subsidies: Percentage in other States

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Considering that he is aware of the Victorian scheme, could he inform the House what proportion the other States pay to non-Government schools of their part of the 20 per cent. subsidy in this current 1973 school year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The latest position regarding policies in the other States will be ascertained and the honourable member advised.

11.

## TJURUNGA

### Parliament House Grounds

Mr. GRAYDEN, to the Premier:

Is he aware—

(a) That the so-called tjurunga buried in the grounds of Parliament House is a "fake"?

(b) That initiated Aborigines throughout Western Australia have expressed resentment at the mockery which has been made of sacred Aboriginal customs by the burying of this bogus tjurunga in the grounds of Parliament House?

(c) How does he justify his support for the move to replace the marker stone on the site of the so-called tjurunga, when such an action can only assist to perpetuate the untruths which are being circulated in respect of the object?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Having had virtually no notice at all of this question and therefore no time to check the correctness of the assertions of the honourable member, I ask that the question be placed on the notice paper.

12.

## ALWEST PROJECT

### Continuation

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

(1) Has he had any indication that the Alwest project in the south-west may not now proceed?

(2) If so, will he give details?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I trust the honourable member will not be disappointed when I give the reply as follows—

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

The SPEAKER: I will not take any more questions without notice. The rest must be placed on the notice paper.

*Point of Order*

Sir CHARLES COURT: In view of the ruling you have just given, Sir, can the questions which were to be asked without notice, now be handed in and be placed on the notice paper for tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: On this occasion, yes.

**TAXI-CARS (CO-ORDINATION AND CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Works) [5.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On the 19th April, 1972, Mr. H. G. Smith, retired stipendiary magistrate, was appointed by the Government to inquire into the taxi industry in the metropolitan area. The inquiry was conducted as an open inquiry and the terms of reference covered all facets of the industry.

At the completion of the inquiry, Mr. Smith made certain recommendations and these were referred to the Taxi Control Board which supported them. Basically, the recommendations requiring amendments to the Act are as follows—

- (a) Two persons—namely, an owner and a full-time driver—to be members of the Taxi Control Board. Previously the Act provided that both may be owners or both may be full-time operators.
- (b) All moneys received by the board as or on account of premiums, should be paid to the credit of the taxi control fund, thus ensuring that the board has sufficient financial resources properly to administer the control of taxi-cars and conduct of operators.
- (c) Provision be made that of the three members of the board referred to in paragraphs (b) and (c), subsection (4) of section 5 of the Act, not more than one shall be a person holding office in any one company carrying on business in the taxi industry.
- (d) Provision be made that the number of taxi-cars that may be licensed to operate within the metropolitan area shall be determined by the Taxi Control Board, having regard to the reasonable requirements of the population of that area.

Provided that the number of such taxi-cars shall not, at any time, be more than one to every 800 of the population of that area.

- (e) Provision be made for a refund of the full amount "or such lesser proportion as the board, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, shall recommend" of any moneys paid as or on account of a premium. At the present time provision is made for a refund of all premiums paid, if a person surrenders the license within a period of five years from the date of issue.

- (f) Provisions be made that—

- (i) a taxi-car license, as well as the vehicle itself, may be charged with the repayment of money advanced for the purpose therein referred to;

- (ii) any transaction, whereby it is intended that a taxi-car license shall be accepted as security for moneys so advanced to the holder of such a license, shall be registered at the office of the board whose approval of the transaction shall be a condition precedent to such registration.

- (g) (i) The definition of "owner" in section 3 of the Act be amended by inserting after the word "includes" in line three, the passage "unless repugnant to the context".

The definition of "owner", which includes among others "a person having the use of the vehicle under an agreement for its . . . lease" in section 3 of the Act seems inappropriate when applied to the owner as contemplated in subsections (3) and (4) of section 18 and subsection (1) of section 18A. Interpolation of the passage "unless repugnant to the context" following the word "includes" in line three of the definition, should clarify the position.

- (ii) That the Act be amended to clarify the situation concerning the provision of number plates for a substitute vehicle referred to in section 17A of the Act.

Section 17A of the Act could give rise to confusion where permission has been granted to operate a substitute vehicle, the use of which is then allowed "as if the vehicle were licensed under this Act".

This would probably involve the temporary transfer of certain essential equipment from the disabled to the substitute car.

The main purpose of this Bill is to amend the Taxi-cars (Co-ordination and Control) Act to provide for these recommendations to be implemented.

In addition, the definitions of "operate" and "taxi-car" have been more clearly defined and this Bill also defines a "taxi-stand" for the purposes of providing authority for an inspector to request the name of the driver of a private vehicle who parks his vehicle on a taxi-stand.

Other amendments include—

- (1) Provision in the event of the absence of the commissioner and the deputy commissioner, for a person, nominated in writing by the commissioner, to act as chairman.
- (2) For administrative reasons, it also provides that the board, with the authority of the Minister, may specifically delegate its powers and function.

Under the present Act, the board is empowered to suspend a taxi-car license. At least a quorum of four members is required to conduct the business of the board.

Should the occasion arise and immediate action be desired, rather than call a special meeting of the board it is considered appropriate to delegate specific authority to the commissioner, or deputy commissioner.

This streamlined administrative procedure would be highly desirable and could be kept under control by virtue of the fact that the board's delegation of authority is subject to the approval of the Minister.

- (3) Provision for the surrender of number plates where license or premium payments have not been paid. Seizure of plates cannot be effected under the Act but this Bill provides that in such circumstances the board may take possession of the plates.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Thompson.

## MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) [5.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before members is a short one to delete from the present Mining Act, the discrimination against Asiatics and Africans which is contained in that Act. Members will be well aware that the previous Commonwealth Government had been examining the implications of Australia becoming a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Australia signed this convention in 1966 but ratification has been delayed in the first instance by the need to remove elements of discriminatory legislation that would be in conflict with the convention.

The present Commonwealth Government has asked for this action to be expedited and members will recall that a similar discrimination was removed from the Gold Buyers Act last year.

The Mining Bill, 1972, which does not have any racial provisions, is still progressing and in order to obviate any further delay in removing racial discrimination from our existing Mining Act, the necessary amendments are now sought. I commend the Bill to the House.

Sir Charles Court: Tell us: If we support this Bill will your side support it?

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Leader of the Opposition).

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 29th March, on the following motion by Mr. Bateman—

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

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

MR. MOILER (Toodyay) [5.21 p.m.]: Some eight or nine months ago I was fortunate enough to be selected as this State's representative to the first Australasian Parliamentary Seminar. The seminar was arranged by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and was held in Canberra. Its purpose was to enable representatives of Parliaments within Australasia, and from the South-East Asian region, to study the parliamentary practices of the Australian Federal Parliament. The seminar was a genuine and worth-while attempt by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to help the representatives of the various Parliaments to conduct their business in a democratic fashion.

But, Mr. Speaker, after watching the efforts of the Opposition in this House, and in another place, over the last two years,

observing the frustration and harassment of the Government by the Opposition merely in an attempt to block legislation put forward by the Government—elected by a majority of the people—and after listening to the Leader of the Opposition put forward a tirade of rubbish in his Address-in-Reply speech, I have no hesitation in saying that although we in this Parliament may be able to present ideas and make suggestions regarding parliamentary procedure, as a Parliament we could not give our Australian neighbours any lead as to the way they should govern.

Sir Charles Court: Do you want to deny the Opposition its rights and responsibilities?

Mr. MOILER: I think the Opposition should oppose and make constructive criticism.

Sir Charles Court: And that is what we have done, the same as your people did when in Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOILER: During the Address-in-Reply over the last fortnight in this House the Leader of the Opposition did not propose one bit of constructive legislation.

Sir Charles Court: If you had listened you would have found there were some constructive proposals put forward in an attempt to stop the Government making a mistake.

Mr. MOILER: I have tried to find something constructive in the 1½-hour speech which the Leader of the Opposition made. Not one piece of constructive criticism was offered by the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: It depends on how you read the speech.

Mr. MOILER: Not once did the Leader of the Opposition say what this Government should do, and how it should go about doing it.

Sir Charles Court: We did.

Mr. O'Neill: Resign!

Mr. MOILER: I will come to "resigning" in just a minute.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOILER: I will answer the interjection, and not dodge it as some members opposite do.

Mr. O'Neill: Such as the Premier!

Mr. MOILER: The Leader of the Opposition listed a few generalities, and most of his address was directed at the Federal Parliament. We can only assume from those remarks that this State Government is doing a remarkably good job.

Mr. May: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOILER: The whole of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition were centred on the Federal Parliament and the Federal Government in general.

Sir Charles Court: Are you indicating that the Federal Government has nothing to do with the State Government or your Premier?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOILER: Returning to the seminar, to which I have referred, some of the delegates from the South-East Asian countries had opposite views, but they were all united in a desire to do something for the countries they represented—something worth while. However, in contrast the present Opposition opposes for the sake of opposing—and the Leader of the Opposition in this State has now acquired the title of being the State's greatest knocker.

Sir Charles Court: That is not right. We have performance to our credit, and you people have not; that is the difference.

Mr. Jamieson: What nonsense!

Mr. O'Connor: The member for Toodyay will be put on the front bench if he keeps this up.

Mr. MOILER: The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking in the debate, stated that the people of Western Australia had indicated their support for the McMahon Government at the last Federal election. That was correct. In Western Australia the people did indicate some support for the McMahon Government, or the Liberal-Country Party Government. At the last Federal election, because of the unfortunate position regarding unemployment in this State, the Leader of the Opposition was able to fool the public of Western Australia and convince the people that the unemployment was caused, primarily, by the State Labor Government.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOILER: At the time of the Federal election, with the aid of *The West Australian*, the Leader of the Opposition was able to fool the majority of Western Australians—or a big number of them—that the unemployment in Western Australia was due to the State Government and not to the Federal Government.

Mr. O'Connor: The Press has pampered your party for four years.

Mr. MOILER: Since the last election the people of Western Australia have come to realise that the State Government was not to blame for the unemployment situation in Western Australia at the time of the last Federal election. The people have realised that unemployment was initiated and instigated by the Federal Liberal Party and the then Federal Government. The people also realise that the State Government can be proud of its efforts over the two years it has been in office. The Government has made great strides in reducing unemployment in Western Australia, and it can be proud of its achievements during the past two years.

Mr. O'Connor: What achievements?

Mr. MOILER: The Opposition will hear about the achievements presently.

Mr. Rushton: We have had to move motions to make the Government work.

Mr. MOILER: The Leader of the Opposition has made many renowned statements, the classic being that if given six months in Government he would correct the unemployment position.

Sir Charles Court: We would not need that much time now.

Mr. MOILER: However, the people of Western Australia are beginning to realise—as did the Leader of the Opposition—that if the Liberal-Country Party had been in Government at the time of the unemployment problem in Western Australia it would have used the surplus work force—the unemployed—to bring the rest of the people in Western Australia to their knees. Western Australian tradesmen and labourers would have been brought to their knees and forced to accept less than a reasonable return for their efforts.

Sir Charles Court: That cannot be done under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, and you know that to be true.

Mr. MOILER: As I have already stated, the present Government can be proud of the action it has taken. It has brought forward public works programmes.

Mr. Rushton: Yes, the Naval Base housing was a positive act!

Mr. MOILER: the Government brought forward a public works programme. It injected \$1,000,000 into the metropolitan area to relieve unemployment where it was the most serious.

Mr. Thompson: More people leaning on State-owned shovels.

Mr. MOILER: And the Government has continued its positive action in recent months, when we have seen a dramatic improvement in the unemployment figure.

A while ago the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said something to the effect that, "The Leader of the Opposition made one constructive criticism—he suggested that the Government resign." I imagine he meant the Government should go to the polls. When speaking during the Address-in-Reply debate, the Leader of the Opposition said, after the Federal Government had been in office for only 100 days, that it should go back to the people and it would not be returned. On the contrary, as pointed out in an interjection at that time, the Gallup poll reported in the *Weekend News* of the 31st March indicates that—

Sir Charles Court: Here we go with Gallup polls again.

Mr. MOILER: —support for the Labor Party in Western Australia, and I assume particularly for the Prime Minister, has risen to 53 per cent. of the electors.

Mr. O'Neill: He is not game to test it at the polls.

Mr. MOILER: Support for the Labor Party has increased by 3 per cent. since the elections at which the Federal Labor Government was voted into office with a great majority. Support for the Liberal Party has dropped by 1 per cent. in the same period.

When he does not agree with the majority opinion—such as the election of a Labor Government in this State, and the election of a Labor Government in the Federal sphere by a great majority of electors—the Leader of the Opposition always says, "Go back to the people." When we go back to the people we will certainly be returned.

Mr. Nalder: You would certainly get a shock.

Mr. Jamieson: You said that last time.

Mr. O'Neill: I remember someone on your side saying we would not last three months and we lasted 12 years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOILER: I do not propose to spend any more time replying to the Leader of the Opposition's contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate.

I now turn to another matter. In the past we have heard in this House, and outside it, debate and discussion about the Legislative Council. I wish to mention what I consider to be one of the most distressing aspects of the Legislative Council—

Mr. Thompson: I thought we were the "knockers".

Mr. MOILER: —that is, the mandatory term of six years for members who are elected to the other place.

Mr. Rushton: Do you want a term of six years, too?

Mr. MOILER: Members of the Legislative Council retain their seats for a term of six years, regardless of whether they are defeated at an election in the intervening period. I think it is a shocking situation, and I suggest the Government give consideration to holding a referendum to establish whether the public of Western Australia agree to it.

Members of this House hold their seats from the day of the election until the following election. In the Legislative Council members are elected for a period of six years from a date in May. I believe that is wrong, unjust, and undemocratic, particularly when it is realised that at the present time 15 members, or half of the Legislative Council, were elected to this Parliament almost five years ago, and by their rejection of some of the Bills the

Government has put forward to the Legislative Council they have demonstrated that they are quite out of touch with the thinking of the community.

It is an undemocratic situation in view of the fact that if an election were held before May of next year some of the members at present sitting in the other place could be defeated on going to the electors, yet they would retain their seats until the expiration of their six-year term.

Mr. Thompson: If that is such a good suggestion, why do you not ask the Labor fellows to resign after three years?

Mr. MOILER: The member for Darling Range again puts forward a ridiculous proposition.

Mr. Thompson: If you believe in that principle, ask your members to resign after three years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOILER: If the Liberal and Country Party members in the other place were to support such a course, I am sure the Labor members would also support it.

Two years ago a Labor Government was elected in this State. Last session the Government introduced legislation dealing with the State Government Insurance Office and with prices control which, together with other worth-while legislation, was rejected by the Legislative Council. Had we gone to the people at that time, we could have brought out half of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Jamieson: Not even that.

Mr. MOILER: We could have brought out less than half of the Legislative Council at that time.

Mr. Jamieson: We can only take ourselves to the people. Members of the Legislative Council have a specific period.

Mr. MOILER: There it is. We could not face the public and seek a mandate in that fashion. I believe the public of Western Australia would agree wholeheartedly that the system here should be the same as that prevailing in the Federal Parliament. If the Legislative Council obstructs or negates the wishes of the great majority of the people, this House should be able to force members of the Legislative Council to go to the public so that they will be made aware of the wishes of the electors of Western Australia.

I believe a referendum should be held on the question whether the Legislative Council should be required to face elections at the same time as the Legislative Assembly, and that the term of members of the Legislative Council should expire on election day, as in the case of members of the Legislative Assembly. The referendum should also include the question of a double dissolution, under which the whole of the Legislative Council could be brought out to face the people at the same time as the

members of the Legislative Assembly face the people if Government legislation is rejected by the Legislative Council.

I now wish to turn to the Toodyay electorate, which I represent. Firstly, on behalf of the electors in the Swan View area, I would like to express thanks for the work done by the previous Minister for Town Planning (Mr. Graham) and the Minister for Public Works. The Swan View area contains 1,000 acres of urban zoned land which for years was unable to be subdivided because the Minister for Town Planning in the previous Government and the Town Planning Department refused permission for subdivision until such time as sewerage was installed in the area, but the Minister for Works in that Government had also for years found some reason for not extending the sewerage into the Swan View area. The same situation applied at Koongamia, which is represented by my colleague, the member for Swan. The people at Koongamia have tolerated a shocking health hazard whereby effluent from septic systems discharges onto the road. Prior to the election of a Labor Government, neither of those issues had been tackled.

Following the election of the Labor Government, the Minister for Town Planning almost immediately authorised the subdivision of 150 acres of land in Swan View, which allows for something like 500 residential blocks, and sewerage is being extended to Koongamia to alleviate the health hazard in that area.

It is worth mentioning that not only was sewerage extended to Swan View at the instigation of the Minister for Works and the Minister for Town Planning but it is now also being extended to the Swan View Primary School, where for years effluent from the septic system and other waste water went into a sludge sump in the school yard which was emptied twice a week by a tanker. The Ministers I have mentioned have now taken corrective action.

I also thank the Minister for Lands for recent notification that the old railway reserve between Mundaring and Bellevue is to be vested in the Mundaring Shire Council—something which has been sought by the local authority for years.

I wish to touch on another matter which is a general problem throughout the State. I will explain my proposition and use an example within my own electorate. I refer to the cost of residential land to the person wishing to buy a block of land on which to build a home. I believe the Government has to some extent stemmed the spiralling cost of land, but we must do much more than we have done so far. I believe land is still too expensive for the average person.

Mr. O'Neil: The Commonwealth Government is talking about giving it away.

Mr. MOILER: I agree wholeheartedly with that proposition, and I intend to deal with that subject. I propose to recommend



that the Commonwealth Government, in conjunction with the State Government and local authorities, should bring about a reduction in the price of land in Western Australia.

To explain my proposal I wish to use as an example an area of land in Mt. Helena. The land in question is Crown land and is zoned urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the Mundaring town planning scheme. It comprises some 75 acres, and I use it as an example because I am familiar with it. The programme I propose to outline, possibly with some minor adjustments, could be carried out in respect of other areas of land.

I believe the land should be valued by the State and Federal Governments, bearing in mind that at present it is vacant and is not providing any revenue for the State. The Federal Government indicated in yesterday's issue of *The West Australian* that it is considering giving land to people in a definite attempt to stop the spiralling prices. I agree entirely with that objective.

Mr. O'Neil: But they might be giving it away on the Nullarbor Plain.

Mr. MOILER: I believe the Federal Government, in conjunction with the State Government, should place a value on the land and negotiate payment to the State for the release of the land for housing. The State Government should then vest the land in the local authority for subdivision and sale. I suggest the local authority should carry out the subdivision and the necessary works because—and I imagine this applies in most instances—it has a qualified town planner who could design the road pattern and the residential area.

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

Mr. MOILER: The local authority also has a qualified engineer, and it has the equipment and the work force necessary to carry out the work. Having carried out the planning and design work for the land, the shire should establish the number of blocks it believes it would need to develop in the initial period of, say, 12 months. It should then raise a loan to cover the development of those blocks. The planning of the land should take into account all up-to-date facilities; and provision should be made for roads, kerbing, footpaths, and underground electricity supplies—in fact, everything to make the development as up to date as possible. The cost of the provision of all services should be the price for which the blocks are sold.

Mr. Thompson: How much do you reckon it would cost to put these blocks on the market?

Mr. MOILER: I cannot answer that with any authority.

Mr. Thompson: It would cost at least \$3,000 to service each block.

Mr. MOILER: If that cost includes every service being provided at the cheapest rate possible it would be acceptable and would be the only cost applicable to the land.

Mr. Thompson: And the Commonwealth will buy the land from the State?

Mr. MOILER: The Commonwealth would negotiate with the State to compensate the State for the land.

Mr. Thompson: Does the Commonwealth manufacture its own money, or does it get it from the people?

Mr. MOILER: The honourable member can have his turn in a moment. It has been suggested that it may cost \$3,000 a block to service the land; but that is quite cheap if it includes every conceivable service.

The council could borrow the money with which to develop the land over a term of 15 years, and it could offer the blocks for sale with a repayment term of 10 years, which would be quite a reasonable term for any young couple wishing to purchase a block. The fact that all services and facilities are provided would mean that the rates and taxes paid by purchasers of the blocks would not need to be spent in that area; they could be channelled into some other area of development within the shire. So for a good number of years the rates and taxes they pay could be spent in some other area in the shire.

I believe this is a practical proposition which warrants investigation. The Federal Government has indicated that it is determined to bring down the price of land, and the proposal I have outlined could be negotiated as a pilot scheme. The land has already been zoned as urban, and it belongs to the Crown; therefore, it would be a good example for a pilot scheme. The fact that it is urban land means there is no hurdle to overcome as is the position with some other land which may be so zoned. If we investigate the proposal and carry out a pilot scheme in the area I have mentioned, the same principle could then be adapted for use in other areas where, perhaps, private land may have to be purchased. Until some three months ago the State Government could not negotiate with the Federal Government. We now have a Federal Government which has clearly indicated that it is determined to reduce the price of land. Therefore I believe the State Government has every opportunity during the next nine months to negotiate with the Federal Government to bring about the situation we promised the people; that is, a reduction in the price of land for those who wish to build a home.

Obviously various conditions of sale would need to be established, but I suggest that they should not be too rigid. I would

recommend that under no condition should the purchaser of a block of land be permitted to sell it without first obtaining the joint agreement of the local authority and the Lands Department, or some other Government department, so that speculation would be precluded.

I would like to make a final recommendation in regard to town planning. I refer to the problem the member for Canning mentioned in his speech, which I have discovered myself in the Mundaring and Swan areas where many people who shifted to the outer suburbs perhaps five, 10, or 15 years ago now find that as a result of the expansion of the metropolitan area their rates and taxes have increased to such an extent they can barely afford to continue to live on their properties. At present we have residential zones, high-density zones, light industrial zones, commercial zones and other zones; and I believe we should have another classification of "private open space".

I feel that a person who occupies a property of, say, five or 10 acres, from which he does not receive the bulk of his income should be able to apply to the Government, with the agreement of the local authority, to have his land zoned as private open space. The owner-occupier should be entitled to have his dwelling on the land, and he should be permitted virtually to sign an agreement that at all times his property would remain as private open space.

Upon reading the report of the Honorary Royal Commission which inquired into the corridor plan, I understand that the actual amount of open space provided in new estates is being reduced. Therefore I believe a person who occupies five, 10, 15, or 20 acres for no other reason than he enjoys living in the locality, and who does not propose to speculate with the land but to leave it in its present state, should be able to apply to the local authority and, with its agreement, make application to the Government to have his land zoned as private open space. I propose that the Governor should authorise such zoning.

Mr. Rushton: That is already taking place.

Mr. MOILER: The land would then remain as private open space for all time, apart from the dwelling of the owner and the appurtenances thereto. I propose that such zoning may be changed only with the ratification of Parliament. This would prevent a person from having his land zoned as private open space and then returning in five or 10 years and wanting to develop it as a residential area. I believe the proposition I have outlined warrants further investigation and I hope that the Town Planning Department, in conjunction with local authorities, gives consideration to it.

I have covered the several points I wished to mention during the Address-in-Reply debate, and I thank the House for its indulgence.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [5.59 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Blackwood upon his election to this House, and also for his performance during the short time he has been here. We in the Liberal Party have known the member for Blackwood for a number of years and we are aware that he has made a significant contribution to the activities of the party over a long period. I am convinced he will make worth-while contributions in the House during his short stay, and that he will return in the near future to represent another electorate.

I would like to congratulate the former member for Bunbury, Mr. Maurie Williams, on the splendid job that he did for the electorate he represented during his period as a member of this Parliament. I believe it is very difficult for members, irrespective of the side on which they sit, who reside in country areas to represent their electorates adequately. Quite frankly, if I had to put up with the deprivation of my private life and with the hardships which they have to endure, I do not think I would be prepared to make the sacrifice.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: I would also like to congratulate the member for Albany who, a little while ago, was participating in what I thought was his maiden speech, because it has been so long since he made a contribution to the debates.

Mr. Graham: It is a pity that a few members from the opposite side of the House do not emulate him!

Mr. THOMPSON: On one occasion when he made a speech in the Address-in-Reply debate in 1971 he indicated he was in support of a certain move to benefit his electorate, but when we on this side moved an amendment and challenged him to support us he had to do an about-face. This has had a great impact on him.

Mr. McIver: You have interpreted him wrongly.

Mr. THOMPSON: I have not.

Mr. O'Neill: Our memories are long.

Mr. THOMPSON: Much has been said in the last few days about the activities of the Transport Workers' Union.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to members that the Transport Workers' Union and certain local carriers are involved in a court case, and therefore this matter is *sub judice*.

*Point of Order*

Mr. O'CONNOR: On a point of order, I should point out there is no case at the moment. The case was finalised today. Surely a member is entitled to speak if he does not specify—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot make a speech in raising a point of order. My latest information at 4.20 p.m. today was that the case was still proceeding.

Mr. THOMPSON: The particular case that has been referred to concerns three individuals. I wanted to make reference to other cases, and I intended to do so by way of a question without notice this afternoon but time did not permit it. The new situation that has developed pertains to people who are involved in the cartage of apples to the overseas container terminal at Fremantle. Whilst some unions are involved, and there has been a suggestion that the Transport Workers' Union is involved, it is also true that other people could be involved.

I believe that if I do not refer to the case that is actually before the court I will be within my rights in making my remarks. I would ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

*Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: I shall give the member for Darling Range some latitude in that regard, but he may not refer in any way to the case involving the oil companies, certain private owner-drivers, and the Transport Workers' Union.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr. THOMPSON: The particular situation to which I make reference relates to the export apple crop. This House spent a great deal of time last year debating whether a board ought to be set up to control the export of apples. The executive of the Fruit Growers' Association and the Minister were quite perturbed at the prospect of loss of income by the fruit growers, by those who transported the apples, and by the State as a whole. Parliament was told that unless a board was set up the apples could be left rotting on the wharf.

The situation which has now developed is one in which the apples will remain on the wharf. In the last couple of days some owner-drivers have conferred with me about a situation which has developed in respect of the overseas container berth at Fremantle. A threat has been made that if people engaged in the transport of this highly perishable commodity did not become members of the T.W.U. these apples would be left on the wharf to rot.

The method of transporting and handling this commodity involves the use of containers which are obtained by the

transport operators from the North Fremantle headquarters of Overseas Containers Pty. Ltd. These are refrigerator units which have to be connected to refrigeration plants for most of the time. The containers are so constructed that they can be transported from Fremantle to the cool stores in the hills area without the cooling apparatus being connected. Once they arrive at the cool stores the apples are packed into them. The containers are then carted to the wharf and loaded onto ships. If these containers are not connected to refrigeration plants then the temperature inside the containers will rise, and the apples will rot. The apple growers and the State as a whole cannot stand the loss of this highly valuable export crop.

Mr. Taylor: Can you help me? Has a complaint been lodged with myself or my department in any other respect than your comment to me by telephone yesterday?

Mr. THOMPSON: No. I referred one particular case to the Minister yesterday. Today by way of question without notice I intended to comment on a number of other cases which have come to my notice. The statement has been made by some transport operators in my area that owner-drivers who cart their crops from the hills area to Fremantle have been told that unless they join the T.W.U. they will not be permitted to handle the cargo.

Mr. Taylor: Has any cargo been refused?

Mr. THOMPSON: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Taylor: Have you supplied to my department any names, other than the one you mentioned?

Mr. THOMPSON: No.

Mr. Taylor: Were any suggestions made that you should make an issue of it here?

Mr. THOMPSON: Whether it is one case or 100 cases, the principle is the same.

Mr. Taylor: The principle is right, and no-one has been refused.

Mr. THOMPSON: But a threat has been made.

Sir Charles Court: This is the time to make an issue of it.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is right. This is the time to make an issue of it before it is suppressed. Once a matter has been drawn to the attention of the Minister—whether it involves one case or a number of cases—he has a responsibility to check on it and to ensure that the situation is not allowed to continue. This was the context in which I raised the matter.

Mr. Taylor: Have the people concerned taken action such as that taken by people in other areas?

Mr. THOMPSON: They have not.

Mr. Taylor: The law is there to protect them.

Mr. O'Connor: I hope the Minister will alter the law.

Mr. THOMPSON: When a question of this nature is raised with the Minister by a member of Parliament he has a responsibility to check on it. Yesterday morning, immediately after I was told that the situation had developed, I gave notice of this matter to the Minister. It was reported to me during the day that a number of other drivers had also been issued with this threat. I did not refer the matter to the Minister, but it was my intention to incorporate it in a question without notice to the Minister. However, I believe that by raising the one case I alerted the Minister to the situation that had developed.

Mr. Taylor: The other matters came to your attention yesterday?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes.

Mr. Taylor: I was not asked about it until 3.15 p.m., or about 24 hours later.

Mr. THOMPSON: Last evening I was at a social function with the Minister for Health. My mother-in-law very obligingly was looking after my children and taking telephone messages. On my return home at 12.20 this morning I found two messages awaiting me. I had two more phone calls this morning from certain transport operators who had been placed in the same position. I can give some names. One was Erini and another was Vinci; they are both from Pickering Brook.

I believe the Minister is playing around with the situation. Even if only one case is raised he has a responsibility to ensure that the situation does not spread. It is bad enough in the case of fuel, but in the case of apples, which are a highly perishable commodity if action is not taken smartly, a very large percentage of the export crop will be lost.

The practice followed by handlers of fruit is to bring fruit produced in the south of the State into the cool stores at Pickering Brook, Karragullen, and Carilla. When shipping space is available the fruit is transported from those cool stores to Fremantle, to be loaded onto the ships for export. I suggest that any interruption of that activity will have a disastrous effect on the apple producers and on those who cart the apples, as well as on the State.

Mr. Taylor: That has not occurred to date.

Mr. THOMPSON: I know it has not, but are we to sit by and wait for the apples to rot?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: All your criticism is destructive and not constructive. Have you the slightest idea of the powers which the Minister could use? You should ask him.

Mr. THOMPSON: I have.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What are they?

Mr. THOMPSON: He has the conciliation procedure available, and he can take action in that regard.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You do not have a clue.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister also has the power of persuasion.

Mr. THOMPSON: May I point this out to the Premier: If the Minister for Labour did not think he had a responsibility in this regard, then yesterday morning when I rang him he would have told me to do something else, but he undertook to do something about the matter.

Mr. Taylor: The answer is here. It is all ready for you.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am sorry I was not given it.

Mr. Taylor: That was not my fault.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: If, as the Premier suggests, the Minister did not have any responsibility in this regard, then he should have told me so yesterday instead of allowing me to labour under the misapprehension that he would do something about the matter. I am pleased to hear by interjection that the Minister has the answer. I hope that in the very near future the answer will be made public, and that the rights of these self-employed people will be protected by this Government. The tardy way in which the Government is coming forward to protect these people is extremely pronounced. I suggest that the reasons which I advanced the other night for the lack of action by the Government in this regard are quite accurate. The Government is beholden to the trade union movement, and the Ministers are not game to take any action that is likely to upset the union bosses.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. THOMPSON: Before the tea suspension I had been speaking about the activities of the Transport Workers' Union in regard to the shipment of apples from the Pickering Brook area to North Fremantle.

It has been said quite often by supporters of the present Labor Government that a Labor Government in office would ensure a greater degree of stability so far as the unions are concerned. In fact it was said there would be less industrial unrest under a Labor Government because its lines of communication are so much clearer than those that exist between the unions and a Liberal Government. I suggest that in the light of experience of recent days that certainly does not hold true.

The member for Toodyay made reference to the price of land. He applauded the system under which one Government buys land and makes it available to another section of the Government which carries out the development at cost to the people who buy the land.

It does not really matter who develops the land, because in the ultimate someone must pay. It costs somebody something for the land, whether it be the people of the State or of Australia generally, or a private individual—they must service the land and sell the serviced land.

I believe the system of employing private enterprise in the development of land is in the interests of those who buy it.

Mr. Moller: This has been a system under which the costs have gone up.

Mr. THOMPSON: I believe costs would escalate under the system suggested by the honourable member; indeed I suggest they would escalate at a greater rate because of the inefficiency of inter-related Government bodies.

Mr. Moller: I said local authorities.

Mr. THOMPSON: I mentioned Government bodies.

Mr. Moller: I believe local authorities are very efficient.

Mr. THOMPSON: I will grant that some of them are very efficient. The difference in cost is only marginal. I fail to see how any great reduction in price or saving would be effected. The people who sit opposite are running away with the idea that land developers are making a fortune; that they are making a mint of money. I have had occasion, recently, to look at the figures of a particular land developer who is developing land in my electorate. The Minister for Town Planning knows the person in question; in fact he is well known to some of the members of this House. I will give the history of the particular piece of land. The man concerned bought the land a number of years ago and at that time it looked to be a good proposition from the point of view of development.

Mr. Moller: He would be speculating.

Mr. THOMPSON: He is a developer.

Mr. Moller: He is obviously speculating.

Mr. THOMPSON: The difference is that someone must initially pay for the development of the land before it is put on the market.

Mr. Moller: If they do not wish to use the land why buy it? Because someone is financial at the time why should he jeopardise the future of the younger ones?

Mr. THOMPSON: That all sounds very good but, in fact, these land developers are doing a great service to the public; they are using their money to buy land and develop it. The person in question bought

the land to which I have referred a number of years ago, after which he immediately instituted the necessary machinery to have it put on the market as serviced blocks.

Because of the frustrations he suffered by going through the various instrumentalities and departments to obtain approval a tremendous amount of time elapsed, and the money he invested does of course attract interest which means that the costs of the person concerned are going up all the time. He will eventually sell the land at a profit to himself of about \$300 a block. In the meantime he has tied up several thousands of dollars over a number of years to make this profit—this huge profit that is suggested by members on the other side of the House.

These land developers do not make a huge profit. There are, however, some smarties in the community who see the buying of such land as a good proposition; they do nothing at all to improve the land and eventually flog it and make a tremendous amount of money. The genuine developer, on the other hand, is doing a great service to the community.

Mr. Moller: If the Federal Government comes in with the local authorities we will produce blocks at a cheaper rate.

Mr. THOMPSON: In such a case it will automatically follow that we will build into the system the inefficiencies that are ever present in a Government-controlled organisation.

Last year we had a typical example in which the State Government negotiated a contract with the E.P.T. company for the construction of the now very controversial 330kV power line through certain areas of the metropolitan region.

I want to refer to the conditions of that contract and emphasise why I consider it to be a very unsound way of having Government work carried out. If we study the history of this particular project we will find the Government gave notice of its intention to call tenders, and a number of firms within Western Australia expended a lot of money to enable them to be in a position to tender for the job. Last February it got to the point where documents were actually made available to the companies interested in tendering and the Government announced it would negotiate a contract with E.P.T.

I draw the attention of the House to the basis on which this contract was negotiated and I would like to refer to questions that were asked and answers that were given in this House. On the 27th March last I asked the Minister for Electricity—

- (1) What was the negotiated contract price of work being done by E.P.T. on the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line?

- (2) Was the contract negotiated on a fixed price basis or are there rise and fall provisions?
- (3) If rise and fall conditions apply, what are the conditions and by how much has the original price varied?
- (4) Has the negotiated contract price varied for any other reason; if so, by how much and for what reasons?

The Minister replied:—

- (1) The negotiated contract is a schedule of rates contract for types of towers and foundations and for stringing of the conductor. At the time of negotiation the numbers and types of towers and foundations and the amount of stringing disclosed by the preliminary surveys gave a basic tender figure of \$7,689,897.04. This was and is subject to variation, for the work actually to be performed, in accordance with the specified and agreed schedules of rates.

The Minister then said that this was on a rise and fall basis. That is about all of the question and answer that is relevant. I would like to draw attention to this particular contract. It is a negotiated contract price on a schedule of rates. Every other tenderer who was competing for the job would have had to look at the situation, assess what it would cost him to construct the line, and give a lump sum tender for the entire project. But the people who have had such favourable treatment from the Government have a schedule of rates. If it is decided a particular type of tower or a particular structure is required the rate in question is applied. If in the meantime there is a rise or fall—it is generally a rise in wages and so on—a claim can be made on that aspect. The people concerned cannot lose.

There is no risk at all for them. It is the State which runs the risk, and I believe this privilege should not be applied to Government tenders, particularly where public money is at stake. It is wrong in principle and I am sure the Government erred in entering into such a loose arrangement for the expenditure of such a great amount of public money.

I suggest that if the Liberal Government had done the same thing we would have heard about it for many days to come from those who are now sitting on the Government benches.

Mr. Graham: I think you are an orphan in a storm in the complaint you are making.

Mr. THOMPSON: Why is that?

Mr. Graham: Because I do not think there are many who support your point of view.

Mr. THOMPSON: That could be open to conjecture. During the life of the Brand Government a Ministry for Tourism was set up and the Tourist Development Authority became a reality.

I think we are very fortunate in this State because we have many tourists attractions, most of which are yet untapped. There is little doubt that ours is the prettiest of the capital cities in Australia. It is certainly a clean city and, because of the initiative taken by the previous Government, it will continue to be a clean city.

We see that development is taking place on the foreshore; it is quite an attractive development included in the system of the Narrows interchange; and although at the time it was decided to reclaim the river to provide this facility it attracted a lot of criticism from those who support us on this side of the House and also from those who support members who sit on the other side, I feel this was a step that had to be taken if we were to do anything to steady the tide of rising traffic problems in the city area. A further attraction is, of course, our beautiful Swan River; apart from which we have the Darling scarp and some fine scenic attractions within the city which are well within the reach of those who choose to live in the city and use it as a base from which to tour the State. We have some of the finest beaches in Australia, if not in the world. We have the scenic beauty of the southern coast.

Mr. Harman: When are you going to get onto national parks?

Mr. THOMPSON: Very shortly. I will have some pertinent remarks to make about national parks. The Kimberley is, I think, an untapped resource as far as tourism is concerned. I believe Western Australia will derive a great deal of benefit from developing tourist attractions right throughout the State—from the south to the north.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. THOMPSON: I was pleased to hear the Minister say the other evening that tourism in Western Australia will be promoted from new premises in Sydney and that the facilities in other cities will be upgraded. The Minister also indicated that we are well represented at tourist conferences overseas and he has done a fair amount of work in studying the potential of tourism in our State. This is to be applauded.

Our international airport is, I believe, a benefit to Western Australia. Pressure is being brought to bear on members of the Federal Parliament—and by members of the Federal Parliament—to have a curfew placed on the operations at Perth

Airport. My own opinion is that we ought to resist any effort to close Perth Airport during certain hours. I know the noise inconveniences people who live close to the airport. However, I hope that in the years ahead—in fact, in the months ahead—aircraft engine design will be such that the noise problem is reduced. I hope the Parliament will never bring pressure to bear on the powers that be to impede or restrict the activities of the Perth Airport.

I do not wish to disappoint the member for Maylands and, for this reason, I will now deal with a specific tourist attraction, the John Forrest National Park. The park covers an area of 4,500 acres; it is situated in the Darling Range; and is only a stone's throw from the centre of the city. It contains some of the most beautiful bushland in the metropolitan region or, indeed, in the State.

Mr. O'Neill: You ought to see my garden when you talk about bushland!

Mr. THOMPSON: It attracts somewhere in the order of 2,000 people a year, most of whom are interstate and overseas tourists.

Mr. Moiler: It is more like 200,000.

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, that is correct; I made a mistake in the number.

Mr. Jamieson: Give or take a "0" or two.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am pleased to hear the Minister for Works give me a hand out.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: E. and O.E.

Mr. THOMPSON: The central unit of the national park development is the tearooms which are extremely old. In fact, an Army hut was shifted to the national park area from Mundaring about 35 to 40 years ago, I believe, and this became the tearooms. I can recall this edifice in the national park in my boyhood. As a lad I pushed my bike with my mates into the national park. We used to swim in the pool. The tearoom facilities have not changed very much in a long time. There were bare wooden boards on the floor, with no coverings of any kind, and old wooden furniture which I thought was substandard. There were few facilities in the kitchen to enable food to be handled, prepared, and served. The roof leaked and the windows would not operate correctly. Some can be opened, but it is not practicable to open them. This is because they are casement-type windows which swing out. Any person who is walking past or up the front steps would be almost decapitated if the windows were opened. Although the park is 4,500 acres in extent, the only grassed area of parkland is one measuring 60 by 45 feet.

I would not advocate planting couch grass all through the national park, but I believe there should be more facilities for picnickers and others to be able to enjoy their lunch, morning tea, or afternoon tea on some areas of grass.

We see a tremendous area of grass in King's Park, even though it is a park which is principally reserved for native flora. People go to King's Park, have their picnics, and altogether it is a delightful spot. I would like to see a greater area of grass provided in the John Forrest National Park.

A few years ago Mr. and Mrs. Black took over the lease of the John Forrest National Park tearooms. They converted the old and dilapidated building I have mentioned into an acceptable tearooms. They expended \$20,000 of their own money to do the renovations. They took out some of the old fixtures and put in floor coverings and window treatments. They generally improved the tearooms to a more acceptable standard and they have drawn the attention of the National Parks Board to a number of deficiencies. Even though they have agitated for quite a long time many things still remain unrepaired today.

I would like to mention an article which appeared in *The Darling*, a newspaper distributed through the eastern hills area. I am sure the member for Toodyay knows this paper. The article is headed, "Oh the shame when we get tourists!" To summarise the article, the Mundaring Shire health inspector has had occasion to go to the tearooms and has listed a number of fairly major deficiencies in connection with that establishment. I will read the eight points raised by the health inspector which are as follows—

1. There is not a suitable or satisfactory water heater for washing dishes. The present wood chip heater does not offer a constant supply of water at the recommended temperature of 180 degrees F.
2. The hood and extractor fan above the hamburger grill are not satisfactory. The condensation of cooking oils can drop onto food being prepared.
3. The wall at the back of the hamburger grill stove is only plaster board. This does not comply with official requirements.
4. Fly wire from the rear door is broken, offering no protection to the invasion of flies.
5. There is only one W.C. for a mixed staff of 10. This applies on weekends and holidays.
6. The only hand washing facility is a cold tap over a concrete wash trough.

7. Due to ineffective drainage, water from the bath and hand basin discharge over the paved car park area. New drains are required.

8. An old wood stove is still in position. This should be removed and the gas stove placed in the recess. The broken flume immediately in front of the stove should be repaired.

All these deficiencies are of a fairly major nature. There should not be such deficiencies in any premises where food is handled. Nevertheless, this is a Government-controlled tourist attraction.

Mr. T. D. Evans: These deficiencies must have existed during the 12 years of the former Government.

Mr. THOMPSON: I cannot deny that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Was the lease taken out for a tearooms or for a total meal-providing service?

Mr. THOMPSON: I think the lease would have been taken for a total meal-providing service.

Mr. H. D. Evans: No.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister would know more about that than I do. Apparently it was a lease for a tearooms only. Even so the preparation of food, even if it is a cup of tea and a plate of sandwiches, can be as adversely affected by the conditions described by the shire health inspector as a full meal. I really cannot see any substance in the point the Minister raised.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I am not registering approbation.

Mr. THOMPSON: I cannot deny that these deficiencies existed during the term of the former Government. However, I do not know whether the situation was ever brought to the notice of the Parliament or the responsible Ministers. I fail to see how any Minister could allow the situation to continue to exist.

I was pleased to hear the reply given to a "Dorothy Dix-er" asked this evening.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Fortuitous!

Mr. THOMPSON: I will say a little more about that later on. For the moment I would like to continue with my own comments. A number of other Government inspectors have been involved in looking at the facilities at the national park.

I believe an inspector from the Public Health Department has been to the park and his report has been filed. Unfortunately I did not give the Minister for Health sufficient notice to enable him to make available to me the Public Health Department report. I am sure it would be a fairly detrimental report because of the conditions which exist at the park.

A short time ago I made reference to a "Dorothy Dix-er" which was asked by the member for Toodyay earlier today.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I draw attention to the tone of the question which reads in part—

- (2) Does he agree that a new facility of this kind is required?
- (3) Is it proposed to rebuild the tearooms at John Forrest National Park?
- (4) If so, when will tenders for proposals be called?
- (5) Will tenders be for tearooms only?
- (6) When will a new building be required to be completed and ready for use?

Perhaps the member for Toodyay had sufficient notice of the answer to the question. I draw attention to some of the replies, because I believe they are rather significant. These are—

- (4) At the last meeting of the National Parks Board a decision to call tenders forthwith was taken. The appropriate documents are being prepared.
- (5) Tenders for tearooms as well as a licensed dining room will be called separately. A decision on the type of facility to be built will be made on receipt of tenders.
- (6) It will be required that the proposed new building be ready for use at the expiration of the current lease of the existing tearooms.

I have the lease with me. We have been told by the Minister that the Government intends to call tenders immediately and that the proposed new building will be ready for use when the lease expires. The present lease expires in 1976! The Government intends to call tenders, but the building will not be completed until the present lease expires in 1976.

Mr. O'Neil: It will take longer to build than the Ord River Dam.

Mr. THOMPSON: This "Dorothy Dix-er" has backfired on the Minister. The Government has tried to indicate that something will happen immediately, but it cannot happen until 1976.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There are two difficulties. In the first place, it would be regrettable to terminate the lease of the present lessee. Secondly, a start would be made immediately if the lessee were prepared to relinquish the lease.

Mr. THOMPSON: This is another of the Government's tricks. It indicates that immediate action will be taken in a particular area when, in fact, nothing can be done for three years.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What does the honourable member suggest should be done?



Mr. THOMPSON: Repairs should be made to the buildings immediately. The Government should examine closely the generous offer made by the present lessees.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What was it?

Mr. THOMPSON: The lessees are prepared to put up \$40,000 if the Government guarantees \$60,000. In other words, a \$100,000 facility will be provided on the present site in the national park.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Over what period of lease?

Mr. THOMPSON: Over a long period; it would be a 99-year lease.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr. O'Connor: What was the counter offer?

Mr. H. D. Evans: It was not as magnificent an offer as the honourable member made out.

Mr. THOMPSON: I believe the Government could negotiate with the lessees and get a facility which would cost the State nothing. This facility would be of advantage to the State.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This is being done now.

Mr. THOMPSON: A great deal of money will need to be spent on the present facility. In the next few days when the reports are tabled by various Government inspectors, the Government will have to state what it intends to do about the unsatisfactory situation surrounding the tearooms in the national park.

Mr. H. D. Evans: If the lessee is prepared to relinquish his lease, it can start right away.

Mr. THOMPSON: Why should he? He has spent \$20,000 of his own money.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you mean we should give him a selective deal?

Mr. THOMPSON: This man was prepared to work under those conditions for five years. He is now prepared to put up more money and I believe the Government should look at his proposition and negotiate to arrive at a solution which is beneficial to both parties. The Government will have to find money to rectify the situation, and in 1976 it will have to expend more money for a new unit.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Would you suggest that Matilda Bay or King's Park should be given to a particular individual?

Mr. THOMPSON: How did this man obtain the lease in the first place?

Mr. H. D. Evans: By tender.

Mr. THOMPSON: I suggest that the lessee was not aware of the dire situation existing in the park until he started working there.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Before he tenders for a lease he should know what the circumstances are.

Mr. THOMPSON: The circumstances have now been brought to the attention of the National Parks Board, and the Government must do something about it.

Mr. Moiler: Before you sit down, what do you suggest—

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

Mr. THOMPSON: Perhaps I could ask for an extension of time to deal with the question raised by the member for Tood-yay?

Sir Charles Court: No harm in trying!

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [8.02 p.m.]: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express to you our gratitude for your decision to allow members to remove their coats in the Chamber when the weather is oppressive. I have felt that this rule should have been relaxed or altered a long time ago; this decision was well overdue. I realise that we may only take advantage of your ruling when the weather is oppressive, but I feel that members will be reasonable in this regard.

I would like to add my congratulations to those expressed already to the member for Blackwood. I sincerely hope the time he spends here during the last session of this Parliament will be interesting and rewarding.

I would also like to refer to the resignation of the member for Bunbury. I regretted the necessity for his resignation because I feel he made a valuable contribution to debates which took place while he was a member. His speeches in the House were always well prepared. I wish him well in his future activities.

In moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, I am pleased that the member for Canning cleared up a situation which was a bone of contention on the part of the then Opposition during 1967 and 1968. I remember the member for Warren and the member for Collie moving motions on a number of occasions criticising the then Government and the then Minister for Agriculture for not taking action to deal with problems associated with the rural industry. I feel that the member for Canning has now cleared up the issue and put those two members on the right track. I will quote from his speech to refresh the minds of members about the remarks of the member for Canning at the opening of this current session of Parliament. He said—

There is ahead of us on this occasion a much more hopeful outlook in respect of the economic situation. Since taking office the Government has been beset by the backlash in Western Australia of an Australia-wide recession, derived from international trade and currency troubles unequalled for a generation.

I congratulate the member for Canning for putting the record straight. I wish these sentences could be underlined in *Hansard* so that future members will know the truth about the situation which existed several years ago. It is very pleasing to realise that at least one person on the Government benches is prepared to recognise that a problem has existed for a long period of time. As a matter of fact I feel it could be said quite truthfully that the predictions, comments, and criticisms made by the Opposition members at that time were completely untrue. Over the period of time these members have occupied the Treasury benches, they have done absolutely nothing to correct the situation. This is apparent from the comments made by the member for Canning at the opening of Parliament.

I am sorry the Premier is not in his seat because I wish to express my concern about his decision, so early in the session, to extend the hours of Parliament on Thursday nights. I have been in this House for 26 years, and this is the first time such a move has been considered necessary. In my opinion it is quite unnecessary. As a matter of fact, the situation in this House last Thursday night was regrettable.

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

Mr. NALDER: I sat here until the House adjourned and only two or three Ministers and 10 Government back-benchers were present during the evening. I drew this fact to the attention of members on this side of the House, and they can verify my statement. If the Opposition had decided to walk out the Government would not have had a quorum.

I am glad the Premier is now returning to his seat because I feel that if the Government considers it is necessary to sit after tea on Thursdays to carry out its business, at least the Government members should set an example by their attendance in the Chamber. I sincerely hope this regrettable situation does not occur again. I would like the Government to extend to members of the Opposition the same courtesies which were extended to its members over the years. As long as I have been here the House has adjourned at tea time on a Thursday afternoon for four, five, or six weeks. If we wish to keep up a high standard of debate in this Chamber, it is vitally necessary that the Government and the Opposition work in full co-operation.

I therefore make a plea to the Premier to revert to our previous custom. Many of the country members are seriously inconvenienced by remaining here for two or three hours after tea on a Thursday night, but they have always been prepared to co-operate in the past. However, I feel

the Government set a bad example last week when 10 or more of its members were absent from the Chamber. Such occurrences tend to deprecate the standard which has been upheld in the House in years gone by.

I will deal with several other matters later, but I would like to express very strongly my support for the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech during the Address-in-Reply. It is obvious that the electors throughout Australia, and particularly Western Australia, are very concerned about the activities in Canberra at the beginning of this year. Perhaps I should say at the end of 1972, because many people were most concerned about what they would see next on television or read in the Press. The bases of our community and national life, the things which made Australia great in the eyes of people overseas, were being challenged and are still being challenged, if I read correctly the reports which have appeared in the Press over the last day or so. It is patently obvious that some of the propositions being put forward by way of amendments to legislation will not be accepted by the electors of this country. I believe this will be shown quite clearly in the by-election which will take place next Saturday. I know that many Labor supporters in the electorate of Bunbury are most unhappy.

Mr. Lapham: A lot of them are happy, too.

Mr. NALDER: If I were making a prediction from the information I have obtained from various quarters I would say that there is no doubt whatever about the result of the election. I would like to say to the member for Karrinyup that the election will be influenced more by the actions of the Commonwealth Government than by those of the State Government—perhaps I should refer to the "Australian Government". I am sure that my prediction will not be very far out.

Mr. Lapham: We will not have long to wait.

Mr. NALDER: Yes, we will know the result soon. I am continually reminded by people—apparently their memory is not short-lived—about what occurred when the State Government took office in 1971. I do not intend to go over these matters again.

It is rather surprising to know that when we talk to people about these matters they are quite prepared to take their minds back over the past 12 or 18 months.

Mr. Lapham: We hope they do.

Mr. NALDER: When they do they will find that the situation at present is completely changed from what it was then.

I now wish to raise a number of matters as a representative of a

country electorate, and as someone with an interest in the general development of this State and its effect on the Commonwealth. One matter in particular is the situation surrounding our stock numbers at the moment. Here again, I am sorry the Minister for Agriculture is not present in the Chamber.

Mr. Taylor: He is.

Mr. NALDER: Well, he is not in his seat; I beg the Minister's pardon.

Mr. Brown: He is going forward.

Mr. NALDER: I hope the Minister will support the several propositions I intend to put forward and will take them further than Western Australia. Over the last few weeks a great deal has been said about the stock numbers in this State. Yesterday week I attended a function at which a Mr. Edwards was opening a conference of representatives of the co-operative movement in Western Australia and he said that in the last few years the sheep numbers throughout the Commonwealth had been decreased by at least 18,000,000.

I would think that you, Mr. Speaker, would sum up this situation very quickly by realising that that number would represent more than half the greatest number of sheep Western Australia has ever produced. Mr. Edwards went on to say that there is something like 10 per cent. less merino wool available in the world today. He did not say that this was attributable to the reduced number of sheep in Australia, but I take it that by far the biggest portion of that 10 per cent. he referred to would represent the lesser quantity of merino wool that is available in Australia. In fact I have evidence to prove the point he made in that there is less merino wool available in Western Australia at the moment than there has been in past years, because I understand that one of the sales at Albany has been cancelled due to the lack of wool coming into store.

As a result of the cancellation of this sale suggestions have been made that those who have wool at Albany could have it transferred to Fremantle for sale if they so desired.

I think everyone in the wool industry knew last year that there would be a large drop in the numbers of sheep in this State, because lambing was very poor. I have not seen the actual figure, but I would estimate that the number of lambs marketed this year would be well under 50 per cent. of the number marketed in other years. On that basis, if the position does not improve progressively, our sheep numbers will continue to drop. In reply to a question I asked of the Minister for Agriculture about the number of sheep slaughtered at the Midland abattoir and at Robb Jetty, he said that 1,175,019 had been slaughtered at the Midland abattoir and 404,101 at Robb Jetty. He also advised me that the number of lambs that had been handled

through the Lamb Marketing Board since its inception until the 14th March last was 262,459, and that the lambs sold by public auction at the Midland saleyards during the same period numbered 65,111.

These figures represent an estimate that may be fairly accurate, but to them we have to add the number of sheep slaughtered at private abattoirs and at all the country killing establishments. I do not know what percentage these sheep numbers would be of the numbers slaughtered at the service abattoirs, but the information I am about to disclose came from a reliable source. Since about the last week in October until about a fortnight ago, an average of approximately 93,000 sheep have been offered for sale at Midland Junction every week. I admit, of course, that nowhere near that number of sheep would be slaughtered, but that is an indication of the number of sheep that were on the move this year, plus the fact that some have been exported to the Eastern States.

I will now quote some figures compiled by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics on the 26th March, 1973, but I am not sure how they were collated. In round figures I will quote only the yearly total of sheep in Western Australia from 1967 to 1972. The figures are as follows—

1967-68	....	....	....	30,000,000
1968-69	....	....	....	32,900,000
1969-70	....	....	....	33,600,000
1970-71	....	....	....	34,700,000
1971-72	....	....	....	34,400,000

From these figures it can be seen that in 1971-72 there was a drop in sheep numbers of about 300,000. I am not sure whether some revision of these figures will be made, or whether they are the total final figures, but to me there seems to be a difference between the number of lambs produced in a normal season and the total number assessed in this report. I would not criticise the figures, but it would seem there is a greater number than could be expected because of the poor lambing year.

I have quoted that figure because it supports the argument I intend to put forward; that is, I believe all sections of the sheep industry should get together as soon as possible to assess the situation in Western Australia. Speaking with my knowledge of the South-West Land Division, I think everyone is aware that there is a grave shortage of feed in many areas throughout that part of the State. I do not know whether the position is any different in the pastoral districts. In fact, I think the areas where good falls of rain have been experienced have been offset by those which have not had much rainfall.

I believe the situation is so serious—I emphasise this—that we should be taking note of all the advice that we can get and

taking every action possible to increase the sheep numbers in this State. I believe it will be necessary for us to keep alive every lamb born this year. In fact, one exporter told me only the other day that he knew of 2,000 ewes in lamb that had been sent to the abattoirs for slaughter. In my view this would be almost criminal because of the situation with which we are faced at the moment, and when we are seeking to increase our sheep numbers in this State.

As you, Mr. Speaker, would readily acknowledge, it is important to do this, especially in view of the price that is being offered for sheep today, and also in view of the high wool prices at the current sales. It will also have a great effect on our production of cereals, to which I will refer in a moment. Therefore the Minister for Agriculture would be doing this State a good turn by calling together representatives of the Farmers' Union and the pastoralists to indicate to the producers in Western Australia how important it is to accept all the advice his department can make available now and not wait until the rains come. In view of the poor start to the current season it will be necessary for many producers to take greater precautions than they are taking now to save those lambs that will be born; because this will mean a great deal to a State that is depending to a large extent on the sheep industry and also to the overall assessment of whether a farmer will make a valuable contribution in the production of sheep and wool for Western Australia.

I now wish to refer briefly to the situation in regard to cereals. I think many people are in a quandary as to the best steps they should take. The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has indicated it will be necessary to produce a large quantity of wheat. However I have my doubts as to whether Western Australia will be able to produce the quantity that has been suggested by the Wheat Federation. Every effort should be made to ensure that all farmers are encouraged to produce as much as possible, because it is obvious that at the moment there is a ready sale for wheat at fairly lucrative prices.

Of course we do not know what will happen in other parts of the world in six months' time; certain events could change the situation completely, but it is fairly obvious from what has been said by those in authority who are aware of the true situation that it is imperative we produce as much as possible not only of wheat, but also of barley and oats. I therefore hope the Minister will give every encouragement to those in the farming areas to make an all-out effort in this regard.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask members to keep quiet.

Mr. NALDER: There is another proposal I wish to put forward, and I hope the Minister for Agriculture will give consideration to it. It is a situation that affects not only this State, but also every other State in the Commonwealth. In fact it would be absolutely necessary to have the full backing and support of the Commonwealth Government if a solution is to be found to the problem. In this State in recent years we have been plagued with adverse seasonal conditions. We have had our run of good seasons, but it is accepted that although we have enjoyed a good season generally, many farmers have been unfortunate enough to miss out. Even on a district basis, most farmers may have enjoyed a good season but some have not been so fortunate.

This seems to be the pattern of rainfall not only here, but also in other parts of the Commonwealth. Not only have we been plagued by bad seasons, but we have also had to contend with the international situation to which I referred earlier and over which we have no control whatsoever. We just have to hope that before long conditions will change.

The Minister has my sympathy because I know only too well that when I was in the position I had to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth to seek some assistance for the farmers in difficulties. I have no time tonight to explain those difficulties, but I think everyone knows what occurred some three or four years ago. The price of land rose and the farmers were encouraged to spend money on development. As a matter of fact I recall only too well that some farmers went to the Development Bank and asked for \$10,000 to assist them. They were told that \$10,000 was not enough and that they could have \$30,000 or \$40,000. The farmers were encouraged to spend that money and then a few years later, when things were deteriorating, that same bank demanded that some of the money be repaid.

I am advocating that we should establish some financial institution, maybe even within the present set-up. We should have some system under which in times when agriculture is not enjoying the best conditions, whether because of drought or some other reason, money can be made available to assist the farmers. We should not rely entirely on the system which operates at present. I have been able to obtain details of the system which operates in the United States of America and in this regard I am appreciative of the co-operation of the Agriculture Attache in Canberra who sent me the details.

I am not suggesting we should adopt the system of the United States without studying it. A credit facility is available in America and in times of difficulty any farmers can call on it for help. As a matter of fact, it is run by the farmers themselves in the various agricultural areas. I believe

a similar scheme should be established here to assist not only the State and Federal Governments, but also the farmers who would be able to continue with the work they have begun.

Over the last two years we have lost too many experienced farmers. I met one in Hay Street not many weeks ago. He had developed what I would term an ideal farm. He was a Jack-of-all trades and had built his own house—a beautiful stone building made from the stones on the property. He had done all the work himself, including clearing the land, sinking dams, fencing, roads, and cattle pits—everything one could think of. He made a fantastic job of it. His son who was also involved in the work with him is now a health surveyor at, I think, Midland, while the father is a counterhand in a firm in Hay Street. All the education, advice, and assistance in the world will not produce farmers of the calibre of the person about whom I am speaking. We have lost too many of his type from the industry. We just cannot afford this. We should have a system under which money is readily available during bad seasons so that it is not necessary to wait 12 or 18 months for a Government to make a decision as to whether or not the finance will be provided. We should have an organisation geared to help immediately these people to carry on.

I am definitely not making a plea for inefficiency. I am making a plea for assistance for those who are in an important industry and whom we wish to retain in that industry. We do not want them to be pushed off their farms because of an unfortunate situation arising from financial problems or seasonal conditions.

If any member would care to study it, I have information on the system in force in the United States and on which we could base a similar scheme which would make a valuable contribution to agriculture in Australia.

Turning to another subject, I was a little intrigued about an article which appeared in the Press recently. I am referring to the differences of opinion between the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for Consumer Protection concerning the price of eggs and I do not think the matter has been clarified for the public. On the 14th March in the *Daily News* an article stated that the Minister for Consumer Protection and the Chairman of the Egg Marketing Board gave conflicting versions the previous evening concerning who was responsible for authorising changes in the price of eggs. The article stated that the chairman of the board said the Government had taken the ability to vary the price of eggs out of the hands of the board. It further indicated that the Minister told the board that there could be no price rise without his approval.

Mr. Taylor: That is referring to the Minister for Labour.

Mr. NALDER: Yes.

Mr. Taylor: That was completely untrue. I had not spoken to that gentleman for something like six to eight months.

Mr. NALDER: In my opinion this matter should be clarified.

Mr. Taylor: Misreporting, obviously.

Mr. NALDER: I believe this type of article does nothing but harm.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

Mr. NALDER: I am glad I raised the matter because people outside have a wrong impression of what is occurring. That statement has never been corrected and the public are still confused.

Mr. Taylor: It was corrected. When approached I said that I had not spoken to the gentleman and did not know what he was talking about.

Mr. NALDER: I have not read any corrected version.

Mr. Taylor: The answers to your questions should have clarified the matter, surely.

Mr. NALDER: In the same article it was stated—

Egg producers' demands for a 4c rise in the retail price of eggs is not justified, says the Consumer Action Movement.

Its secretary, Mrs. Ruth Coleman, said today that producers had already been given increases to cover higher feed costs.

I do not believe that to be correct because, in answer to a question I asked, the Minister indicated very clearly that the price the producers have received over the last two years has decreased. I am sure the Minister can verify that statement.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There has been no increase since 1971.

Mr. NALDER: The article continues—

The Agriculture Minister, Mr. Evans, said any decision to increase the retail price of eggs would rest with the Egg Marketing Board.

That is what the Minister just indicated. Further down the article continues—

Mrs. Coleman said: "Egg producers have already received on most grades of eggs a 6c increase within the past month."

That is completely false and yet the consumers of eggs in this State have read that article and want to know why the crazy egg producers are requesting another 4c increase when they have only just received a 6c increase.

Mr. Rushton: She is a member of the consumer protection authority, too.

Mr. NALDER: Just imagine the confusion when conflicting reports are published which condemn in the eyes of the public the producers who are doing a remarkably good job.

Mr. O'Neil: Mrs. Coleman is in the Labor Senate team and also writes for the *Sunday Independent*.

Mr. NALDER: In my view it is completely wrong when incorrect information is not refuted. I could not see any correction in the Press, but the Minister's answer to my question indicates very clearly that the information given in the Press was false and that the egg producers have not received an increase in the price of their eggs for at least two years.

Mr. Rushton: Is she not in the Labor Senate team as well?

Mr. Davies: She would do very well.

Mr. NALDER: How is my time going, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. NALDER: I did wish to speak on several other matters, but time is against me. However, I will deal with the problem of water supplies. The Minister for Water Supplies knows my views on the subject and he is fully aware of the problem.

I believe that it is the responsibility of every person in this country to ensure, firstly that water is not wasted, and, secondly, that everything possible is done to conserve it. Water must be conserved and it must be conserved as quickly as possible or this country will experience a water shortage. In my book this should have number one priority or we will find ourselves before very long in an embarrassing position if we experience another bad season or two such as those we have faced in the past. Then we will be able to do nothing about the problem because it cannot be tackled in a short period. We must adopt a long-range plan to do everything possible to conserve the water we have.

In the last remaining few moments I will deal very briefly with transport as it affects decentralisation. For a long time I have believed that in order to encourage people and industry away from capital cities we must provide a greater incentive transportwise. The population in the metropolitan area is ever increasing. If the money used in the metropolitan area to cater for this increased population were instead utilised to provide subsidies—perhaps "subsidies" is not the right word—industry and people would be encouraged to go into the country. Subsidised freight costs for the transport of raw materials to their destination and for the return of the finished product to the port for export would provide a tremendous incentive. The transport problem in the metropolitan area to and from the city and between one suburb and another would be alleviated. Under the present system the cost of transport will increase and we will not achieve the desired decentralisation.

The State and Commonwealth Governments should get together to decide how far they can go in subsidising the freight on raw materials from the seaboard to the town in which the industry concerned is prepared to establish itself. We must remember that in the country land is readily available and the cost is attractive. If we introduced a subsidised freight scheme we would attract people and industry into the country and this in turn would overcome many of the problems we are facing today. Ultimately it would be the responsibility of the Government to pay the freight. If it did this we would be much better off than we are today.

If this were to happen we would achieve a decentralised situation in a practical way, and very much quicker than in any other way. I hope this matter will not be passed over without further thought. As a matter of fact, I have suggested this to an authority which has been very pleased to look at it. I would be surprised if a proposal is not brought forward within the next few months. I believe it is important and I leave the matter with the House.

MR. BRYCE (Ascot) [8.46 p.m.]: During the course of this debate—commencing with the words of the Leader of the Opposition—many members opposite have been assigned—or have assigned themselves—to the task of denigrating the achievements of the new Commonwealth Labor Government. I suppose to some extent this is almost understandable because it constitutes a fundamental reaction to the rejection of their party by the people at the polls recently.

The theme of the vilification was established by the Leader of the Opposition in his characteristic use of extravagant and exaggerated language. I want to refer very briefly to some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition so that I can illustrate the point I wish to make about his persistent use of extravagant and grossly exaggerated language. The first of his remarks appears on page 41 of *Hansard*, and I quote as follows—

Since we last met as a State Parliament a lot has happened in Australia which has caused a tremendous amount of apprehension and concern.

The operative phrase is "apprehension and concern". I wonder precisely which very selective vested interest group constitutes the people who feel apprehension and concern. The Leader of the Opposition continued—

In fact I would go so far as to say that some of the events of the last three months have been quite devastating so far as the credibility, the goodwill, and the reputation of this nation of ours are concerned.

The operative phrase here is "devastating so far as the credibility and goodwill of the nation are concerned".

Sir Charles Court: Well, that is true.

Mr. BRYCE: I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition, when he used those words, was referring to countries such as South Africa, Rhodesia, Taiwan, and other similar places.

Sir Charles Court: I was referring to America, Britain, Europe, and Japan.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: The Leader of the Opposition continued—

I think it is fair to say that none of us ever bargained on the raw deal we have had from the Whitlam Labor Government in Canberra since it was returned to office on the 2nd December last.

The operative phrase here is "raw deal". I wonder just precisely who the Leader of the Opposition is referring to when he refers, in such generalised terms, to a "raw deal".

Another claim which appears in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition is on page 42 of *Hansard*, and is as follows—

We have seen actions taken in the Federal sphere during the last three months which, whilst they might be legally right, are certainly morally very wrong.

The operative phrase concerns the difference between what is legally right and what is morally right. I wonder how many people in Western Australia—in this House and outside of this House—consider that the Leader of the Opposition would be the last person in the world to set himself up as a judge on the question of the difference between what is legally right and what is morally right in terms of Government action.

The Leader of the Opposition further stated—

I was staggered by the viciousness and speed with which the present administration in Canberra moved in and did some of the things which we felt the Government would talk about but which it would not implement.

The operative phrase here, of course, is "viciousness and speed". I wonder, had the Leader of the Opposition become the Prime Minister of the new Government—with a change of Government after 23 years—whether the operative words would have been, "great vigour, vitality, enthusiasm, and progress".

In contrast to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Governor-General in his opening Speech in the Federal Parliament pointed out to the people of Australia that the new Government was

anxious to build a more tolerant, a more open, a more humane, a more equal, and a more unified society. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, such a laudible aim is likely to prove quite unpalatable to members opposite.

Mr. Rushton: Who do you think wrote the Speech?

Mr. BRYCE: In view of the heavy criticism meted out to the new Federal Government I am pleased to have this opportunity to place on record some of the tremendous decisions and courageous actions taken during the first 100 days of the new Government, which the Leader of the Opposition in this House—and some of his extremist followers on the Opposition benches—regard as a raw deal; a cause for apprehension and concern; devastating to the credibility and goodwill of our nation; and having been implemented with a viciousness and speed unparalleled in the nation's history. To top the list I will refer to the immediate financial relief to the pensioners of this country.

Mr. Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRYCE: I wonder if the pensioners view their relief as a raw deal, or whether they were satisfied. Two increases of \$1.50 have been promised, and one increase has already been implemented for the pensioners. The pension will be increased until it reaches 25 per cent. of the average weekly earnings. Furthermore, the payment which has been made was backdated to the 2nd December. No longer will it be necessary for special reciprocal arrangements to be made between Governments of different countries to enable Australian citizens overseas to enjoy their pensions.

A national scheme for compensation and rehabilitation is envisaged for people who suffer personal injury; particularly, the breadwinner. Action has been taken in this respect and a committee has been appointed under Mr. Justice Woodhouse to inquire into the scheme. I am not exactly sure to whom this would constitute a raw deal, or be a cause for apprehension or concern.

I would suggest that the ratification of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty to the Federal Government has been to the benefit not only of Western Australians and other Australians, but also to the citizens of the world—particularly peace-loving people.

Referring to the National Service Act, conscription has been abolished. I wonder who would regard the abolition of conscription as having been implemented with viciousness and great speed. Surely this has divided this nation more than any other legislation.

Perhaps one of the most momentous decisions of the new Federal Labor Government has been the decision to create the Australian Schools Commission. An interim committee has already been set up comprising representatives from all over

the Commonwealth. Members opposite conveniently overlook the fact that this sort of commission will guarantee a much greater equality of opportunity in education than ever existed previously. The previous Federal Government, during the last 23 years, has refused to extend its educational responsibilities claiming it was a constitutional responsibility of the States.

I now refer to the abolition of fees for entry to tertiary education institutions. I wonder who would consider that action to be a raw deal, and I wonder who felt apprehension and concern. I also wonder which country now considers that our credibility has been devastated because of actions such as this.

The universal health insurance scheme is already well and truly under way. A very small minority of doctors may consider that to be a raw deal.

A task force of inquiry into migration matters has been set up. It will inquire into the problems of the migrants who have made a tremendous contribution to the development of this nation. Many migrants have been beset by a great variety of different problems in recent times. The new Minister for Immigration has already announced the setting up of the task force and I am particularly pleased to note that it will take some interest in the problems which beset the migrants in Western Australia.

The Commonwealth has decided to acquire a pharmaceutical manufacturing company. No member in this House—or in any other Parliament in Australia—could deny that one of the most scandalous charges made in respect of health services is that associated with the cost of drugs. It is pleasing to me—and I know it is also pleasing to my colleagues on this side of the House—to know that the Commonwealth Government has entered this field in a direct and positive fashion in an attempt to reduce the cost of medication.

The new Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement is a concept with a highly principled social purpose.

For the first time we see that a national Government will have a close look at certain sacred cows in an economic sense. This will bring about fundamental justice in the economy. I refer, firstly, to the establishment of prices justification machinery. The Whitlam Government will also enter the field of consumer protection—as a national Government—for the first time. Machinery has already been set up for this purpose, and it will strengthen the laws against restrictive trade practices.

I am delighted to note that the national Labor Government has acted positively on budgetary assistance. The new Government has already handed out

\$50,000,000 by way of assistance to the State Governments throughout Australia to assist with budgetary problems.

The Australian Industry Development Corporation is to be expanded. This is one of the most remarkable institutions created by the previous Government and I am pleased to acknowledge that it is affectionately referred to as the "McEwen" bank. It is intended to use that instrumentality to buy back a very substantial portion of Australian resources which were allocated heedlessly and without any regard for planning whatever during the life of the previous Federal Government.

The new national Labor Government is interested in a maximum degree of Australian ownership and control.

A special Department of Northern Development has been created in Canberra to co-operate with the Western Australian Government, the Northern Territory, and the Queensland Government. The emphasis will be on co-operation. I just wonder who would consider that action to be a raw deal, or a cause for some apprehension and concern.

Referring to the ratification of international conventions and agreements, an International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination has been signed by the new national Labor Government.

I look very closely at the faces of some members opposite when I ask: Exactly to whom does this constitute a raw deal? Which members opposite feel a sense of apprehension and concern because the new national Government in Australia has agreed to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination? Furthermore, we have the I.L.O. Convention on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise dated 1948, the I.L.O. Convention on the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining dated 1949, and the I.L.O. Equal Remuneration Convention dated 1951? The dates are significant. International decisions were made in respect of these matters and they were never ratified by a Tory Government in Canberra.

Ultimately, the vote has been extended to 18-year-olds. I can understand, in the words of the Leader of the Opposition, a sense of apprehension and concern, because in places where conservatives have opposed the extension of the franchise to the younger generation—by that I mean particularly the people between the ages of 18 and 21—their policies and politicians have paid the price on the hustings. I can well understand that this is a cause for apprehension and concern.

Clear and constructive attempts have been made to introduce electoral reform and remove malapportionment in electorates for the House of Representatives—a



great step forward and one which I welcome. Once again, I suggest a group of representatives in this House would consider it to be a raw deal.

The action taken by the new Federal Government which has probably constituted a raw deal and a cause for some concern and apprehension to the Leader of the Opposition is the admirable action that has been taken by that Government in connection with political terrorism and violence associated with political terrorism in this country. I listened with great patience not only to the Leader of the Opposition but also to successive speakers on the opposite side, and I waited in vain to hear one of them denounce this very terrifying dimension in Australian politics.

Sir Charles Court: We have all denounced it.

Mr. BRYCE: Not one speaker on the Opposition benches has raised his voice against this state of affairs. There are numerous other matters but I do not intend—

Mr. Hutchinson: Be sensible!

Mr. BRYCE: The member for Cottesloe has not risen to his feet to denounce it and he is usually the first to denounce anybody demonstrating in the streets.

Sir Charles Court: What did you do about nazism and fascism? Not a thing.

Mr. R. L. Young: There are more bombs in Floreat Park than in Sydney.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: I could quote many actions which have been taken by the new Federal Government but I do not propose to turn this into a pseudo Federal forum. There are two particular actions that have been taken by the new Federal Labor Government which have very important implications for Western Australia as well as for people in other parts of the country. I would like to examine them more closely. I believe all members of this House should give some serious thought to the stand the Government has taken on the question of political terrorism and the fact that the role of A.S.I.O. is now under question.

The next matter relates exclusively to the question of the new Federal Government's attitude towards the rape of Australian resources through the lack of planning and co-ordination by previous Federal Governments, and the attitude of the new Federal Government towards foreign investment.

Mr. R. L. Young: Did you hear the Federal Attorney-General's statement in the House today?

Mr. BRYCE: I will speak about these issues in my own way and in my own time.

Sir Charles Court: I wish you would remember this when you are interjecting on other people all the time. You cannot take interjections.

Mr. BRYCE: I do not mind interjections. I fully appreciate that they are contrary to the purpose and the spirit and the Standing Orders of this House. I do not have the slightest objection to interjections.

The question of terrorism has been highlighted by the events of a particular political group in this country in recent weeks.

Mr. W. A. Manning: I thought it was trade unions.

Mr. BRYCE: It was upsetting, to some extent, to sit in the Chamber and hear the long succession of Government speakers—

Mr. O'Neil: We have not had that yet.

Mr. BRYCE: My error; the long succession of Opposition speakers over the period of six days or so in which this debate has taken place. Those members of Parliament have had the opportunity to stand on their feet and declare their position in respect of this important question.

Mr. Thompson: They have. There is terrorism in this State.

Mr. BRYCE: Instead, they have chosen to play party politics because of a by-election in a town 120 miles away. They have preoccupied themselves with a relatively minor industrial dispute—

Mr. O'Neil: Minor!

Sir Charles Court: Blackmail and personal intimidation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: Do members opposite compare that for one minute with death and destruction by bombing?

Mr. R. L. Young: A fellow was gaoled for five years for planting a bomb in the office of the Department of National Service.

Mr. BRYCE: I am not really concerned—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Every member has a chance to speak. Every member has the right to be heard. I ask members to keep order. The member for Ascot.

Mr. BRYCE: To complete the sentence that was misrepresented, I am not concerned about the question of the political spectrum. The Australian Labor Party as the Government of this State and this nation is opposed to all forms of political extremism and terrorism.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: The Opposition spokesmen were up on their hind legs about peaceful demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

The right to demonstrate was their fundamental issue of law and order which was exploited by members opposite when some thousands of citizens in this State peacefully demonstrated through the streets of Perth. Members opposite spoke about the inconvenience to motorists, passers-by, and shoppers. How does that compare with their concern about threats that have been made on the life of the Prime Minister and the Attorney-General of this country in recent weeks? Not one of them rose in his place to denounce the actions of Senator Greenwood in concealing the existence of this conspiracy. Not one of them rose in his place to denounce political terrorism in a form we have never known in this country.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: I wonder whether it was simply because the Prime Minister and the Attorney-General whose lives have been threatened are Labor men, or is it simply because the Liberals are only opposed to political extremism and terrorism from the left.

Sir Charles Court: Do not give us that nonsense. What about the threats on the lives of people on this side?

Mr. BRYCE: The Prime Minister and the Attorney-General of this country have said in unmistakable terms that the Australian Labor Party is opposed to political terrorism whether it comes from the right or the left, and I suggest that is one of the obvious differences between our two parties. Senator Greenwood deliberately concealed information about a conspiratorial group in this country.

Mr. R. L. Young: Mr. Whitlam took a long time to come out with his statement.

Mr. Graham: His popularity is going up. That is how much out of touch you people are.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: The question of terrorist groups in Australia has been highlighted by three particular events in the course of the last 12 months. In June, 1972, there were certain incursions into Yugoslavia.

Mr. R. L. Young: Go back to 1971.

Mr. BRYCE: Nineteen men were involved, six of whom were Australian citizens and three of whom were former Australian residents. In July, 1972, there was the discovery in the Warburton Range outside Melbourne of a cache of explosives and documents belonging to a Ustasha-type organisation. In September, 1972, there was a rash of bombing incidents in Sydney involving Yugoslav people and the embassy.

This issue has been raised in the Federal Parliament, particularly by many A.L.P. members, and also by some Liberal Party members, including the former Prime Minister. In his speech to the Senate recently, the present Attorney-General made this statement, *inter alia*—

I am now in a position to state categorically that the Liberal Attorney-General's oft-repeated assertion that there is no credible evidence of the existence in Australia of organised Croatian extremism cannot be sustained. The contrary is true and was true at the time he made such statements.

To identify these groups and indicate that they are not figments of the imagination, I will quote what the Attorney-General said later on in his speech. He said—

There is incontestable evidence that three extreme Croatian terrorist organisations exist in Australia today.

There are:

1. The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood (H.R.B.).
2. The United Croats of West Germany (U.H.N.).
3. The Croatian Illegal Revolutionary Organisation (H.I.R.O.).

He goes on to describe two youth organisations which are associated and affiliated with those parent bodies.

He then spoke about the Troika cells, which are self-contained groups consisting of an individual responsible for intelligence, one responsible for explosives, and one who is regarded as a scout. This form of political activity is completely new to this country. It creates a new dimension and one which was concealed deliberately by Senator Greenwood when he was the Attorney-General.

The question of terrorism has brought to light the role which the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation should play, has played, and does play in the life of the citizens of this country. The spotlight has been turned on it in recent times. Everybody here is aware that it was established in the first instance by the Chifley Government, I think, in 1947. It was established by an administrative act and it was placed on a statutory basis in 1956.

Mr. O'Connor: You cannot say it was those fellows who put the bomb in the office of the National Service Department.

Mr. BRYCE: The member for Mt. Lawley wants me to traverse the ground I have already covered.

Several members interjected.

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

Mr. BRYCE: I will be delighted to do so.

Sir Charles Court: The chap who put the bomb in the National Service Department is a left-winger, so that was not terrorism.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRYCE: The A.S.I.O. has unfortunately been diverted from its legitimate charter of activities during the period of the Menzies, Holt, Gorton, and McMahon Governments.

It has effectively—and I intend to point out a few instances in a moment—become an arm of the conservative political parties. Instead of concentrating on the control, recognition, and detection of espionage, it has in many respects become a tool to be employed in domestic politics in this country.

In recent times we saw a disgusting spectacle when a young university student was interviewed in public on the "Four Corners" television programme. That student had been used by A.S.I.O.—and the danger of this approach applies equally to the students in our Western Australian tertiary educational institutions as it does to the tertiary institutions in other parts of Australia—to provide information about fellow students. One of the most abominable things imaginable in a democracy is for a spy network of pimps and squibs to penetrate universities and institutions of learning in order to impose some form of censorship, intelligence, or spy supervision of learning activities.

Mr. Rushton: How do you think the universities work?

Mr. BRYCE: Recently on television we saw an example of a university student who had been approached by A.S.I.O. and asked to supply details on the activities of his fellow university students. One of the most criminal aspects of this practice is that very many young people in the 18 to 20-years age group really have no idea about where their future careers lie. Their minds and their senses of value are in a state of flux and one of the most criminal things that can happen is for some irrelevant spy organisation to label them as security risks.

Sir Charles Court: Don't the communists do that?

Mr. Graham: You should know.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will keep order. The *Hansard* reporters are experiencing difficulty in hearing the member for Ascot.

Mr. BRYCE: We are asked to condone an organisation which is ruining the lives of those young people who aspire to become State or Federal public servants: on the basis of spy or pimp reports by fellow students on the campus they are allocated

poor security ratings. Some young people genuinely feel their careers have been prejudiced as a result of this.

Perhaps the most unforgivable feature of such action is that at a university the freedom of students to explore knowledge and to exchange and develop ideas should be completely unchallengeable. That is one of the tremendous benefits we have in this country; and it is one of the contrasts between educational institutions at that level in Australia and institutions at that level in some of the totalitarian countries, as we have heard so recently.

One of the principal faults with the employment of such an activity is that at a time when the young people of our country should be encouraged to challenge the *status quo*, to look at society, and to put our society and its history under a microscope, we have a possibility they will be afraid to do so as a result of the way the A.S.I.O. has been abused. Our young people will be afraid to challenge the sacred cows because somebody in a study or discussion group—

Mr. O'Neil: I haven't noticed any evidence of that.

Mr. BRYCE: —may convey that information back to a source which will affect their careers. Eventually they could be classified as a security risk. Perhaps the most unpalatable feature of this practice was revealed by the student who was interviewed on "Four Corners" when he said he was actually asked to secure details about the private lives of students including their sex life—information which could be used only for the purpose of blackmail.

Mr. O'Connor: Didn't you do that in respect of our leader?

Mr. BRYCE: They were public details, my friend. The real weakness of this is that any society which allows a secret police force to develop unchallenged—and I was amazed and astonished to hear the Federal Leader of the Country Party suggest that A.S.I.O. should be above and beyond Parliament—

Sir Charles Court: He did not say "above Parliament", but "above the Government", which is different.

Mr. BRYCE: Any society which allows a secret police force to achieve a position above and beyond the control of Parliament will finish up with people like J. Edgar Hoover who, it has been alleged on many occasions, had so much information of a scurrilous nature about so many political figures that nobody dared to sack him. The manner in which the F.B.I. became unchallengeable in the United States was a scandalous thing.

In respect of my claim that A.S.I.O. has breached the scope of its charter it is useful evidence to quote very briefly from an article which appeared in *The*

*National Times* of the 19th March under the heading of, "How ASIO exceeds its charter". The article was written by Robert Mayne, and appeared on page 1 of the newspaper. Referring to the activities of the A.S.I.O., the article states—

For some startling facts about other ASIO activities lend weight to Senator Murphy's case that ASIO has exceeded its charter and engaged in some highly unorthodox—to say the least—activities.

The journalist took this stand publicly and in print, and continued on to say—

I know from personal knowledge that ASIO:

Was involved with a leading Sydney businessman, a right-wing member of the NSW Legislative Assembly and a Country Party member of the NSW Legislative Council in a bid to produce a magazine aimed at discrediting left-wingers, communists and others.

Mr. Rushton: Who wrote this article?

Mr. BRYCE: It continues—

Keeps files on a number of Sydney journalists because they expressed views in print opposed to the Liberal Government's policies on the Vietnam war.

Feeds out selected material to members of parliament,—

The member for Dale will be interested to hear this. To continue—

—journalists and others in attempts to damage trade-unionists and others . . .

Mr. Rushton: Who wrote it?

Mr. BRYCE: For the last 23 years that organisation has not been supervised in the best interests of the nation. As an individual I am pleased to see that it will no longer be used as an arm of a political party—

Sir Charles Court: It never has been.

Mr. BRYCE: —but will be asked to concentrate on its charter, which is to correlate and evaluate intelligence relevant to security and to keep watch on espionage activities.

Sir Charles Court: It will not be able to do that any more because it has been completely ruined by Senator Murphy. What nation would tell them anything?

Mr. Graham: What a crying shame for a Government to know what is going on in its own country.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: It is important to us that they get information.

Mr. BRYCE: The Leader of the Opposition had unlimited time in which to make the points he wanted to make. I do not object to interjections which attempt to clarify what I am saying, but if he chooses to use my time to carry on a private debate with somebody else I think he is being totally unreasonable.

I refer now to the question of overseas investment, which involves the attitude of our friend, the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: And your Premier and Deputy Premier; they have welcomed it here.

Mr. BRYCE: I am not suggesting for a minute that the A.L.P. is opposed to investors from overseas; that has never been suggested.

Sir Charles Court: Haven't you seen the transcript of the speech of Mr. Connor, the Commonwealth Minister, in Melbourne?

Mr. BRYCE: The Leader of the Opposition is trying deliberately to misrepresent the position, which he is so capable of doing.

Sir Charles Court: You read the speech he made in Melbourne.

The SPEAKER: The member has five more minutes.

Mr. BRYCE: The position of the A.L.P. in respect of the question of overseas control and ownership of the economy differs in a matter of degree from that of the Liberal Party. Labor Governments have never been opposed to investment in Australia by overseas companies and organisations. The difference in emphasis is, of course, that we believe there should be a maximum of Australian participation—

Mr. O'Neil: And so do we.

Mr. BRYCE: —and we believe we should not sit back and allow development at any price whatsoever—development by foreign investors at any price so far as our resources are concerned and which will not bestow benefits upon subsequent generations of Australians.

On page 58 of the current *Hansard* we find that the Leader of the Opposition was explaining his attitude to the question of foreign investment—and I hope he explains it to the people of Western Australia when we are on the hustings next year. The Deputy Premier interjected and said—

You are saying that if you cannot get Australian participation, it is far better to allow foreign participation than to allow the Commonwealth Government to associate with the development on behalf of the people of Australia.

The answer of the Leader of the Opposition is vital. He said, "That is right; a better result will be obtained."

Sir Charles Court: You read the lot.

Mr. BRYCE: I sincerely hope the Press will convey to the people of Australia and of Western Australia at the next State election that the Leader of the Opposition should prefer foreign, multi-national cartels to develop the resources of this State rather than the people of this country and of this State through the A.I.D.C. Indeed, the A.I.D.C. will play a most important role in the future development of our resources. It is the intention of the new Federal Government to use that instrumentality to ensure a higher degree of Australian participation in the development of our resources. Even if it is necessary for the representatives of the A.I.D.C. to go overseas to borrow money in order to provide Australian equity, that is far preferable to sitting back and saying, "We cannot find the investors in Australia who will come forward with the finance—"

Sir Charles Court: And the know-how.

Mr. BRYCE: —so we will hand it on a plate to the multi-national cartels from overseas." The other vitally important role the A.I.D.C. is going to play for the benefit of the Australian community, as well as for the benefit of every Western Australian citizen, is that it is proposed to embark upon the long and tiresome task of trying to buy back Australia.

One of the most regrettable tendencies of the previous Government—and perhaps the most dangerous feature of its policies—was to allow willy-nilly the sale of land to overseas investors. Even at this time nobody in Western Australia knows how much of this State is owned by foreign landowners. Soon after my arrival in this Parliament I asked a question of the Minister for Lands regarding how much land in the State is owned by foreign interests. The Minister replied that the information was not available. Nobody knows how many of the manufacturing industries are owned by foreigners.

I sincerely believe that action should be taken by the Commonwealth and State Governments in a co-operative effort to achieve at least the level of enlightenment in this respect which has been achieved in Japan and Canada. Action should be taken to accumulate information so that we may at least know precisely how much of our economy is owned by overseas interests. After all, the moment the control of our economy slips from the grasp of the Australian people—and when I say "the Australian people" I also include the Australian Government—we lose control of our economic destiny. Unfortunately that is something I really do not believe the Leader of the Opposition is very concerned about.

Mr. R. L. Young: Bob Hawke has control of it.

Sir Charles Court: Don't talk nonsense.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [9.30 p.m.]: I did not intend to speak in this debate, but some matters have been raised on which I feel I must comment. Firstly, I join with other members in complimenting the member for Blackwood on his contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate. His contribution was quite forthright, and it is refreshing to hear a member from the opposite side of the House putting up constructive suggestions in relation to the disabilities of people living in the country.

I hope the honourable member will continue in that vein in the future; if he does he will be an asset to his electorate. What he has said is preferable to the nonconstructive criticism which we often hear in the debate on the Address-in-Reply. I realise the member for Blackwood was lulled into a false sense of security, because on the second occasion that he spoke he was heckled quite considerably. The honourable member overlooked the fact that a member making his maiden speech is given a free rein and is permitted to say without interference what he thinks about his position in this Parliament and what he can do for his electorate.

Mr. Thompson: It was the Minister for Works who was lulled into a false sense of security.

Mr. BRADY: It was not the Minister for Works. It was the member for Blackwood, because he was heckled to a great extent by members on this side.

Mr. O'Neil: You managed to hear him all right.

Mr. BRADY: In all the 25 years that I have been a member of this House I have not heard previously so many speeches contributed by members from both sides dealing with Federal matters. One would imagine that we were sitting in the Federal Parliament. Member after member on the Opposition side of the House, and some on the Government side, dealt with various Federal matters. I was wondering whether the Opposition did that because it felt it had no answer to what has been set out in the Speech of the Governor delivered at the opening of Parliament.

Mr. R. L. Young: You are not suggesting the member for Ascot indulged in those tactics!

Mr. BRADY: I do not intend to go over all the points that have been raised, but I do want to remind members of some of the matters which the Governor said would be dealt with in this session of Parliament. His Excellency the Governor said that of the 228 Bills presented in the last two years by this Government 180 had been passed. He said further that it was intended to amend the Hospitals Act, the Administration Act, the Public Service Act to provide for Civil Service Association representation on the board, the Land

Agents Act, the Sales of Land Act, the Strata Titles Act, the Auctioneers Act, and the Companies Act.

Whilst I am on this subject I do hope that somewhere along the line the Government is able to see its way clear to prevent the legal fraternity from making a bonanza out of the transfer of a land title from one party to another. It is a disgrace to Governments—whether they be Liberal or Labor—that every time a transfer of a land title is effected the legal fraternity makes something out of the transaction. For some 100 years it was not necessary to engage the legal fraternity to perform that service, so I do not think it is necessary now. Some formula should be devised to enable people to effect the transfer of titles without having to pay the legal fraternity.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is not absolutely necessary to have lawyers to do that work.

Mr. BRADY: It may not be, but if the Attorney-General investigates the position he will find that 99 per cent. of the transfers are done by the legal fraternity.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is often prudent to do so, but it is not binding to engage lawyers for this purpose.

Mr. BRADY: I know this work is supposed to be done by the legal fraternity so as to protect all the parties. However, if the position is analysed to the nth degree it will be found that many weaknesses exist in the present system. I do not think people should have to pay the legal fraternity to draw up documents for the transfer of titles.

Mr. O'Connor: You have a good point.

Mr. BRADY: In the Governor's Speech it is indicated that the Electoral Act is to be amended to provide for joint Commonwealth and State rolls, and for the designation of political parties to be printed on ballot papers. This is another reform which has been long overdue. I am pleased that the Government is up with the times in this regard. I cannot think of any procedure which is more farcical and more expensive to the taxpayers than the present system of having two electoral departments in Western Australia—one run by the Commonwealth, and the other by the State—with both virtually doing the same job; dealing with the same people, streets, and localities; and to a large extent following the same mode of enrolment. I believe the time is long overdue when this duplication of expenditure should be eliminated. I cannot see why one comprehensive electoral roll cannot cater for both Federal and State elections. I hope that some move will be made at an early date to implement the proposal announced in the Governor's Speech.

It has also been announced in the Governor's Speech that the recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission into hire purchase are to be adopted. I was

one who referred a hire-purchase transaction to the Minister in October last. It is appropriate for me to refer to the reply which I received in the last week. In my opinion it reveals a shocking state of affairs in regard to hire-purchase agreements. The reply of the Attorney-General was, in part, as follows—

The circumstances of both transactions have been fully investigated by the Companies Office, and the car transaction by the company fraud squad. With respect of the hire-purchase agreement with the credit firm, the finance organisation used by the seller firm who sold the vehicle, there are a number of unsatisfactory matters revealed by the inspector's report. There is a suggestion that the vehicle represented as a 1967 model was, in fact, a 1965 vehicle. Although a deposit of \$50 was paid the amount of deposit shown in the hire-purchase agreement was \$420 with a consequential increase in the total price.

This is typical of what has been going on for many years in the sale of used cars in the metropolitan and country areas. The time is long overdue for the Hire-purchase Act to be amended to prevent people from playing around with the money provided by credit firms, and from taking others for a ride. The last paragraph of the letter is as follows—

Consideration has been given to charges being preferred under section 424 of the Criminal Code in relation to the alleged overstating of both the deposit paid and the residue to be paid by the hirer. However, lack of evidence will not enable the charge to be sustained.

This would indicate that although it was proved beyond doubt that some people engaged in the motor industry were resorting to malpractices, they could not be charged because the time had run out. That is a shocking state of affairs, because in the particular case mentioned the family concerned met with bad times. That family had paid a considerable amount to purchase the vehicle, and was told that if the car was returned a substantial repayment would be made. Instead of that, the family received a bill for \$525 and the firm kept the car which it sold for an amount considerably higher than it was prepared to give back.

This is not the first case of this type which has come to my notice. I am very pleased the Government is to introduce legislation to amend the Hire-purchase Act to put a stop to these malpractices.

Mr. McPharlin: Did you read the report of the Honorary Royal Commission?

Mr. BRADY: Not the whole of it, but only extracts. I understand the report indicated that the time was long overdue for matters such as I have mentioned to be dealt with.

Mr. O'Neill: The Government would do better to look at the Victorian used cars Act which is more appropriate than our Hire-purchase Act.

Mr. BRADY: I do not mind which Act is looked at. In the last 12 years, most of which was during the term of Liberal Governments, the used car firms have had a bonanza. It is about time that the sharks in this business were put in their place, and the public protected against the reprehensible methods of trading in second-hand cars.

The next matter with which I wish to deal concerns the native people. The member for Kimberley seems to take the viewpoint that the Labor Government should now be doing something which his own Government in its 12 years of office did not do. The other night he took the present Government to task in respect of various matters. I shall deal with a few of them to show that the member for Kimberley was less than fair in what he said.

Let me refer to the alleged disabilities that are supposed to exist in the north and in the Department for Community Welfare. The honourable member referred to the position at Halls Creek, Fitzroy Crossing, and a number of other northern centres. He criticised the Government at length for doing certain things which, in his opinion, were wrong, and for not doing other things which, he thought, should be done.

I recall the occasion when the member for Kimberley participated in a debate in this House and pointed to the necessity for the Government to provide some Aboriginal in the Fitzroy Crossing area with pumping equipment, tanks, etc. Subsequently the Government provided far in excess of what that particular person or the member for the district expected. The value of the equipment supplied was in the vicinity of \$10,000. Now, the member for Kimberley is criticising the Government because he says it should ensure that the person to whom the equipment was supplied did the job.

Mr. R. L. Young: It was a waste of money; that was the point.

Mr. BRADY: The Aboriginal concerned did not do the job because he did not have the equipment. Apparently in the eyes of the member for Kimberley the Government cannot win. When it provides equipment to enable the Aboriginal to engage in market gardening and other activities, the honourable member criticises the Government because the Aboriginal has not the knowledge to carry out the activities.

It is a pity the member for Kimberley did not look into that aspect of the problem before he urged the Government to provide the equipment. From his knowledge of the district he should know

whether the native had the know-how to make the venture a success, and whether success was anticipated.

Apparently when the Government spends more than was expected in the area—somewhere in the vicinity of \$10,000 worth of equipment—it is still accused of not doing what it should be doing in the north.

Mr. R. L. Young: He criticised the Government for spending too much money.

Mr. BRADY: Let us now have the other side of the story. The member for Kimberley criticised the action taken by the Government at Fitzroy Crossing and said that the white population was between 30 and 40. This is an area, he claimed, where many Aborigines have been forced out of the pastoral industry. I want to give the member for Kimberley full marks for trying to do something for the Aboriginal people because I think those people have to be helped. For over 500 years they have been behind scratch but they are now starting to show some progress, and they should be assisted. However, I do not think the pastoral industry, as such, should force these people out. Why should they be forced out when the pastoral industry is in the hands of very wealthy landowners who are mostly living overseas? Those landowners should be looking after the Aborigines and not forcing them out.

Mr. Ridge: It was not the pastoral industry, but the introduction of the pastoral award which forced them out.

Mr. BRADY: Of course. The pastoralists did not want to pay union rates. They wanted to pay the low rates which have applied during the last 100 years. They want to build up wealthy businesses and pay big dividends.

Mr. Ridge: Bulldust.

Mr. O'Connor: Will the member for Swan speak up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRADY: The member for Kimberley was less than fair when dealing with the position at Fitzroy Crossing. He did not mention the United Aborigines Mission Federal Council which conducts a very successful mission in the Fitzroy area. In fact, it accommodates 178 persons under the age of 16 years and 93 persons over the age of 16 years. It is providing education for 215 children drawn from the town and the reserve, as well as the mission. The children attend a five-teacher Government school.

The member for Kimberley did not mention those details and he made out that poverty, destitution and unemployment existed in the Fitzroy area and nothing was being done by anybody to help those

unfortunate people. In the northern district to which the member for Kimberley referred no less than one-quarter of the 25,000 Aborigines in Western Australia reside. It is to be expected that there could be many problems. The fact remains that the various missions in the area are doing a tremendous job, and it is as well to advise members that eight church missions operate in the area.

If the member for Kimberley desires to do something for the Aborigines at Fitzroy Crossing, Halls Creek, Wyndham, Derby, and other places, I think he should advocate to the Minister for Community Welfare the advisability of holding a conference comprising all the people who are trying to help the Aborigines to get on to their feet.

For over 100 years people have been sacrificing themselves by working to help the Aborigines. They have been running cattle stations, vegetable farms, and all types of settlements. Generally speaking, they have been doing a tremendous job and many Aborigines are now taking their place and working side by side with white workers in the abattoirs and various other undertakings in the north-west, such as on the main roads.

Mr. Ridge: And in the hotels.

Mr. BRADY: Aborigines are working on building projects and in the stock industry. Because a few Aborigines in one isolated area are not receiving the assistance which the member opposite feels they should receive he comes to this House and criticises the Government. I would point out to the member for Kimberley that the most conscientious Minister in the whole of the history of native welfare was the man who has just stepped down from the office. It would not surprise me to learn that Mr. Bill Willesee had to step down because of ill-health brought about by the worries and troubles associated with trying to help the Aboriginal people.

Mr. O'Connor: A very decent gentleman.

Mr. BRADY: So the honourable member opposite should not try to detract from the efforts of the Government which has spent no less than \$3,250,000 in assisting Aborigines over the past 12 months. In addition, approximately \$3,000,000 has been spent in loan moneys and financial grants for building houses, planning education and health projects, employment, training, and so on.

Although I go along with the member for Kimberley in trying to look after Aboriginal welfare I think he was less than fair to the Minister and the Government in trying to make out that the Government was not assisting.

Mr. Ridge: It was not mine to make out. The case I presented showed the Government in a poor light.

Mr. BRADY: The honourable member opposite did not tell the other side of the story; he told only one side.

Mr. Ridge: I told the correct side.

Mr. BRADY: He referred to all the other matters. The missions are spending a tremendous sum of money. In this morning's issue of *The West Australian* there appears a four-column article setting out what has been done towards training young Aborigines in the Broome district. The young people from the northern district—mainly represented by the member for Kimberley—are brought in and trained at Broome.

For the benefit of members who may not be aware of the fact, the 1972 annual report will possibly be the last report from the Department of Native Welfare in Western Australia. I would advise all members in the House to try to obtain a copy of the report as a memento of the tremendous job done by the various Governments—Labor and non-Labor—for the Aboriginal people over the years.

As a past Minister for Native Welfare I want to say that the Aboriginal people are progressing at a tremendous rate. During the last 20 years they have progressed at a rate faster than they have previously in the history of Western Australia.

Mr. Ridge: Some are going backwards, too.

Mr. BRADY: The member for Kimberley is, no doubt, referring to alcohol. Well, who gave it to the Aborigines?

Mr. Ridge: A Labor Government.

Mr. BRADY: It was a Liberal Government. The previous Minister for Native Welfare would be the first to admit that he introduced a Bill to allow Aborigines to have alcohol. I criticised the Minister at the time and said that I did not mind the Aborigines getting alcohol, but I said they should be educated in how to use it. That is where the plan fell down.

Mr. Ridge: In the Kimberley area drinking rights were introduced by a Labor Government.

Mr. BRADY: I have advocated an educational plan for the Aborigines.

Mr. Ridge: Who will take any notice?

Mr. BRADY: The member for Kimberley wanted to know who gave the Aborigines drinking rights.

Mr. Ridge: I know who gave them drinking rights.

Mr. BRADY: The honourable member should educate the Aborigines in how to handle their alcohol.

So much for the matter of Aborigines, and the remarks of the member for Kimberley when he criticised this Government for not doing anything. I could go on discussing Aborigines for the next hour because I have always taken a great interest



in them. I can advise the member for Kimberley that very often a group of 50 or 60 Aborigines will march into an area and nobody is aware of the fact until they are there.

I have a letter on my file concerning a family who shifted into Guildford six months ago and who sought my assistance. That family has now shifted out and they do not require any help. This sort of thing goes on all the time. Families of 10 and 12 people are here today and gone tomorrow.

According to the member for Kimberley it seems that the Government should employ a man in an aeroplane to track the Aborigines through the mulga so that the Government will know where they will land next!

Mr. Ridge: After a period of 18 months the Government should be able to do something better for the Aborigines in Camballin.

Mr. BRADY: We have heard about certain Aborigines being placed in bad situations because certain pastoralists are putting the Aborigines on trucks and telling them to get out. The Minister for Community Welfare has told me that if the pastoralists put the Aborigines on trucks and send them from the stations he will see that the trucks are available to take the Aborigines back again.

Mr. Ridge: What will they do when they get back?

Mr. BRADY: The member for Kimberley had better tell the pastoralists in the north that those people are human beings and they need some protection. The Government will see that they are looked after as well as the white people are looked after.

It has been claimed by some in the north that the Aborigines are getting more assistance than the white people.

Mr. Ridge: They are calling for equality.

Mr. BRADY: In fact, were the Aborigines to get twice as much they would not be getting more than they are entitled to because the pastoralists have been using them as slaves for the last 100 years.

Mr. R. L. Young: The Aborigines originally owned your property.

Mr. BRADY: I want to deal with one or two other matters, and I will first of all refer to tourism. We heard the member for Avon speaking the other night about the necessity for some assistance to be given to the York district in order to preserve the remnants of the old York town. I do not want to detract from his argument regarding the preservation of the York district and the value of its historic buildings, but in my opinion many items in the Guildford area could be preserved for the benefit of tourists.

It may be a surprise to some members to know that the port of Guildford was used as the hopping off place for the York and Toodyay areas. At that time Toodyay was called Newcastle. I agree that some of our historic places should be preserved, but not York alone comes into that category.

Mr. Gayfer: It comes into that category because it is the oldest country town.

Mr. BRADY: I think the history of Guildford should be brought into the picture together with York and Toodyay—or Newcastle as it was known.

It may not be realised that the Rose and Crown Hotel in Guildford was probably the first licensed house in Western Australia. I could also refer to Barkers Bridge. Many places around Guildford, such as the Woodbridge Home could be preserved so that the record could be kept straight. The history of this State should be correctly recorded.

Mr. W. A. Manning: The member who is speaking is getting that way now, too.

Mr. BRADY: Not on his own! Another matter on which I wish to touch is the very successful carnival held in the Swan district recently over a period of three days. It was called "Vintage 1973". In my opinion it was the most successful carnival ever held since the establishment of the wine-growing industry. Now that the vineyards have come into their own and the Vintage 73 Carnival was successfully floated over a three-day period—

Mr. Gayfer: Floated?

Mr. BRADY: —the time is long overdue for a school of oenology to be established in this State. Apparently a school of oenology has already been established in South Australia. At the school people learn the finer points of handling wines and of the vineyard industry generally. The time is now ripe for a similar establishment to be set up in the Swan area, particularly around—

Mr. O'Connor: Mandalay?

Mr. BRADY: —the Caversham and Herne Hill areas.

Mr. O'Neill: There are two dissenters on this side of the House.

Mr. BRADY: In this way the industry would come into its own and would receive the recognition which it deserves. Wine is a very old industry and dates back to Biblical times; namely, the Last Supper. Throughout the centuries people have continued to cultivate vines.

It is a tremendous industry for the people working in it. It creates a good deal of employment and has a great future. I hope the Minister will seriously consider establishing a school of oenology in this State so that the people in the industry may gain qualifications in their trade of cultivating vines and producing wines.

Mr. O'Connor: Do you support the industry extensively?

Mr. BRADY: I am a teetotaler, in case this may be news to the honourable member. The member for Mt. Lawley, who has interjected, may have a likeness for a particular vintage. I occasionally take a sip of wine for health reasons.

Mr. R. L. Young: It is just that some of us are sicker than others.

Mr. BRADY: It is a small sip.

Mr. O'Neill: It shocks you into life.

Mr. BRADY: There are many other matters I could discuss tonight but I do not want to delay members unduly; the hour is already late. On another occasion I will discuss at length the growing pains in the eastern districts suburbs. These exist because of the many activities in the area. We seem to be short of the essential requirements which benefit the people. I do not wish to enlarge on this subject tonight. In all I have a list of nine or 10 matters. Of these, the question of transport comes readily to mind. People in my electorate are disappointed with the metropolitan transport system in new areas such as Middle Swan, Lockridge, and Eden Hill. They feel that the transport schedules into those areas, as well as into the Middle Swan should be upgraded. I personally feel that the railways could assist the transport in the Middle Swan-Upper Swan and Millendon-Bullsbrook districts. I will not enlarge on this point at the moment.

At some opportune time later in the session I will address the House at length on other matters which I have listed. In the meantime I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply and I hope it will be carried in its present form.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Health) [10.05 p.m.]: I, too, wish to support the motion which has been moved—and moved very capably—by you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may say so. I wish to comment upon one or two matters which have been raised during the debate. I have been rather surprised at the sparseness of matters warranting comment. Most of the debate seems to have been repetitive and along lines which I earlier predicted: namely, an attack on the Commonwealth Government.

Even at the risk of incurring the wrath of the member for Swan, who has just resumed his seat, I say I have been happy to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government on matters affecting various portfolios for which I am responsible. I have been delighted with the refreshing approach of the Commonwealth Government which has displayed an interest in many matters in which we could not provoke even the slightest spark of interest from the previous Federal Government.

It is refreshing to know we have a Government which is prepared to put some money into Western Australia. It is prepared to assist us financially with feasibility studies in areas which have needed attention for a long time. I refer to transport, town planning, urban commission, Aboriginal welfare, health, and many other matters with which the previous Federal Government was reluctant to concern itself. We now find the present Federal Government is at least forwarding us some money to see what can be done in the way of feasibility studies. I hope the Commonwealth Government will follow this up in due course with additional money.

I venture to say that, should the Government in this State change, the incoming Government would not refuse to accept one cent of the money which is coming from Canberra to benefit this State—and it is to the benefit of the State.

Sir Charles Court: As long as we do not have to surrender our rights and responsibilities.

Mr. DAVIES: That is becoming the catchword in this House. This is obvious from reading the *Financial Times*, *The Australian*, and *The Nation Review*.

Sir Charles Court: They support the Labor Government.

Mr. DAVIES: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would read *The Nation Review*. The catchword is that we cannot trust the Federal Government because of a centralist policy. This is absolute poppycock. Apart from the catchword, not one iota of proof has been brought before the Parliament to prove to my satisfaction that the Commonwealth is trying to take over the control of our State.

Sir Charles Court: You want to be taken over.

Mr. DAVIES: Any State Government should be strong enough to know whether it is being taken over. It should know when to surrender and for what reasons. It should know what to do to maintain its own rights. To suggest otherwise is to say that one does not have faith in one's own State.

Mr. Mensaros: What about the universities?

Mr. DAVIES: I repeat that I would be interested to see what attitude would be adopted if the Government in this State were to change. I am sure any new Government would not reject the money which is so sensibly and generously made available to us now by the Australian Government.

Mr. Rushton: The Australian Government!

Mr. DAVIES: I knew someone would bite if I said "Australian Government". It is now called the Australian Government and we are holding our heads high that it is such a Government.

Mr. O'Neil: It is denying the existence of the Commonwealth.

Mr. DAVIES: The Australian Government is the Commonwealth Government but, in addition, there are six States to the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Neil: Why not call it "The Commonwealth"? That is what it stands for. It is centralism right from the base.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): Order!

Mr. Graham: Like the Canadian Government!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: Let us be proud to be Australians.

Sir Charles Court: Of course we are.

Mr. DAVIES: We should be Australians first and Western Australians second.

Sir Charles Court: There are seven Governments.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: With all the jingoism we have heard from the other side of the House I would have thought that members opposite would be proud to call themselves Australians first and Western Australians second.

Sir Charles Court: We have done more about it than members of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES: I want to comment on only two matters. I am sorry to see that the member for Kimberley has now disappeared from the House, because I want to speak about the Aboriginal problems in the Kimberley, as they affect my own department, even though the member for Swan ably dealt with the matter earlier in the debate.

With all the fervour of a knight errant with a newly-found cause, the member for Kimberley stood up the other evening and told us about an age-old problem.

Sir Charles Court: It was not a new cause for him.

Mr. DAVIES: It seemed to be a new cause as far as he is concerned.

Sir Charles Court: He has lived with it for years.

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister for Health has only just woken up. He did not even know there was a cause.

Mr. DAVIES: The way the member for Kimberley made his speech in the House, one would have thought it was a brand-new cause he had just discovered. He certainly did not prod the previous Government like this.

Sir Charles Court: He did so.

Mr. O'Neil: We did not give drinking rights to the Aborigines.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: We did not give the Kimberley Aborigines drinking rights.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister will address the Chair and speak only to the Chair. I will deal with the interjections, and we will get more sense.

Mr. DAVIES: I am sure I will get more sense if I address the Chair than I do out of members of the Opposition.

The speech made by the member for Kimberley makes rather remarkable reading. I cannot make up my mind whether he is in favour of or against the Aborigines.

Sir Charles Court: He has their confidence in the Kimberley.

Mr. DAVIES: I wish to deal with one point he raised—the health of the Aborigines.

Criticism has been made about a letter I was said to have written to a Mrs. Hayes of Gordon Downs Station via Kununurra. I want to remind members that the Government has been in office for two years only. During this period we have done a great deal, not only in the field of health, but also in other fields, for the advancement of the State. To hear some of the carping criticism of members of the Opposition and even some of the talk outside the House, one would have thought we had been in control for some 15 or 20 years.

Mr. O'Neil: Heaven forbid!

Mr. DAVIES: I believe the Government has a very good record for its two years in office. By the end of this session there will be a lot more legislation to be proud of on the Statute book. To hear Opposition members speak it would seem that in two years we should have cleared up the whole Aboriginal problem, although it has been in existence since the white man came to the country. Let the Opposition imply that in two years we should have been able to assimilate the natives or have them adapt in their own community or their own way of life! They should not be a worry to us at all!

During the last year of the Gorton Federal Government, and I think even during the term of the McMahon Government, we saw some enlightenment in regard to natives' rights. It was at the insistence of the Federal Government that Western Australia moved to give drinking rights to the natives. The Federal Liberal Government wished to do away with discrimination and we were given a lead in this regard. The Opposition should not now point the finger at the Labor Government. It was only after years and years

of unconcern that the Federal Government recognised there was a problem and wanted to do something about it.

Sir Charles Court: That is not correct comment. The Federal Government asked for a referendum.

Mr. Jamieson: That gave them the right.

Mr. DAVIES: For years the Liberal Government fought against a referendum. It did not want to register natives as persons living within a State. It was only after probing by the Labor Party that the—

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister is on the defensive again.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not on the defensive; I am telling the truth. It is disgusting to think that the natives were not even recognised for the 23 years or more of the Liberal Government.

Mr. Grayden: We had a Select Committee in 1956. The Labor Government refused to implement its recommendations, but they are being implemented now.

Mr. DAVIES: I am talking about the recognition of Aborigines as people. Right up until the last referendum they were not recognised.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: You were talking about drinking rights and they were given before the referendum.

Mr. DAVIES: Not in all areas. Drinking rights were given progressively in different areas. I think one of the first arguments I had with the late Mr. Charles Perkins, when he was Minister for Native Welfare in 1962 or 1963, was over drinking rights.

I am getting away from what I wanted to say. It seems that in two years we were supposed to solve the native problem. It is easy enough for a member to go into isolated areas and to be critical of the conditions there.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: We will have problems for the next 20 years.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope we will see considerable improvement even in the next five years.

Mr. W. A. Manning: I thought you said there will be an improvement in two years.

Mr. DAVIES: Deafness or lack of concentration comes with age. My comment was that the member for Kimberley implied we were supposed to have solved the native problem in two years.

Mr. Ridge: You are wrong—I did not say that at all. I pointed out that certain things were happening in my electorate and that the Government is oblivious to them. I pointed out that 60 people were camping in the Kimberley and the Department for Community Welfare will not do anything about it.

Mr. DAVIES: Could I interject?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister.

Sir Charles Court: That has improved his speech, anyway.

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that the member for Kimberley was critical in some areas where he was not entitled to be critical. His speech reflected the opinion that not sufficient is being done and we were not making the proper moves to help the natives.

When we took office we did not have a community health system. We now have five doctors and 45 nurses from Kimberley to Gnowangerup. These people look after the natives and other sections of the community. We have established schools for Aboriginal nursing aides in Port Hedland and Derby. Seven Aborigines graduated from the last school—six passed on the first attempt and one passed with a supplementary examination. After these girls have worked in a hospital for six months they will probably go back to look after their own people. If members think that the establishment of a system incorporating five doctors, 45 nurses, and seven nursing aides in two years is not something worth while healthwise for the natives, I do not know what we are supposed to do. I have been to Derby, Broome, and to other native camps. I have seen these sisters—

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Not natives—Aborigines.

Mr. DAVIES: —and they are doing a splendid job. They have the confidence of the natives and they are teaching them to use the facilities available, including the homemaker facilities commenced by the previous Government. We have been very happy to continue this service. I believe the community health service we have set up is something to be proud of.

Mr. Ridge: Can you not see a need for an extension of this service to pastoral properties along the lines of the scheme I suggested to you?

Mr. DAVIES: I am about to deal with that scheme and I will endeavour to point out some of the difficulties which would be involved in its establishment. If we have available the large amount of money which some people seem to think the Commonwealth will give us for selling our rights, we could implement such a scheme. However, we do not have the money which the Commonwealth has. We need to use the money which is available for the benefit of the greatest number; and this is precisely what we are doing.

The honourable member has told me about the system operating in the Northern Territory. Certainly his ideas have some merit and I investigated them with a view to incorporating a similar system in Western Australia.

Mrs. Hayes wrote me a very long letter, which I read right through, and asked if something could be done. The matter was also taken up with the Minister for Community Welfare who wrote her a very long letter in reply. The lady subsequently received a reply from me and was not very happy about it.

Mr. Ridge: Your reply indicated that a vacancy would become available at the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: I really do not know how the honourable member can say what was in my reply. Mrs. Hayes wrote another very long letter in which she said that she thought my letter was quite rude. I have just looked for the quote in *Hansard* but I cannot find it quickly. However, she could not send a copy of my letter to the member for Kimberley, because, unfortunately—it was a great tragedy, no doubt—her house was burnt down and the letter was in it. So how the member for Kimberley can say what was in my letter is beyond my knowledge.

Her letter is recorded in *Hansard*; I believe my reply should be recorded also, and I would like to read it. It is dated the 13th October and I said—

The delay in replying to your letter has been occasioned by the need to await developments of a number of proposals, which may have permitted payment for your part-time nursing services at Gordon Downs.

In the interim, I have investigated the possibility of relieving you of an onerous task which invariably falls to some responsible person on every large station, and in fact is often a condition of lease from the Lands Department.

Shortly, an itinerant Community Health field sister will be appointed to cover the area "South of the River", and this, combined with the posting of the Community Health Sister at Kununurra, should serve to alleviate the present position. In addition, the location of another Royal Flying Doctor Service base at Kununurra in May has extended the availability of medical services in the area.

With regard to your own application for a position, I must advise you that, while not doubting your ability to perform the tasks described in your letter, I am concerned that you may be accepting too much unqualified responsibility, payment for which would necessitate a definite system of control and accountability in terms of cost benefits and work performed.

Referring to your sister-in-law at Wave Hill, I feel bound to point out that the Northern Territory enjoys

financial provisions of the Commonwealth Government, and these are in no way equable with State Budget allocations.

In view of the foregoing factors, which are understood and appreciated by a number of organisations and private persons actively engaged in the promotion of aboriginal health on Kimberley stations, I have no alternative but to decline your application for employment.

I do not think there is anything rude or discourteous in that letter. It followed a long letter written by the Minister for Community Welfare. I think it clearly states that we would be unable to supervise her; we expect that the people who hold the leases should take some responsibility for their employees, because apparently most others do; we do not have the resources of the Commonwealth Government, and the resources we have were best used in the manner in which we were using them; and that if we had an unlimited amount of money we would still have no control over her or be able to supervise the standard of her work.

We would not want the member for Kimberley saying we had a half-trained or incompetent person tending to the needs of the Aborigines; and we would not want the Audit Department saying we were paying \$60 a week to the lady without having any check on her work. We must be responsible; so, taking all those things into consideration, we had no alternative but to decline her offer.

I believe the Government approached this problem in the only way it could be approached. We have got right out amongst the Aborigines and are doing a great deal for them. We are trying to show them the way, to teach them, and to train their own kind to look after them. As far as the health angle is concerned, I believe this is the way we should be handling the problem. I agree there are problems with drink. However, I do not know the answer; nor does the member for Kimberley. I think he suggested additional policemen, but of course that is not the answer.

Mr. Ridge: You are reading my remarks out of context. I did not say additional policemen would overcome the situation. I said we need additional policemen there to help these people.

Mr. DAVIES: I was not certain what the honourable member meant by that; whether he meant to help keep them out of or in gaol. However, I do not think additional policemen would help them.

Mr. Ridge: The police certainly need additional help to handle the problem they have.

Mr. DAVIES: The way to tackle the problem is through additional community welfare services, and not by the provision of additional policemen. I am afraid they would not get much co-operation. Of course, I agree the police themselves could do with some help.

Mr. Ridge: They certainly could. Do we have to wait for one of them to be killed?

Mr. DAVIES: However, unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately—that is not my responsibility.

I was not in the House last week when the kerfuffle arose over the Premier moving the gag to end the debate on an amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion. I note the debate was in respect of a Press report. For a start, I think an unconfirmed Press report is a flimsy pretext for a censure motion against the Government; bearing in mind that at that time the Press report had not been acted upon. I believe it still has not been acted upon. However, it was good politics.

I am concerned about allegations that the action of the Premier was dastardly. I believe the Leader of the Country Party said tonight that in living memory such a thing had never been done in the Parliament, and we had all the usual strong words which are said on such an occasion. Possibly if the position had been reversed we might have done the same thing.

However, people have short memories. Although discussion ensued on the position which pertained during the debate on the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill in 1963, and several other instances since that time, no mention was made of a situation which arose during the term of the McLarty-Watts Government which I think was a disgrace. I do not suppose one should speak ill of the dead, although I am not blaming those gentlemen but rather the Government of the day. I refer to the year 1949 when two members of the Government—the present member for South Perth and Mr. Leslie—were about to leave this House to go into Federal politics. This would have left the Government with only the vote of an independent to keep it in office.

Naturally, the Government was striving for its preservation and with an election coming up the following year one can understand that it did not want to face two by-elections. So to get the Parliament out of the way as quickly as possible, what did the Government do? It did not have an opening of Parliament in 1949: it continued the 1948 session into 1949 and abandoned completely the Address-in-Reply. The Government wanted to close down the Parliament as quickly as possible because two of its members intended to leave it in the lurch, as it were, to

better themselves in the Federal scene. So it decided to abandon the Address-in-Reply.

From my reading of the debate at the time I find no explanation was given. The Government simply said, "We will start the session as though it is a continuation of the 1948 session" and that is exactly what happened. It did so in order to save its own skin, without any thought of the democratic rights of members and—

Mr. Grayden: There was no alternative then. The other night you simply stifled debate.

Mr. DAVIES: —without any thought of giving the Opposition of the day the right of the usual debate on the Address-in-Reply. In fact the Government said that did not matter because the Opposition could have its say on the Estimates. I suppose that is a reasonable excuse if one gives that Government the benefit of the doubt. The Opposition said, "We realise you are doomed and we want to get the session over as quickly as possible, so we will do without the Address-in-Reply." But what happened? After some debate on the Estimates the Leader of the Government, then Mr. Ross McLarty, stood up one night at 11.50 p.m. and said, "Righto, this is the timetable for the Estimates" and chopped off the debate. In effect he said on a certain date at a certain time so much of the Estimates would be completed, and by another date the whole of the Estimates would be concluded.

That is the type of treatment which was meted out after the Government abandoned the Address-in-Reply and told the Opposition it could discuss matters on the Estimates. Yet some members now have the hypocrisy to stand up and criticise the recent action of the present Premier. Obviously we are only tyros in political manoeuvring when compared with previous Liberal-Country Party Governments.

Sir Charles Court: You obviously have taken no notice of the information we gave you.

Mr. DAVIES: I am quoting a little of my own research. On the 10th October, 1951, this House was adjourned until the 16th October, 1951. However, what happened in the meantime? The Government of the day—the same McLarty-Watts Government—prorogued Parliament and commenced a new session apparently without telling the Opposition what it intended to do. Members of the Opposition arrived at Parliament House expecting a continuation of a session after a normal adjournment, but the session that was under way had been completed, and during the six-day adjournment a new session commenced, simply to meet the Government's own political ends. So I repeat that this Government, if we were to talk about political

points, is only a tyro when we look at some of the past actions of Liberal-Country Party Governments in this State.

I thought the member for Swan may have mentioned in the House this evening that on two occasions he complained vociferously during the felicitations that are offered at the conclusion of every session. He had to complain that the Bills he had introduced into the House as a private member, which were still on the notice paper, were among the slaughtered innocents, and that the Government of the day did not have the decency to tell him it did not intend to proceed with them. That is the kind of treatment that has been meted out by Liberal-Country Party Governments in the past.

If we care to look up the records we will find that last week a great deal of hypocrisy and humbug was practised by members of the Opposition. Therefore I thought that into the record should be written some of the dealings and actions of the Liberal Party Government—or whatever its political colour happened to be at that time—in previous years.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

*House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 4th April, 1973

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

*Motion, as amended*

Debate resumed, from the 3rd April, on the following motion by The Hon. R. F. Claughton, as amended—

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.

However, this House is of the opinion that the best interests of the State and the people would be better served if the Government were to

concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State, instead of endeavouring to denigrate the Legislative Council (an integral part of the bicameral system of Government in this State) in an effort to cover up its own shortcomings.

**THE HON. L. D. ELLIOTT** (North-East Metropolitan) [4.36 p.m.]: Before addressing myself to the motion before the Chair I would like to add a few remarks in support of those already made by other members in congratulating Mr. Dolan on his appointment as Leader of the House and Mr. Ron Thompson on his appointment as a Minister of the Crown.

I would also like to say how sorry I am that, because of ill-health, Mr. Willesee was forced to relinquish his portfolio and his position as Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council. No-one appreciates more than I do the kindness shown and assistance given by Mr. Willesee. I was particularly appreciative because I am a new and very green member. I wish him well for the future.

I find myself in a rather difficult position because I must speak to a motion which I neither wholeheartedly support nor oppose. Consequently with reservations I will support the motion.

I wish to speak firstly about consumer protection. People will stand just so much for so long, but when they finally realise they are being exploited they will take action to defend themselves. Just as the working people of Australia found it necessary many years ago to form themselves into unions and seek legislative reforms to protect their rights, so, too, are the consumers now beginning to realise they must marshal themselves into some kind of organisation and seek legislative protection against exploitation.

It is all very well for people to say that no-one is forced to buy anything and that people should carefully examine the price, quality, and so on of commodities before they buy them. The average shopper, particularly the normal housewife who has several small children in tow, has neither the time nor the skill to investigate everything she buys. A person would have to be an expert in nutrition, chemical analysis, motor mechanics, and mathematics—just to mention a few—to understand the ingredients, quality, and pricing of goods, not to mention the psychological implications of advertising.

We have in this State an organisation called the Consumer Action Movement which is very fortunate in having as its Secretary an energetic person who devotes a great deal of her time, in an honorary way, to fighting for consumer rights and endeavouring to educate people on their