

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are joking.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not know why Mr Wordsworth should say that, because a worker cannot remain on compensation unless he has medical evidence to support his incapacity.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know the Act better than that.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Slam the workers.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Tell me of any insurance company that will pay compensation without a medical certificate?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are not slamming the workers. Mr Cooley is saying we are slamming the doctors. Why don't you two make up your minds?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The facts of the matter are that no worker can obtain workers' compensation unless he has medical evidence to support his claim. Employers are not so benevolent that a worker can go to them and say, "I think I am suffering from an injury; will you pay me compensation?" If there is any suspicion abroad it would have to be levelled at the members of the medical profession and not the workers.

The Minister has plucked two nebulous figures out of the air. I gave one figure to Mr Wordsworth that related to the building industry in 1971. By way of interjection I said that the premiums in the building industry increased by 75c a week for each worker. Mr Wordsworth has said he has to pay his shearers \$7 a week extra to insure his shearers so that they may be granted a full makeup pay. This is used as a general guide; that is, to make the statement that there has been an increase from 75c to \$7 a week; but that is not a fact. There are many workers who are covered by workers' compensation who never make any claims. The examples I can cite are those who work under the clerical workers' award and many other nonmanual workers who are employed in other industries. There is only a light load imposed on employers so far as those workers are concerned.

In any case, the Premiums Committee is established under the Workers' Compensation Act and this committee sets the premium rates. From my understanding of the Premiums Committee there is always a 30 per cent profit margin between the premiums and the claims that are made from time to time, and the premiums are adjusted accordingly. So whilst there may be a great caterwauling among employers about the increase in compensation payments, this increase has only been felt in some areas. We never hear of the enormous profits that are made by insurance companies. Only a few workers have been paid as a consequence of the Kezich decision. I think I am right in saying that case is almost unique in character.

In fact, I do not think the insurance companies are paying on that decision at present. They refuse to pay on such a determination.

So to make these statements about the work force is quite misleading, especially when the Minister tries to denigrate the work force.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not denigrate the work force; I did not even mention it.

Clause, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—13

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcall
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. V. J. Ferry
Hon. M. McAleer	(Teller)

#### Noes—8

Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. Lyla Elliott
	(Teller)

#### Pair

#### Aye

#### No

Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. D. K. Dans
----------------------	-----------------

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 21st October, 1975

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

### QUESTIONS (9): ON NOTICE

1.

#### HEALTH

##### Arteriosclerosis: Treatment

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

What is the present position regarding introduction of the Dr Moeller treatment for arteriosclerosis?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Computer-controlled equipment for the accurate measurement of muscle blood flow has now been installed in the investigating laboratories at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. This equipment will enable the research

team investigating the value of the machine acquired by the Government from Dr Moeller to determine whether significant changes in muscle blood flow can be produced by its use in patients with peripheral arteriosclerosis.

## 2. MOTOR VEHICLES

### *Annual Inspection: Legislation*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Traffic:

When is it anticipated legislation relating to annual inspection of motor vehicles will be brought into force?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

It is not proposed to bring this legislation into force at present.

## 3. HEALTH

### *Bolgart: Nursing Post*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the desperate need for a Silver Chain nursing post at Bolgart?
- (2) What steps are being taken by the Government to establish a nursing post at Bolgart to service that district?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) A request for a nursing post at Bolgart has been received by the Silver Chain.
- (2) The need for such a centre is being investigated.

## 4. GAMBLING ROYAL COMMISSION

### *Report*

Mr MOILER, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he studied the report of the Royal Commission into Gambling, 1974?
- (2) Has he studied that portion of the report in which the commissioners recommend that football pools on Australian and United

Kingdom soccer matches should be allowed to be conducted in this State in conjunction with such other States as agree to join the pool scheme?

- (3) (a) What is his policy in respect of the commissioners' recommendations;
- (b) if not in favour of the recommendations on what information does he base the policy?
- (4) Does he propose to take any action in accordance with the recommendations made by the commissioners?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) and (4) The matter is still under consideration.

## 5. HOUSING

### *Northam, York, and Beverley*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In relation to my question of Thursday, 4th September wherein the Minister informed me priorities for building construction in country areas have yet to be determined, would he advise if a decision has been arrived at and, if so, would he detail the number of State Housing Commission homes to be constructed in Northam, York and Beverley this current financial year?
- (2) If so, when will tenders be called and where specifically in the centres mentioned will the houses be constructed?
- (3) Has the State Housing Commission made any submissions to the Public Health Department to purchase land vested with the Health Department in Robinson Street, Northam?
- (4) If so, what is the current situation?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2):—

Town	1975/76 Programme	Anticipated tender date	Proposed location of units
Beverley	Nil	....	....
Northam	1 house—4 Br 4 Town Houses —2 Br	Feb 76 Feb 76	Lot 120 Inkpen Rd. Lot 302 Charles & Burnside Sts. (Subject to suitability of site)
York	1 house—3 Br 2 Dup Units— 2 Br	Oct 75 Apr 76	Lot 28 Pelham St. Land to be acquired

- (3) Negotiations to acquire Crown Reserve 25130 (Hospital Site) Robinson Street, Northam, have been made to the Public Works Department and the Department of Lands and Surveys.
- (4) Recent advice from the Department of Lands and Surveys indicated that the Medical Department requires the subject land to be retained for future hospital requirements.

#### 6. YORK HIGH SCHOOL *Sports Ground*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

What is holding up the upgrading operations of the York Junior High School sporting oval, having regard that expenditure was approved in October 1974 and that RED scheme funds would also be utilised if necessary?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The Public Works Department has been requested to proceed with the proposed oval up-grading forthwith.

#### 7. POLICE STATION *Rockingham*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) (a) How many shifts are operated over a 24-hour period at the Rockingham police station;
- (b) how many policemen are rostered for each shift?
- (2) (a) What is the area of control for the Rockingham police station;
- (b) what is the number of square miles in the area;
- (c) what is the number of people resident in the area of control?
- (3) (a) How do the numbers of police, supplied for each shift, compare with the numbers supplied for other areas of a similar nature within the State?
- (b) what are the areas used as a comparison for the answer to (3) (a)?

Mr O'Neill (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

- (1) (a) Six.
- (b) Varies from 4 on varied day shifts to 1 on night shift. After 10 p.m. a constable from Rockingham combines with a constable from Kwinana on joint patrol of both areas to 6 a.m.

- (2) (a) Area of control extends 3 miles north of Rockingham 10 miles south and 13 miles east encompassing localities of Rockingham, Warnbro, Walkiki, Safety Bay, Baldivis, Garden Island and Penguin Island.
- (b) 71 square miles.
- (c) 20 674 estimated to 31/3/75.
- (3) (a) Favourably.
- (b) Wanneroo, Wembley, Scarborough.

#### 8. NORTHAM REGIONAL HOSPITAL *Permanent Care Centre*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Further to my question of 27th August, 1975 re the permanent care centre, Northam, has a decision been determined to extend or construct additional permanent care centres in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, will Northam's permanent care centre be extended?
- (3) If "No" will the Minister state reasons why?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) The building is not suitable for extension as a permanent care unit.

#### 9. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE *District Offices*

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Could he provide the following—
  - (a) the location of district offices of the Department of Agriculture in cereal and sheep areas;
  - (b) the services provided from each office;
  - (c) the area in hectares handled by each officer in the following disciplines—advisory (cereal and sheep); soil conservation; veterinary practice; stock inspection;
  - (d) the ratio of farmers to departmental officers of the four disciplines mentioned in (c) working from the offices listed in (b)?
- (2) Is the Minister aware of the potential soil erosion and salt problems in the Roe electorate and does he not feel the need for better location of soils advisory and technical staff in the area?

- (3) (a) Is it his intention to locate veterinary practitioners at Lake Grace and/or Jerramungup in the near future;

(b) if not, why not?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) Geraldton,  
Three Springs,  
Moora,  
Northam,  
Merredin,  
Narrogin,

Katanning,  
Bridgetown,  
Albany,  
Lake Grace,  
Jerramungup,  
Esperance.

- (b) Advisory (Crops, pastures, animal production) Soil Conservation (Advisory and Technical) Veterinary, Stock inspection.

(c):—

District Office	Advisory (general)	Soil Conservation Advisory	Technical	Veterinary	Stock Inspection
Area handled by each officer (hectares)					
Geraldton ....	1 365 108	3 451 142	3 451 142	1 091 462	1 091 462
Three Springs ....	1 650 972	....	....	1 929 433	1 929 433
Moora ....	952 373	2 843 737	947 912	2 037 467	1 018 733
Northam ....	778 750	1 557 500	519 166	652 054	1 304 109
Merredin ....	3 387 373	3 387 373	1 129 124	3 640 764	3 640 764
Narrogin ....	99 689	970 170	727 628	1 655 120	1 655 120
Katanning ....	711 390	1 300 481	866 988	2 364 282	1 182 141
Bridgetown ....	1 025 889	....	....	316 927	316 927
Albany ....	460 169	....	....	849 478	306 779
Lake Grace ....	742 214	....	....	....	....
Jerramungup ....	379 862	....	....	....	778 619
Esperance ....	1 565 515	4 682 915	2 341 420	2 348 272	2 348 272

(d):—

Number of rural holdings per officer

Geraldton ....	480	1 192	1 192	373	373
Three Springs ....	665	....	....	761	761
Moora ....	676	1 787	596	1 249	624
Northam ....	766	1 533	511	682	1 365
Merredin ....	1 534	1 534	511	1 702	1 702
Narrogin ....	792	755	566	1 299	1 299
Katanning ....	577	921	614	1 206	603
Bridgetown ....	3 230	....	....	729	729
Albany ....	912	....	....	1 192	608
Lake Grace ....	412	....	....	....	....
Jerramungup ....	359	....	....	....	569
Esperance ....	231	692	346	346	346

Note: The answer to question (1) (c) and (d) includes all shires in agricultural areas considered relevant. In some cases these shires include pastoral areas and these holdings have been included in the figures (e.g. note the large area in the Esperance figure attributable to the Dundas Shire).

The responsibility of officers in some centres extends into shires which are wholly pastoral. These areas have not been included in the tables above (e.g. Esperance, Merredin and Geraldton).

General advisers of the wheat and sheep division are located at all the offices listed. Some small offices do not have resident soil conservation advisers or veterinary officers and these districts are serviced from neighbouring

centres. The boundaries for these specialist services do not therefore always coincide with the boundaries of the advisory districts listed. In essence for soil conservation purposes, Three Springs is serviced from Geraldton and Moora, Lake Grace from Narrogin, and Bridgetown, Albany and Jerramungup from Katanning. For veterinary purposes, Lake Grace is serviced from Narrogin and Jerramungup from Albany. In the table, data for Three Springs, Bridgetown, Albany, Lake Grace and Jerramungup are incorporated in the data for the centre which services the district.

- (2) I am aware of the potential soil erosion and salt problems in this area, but the present allocation of staff is adequate to meet these needs.

(3) (a) No.

(b) Because of the lower number of livestock in these two areas relative to many other districts and the very low incidence of some diseases such as brucellosis, tuberculosis and footrot it has been considered that the services of available veterinary staff can be utilised more completely and more efficiently at District Offices at which they are currently stationed. This matter is kept under review.

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### CONSUMER PURCHASE TAX

#### *Legal Opinion*

Sir CHARLES COURT (Treasurer): I have the balance of an answer to a question I answered partially for the member for Kalgoorlie on Tuesday last. The member asked about an opinion from Professor Geoffrey Sawer of the Australian National University. I replied at the time that a check was being made of the relevant files and that I should be in a better position to answer the question later. I went on to say it was not normal to make available opinions of this kind. This is the follow up answer—

I refer to the answer given to question 4 on Tuesday, the 14th October, 1975.

A copy of Professor Geoffrey Sawer's 7th April, 1971, opinion has been found.

I understand the member obtained the opinion when he was Treasurer and knows its content.

The opinion would now have to be read in the light of subsequent High Court decisions; for example, the Tasmanian tobacco case.

I am not prepared to make the opinion public, but if the honourable member wishes to see it privately to refresh his memory on its content, I am prepared to so arrange.

## CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and read a first time.

## BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL

### *Second Reading*

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [4.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is the first of the measures foreshadowed when introducing the Budget and it is for the purpose of raising additional funds for essential Government services.

The licensing scheme of persons engaged in the business of selling tobacco contained in the Bill now before the House, is based on the legislation operating in Victoria and South Australia. The Government of New South Wales will be introducing a similar measure this financial year.

The persons to be licensed are those engaged in wholesaling and retailing tobacco, which is defined in the Bill.

The provisions also cover machines vending tobacco and are to bind the Crown to cover establishments selling tobacco on land held or vested in the Crown or its instrumentalities.

In respect of wholesalers' licenses, these must be held on and from the 28th February, 1976, in order for wholesalers to be legitimately carrying on the business of wholesaling tobacco. After that date it will be an offence to wholesale tobacco without a license issued under the proposed law.

The wholesaler is to be required to apply for the license before the 28th February, 1976, and will be required to pay a fee of \$100 plus 10 per cent of the value of the sales he effected between the 1st December, 1974, and the 30th November, 1975. The license will be for a period of 12 months and the fee is payable in advance of the issue of the license. The license is to be renewed each year.

The value to be used for calculating the license fee for succeeding years will not include any amount paid in respect of license fees in previous years.

It is proposed that the license fee be paid in six equal instalments spread evenly over the 12-month licensing period. The first bi-monthly payment is to be made in advance of the issue of the license.

The Bill contains a provision authorising the commissioner to receive the license fee in instalments.

In order to meet the license fees, an increase in the price of tobacco will be required. It is expected that this will be effected about mid-December.

Members will note that the commencing date proposed in this Bill is to be the 28th February, 1976, instead of the 1st January, as originally proposed. This alteration has been made to meet the request of wholesalers for bi-monthly payments instead of monthly payments and to allow time for a determination to be

made by the Prices Justification Tribunal, as well as to give time to wholesalers to apply the necessary price increase.

The license fees for future years will be based on a formula similar to that described, with the calculation being made on the value of sales made for the year ending the 30th day of November last past.

For constitutional reasons, the calculation of the fee will be confined to the value of sales within Western Australia. Sales for delivery and consumption outside the State are specifically excluded. Also, in order to ensure that the fee is not doubled in certain cases, sales between licensed wholesalers are specifically excluded.

To cover this situation in the second year of licensing, a special provision has been placed in the Bill.

So far as retailers are concerned, they too will be required to apply for their initial annual licenses. This they must do before the 1st July, 1976.

The fee for this license will be \$10 plus 10 per cent of the value of intrastate sales of tobacco between the 1st April, 1975, and the 31st March, 1976. However, the calculation of the fee will exclude the value of tobacco purchased from licensed wholesalers.

As the great majority of retailers obtain their supplies from wholesalers, the greatest number of fees collected will not exceed \$10 each. License fees for retailers will be renewed annually and a similar formula will apply each year.

Members will see from the Bill that the licensing of retailers will not take place until four months after the wholesalers have been licensed. This is to enable the administration to prepare for the license issues, as while there are only a few wholesalers, there is a relatively large number of retailers. The delay also has the advantage that the retailers will know the status of their purchases by the time they need to apply for licenses.

This difference in commencing dates has appeared in each of the other States' legislation and has worked very well in the introduction of the license system.

Provision is made in the Bill for the situation where a new wholesaler or retailer commences business.

The commissioner is to be empowered to estimate the basis on which the fee is to be calculated and a proportionate fee is to be charged where applicable.

The administration of the proposed Act is to be vested in the Commissioner of State Taxation and the Bill contains the usual provisions for delegation of powers to State Taxation Department officials, inspections, secrecy, and exchange of information with other taxation authorities. The commissioner is to be vested with power to issue and, where lawful instalments are not paid, to revoke licenses.

Where errors are made or incorrect information is provided, the commissioner is to be given power to reassess the fees. He

is also to be empowered to make refunds where the reassessment shows this is warranted.

From time to time transfers of licenses will be necessary; for example, following the sale of a business retailing tobacco. Provision is made for the commissioner to endorse the license accordingly and to charge a small handling fee to cover costs.

The usual provisions for the maintenance of records by licencees and the power of the commissioner to acquire essential information for the purpose of licensing are included in the Bill.

Provision is made for licensees to object to and appeal against the commissioner's assessment of fees.

The regulation-making power covers matters such as records required, licenses, period of application for the licenses, and related matters.

As I stated earlier, this Bill is based on legislation which is operating in other States. We have had the benefit of their experience and, therefore, have been able to prepare legislation which should produce the minimum of difficulties for licensees and the administration. In this connection I should mention that the commissioner has been able to obtain advice from a number of the major wholesalers in this State.

While these gentlemen understandably are not happy about a further cost being imposed on their operations, nevertheless they appreciate the position which has made it necessary for the Government to bring in this revenue-raising measure and I should like to take this opportunity to acknowledge publicly their help and co-operation.

We have budgeted to receive \$3.2 million from this measure in 1975-76 and have estimated that it would yield \$5.5 million in a full year. It will be appreciated that as this is a new system of licensing, we have no previous experience on which to base estimates. These have been made on the best statistical information available.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr J. T. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition).

## FAMILY COURT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR O'NEIL (East Melbourne—Minister for Works) [4.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to set up the Family Court of Western Australia. It will exercise Federal jurisdiction under the Family Law Act, 1975, of the Commonwealth and non-Federal jurisdiction under the various relevant Acts of this State.

In accordance with section 41 of the Commonwealth Family Law Act, 1975, this State has signified to the Commonwealth Government that it wishes to enter into

an agreement for the creation of a State court to be known as a Family Court. The agreement which will follow the passing of the present legislation will be between the Government of Western Australia and the Commonwealth Government, and is the basis for the provision by the Commonwealth of the funds necessary for the establishment and administration of this State's Family Court.

The reasons for the establishment of a State Family Court are—

- (1) To provide within the one court for both Federal and State jurisdiction in relation to matters of family law, thereby going beyond the range of matters which could be entertained in a Commonwealth court. This objective is of great importance to those who will be resorting to such a court, because it overcomes the problems associated with the choice of the proper tribunal. When jurisdiction is divided, unfortunately there is often a problem of demarcation, and this can have serious consequences for parties who choose the wrong forum.
- (2) To enable the State, through its court, to continue to exercise jurisdiction in family law matters, with the opportunity to retain complementary action with other responsibilities in the area of welfare and counselling services of the State Welfare Department. This would allow jurisdiction on all related matters to be carried out under the one jurisdiction.
- (3) In the public interest, to keep the administration of justice as close as possible to the people it is designed to serve.
- (4) To make it unnecessary to establish a further Commonwealth court in this State.

The Commonwealth Attorney-General has indicated that the Family Law Act, 1975, will come into operation throughout Australia on the 5th January, 1976, and it is hoped that the State Family Court will be established and ready to operate by the 1st April, 1976, or shortly thereafter.

On the passing of this Bill, agreement can be finalised between the Commonwealth Government and the Government of Western Australia, after which the necessary accommodation can be acquired and the Family Court set up. The appointment of judges, administrative and office staff must also be arranged in order that the State's Family Court can become operative as soon as possible, the earliest date at this stage being the 1st April, 1976, as mentioned.

During the interim period between the time when the Commonwealth Family Law

Act comes into operation and the commencement of the State legislation and the setting up of the Family Court, the Supreme Court and the Summary Relief Court will exercise the jurisdiction invested under the Family Law Act. It is desirable that the interim period be kept as short as possible in order to minimise the burden of work that will fall on the Supreme Court with the anticipated substantial increase in matrimonial matters.

The Family Court as created will be constituted as provided in this Bill with the jurisdiction of the court exercisable by one judge. The court shall consist of a chairman and such other judges as the Governor may consider necessary to conduct the business of the court. The chairman will be the equivalent in status and salary to a puisne judge of the Supreme Court, and the other judges equivalent to a judge of the District Court. It is a requirement that judges be persons who, by reason of training, experience and personality, are suited to deal with matters of family law, and that they cannot hold office beyond the age of 65 years. It is anticipated that a court consisting of a chairman and three judges will be required in the first instance.

The judges of the Family Court in discharging the duties of their office and the counsel appearing before them shall not wear the usual court robes.

Officers of the court are also appointed by the Governor. They consist of a registrar, marshal, director of counselling and welfare, and such other officers and staff as are necessary for the court's proper functioning. These officers hold office subject to and in accordance with the Public Service Act, 1904.

The jurisdiction of the Family Court, as expressed in the Bill, has, throughout the State, the Federal jurisdiction with which it is invested by the Family Law Act. This requires that it shall have regard to—

- (a) the need to preserve and protect the institution of marriage as the union of man and woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life;
- (b) the need to give the widest possible protection and assistance to the family as the natural and fundamental group unit of our society, particularly while it is responsible for the care and education of children;
- (c) the need to protect the rights of children and to promote their welfare; and
- (d) the means available for assisting parties to a marriage to consider reconciliation or the improvement of their relationship to each other and to the children of the marriage.

Also the court has non-Federal jurisdiction throughout the State in regard to—

- (a) affiliation proceedings and proceedings relating to the maintenance and custody of ex-nuptial children. This jurisdiction is currently exercised by the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Court; and
- (b) adoptions, and guardianship of children. This jurisdiction is currently exercised by the Supreme Court.

Also included in the Bill as a requirement of the Commonwealth Act is provision for a Family Court counselling service. In this regard it is anticipated that, initially, three welfare officers will be sufficient. One of these will be the director of counselling and welfare, an appointed officer of the Family Court who will be responsible for providing assistance to any person seeking counselling facilities.

A further provision contained in this Bill is the exercise of Federal jurisdiction by courts of summary jurisdiction constituted by a stipendiary magistrate only and sitting outside the metropolitan region. These courts of summary jurisdiction also may exercise all the non-Federal jurisdictions of the Family Court of Western Australia except those conferred by or under the Guardianship of Children Act, 1972, and the Adoption of Children Act, 1896.

Part IV of the Bill contains references to appeals. A person aggrieved by a decision of the Family Court in the exercise of Federal jurisdiction may appeal to the Full Court of the Family Court of Australia. In respect of the non-Federal jurisdictions of the Family Court, an appeal may be made to the Full Court of the Supreme Court of Western Australia. From any decision made in a court of summary jurisdiction an appeal may be made to the Family Court of Western Australia.

In part V of the Bill the Governor has a regulation-making power. There are a number of matters which can be the subject of regulations. Included are the practice and procedure of the Family Court and courts of summary jurisdiction, the establishment of registries, places and times of sittings of the courts, attendance of witnesses, manner of service of process, enforcement and execution of judgments and orders of the court, appeal procedures, duties of court officers, powers and functions of court officers, and a number of other matters that will assist in the smooth running of the Family Court and courts of summary jurisdiction.

Western Australian Statutes under which the Family Court will have non-Federal jurisdiction are the Adoption of Children Act, 1896-1973, the Guardianship of Children Act, 1972, the Child Welfare Act, 1947-1972, and the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act, 1947-1972.

Necessary amendments to these Statutes which are all of a machinery or consequential nature, are included in this Bill in the form of the first schedule. In the third schedule the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act is further amended to abolish imprisonment for failure to pay moneys ordered to be paid under the Act. This will bring the non-Federal jurisdiction of the court into line with the Federal jurisdiction of the court.

Although the Bill does not seek to repeal provisions of State law which would appear about to be covered by the new Commonwealth provisions, those State provisions will be superseded by the operation of the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 2 of the Bill permits the various provisions to come into operation on such day or days as is or are fixed by proclamation.

The passing of this legislation will allow the necessary preparations to proceed smoothly to ensure that the Family Court of Western Australia is set up as quickly as possible.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

## BILLS (2): MESSAGES

### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Grain Marketing Bill.
2. Family Court Bill.

## SECURITIES INDUSTRY BILL

### *In Committee*

Resumed from the 16th October. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 1 had been agreed to.

Clause 2: Division into Parts and Divisions—

Mr BERTRAM: When replying to the second reading debate on Thursday last the Minister tabled paper No. 481. Since then he has also been good enough to supply me with answers to sundry questions which I asked a short time ago and to which I made reference during the second reading debate.

I have perused all those papers—there are hundreds of pages involved—but the material in them is really of very little use to me or the Opposition in the Committee stage. It is material which clearly was more appropriate for use and should have been within my knowledge at the second reading stage.

As I have already pointed out, it is the intention of the Government that this Bill



be completely uniform with the legislation of the other participating States. The Opposition can see no point at all in discussing the Bill further in the Committee stage or in wasting the time of the Chamber for the fruitless purpose of proposing amendments, well knowing in advance that they will not be accepted. That would simply be an exercise in futility.

In conclusion, the Opposition wants to place on the record that it strenuously objects to what is happening in respect of this Bill; namely, that the Parliament is acting as a rubber stamp for four people only, who comprise the ministerial council of the four participating States which supervised the establishment of the Corporate Affairs Commission. Of those four Ministers, only one is a Minister of this Parliament, and although he is of course accountable to the Parliament he is not directly accountable to this Chamber. The effect of this rubber-stamping procedure is that the 300 000 people whom we, as members of the Opposition, represent here are for the purposes of this Bill being completely disfranchised. Because of that procedure we raise a very strong objection, but apart from that we can do no more. We therefore do not propose to discuss this Bill further in the Committee stage.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 135 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### **BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

2. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

### **PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

### **COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

**MR BERTRAM** (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.09 p.m.]: This Bill is the product of the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission and, as members will know, this State became a member of that commission on, I think, the 31st May of this year. It was the fourth State to sign the Interstate

Corporate Affairs Agreement. The other States, as one would imagine, are New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria.

As Western Australia has joined the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, steps have been taken to ascertain the differences existing between the Western Australian Companies Act and the Companies Acts of the other three participating States. Having done that, the commission has recommended to the ministerial council the provisions in the Western Australian Act which should be altered to bring them more or less into conformity with the Companies Acts of the other States. The idea has been to have all of the comparable sections of the Companies Acts of the four participating States reading as nearly as possible the same, word for word, and for the comparable sections to bear also the same numbers, and so forth.

I can see no objection at all to that procedure for so long as we have the situation where each State is legislating in respect of companies instead of there being one Federal Act to do the job. I understand even at this stage the Australian Parliament is doing the necessary preparatory work for a Bill for an Australian companies Act. One can really be only amazed that so many years have gone by since companies legislation became so important in Australia—in the last 15 or 20 years—and, while there has been significant liaison between the various States, it should have taken us until 1975 to wake up to the obvious fact; that is, that the Companies Acts should be identical, if possible, bearing in mind that the secretaries of companies very often have to deal with other States, and it is absurd for them to have to study the provisions of the Companies Act of each State.

One can imagine the position of the Registrar of Companies—or the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs, as he is now called—when trying to liaise with his counterparts in the other States, and during every conversation having to have in front of him a tabulated sheet in order to be able to “home” onto the sections they are talking about. It is remarkable that all these years have passed before this step has been taken, but I mention the fact that it did not require a Corporate Affairs Commission to achieve this. It could have been done by liaison in the ordinary way. To my mind, it should have been done very many years ago, and it does not reflect very much credit on this Parliament that the delay has occurred. If anyone suggests the Tonkin Government is partly to blame, I do not think any blame should be placed on it, because its legislative efforts are well recognised. I think the volume of legislation the Tonkin Government brought in by way of Bills constituted a record. It could not have been expected to do everything in three years.

Most of the comments I made in the second reading debate on the Securities Industry Bill last Thursday are applicable to this Bill. Once again we have the position where the four Ministers, making up the council of the Corporate Affairs Commission, have come together, no doubt having before them recommendations from their commission and having to decide which States should amend particular sections and subsections of their Companies Acts in order that there could be conformity.

I ask members to bear in mind that one Minister only represented Western Australia, and the other three Ministers represented the Eastern or central States. Members can imagine how well we fared when the voting took place! We have been told—and I hope it transpires that we were told accurately—that in the main the amendments to bring our legislation into line with the other States are minor ones. There are very many amendments—I notice the Bill is made up of about 150 clauses.

Mr Thompson: There are 164.

Mr BERTRAM: Whilst it may well be that these amendments are of no substance, one wonders about it because we are all aware that even the alteration of a word or two in a section can bring about dramatic results. One can only hope that the alterations are merely administrative ones and nothing of great substance.

It is worth remembering that when our original legislation was prepared—and the various amendments to it which have been approved by the Parliament from time to time—we were aware of the variations between our provisions and those in companies legislation in other States. Notwithstanding that fact, we opted to do our own thing, and to word our legislation accordingly. Therefore, we should not now lightly agree to bring our provisions into line with those of the other States.

If we study the Acts already in existence in the other three participating States and compare them with the Western Australian Act, I believe we will find that we are the ones who will change our law in order to comply with theirs, and not vice versa.

Other provisions are included in the Bill and these have been inserted in the light of recent events and happenings in the company world. Flaws have been found in companies legislation, and these amendments were necessary to improve and strengthen it. To the extent that this amending Bill is following that proposition, naturally the Opposition wholeheartedly agrees with it.

The Minister mentioned one aspect of the measure very briefly, and the Opposition is not greatly impressed with it. He said—

Accordingly, it seems to the Government to be desirable to provide that

the fees may also be altered by regulation rather than only by amending the Act in order to confer the necessary flexibility in timing.

Perhaps I should read the first part of the paragraph. It says—

Members will appreciate that it is implicit in any fee-sharing arrangement that changes in the scales of company fees must hereafter be contemporaneous, at least in respect of the fees liable to apportionment.

The Opposition is not very enthusiastic about that proposition, unless it can be shown very clearly to be necessary. We believe that fees which were included previously as part of the Act should continue to be treated in that way, and should not be prescribed by regulation. That is our view. We believe the excuse given here for the inclusion of this provision is not good enough. By a process of proclamation, the timing of the implementation of the actual date upon which new fees should operate could be made contemporaneously with the other States. It is unnecessary to alter this provision so that in the future fees are fixed by regulation. We are all aware that the fixing of fees by regulation provides Governments with a rather convenient way to increase fees with the minimum of publicity. In other words, the increase is not spotlighted as it would be if the fees were fixed by legislation in the way in which they have been fixed for many years past.

I imagine one of the first things to be done as a result of the passage of this Bill will be that the Companies Act, as amended, will be reprinted. We are considering wholesale amendments, and the whole object of the exercise is to achieve uniformity. Therefore, it is most desirable that the Act should be reprinted as quickly as possible. In these circumstances it seems a little odd that the Companies Act, which is inches thick, has just been reprinted this year! With the passage of the measure before us, it will need to be reprinted again, and this appears to be a needless waste of a considerable sum of money. Of recent times the Government has indicated its concern about unnecessary expense in relation to parliamentary questions, and it does not appear to have been consistent on this matter. However, it is quite obvious that a reprint will be necessary so that the very objective of the measure will be consummated in full.

There are many reasons why legislation of this kind coming from the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission is most objectionable to the Opposition, and it would be objected to by hundreds of thousands of Western Australians if they really knew what was involved. However, in this case I do not see that we will come to any great harm because, as I have already pointed out, this Bill could well have been prepared without any Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, and the objectives of

seeks are well overdue. For that reason the Opposition does not propose to object to the Bill.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.25 p.m.]: I wish to thank the honourable member for his support of the contents of the Bill, if not for his support for the way in which it was brought to this Parliament. In that regard I would like to mention the fact that the Government believes, because of the establishment of the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, this Bill has come here much more quickly than it would have done under any other circumstance.

I do not want particularly to have a shot at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, but I would like to talk a little about some of these ministerial committees which in fact finally come under the control of the Commonwealth Government, irrespective of the complexion of that Government, and become Australian ministerial standing committees. For my part, in the portfolios I have held in the past, I have resisted very strongly any offers from the Commonwealth Government to set up a secretariat to service the Ministers in the various States at their meetings, and finally, have all of those meetings of Ministers chaired by the Commonwealth Minister. We find this in the field of the Australian Agricultural Council, the Australian Mining Council, and so on. It is probably too late to turn back the clock, but I must say that at all times within those portfolios which were my personal responsibility, I have resisted strongly this tendency. One finds, whoever may be in power in Canberra, that the offer of a secretariat, research assistance, accommodation for ministerial meetings, and the like, give far too much power to that Commonwealth central Government. It determines almost entirely what goes on the agenda, the order in which it is placed, and the person in the chair has the capacity to stifle debate in one particular area so that he can move to another which is important to him.

Relating that to the situation which we now have, it is quite significant that between the date Western Australia joined the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, on the 31st March, 1975, and now, we have been able to submit to this House substantial legislation creating uniformity in areas of company law. In this particular case, these amendments are extremely desirable, and they would not have been here so quickly if there were two other States and the Commonwealth involved in the deliberations to bring about this desirable uniformity.

So I must differ from the member for Mt. Hawthorn in this matter. I believe this is quite a significant indication of what can be done in the field of co-operation, particularly in the establishment of

the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission. It may be that in a little while other States, and perhaps even a Commonwealth Government, will be involved in the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission. If that happens then it may be that we will no longer have a Standing Committee of Attorneys-General chaired by the Commonwealth Attorney-General at all times, and that the Ministers of each State will have the opportunity to chair and conduct a meeting.

**Mr T. D. Evans:** You are not correct, you know, in saying that the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General is always chaired by the Commonwealth Attorney-General.

**Mr O'NEIL:** Perhaps not, and the honourable member knows I am not the Minister for Justice. However, in respect of most meetings, the Federal Minister chairs the meeting and he can cancel meetings. To give one example, on three occasions recently we were to have a meeting of the Australian Water Resources Council, and the Federal Minister for Conservation happens to be the Chairman of the Australian Water Resources Council. There has been a little difficulty in Canberra about keeping the same man in the one place; first there was Dr Cass, then Dr Cairns, and now Mr Berinson. A meeting of that council is to be held on Friday, and after two cancellations, I am waiting with bated breath to see whether this meeting is cancelled between now and Thursday when I am supposed to leave for Melbourne.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## **EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

### ***Second Reading***

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

**MR BERTRAM** (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.32 p.m.]: The Minister's speech introducing this Bill appears at page 3174 of *Hansard* of the 7th October, 1975. He explained how the purpose of the Bill was to update sections 73B and 79 of the Evidence Act, 1906. In other words, the Bill will bring those sections into a position where they refer not to the Registrar of Companies or the Assistant or Deputy Registrar of Companies but to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, which is the expression now commonly used in the various Companies Acts of most of the States of Australia. The Minister stated—

The purpose of this Bill is merely to recognise that in some other States as well as in this State the title "Registrar of Companies" has been altered

to "Commissioner of (or for) Corporate Affairs", and that the titles of the assistants and deputies have been similarly altered.

The Minister goes on to mention that in New South Wales the Corporate Affairs Commission is a body corporate and that, too, needs to be kept in mind in any discussion of this Bill.

Although the Minister said, "The purpose of this Bill is merely to recognise that in some other States . . .", when we look at clause 4 of the Bill we see that that is not an accurate statement. Clause 4 refers to section 79 of the principal Act and, as I see it, has nothing to do with the matter of changing the nomenclatures of the chief executive officers of the various companies offices.

Clause 4 provides for the deletion of the words "Australasian Colony" in section 79 (1), yet no reference is made to this intention in the second reading speech. Having deleted those words, the intention is to insert in their place the words "Territory of the Commonwealth".

I find myself wondering at this proposal because, as I see it, it will make the Evidence Act inconsistent within itself and I believe that is undesirable and should be examined before the Bill proceeds into the Committee stage.

A definition of "Australasian Colony" appears at page 3 of the parent Act and it seems to me that, amongst other things, that definition includes New Zealand and such an inclusion would appear to be desirable. If we strike out the words as proposed by clause 4(a) we will excise from section 79 of the Act reference to New Zealand, and that would seem to me to be an unlikely intention on the part of the Government.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that section 79 of the Evidence Act includes the United Kingdom. So, the intention of the parent Act was, and I believe still is, to treat the United Kingdom and New Zealand differently from the way we may treat, for example, Japan, the United States, Canada, or some other country. By deleting the words "Australasian Colony" we will break with that long-standing desire and intention and will remove New Zealand from the provisions of section 79(1).

Without any explanation, that seems to me to be clearly unsatisfactory; it may be that the Government will inadvertently exclude New Zealand. The Opposition would like to know the true position; if we are viewing the position incorrectly, we should like to know the precise, correct way it should be viewed.

As I quickly look through the Evidence Act I see in section 58(1) two references to "Australasian Colony". Section 58(1)(d), and sections 66, 67, and 75 all contain references to "Australasian Colony". So,

members will see that running through the Act is a clear policy of treating New Zealand differently from what, for the purposes of this discussion, I shall call foreign countries generally.

It still may be possible for the Bill to be amended to make the entire Evidence Act consistent, and not excise "Australasian Colony" out of just one section of the Act, leaving it unaltered in others, particularly when it appears to be doing something which we do not want to do. For example, the Attorney-General of New Zealand comes over here from time to time and liaises with and forms part of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. That would indicate a very close liaison and a desire not to treat New Zealand any differently from the way it has been treated under the parent Act since 1906.

There may even be some virtue in amending the definition of "Australasian Colony". Therefore, the Opposition would like to know whether the amendment contained in clause 4(a) is really that which is intended; if it is the intention of the Government, we should like an explanation as to precisely what the Government is aiming at; we would like to be satisfied that New Zealand is not now to be relegated, as it were, and treated as a foreign country so that the flow of documents and so forth from that country will be handled in a manner different from the way it has been handled since 1906.

As I say, if it transpires that clause 4(a) is satisfactory, it may be time now, through this Bill, to amend the other parts of the Evidence Act where this expression "Australasian Colony" appears. Subject to those comments, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.43 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his acceptance of the Bill, and I take the opportunity to apologise for the fact that no reference was made in my second reading speech to the deletion of the expression "Australasian Colony" and the word "Colony" in other parts, and the substitution of other words in place thereof.

However, from my reading of the Bill, it appears that these particular deletions in section 79 of the principal Act are covered by the amendment contained in clause 4(d), where it states—

(3) A reference in subsection (1) or (2) of this section . . .

I should not proceed very much further, Mr Speaker, because you will quite rightly tell me that this is more a matter for the Committee stage of the Bill.

In any case, I am prepared to offer two alternatives to the honourable member. He may be prepared to accept my assurance that I will have the Minister for Justice examine his remarks and provide him with an explanation of the position

at the third reading stage of the Bill; I am quite happy to go along with that.

Alternatively, if the member for Mt. Hawthorn insists on progress being reported on clause 4 I will do precisely the same thing, except the explanation will need to be given in this Chamber at a later date than otherwise would be the case, because I would have to refer these matters to the Minister for Justice. If the honourable member will go some of the way with me we might pass the Committee stage of the Bill, on the undertaking I give that if there is any need for a change to be made I will give an explanation at the third reading stage, and the amendments could be made in another place.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr O'Neill (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

Mr BERTRAM: I note the comments made by the Minister in his reply to the second reading debate, and his intimation that he would comment at the third reading stage on the matters raised by me. I see nothing wrong with that course being adopted, so there is no need to hold up the Committee stage.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from the 15th October.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.49 p.m.]: I desire to avail myself of the opportunity which this measure traditionally presents to make reference to a number of areas, as they affect my electorate and the State generally. The first point about which I would like to make reference is in connection with assistance to migrants, and in specific terms to the mental health of migrants as a consequence of the stresses which they face to a far larger degree than any other segment of the community faces.

It must be remembered that among the 3 250 000 people in Australia who are of migrant extraction, there are something like 60 different sets of cultures, and 60 different backgrounds of environment and upbringing. As a consequence the diversity of problems and pressures those factors give rise to is very considerable and complex, indeed.

The extent to which the problem of mental health and mental stress pertains to migrants is difficult to ascertain, because the nature and the extent of the

problem are largely unknown. Indeed, on the 28th August last I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister for Health relating to the mental health of migrants. I was informed by the Minister representing the Minister for Health that there had been no examination of the problem; that there was a lack of research and a lack of availability of case history studies and results; and that the conclusions reached were generally negative. In that unfortunate situation where we do not even know the nature and extent of the problem, it is very difficult to arrive at solutions.

It is to be remembered that the position in which migrants are placed is far beyond what we can understand properly. There is an experience of situations with which we have not yet been confronted, and probably never will be. The experience of moving to another country under even the most idyllic conditions would be something of a strain. This is assuming that the person is migrating to a country where the people have a similar language, and generally similar customs as, perhaps, is the position in New Zealand.

However, when the move is made in conditions that create stress, and the circumstances of the move as well as the new situation in which the individual is placed are undesirable and unpalatable, the stress factor must increase proportionately. In no way does nationality become involved in this. It is purely a human problem dealing with human beings. It, therefore, is a problem of universal nature.

I could cite many examples. Migrants who come from comparatively densely populated areas of the United Kingdom and other countries will find themselves in no doubt about the existence of the problem. Other migrants can adjust to the circumstances, irrespective of the situations that confront them. When we have regard for the problems of isolation and lack of transport, we find that extensive adjustment is required. Most newcomers to this country placed in this situation feel the problems most acutely. In fact, when they buy a second-hand motor-car as soon as they are in a position to do so, straightaway they are confronted with a new set of problems and circumstances. This might appear to be a relatively trivial matter to most people, but it could be an issue of great import to migrants.

The living conditions in mill towns are generally substandard by metropolitan standards. There is no gainsaying this. These conditions have improved in recent years, but they are still poor. Frequently recreation is lacking. Facilities and opportunities for sport and recreation vary extensively, and with each town. Often the sports and diversions that suit native Australians who have grown up with shooting, fishing, and football, are not available to migrants readily and are not appreciated by them.

I am aware that the language barrier has a tremendous impact and effect on migrants. The language problem compounds those difficulties that would arise anyway; but when there is a language problem the difficulty of communication cannot be overstressed. I refer to communication in the normal operation of day-to-day living, such as shopping, working, and general living which confront migrants.

Of course, in this regard men fare better. They have greater opportunity for contact with other people, and they are out of the home situation far more frequently than the migrant womenfolk. As a consequence the degree of boredom and depression amongst female migrants is proportionately greater.

If we take the simple issue of people dealing with Government departments and business generally, we find that in this respect difficulties are presented even to the native population. Many people, especially those living in the country, are unaware of the avenues that are available through normal channels. This applies to the "old" Australians as well as anybody else; but how much more difficult is this for the migrants? They cannot understand our system of voting. Indeed, this would apply to people other than migrants.

No doubt other parliamentarians have found, as I have found, that they provide a very valuable service to the migrants and other people in their electorates in this matter. I find that a good deal of the work in my electorate comes through providing liaison with Government departments. I am sure other members of this House have shared my own experience.

The complexity of modern government and the changes within the administrative structure are difficult enough for the initiated. How much more difficult are they for those who are inexperienced? Even minor difficulties present an insoluble problem. While physical assistance to overcome problems is possible through the services of members of Parliament and others, there is not a lot that can be done to relieve the anxieties and distress of migrants. The solution of these last-mentioned problems is beyond our scope. Probably we do not even have the training to cope with them. No doubt it would be the same story with others who are operating in the field.

The education system also has deficiencies that perpetuate this entire situation. The migrant child develops under a definite handicap, especially if a language problem is involved. The child has to contend not only with the control of the subject, but also with the language component and problem.

In the examination situation the migrant child is being examined on two counts, and not just the content matter of the examination paper he answers. He is confronted with the disadvantage of

having to do that in a tongue that frequently is not native to him. Some schools do recognise this, and in recent years have made earnest efforts to overcome the problem through the introduction of remedial classes. I pay full recognition to the job that has been and is being done by many teachers who endeavour to alleviate the situation. These steps are not sufficient, and they cannot possibly hope to cope with the extent of the problem with which we as a community are confronted.

I suppose if a comparison is made between a migrant child and an "old" Australian child—we can use those two terms in the broad sense—it will be appreciated readily that the normal expansionary channels of vocabulary, for example, are very limited. The child in a non-English speaking home frequently does not start his expansion of vocabulary until he leaves home. This is in contrast with the home situation of the "old" Australian child who even in the course of the evening meal often hears a new word used, the intention and connotation of which are understood and appreciated. The word then becomes part of that child's vocabulary. This is not so in a home where a language barrier exists and English is not the norm.

There is also the aspect where family conflict is raised. Many migrant women have problems of understanding the development of their children in the new circumstances which they themselves cannot understand or fully appreciate. So, it is not only the migrant child who has a problem of adjustment; the parents of such a child also face this problem. This is getting into the issue, as it exists, in some depth.

Mothers who are migrants probably have less communication with their daughters than is normal in some situations. The children, on their part, feel resentment towards their parents—sometimes mingled with shame—simply because their parents are different. This, again, is largely because of the present situation.

All these circumstances result in the creation of stresses—and very great stresses—on migrants which it is difficult for us to appreciate. While these special stresses and difficulties are manifested I find that the answer the Minister gave to question 9 on the 2nd September, 1975, to be rather ironical. On that occasion the Minister said that the State Mental Health Services do not discriminate against persons. In that reply the Minister implied that migrants have equal opportunity with anybody else to take advantage of the facilities and the services of the department. But that is not the issue. Most of the time the average migrant does not even realise that those services are available, and for the Minister to say that the services are available, without discrimination, is begging the

question and certainly evading the problem to which I have alluded.

The Migrant Issues Committee of the Department for Community Welfare of Western Australia sought information from the Department of Social Security regarding the nature and extent of research, and I am afraid that it received an indication that very little, by way of research, was being done in Western Australia. Figures were being compiled but the research was still in an exploratory stage. An examination has been made in one of the reception homes with a particular group of migrants of a particular nationality and it has been found there is little correlation with the suggestion that stress—mental stress—might be responsible for pressures being placed on migrants who required special consideration and attention. I register the fact that it is most unfortunate that we have this lack of facilities, services, and understanding in this State. It is an issue for which I do not blame any particular State Government. It is the sort of issue which has to be pushed by the community before a Government will act and make funds available in the Budget. As we are discussing the Budget it is appropriate to refer to this matter because Governments will provide budgetary funds only where community pressures demand that they be spent.

Although many migrant people have special problems no special assistance is available to them. I would also point out that the number of people in this special category is unknown. There are at least a dozen within my own personal knowledge. Visiting health services have been conducted in Geraldton and Kalgoorlie on a fortnightly basis, and I believe that service is to be expanded into a doubly expert field—the field of migrant problems as they apply to mental stress. Research into this particular problem needs to be intensified and stepped up, and an extension of the services should be made available. The State Government must buy in eventually and make funds available. It must also press the Commonwealth Government to do likewise.

While speaking about economic needs, I will reflect on the inadequacy of the present Government in its economic policy. It is probably appropriate to make reference to the frightening consequences which are liable to follow if the Federal counterpart of this State Government continues with its folly. The actions of the Federal Opposition, which this great State Government condones, will further disadvantage Western Australia if they are allowed to proceed. The Premier should make immediate advances to his Federal counterparts in an effort to gain some sanity and sense. The Federal Opposition is blaming the performance of the existing Commonwealth Government for forcing a double dissolution. To say the least the Federal Opposition is acting in a most reprehensible and irresponsible manner.

I would point out that after 23 years of stagnation by the previous Commonwealth Government it is only to be understood that there would be radical and drastic changes. I would like to read portion of a letter which appeared in the Press recently. It is from a mother of four in your own electorate, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Blaikie), and it states most succinctly some of the issues which completely refute the attitude adopted by the Federal Opposition. There are four points I would like to extract from the letter. The opening remarks are, indeed, enlightening and read—

The Liberal-Country Party's lust for power is both sad and frightening—and the inability to take defeat honourably is repugnant.

Mr Rushton: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr H. D. EVANS: What she says is repugnant in the national sense.

Mr Rushton: You know that the Whitlam Government tried to wreck the Constitution.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I will discuss that later, when we look at the excuses that have been put forward, the justification for, and the basic principles involved in this issue. To continue with the letter which appeared in the Press, this mother wrote—

As a mother of four young children, I can thank the Australian Government for many things.

No longer do I fear my boys growing up to be conscripted to war, to kill and perhaps be killed.

No longer do I have to worry whether I will be able to afford to send my children to university. All tertiary institutions are now free for all adults and children.

No longer do I have to worry on my own. Free legal advice and assistance are available to me.

No longer do I have to worry about the cost of health care for my children. It is free.

No longer do I have to bear the full financial responsibility of looking after my sick parent at home. Home help and a home subsidy are available.

Pensions have increased rapidly and are a greater percentage of the average national wage than they were.

Mr Rushton: Inflation has, too.

Mr H. D. EVANS: To continue—

More houses and cheaper land are available for low-income earners.

I will not press your tolerance, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Blaikie), by reading the letter further, but it clears the record of the Whitlam Government.

Mr Grewar: What record?

Mr Mensaros: Why not call for an election?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Members opposite do not like what I am saying. During the last 23 years education has been the greatest single issue in this community—in this nation—because it is as a result of education that not only does an individual arrive at fulfilment, but also he is able to make his greatest contribution to the nation as a whole. As Japan found out, it is the greatest single investment of the money of any nation.

The problem has been with us for 23 years and it is only now that sufficient funds have been made available to the States. That has been the work, in a very short time, of the first Labor Government in 23 years. Members opposite do not like what I am saying. I again say to them that if the Federal Opposition proceeds on its course, and if we reach the stage where supply is denied, the consequences will be chaotic.

Mr Rushton: Why?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Civil servants and pensioners will not receive payment—

Mr Rushton: Why not?

Mr H. D. EVANS: —if supply is denied. I imagine that even the Minister for Local Government would understand why not. Payments to holders of public contracts, and small businessmen, will be held up. Many of those contractors will be depending for their existence and survival on payments from the Government. Students, at all levels, will find that they will have reduced allowances, or no allowances at all. Members of the defence forces will be similarly positioned. The Air Force will be grounded, and our naval ships will be tied up at ports. That is the sort of situation which the Commonwealth Opposition, in desperation, is trying to force on the nation.

If we come back to basics, the principle of democratic government, and a system which we must maintain, is that rule is by the majority. The Senate, which has never accepted the responsibility of blocking a money Bill previously, is not a representative House.

Several members interjected.

Mr H. D. EVANS: When the size of Tasmania and its population is compared with the population and size of New South Wales and Victoria, the Senate can hardly be said to be a representative body. The Senate is not a proper democratically-elected House.

Mr Clarke: Are the House of Representatives members from Tasmania not properly elected?

Mr H. D. EVANS: When Fraser can pull them out at his whim it cannot be said to be a State House.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The member for Warren will continue.

Mr H. D. EVANS: When regard is paid to the record of the Opposition—and it can scream and shout about Gair—what does it show? Look at the record book as it stands. When Senator Prowse retired the Tonkin Government had no hesitation; it immediately cleared the situation by appointing a Country Party senator to take his place. However, that was not so in New South Wales and it was not so in Queensland—I cite Bunton and Field. Legitimate members did not take up positions in the Senate—political impostors did. There can be no justification for what occurred and it indicates desperation on the part of the Federal Opposition in its attempt to gain the Treasury bench.

"Reprehensible" and "irresponsible" were the two adjectives I used.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Give it to them; they do not like the truth over there.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I would like to continue but I have several other points to make. I know the Acting Speaker is interested in what I am saying but I will get back to the record of this Government. I will touch only briefly on this matter in order to serve notice of what to expect when we get to the items.

Firstly, I will refer to the needs of the beef farmers and nobody would appreciate the plight of the beef farmers in Western Australia better than you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Blaikie), unless it is myself because of our areas. The minimum beef price scheme which was implemented was to show, if not do anything else, that the Government was aware of the situation and that some windowdressing had to be done. It did that, if nothing more. However, there is still the question of survival for many producers, and it is on this account that we had to introduce a minimum price scheme without any regard to the cost of production. The cost of production may have been looked at, but it was not recorded.

The essential requirement of the beef producers is cheap finance, and that is urgently needed. The interest rates now paid to stock firms and hire-purchase companies are crippling.

Under the beef finance scheme an amount of money was allocated by the Commonwealth Government. It was \$800 000, and a similar amount was allocated by the State. Of that amount, \$595 000 has been expended and allocated to an approved 113 applicants. A total of 140 applications were rejected, and nine were deferred. That is not a very happy situation for the farmers.

The conditions of the persons who are eligible to claim under that scheme have to be reduced to the situation where their chances of survival are very slight indeed. It is necessary to finance those people if they are to be given any chance of survival. The only way to do that is to



subsidise the rate of interest they are paying. A sum of \$1 million spent subsidising interest rates on loans raised through the traditional sources would be equal to an amount of \$20 million. A capital investment equal to \$20 million would be possible at a cost of \$1 million to the Government.

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

Mr H. D. EVANS: Before the tea suspension I made reference to the situation confronting the beef producers of the south-west. I pointed out the extent to which the beef finance scheme had been effective and the limitations that it imposed upon the applicants; and the very few who could claim eligibility and financial assistance. It was at that juncture I suggested that the most effective way to give aid to beef producers would be through cheap finance and subsidised interest rates.

If this could be done it would certainly help the beef producers who with assistance at this stage—and without having to wait until they are brought to their knees—would be able to survive the present crisis and continue as a viable operation.

There is no record of the Government having examined this particular line of financial assistance, and I feel it is appropriate the Government should do this while the Budget is before the House.

On the subject of financial policies in regard to rural industries, the question of dairy finance cannot be overlooked. There has been again, on the part of members opposite, some stringent criticism of and some lamentations against the Commonwealth Government when the funds made available for the Australian dairy industry adjustment programme terminated—the funds had been used up before the two years of operation of the scheme ended. As has been mentioned in this place, some \$28 million had been allocated over a period of two years to assist the adjustment in the dairy industry.

At this stage these funds have cut out. The allocation to Western Australia has been used and I believe a proportional allocation to existing applicants is in progress. The parties feel these funds were to be used firstly for the broadening of the present marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme and for interest-free loans to help suppliers change over to refrigerated milk, including the tank and the required roadways that may have to be involved in such a changeover. The other point was the relocation of assistance to displaced dairy farmers who were unable to adjust for any one of a number of reasons.

Finance also is to be made available for land purchase at 6 per cent; the interest rate varies with the purpose to which the particular land is to be put, but it is a concessional rate of finance; and in the case of purchasing a refrigerated tank the finance carried no interest rating at all.

Regrettably at this time when the dairy industry is in the process of readjustment, these funds have cut out. It is unfortunate, because funding is going to be an important part of selected dairy farmers taking up the proposed issue of market-milk quotas which is to commence next year.

Without the concessional finance, many of them will not be in a position to do this, and this is most regrettable. Some of the dairy farmers will be lost to the State and their contribution to the industry which would assist to offset the adverse balance of intrastate trade will not be available to overcome this problem.

It is all very well to point to the Commonwealth Government and cry "Shame" when the finances cut out; or to make other cries of frustration and desperation, but I feel that as a State Government there is a requirement for it to take the initiative and show a sense of responsibility and do some funding with our own State resources.

If it is desirable, and if it is a viable proposition industry-wise, to finance a dairy adjustment programme from one source—that is, from the Commonwealth—then surely it is defensible and justifiable on the same ground to see State funds used for this purpose.

There is no reason that this should not be the case; and instead of the Government crying poverty and making no effort whatever, it should take the initiative in this matter, because it is at this time that the total adjustment of the dairy industry will be carried out.

This Government has lost a number of opportunities in so many fields of rural industry, and this is one it should not lose.

Fortuitously during the tea break I opened my subscription copy of the *Farmers' Weekly* and it reiterated the point I was making when I commenced speaking; that was in connection with the rejection of the proposed Federal Budget. It is even more significant because it is a warning given by the president of an Australia-wide farming organisation which speaks for 160 000 dairy farmers in Australia.

The President of the Australian Dairy Farmers' Federation (Mr Noel Hogan) had quite a lot to say. He reiterates the opinion I expressed earlier which is to the effect—and we must appreciate, of course, that Mr Hogan is a farm leader—that there must be a stage of serious mismanagement when any Government is dismissed; but not at the price of breaking a precedent and destroying the democratic basis upon which our system of government is founded. Instead of retaining the sacred principle of a three-year tenure for Governments which we have, an endeavour is being made to reduce that to an

18-month tenure; and if the present proposal foreshadowed by the Federal Opposition bears fruit in the manner in which the Federal Opposition intends that it should then, effectively, Australia would be reduced to a six-month Government tenure, together with everything it entails.

It would mean, of course, that no Government could possibly introduce unpleasant policies without a threat of an election hanging over its head in that way. It would mean that there would be innocuous and tame cat Governments, because every Government in the course of its term must introduce policies which are not acceptable to the bulk of the electors and if the situation is such that measures of this kind must be taken under the threat of an election being called by a hostile Senate, the very structure and basis of democratic government—indeed the very fabric of democratic rule by the majority—will be virtually at an end. The consequence of this in Australia is so far reaching that it is frightening to dwell upon.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr H. D. EVANS: Here we have the leader of the largest farmer organisation, representing 160 000 dairy farmers, coming out in exactly the same terms as the Opposition in Western Australia has done.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It was interesting to note that on the same front page—and I was quite surprised to see this in print—the Leader of the Federal Country Party has come out and castigated the Commonwealth Government for its failure to act on the AIC beef plan, claiming that the beef industry has been virtually annihilated, and several of his statements include such expressions as the “signing of the death warrant of the beef industry”. Apart from Mr Anthony, Mr Sinclair has also come out in strong terms about this. But when pressed to indicate whether they would implement the terms of the AIC report—oh no, they would not commit themselves.

This occurred prior to the last Federal election. They were asked whether they would restore the concessions of the 1973 Budget, and again they would not accept the challenge to do so.

While on the one hand Mr Anthony and Mr Sinclair castigated in the strongest possible terms the Government that has the AIC report before it, they are not prepared to bring in and implement the recommendations the report contains, the same as Mr Fraser.

There are several further matters that should be raised in the course of this debate but they can be more properly left until the Committee stage when the items are taken. It is on that note that I put these matters before the House.

MR CRANE (Moore) [7.43 p.m.]: I too would like to take this opportunity to speak when I may bring forward to this House some of the matters which cause me concern in my electorate.

Firstly, I would say that I am very thankful our State Government has considered making available a subsidy for swimming pools in country areas, because this is one matter which has been causing some concern. People have been writing to me on this matter—and indeed I have written to the Premier about it—because they feel that amenities in country areas are an absolute necessity; they are a must.

We talk of decentralisation, and it is these amenities which make life in the country areas more acceptable for the people who must live there, particularly if this country is to continue to prosper and to provide the balance of payments so necessary to enable the vast majority of people in the urban areas to enjoy their way of life.

As usual, many of the problems which face us in the rural areas are problems which cannot be solved by our State Government. This is unfortunate, and I believe it is indicative of how power should be returned to the people so that we may have some say in matters which affect our daily life.

Every week I receive letters from people—mainly from mothers—who are desperately concerned at the increased cost burden of living in the country. Their main concern relates to telephone charges and postal rates.

These are matters that we have all brought to the notice of our Federal Government and yet it has never acted in relation to them.

Mr Skidmore: Did you bring it to your Federal member's notice?

Mr CRANE: I have written to my Federal member in the House of Representatives, and to my senator; I have also written to the senators of the Opposition party, but all I ever receive by way of reply is that it is being brought to the attention of the Government. However, nothing seems to be done about the matter.

Only today I received another letter in this regard. These costs are a tremendous burden on country people and, coupled with the added burden of transport costs, make our life a little more difficult than it ought to be. I am sure that we should have a separate department in the State Government concerning itself only with decentralisation so that it does not become only a word but can be dealt with by that department; and perhaps more pressure would then be brought to bear on the Federal Government to right these matters.

Speaking of decentralisation, we find in our State Government that we have conflicts of interest. I would refer to the Main Roads Department and our local shires.

I received representation from one of my local shires only recently; to keep its plant operating and its men employed the shire was seeking permission to do work which normally is done by the Main Roads Department. But here we come up against a conflict of interest. We find the Main Roads Department is itself endeavouring to keep its big organisation going; and one has only to go down to the building occupied by that department to realise just how big and centralised the organisation has become. I bring this matter to the attention of the House because it concerns me. I believe that in the interests of decentralisation much of this road-making work could be done by local shires. They have the ability to perform the work to the same standard as the Main Roads Department, and we should give this matter our earnest attention.

I would mention now the Moora Hospital. It is overcrowded. I hope that the representations for additional buildings will bear fruit and that we will soon have a better hospital to cater for the needs of this growing area. The area to the west of Moora—that is, the Jurien Bay area—is growing tremendously.

This brings me to another problem concerning a police station and courthouse for Jurien Bay. As all members know there is a mining interest in the Jurien Bay area now. About 50 houses were built last year and the school which was newly built last year with two classrooms is now bursting at the seams, and the two demountables which I was fortunate enough to persuade the Education Department to leave there are also bursting at the seams.

The matter of the police station is of great concern to us all. The police are understaffed and do not have adequate housing facilities. Their office is a very dingy building indeed. I noticed that the priority for a police station at Jurien Bay was such that it was number eight on the list in the Estimates for 1974-75. It has not yet been built, and I am sure the Government will take note of my comments and build a police station and courthouse at Jurien Bay early in this financial year.

Mr McIver: You are not serious.

Mr CRANE: I must be serious; I am ever hopeful.

I would like to mention the Road Traffic Authority. I am a little concerned about this authority. I have received some complaints in respect of it, and I wonder how much of a monster we may have created.

Mr T. H. Jones: You can say that again.

Mr CRANE: I believe country people have been let down a little in this regard.

Mr T. H. Jones: Why didn't you support us when the Bill was before the House?

Mr CRANE: I am sure some of the expenses being incurred by the Road Traffic Authority are not necessary. Only last weekend when I returned home to my farm I received a letter from the authority asking me to fill out all the relevant information in respect of a concession license for my truck. When the licensing was handled by the shire, this was not necessary; the shire with its usual competence and efficiency undertook to do this work with a minimum of fuss.

I just hope that the big white form I have in my hand marked MR21 will not be posted to me each year at a cost of 18c for postage, plus further cost for stationery. The form contains questions related to the size of my property. It also asks for my address. I should have thought the authority knew my address in view of the fact that it sent me a letter. The form also asks what area of my farm is under cultivation and grazing. I do not know what that has to do with the concession for my truck. I know I am a bona fide farmer, and I think this is an added burden and cost which we can ill-afford. I bring the matter to the notice of the House.

Whilst speaking on the Road Traffic Authority, I mention that I have been told the authority is holding a drive in country areas to raise revenue. I do not know whether this is in order to make it pay for itself; I understand it is not. However, one of the matters which concerns me is the way in which the officers of the authority seem to park their radar-equipped vehicles very close to a town, and not far inside the 110 km/h sign, so that unless one brakes vigorously one will be trapped for speeding. Normally when a person drives he does not put his foot on the brake pedal in such a case but allows the car to slow down of its own accord. I believe it is the first sign of a bad driver to use the brakes in that way, and it leads only to worn out tyres.

I suggest that we should consider seriously that on the approaches to major country towns the speed limit should be broken down in stages from 110 km/h to 80 km/h, and then down to 60 km/h. I believe that makes common sense. I mention this matter because I know some people who have been fined \$50 in this manner, and these people are not speedsters at all; they just have not slowed down quickly enough. The laws and regulations which we make must be good laws if we expect people to obey them. There is one problem related to the country town of Ballidu which concerns me. Some years ago the citizens of Ballidu felt their children should be educated in the use of crosswalks. For this reason the Shire of Wongan-Ballidu painted a crosswalk on the road at Ballidu. Unfortunately it was told later by the Main Roads Department that the population was not large

enough to warrant a crosswalk and, therefore, it had to be removed.

The children now do not have an opportunity to learn what a crosswalk is all about. When they come to the metropolitan area I suppose they learn fairly quickly, but sometimes very sadly.

There is another matter which concerns me greatly, and leads me to ask whether the Ministers themselves always have control of their departments or whether they are merely rubber stamps for a bureaucracy which at times tends to be dictatorial. The matter in question concerns the speed limits on the road between Pithara and Perenjori. I have written to the appropriate authority many times in respect of the 70 km/h speed limit through the town of Pithara. This is a built-up town which is situated on an "S" bend, and the local CWA is very concerned about the speed limit and hoped it would be reduced to 60 km/h. But that was not to be; the limit of 70 km/h was considered to be safe.

However, if one cares to travel a little further north past Dalwallinu one comes to the little wheat siding of Buntine, which consists of a few buildings and a wheat bin. We find the speed limit for that little country town is 60 km/h. The town is nowhere near as large as Pithara, but I suppose that is in order. Then if one goes a little further along the road to Maya, where there is only a Co-operative Bulk Handling wheat bin, one finds the speed limit there is also 60 km/h.

Mr McIver: What happened to the store?

Mr CRANE: I think it is just a little further on; but sometimes if one is travelling at much more than 60 km/h one does not see it very plainly. The point I make is this: Why is there such a difference? Why is a speed limit of 70 km/h considered to be safe at Pithara, while at these other places which have very little in the way of buildings there is a speed limit of 60 km/h?

This brings me back to the point that when we make laws and regulations I believe we should be guided by common sense, and that if they are to be obeyed at all the laws must be good laws. Laws are made for the guidance of wise men and for the obedience of fools; and it would seem from some of our laws that we consider many of our population to be fools.

Because of the problems we as a nation are facing I would like briefly to comment on remarks made in the House tonight by the member for Warren. I do not intend to become entangled in party-political intrigue.

Mr Davies: Don't bring politics into it!

Mr CRANE: However, I would say in fairness that Australia has been facing an increasing crisis for some time. We as citizens of Australia are entitled to have the laws of our land obeyed by Governments as well as by people. We have a

Constitution, and I believe we have a right to expect that Constitution will be abided by also.

Mr T. J. Burke: It will be.

Mr CRANE: Yet we find repeatedly that the Government in Canberra has used every trick in the book to turn our democracy into a republic; and in my opinion we have the right to object to this.

Mr Jamieson: What is wrong with that?

Mr CRANE: Whilst two wrongs do not make a right, I believe we do have a right to ask the people of Australia if this is what they desire. Surely the people ought to be the judge.

Mr Bryce: Three times in three years?

Mr CRANE: It never ceases to amaze me that the Senate is now being accused of being undemocratic; yet how often do we read in the Press letters written by senators who never fail to sign at the bottom "Senator for Western Australia", and the context of their letters shows they are attempting to destroy the very democracy that we admire. In my opinion this borders on hypocrisy. I believe the Senate is a States' House and by taking the action which was taken recently the senators have shown they are very concerned for the States of Australia.

Mr Bryce: Political thugs.

Mr CRANE: I believe the laws of any land should be very simple laws.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr CRANE: Perhaps at this time it is appropriate to quote some simple laws spoken by a great statesman in America over 100 years ago. Every one of these laws has been broken in the last three years. I would quote Abraham Lincoln as follows—

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich

You cannot establish sound security by borrowing money

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

What have we seen in the last few years? We have seen each of those laws broken. Class hatred has been encouraged.

Mr Davies: You are encouraging it now. Absolute nonsense.

Mr CRANE: I would agree entirely with the member for Victoria Park: What he has just said is nonsense.

Mr Davies: You are encouraging it with that kind of nonsense.

Mr CRANE: I am not encouraging anything: I am merely pointing out facts. If the member for Victoria Park does not wish to accept the facts, that is up to him.

They are simple types of laws that anyone can understand; one does not need to be a Rhodes scholar. They are simple fundamental laws of life and if all of us followed them we would put this nation of ours on a sound footing. So what is wrong with all of us following them for a charge? What is wrong with accepting what is true and recognising facts when they are so soundly based?

I do not intend to speak for long tonight, but I would like to mention, in my closing remarks, something which gives me great pride. I refer to our little wheatbelt town of Goomalling. Last Friday evening I spent a few enjoyable hours at a small reception held by the shire council for a very fine young lady—Miss Western Australia, Miss Jane Fisher. I believe she is to be commended for what she has done.

We know the reason for the Miss Western Australia competition. I believe that when Our Lord said, "Suffer little children to come unto me" he laid the foundations for people to care for our young children. Miss Fisher, a teacher at the Goomalling school, has always shown kindness to children. She has always been recognised and appreciated by the children and they love her very much. Whilst members of the Opposition may not have much consideration for a fine young woman, I would still like to carry on and tell the House what the people of Goomalling and myself think of her.

Mr T. H. Jones: You were responsible for most of her training, were you?

Mr CRANE: No, I was not. She is a person who has shown a great deal of kindness to other people. I am sure her Uncle Jim—the member for Karrinyup—would agree with me when I say that her generosity and kindness—

Mr Jamieson: You'll get a pair!

Mr CRANE: —is exceeded only by her charming personality. The people of Goomalling and, in fact, all the people of Western Australia ought to be extremely proud of her.

Mr T. H. Jones: What part did you play in that?

Mr CRANE: I am not trying to say anything about myself; I am telling members the attributes of a very fine young

woman. I believe that on Thursday she leaves here to go to South Australia to enter the judging for the title of Miss Australia. I am sure the people of Western Australia are proud of her. She is a fine ambassador for this State and, on behalf of the people of Goomalling and all the people of Western Australia, including members of the Opposition, I wish her all the best in the years to come and in the final judging for Miss Australia.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.03 p.m.]: I am sure that we, the members of the Opposition, do not need the efforts of a member of the Government who has just resumed his seat to acquaint us of the type and style of young woman to whom he has just referred; that is, Miss Western Australia. Most of us are not that old that we cannot appreciate her extremely fine characteristics. I would resent such an implication personally and I hope that others would resent it just as much.

However I point out, before the honourable member gets too carried away, that she is a product of the North Perth school. This is one of the points the member for Moore failed to mention. This principle of separating one group from another—which he claims he does not like—is being followed by him right now by trying to indicate how the country order is against the order of the metropolitan area. I have always disliked such an attitude and I have never encouraged it, because there are ways of avoiding it.

I was very concerned about the attitude of the Premier towards certain Commonwealth financial arrangements. In particular I have been concerned about his reactions to the assistance the Commonwealth Government has been giving to local authorities. Being the representative of an area where two local authorities have made extensive use of funds both under the RED Scheme and the recreational scheme, I can tell the Premier that the standard of living of the people in the suburbs concerned has improved immensely in only a few short months. If they had to rely on their own resources or on finance from the State Government many of the undertakings that were brought to fruition recently would not have been achieved in our time.

Government departments in this State have looked at a number of schemes ranging from recreational schemes to essential drainage schemes. One drainage scheme which we inspected over the weekend would not have been undertaken and completed by the Metropolitan Water Board for goodness knows how many years, because the officers of that board had inspected it and had decided that the board could not get a return from it. Although it was essential to make

available land which was in close proximity to the city and fully serviced by roads, water supply, and electricity, the land, being low-lying and having a clay base, did not attract the Metropolitan Water Board for the implementation of a drainage scheme.

This is only one of the many schemes, including many outdoor encouragement schemes, that have been undertaken by the Belmont Shire, the Shire of Canning, and other local authorities. Although I am fully acquainted with the schemes that have been implemented by those shires, I know there are others of equal moment that have been achieved as a result of the finance made available by the Commonwealth Government, and these schemes have led to the betterment of life for all the people who reside in my electorate, and in other parts.

I am interested in all the people. I am not interested in the Homeric House push. They can look after themselves. They always will and they get a little more out of life than most people. They will grab their bit extra, because in the handling of money some of it always seems to stick.

Mr Young: You are taking advantage of the Premier in his absence.

Mr JAMIESON: Bring him back to the Chamber! He is the last one I am afraid of!

Mr Young: It is a rotten thing to say.

Mr JAMIESON: That is nonsense and the member for Scarborough knows it.

Mr Young: It is a rotten thing to say whether he is here or not, and you know it.

Mr JAMIESON: For the benefit of the honourable member I will repeat it when the Premier returns to the Chamber.

Mr Young: You have a chip on your shoulder.

Mr JAMIESON: The honourable member has a log on his. Having been successful in drawing a few comments from the other side of the Chamber I would like to continue by saying that, in my opinion, when the economy of a country is in a doubtful state—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will members refrain from chatting across the Chamber, please?

Mr JAMIESON: —as it has been during the last several years, it is incumbent upon a central Government—as has been the case with the Whitlam Government—to come forward with schemes that will achieve something for the lifestyle of the people of the country. It should not just shut up shop and issue some dole cheques, but should achieve something that is really worth-while for the welfare of the people who can see the results of such efforts.

I would suggest that some members who do not like this sort of thing should open their eyes and see what is going on.

Mrs Craig: Some of the people would have preferred to keep their permanent jobs instead of being forced into unemployment.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course they would have, but unfortunately the member for Wellington, like me, is not King Canute and we cannot stop the tide, as some people highly placed in financial circles—such as the recently retired chief of the R. & I. Bank—have clearly indicated. It is a pity the member for Wellington does not wake up and realise that this is the situation and stop living in her own backyard all the time. She should realise that other situations exist and not just ones which she imagines are the be-all and end-all of everything.

When Mr Collins, just before he retired from the R. & I. Bank, referred to this matter that causes our problems, he said—

However, the problems of inflation would not be overcome in Australia, while the rest of the world suffered from the same disease.

This is obvious, and I have been saying that for a long time. However, it is something we cannot get through the skull of the Premier.

Mr Clarko: It is not appropriate to Western Australia. Since we had—

Mr JAMIESON: Here is another one of those leading economists trying to give us a lecture again. These economists are very adept at giving lectures, but they are no good when it comes to achieving results.

Mr Clarko: That is easy. Just cut the huge deficits created by the Federal Government.

Mr JAMIESON: Oh, yes! I notice that the proposal put forward by Mr Fraser included a cut of about \$1 billion. He categorised only half a billion dollars that he was going to cut. What is being done with the other half a billion dollars he is going to cut? I would not know. However, the Premier races into the Press with statements and appears on TV to make similar statements. He has said, "We will not be harmed by the Senate refusing supply, or the proposals that they are now putting forward. We will not be harmed by them."

If we get another Government that is going to chop and change in this manner we will be harmed all right! Many of the schemes now in operation with funds from the Federal sphere will have to be cut back, because there is no other way.

Mr Sodeman: They are cut back now.

Mr JAMIESON: They will be cut back again. The funds will not be cut back by half, but cut back to achieve the objective of the Federal Opposition. Then the State will really feel the effects of such a move. It is of no use the member for

Pilbara shaking his head; it will fall off, as it is not screwed on that tight. Many schemes, such as the sewerage improvement scheme would be cut back.

Mr Sodeman: You should not build up the hopes of people with short-term schemes.

Mr JAMIESON: They are necessary schemes and worth achieving. The honourable member would not know what to do when he got there; he is like a collie dog that catches a car—he does not know what to do with it. I do not need to have nightmares at home; I suffer them as a result of looking at members on the cross benches on the Government side of the House.

I was speaking of economics, which is a very strong subject of the member for Karrinyup and not a very strong subject of mine. Nevertheless I do have a look at these subjects a little more than those who trot around all the time with a "mace" on their shoulders. I do try sometimes to see what is going on.

Mr Sodeman: Did that log fall off your shoulder in King's Park?

Mr JAMIESON: Having had a look at the economies introduced in Britain, it would appear that in the June issue of *The Economist* a number of countries were mentioned in which there is the problem of inflation. This happens periodically, of course, and I only wish to mention these economists' reports because the comparative figures related to the present, or as near as I can get. A short time ago I asked the Premier where he obtained his information when he made his news release, because usually he plucks his figures from anywhere and uses them as an economic basis.

He said he obtained them from economic studies and reports. There was no basis for them and they do not seem to conform with those in the official publications on which we should be able to rely.

A report of the Organisation for Economic and Co-operative Development indicates very clearly one fallacy which exists in connection with the Liberal Party; that is, that one of the great problems of inflation is the high wage structure. The June edition of *The Economist* indicates that the rate in such low wage structure countries as India is a lot higher than ours. South Africa has almost the same rate, but the wage structure in relation to manufacturing items is a lot lower there.

Mr Clarko: You are not suggesting that South Africa's position has been the same as ours over the last 12 months?

Mr JAMIESON: I am suggesting that if we compare South Africa's wage structure with ours it would be higher.

Mr Clarko: That would be difficult to prove.

Mr JAMIESON: It would be difficult for the member for Karrinyup to prove otherwise, too. He should go there to see the conditions under which the people work.

Mr Clarko: Show us the evidence.

Mr JAMIESON: What about the member for Karrinyup giving us the evidence against it? My evidence in this connection is my personal observation of the conditions and wage structure under which the bulk of the people in South Africa are working.

Mr Clarko: In the first two years under our Labor Government the inflation rate there doubled. Ours quadrupled while theirs doubled.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it did and it did in other countries such as Ireland, Britain, and India, too. In some countries it is increasing at a rate in excess of 50 per cent.

Mr Clarko: Of the 24 overseas countries we are fifth, and we were right down the bottom before.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Karrinyup keeps quoting that figure. I do not know where he obtained his information, because the latest information I have does not confirm what he says. I received my information from Hayden's office because we were trying to verify what the Premier said. This was only a couple of days ago, and it shows that in fact we were seventh. Therefore I do not know how the member for Karrinyup can justify his statement. He plucks a figure from the air. He listens to the Premier and believes him. He does not bother to check. From where did he get his information?

Mr Clarko: It was published in the Press.

Mr JAMIESON: It was published in the Press!

Mr Clarko: If you say it is seventh, it is still just as bad.

Mr Coyne: You are quoting from the Press yourself.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Murchison-Eyre should not point because it is rude!

Mr Clarko: Yours is an argument of convenience.

Mr JAMIESON: I was quoting from a document.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! One interjection at a time.

Mr Clarko: You realise Hayden is an economist, too.

Mr JAMIESON: Some are all right.

Mr Clarko: That is what I am trying to tell you.

Mr JAMIESON: Those who are right have a much more progressive outlook than has the member for Karrinyup. The criterion is how successful a person has been in his particular vocation.

I did wish to make the point that while the Premier was berating us and complaining about the situation here, and saying that we are out-pricing ourselves with countries which trade with us, it is significant that they are going along at about the same rate at present. There may be a difference in their overall rate, but the present inflation rate in the principal of those countries—except the United Kingdom which still is the third biggest as far as we are concerned and the inflation rate in that country is so far in advance of the rate here that we do not have to consider it—is similar to our own.

Mr Coyne: How do you account for the position with regard to new motorcars from Japan? It is simply because of the cost factor.

Mr JAMIESON: They are ahead in that field because of the situation.

Mr Coyne: They are killing us because of the wage structure in Australia.

Mr JAMIESON: They are killing us now because of various other factors.

Mr Coyne: Because of a better and more reliable product.

Mr JAMIESON: That might not be argued. In some instances it might be advisable to import items. We know that Japan can outdo us with electrical goods. We cannot possibly compete with Japan because of that country's production figures in its factories in comparison with what we can hope to produce and sell on the world market. Sometimes we must accept that that country is in a better economic situation to be able to produce consumer goods in certain categories, and cars could be one of them. I have read in the Press recently—

Mr Clarko: Is it right?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know whether I can believe it, but some economists suggest that in 20 years' time there will not be any cars produced in Australia. I do not know whether we would like that situation to occur. We have a comparatively sound industry and we want to protect it to a great degree, although we must make it more competitive than it has been. Tariff protection has been provided in the past, as has been mentioned, and this has been more than a fair thing. A competitive situation must be evolved.

I notice that the Premier is not back in his place yet, so I had better not talk about him for fear his little boy will worry about what I say.

I would like to say a little about the Federal scene. It is high time we studied the way Australia is heading. Some weeks ago I warned that the action of the Liberal Party in disregarding convention would eventually put us in a position of being at one another's throats.

Mr Young: Which convention?

Mr JAMIESON: All sorts of conventions. The particular one to which I was referring

at the time concerned the replacement of a senator. That incident only triggered off the present situation. If the correct person had been appointed, we would not be in our present trouble.

Mr Young: What about Gair?

Mr JAMIESON: He was never replaced because there was a double dissolution.

Mr Clarko: The Prime Minister was seeking an advantage.

Mr JAMIESON: Maybe, if that had developed the way it was intended to develop. Because of the voting in Queensland, I do not think it would have. Again facts must be considered.

Mr Clarko: The Prime Minister was trying to get the advantage of one extra senator.

Mr JAMIESON: But the figures do not prove he would have done that.

Mr Clarko: Because Bjelke-Petersen was too quick for him.

Mr JAMIESON: He is too quick for himself. He is a little like our Premier.

Mr Clarko: That's right—very popular.

Mr JAMIESON: They are in one another's pockets all the time. As the Premier has returned, I will repeat what I said, for the benefit of his little case-carrying boy over there who took exception to what I said. I said I wanted all the people of this State looked after. I referred to the Homeric House push and their ilk. That is what I said, and I have no hesitation in repeating it, because they are the people who can look after themselves and they do look after themselves more than they should.

Mr Young: What about the Trades Hall people who robbed the State of two million bucks? Why not talk about them?

Mr JAMIESON: They have never robbed anyone of anything.

Mr Young: They are robbing the State taxpayers of two million bucks, and you know it.

Mr JAMIESON: How are they doing that?

Mr Young: By falsifying a tenancy situation and by putting the State Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr JAMIESON: That remark is objectionable to me and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The member for Scarborough has been asked to withdraw the offending remark.

Mr YOUNG: I would have to ask what was objectionable to the member for Welshpool.

Mr JAMIESON: That the taxpayers were being robbed of two million bucks by Trades Hall.



The SPEAKER: The member for Scarborough now knows the words which are offensive, and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr YOUNG: If you ask me to withdraw them, I do.

Mr McIver: What about the \$500 000 you gave to the brewery?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Welshpool.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr JAMIESON: Now we have settled that, we will get onto other matters dealing with the Premier. I wanted him to be present to hear what I had to say.

Sir Charles Court: I was only absent—

Mr JAMIESON: I was not raising any objection to the Premier's absence, but one of his own members did. As a matter of fact, I had not noticed the Premier had gone. He was still scampering out of the Chamber when I made the remark.

Sir Charles Court: I want to explain that I was doing something to oblige one of your colleagues.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not finding any fault with the Premier's action, but a problem did arise.

I saw the Premier on a television telecast on Sunday night and I am sure that when he saw the playback he could not believe he said what he did. It did not come over very sincerely, and there was a very bad reaction to what he said. I suggest that if he were trying to fool the public into believing there would be no reaction from the Senate's action and the delay in the provision of finance continued, he would not succeed completely because a number of other factors are involved and other funds must be made available.

One of the items which would vitally affect this State in several fields is being debated again today. I am referring to the SAS regiment and the RAAF. If the maintenance of those organisations is affected because of a lack of finance, the people who supply those organisations will also be affected. It is no good the Premier trying to hoodwink the public into believing that we are in a kind of island and will be able to hang on indefinitely without any ill-effects.

Sir Charles Court: I referred only to our State commitments.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, but the State finances are all tied up with other matters which must be considered. The Premier cannot consider only one item on its own and set it apart. That is what he does far too often.

Sir Charles Court: There is no need to withdraw supply.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course there is to guarantee that the Constitution of Australia is upheld and not trodden on by dirty feet. That is what the Premiers of Western Australia, Queensland, and New South Wales are trying to do.

Sir Charles Court: The Constitution provides for the Senate to reject a Bill. Do you want to tear that up?

Mr JAMIESON: If the Premier had read Oates' article in tonight's paper he would have been better informed of what goes on in the world in respect of bicameral systems. In the Westminster system over the last 50 to 70 years, this—

Mr Young: You disagree with every constitutional lawyer in Australia.

Mr JAMIESON: I would not even disagree with the member for Scarborough on some things.

Mr Young: Do you disagree with the Prime Minister in regard to this?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not suppose anyone has had more disagreements with him than I have had, but I do not say I disagree with him on this.

Sir Charles Court: Have you read Evatt on the situation?

Mr JAMIESON: The circumstances have changed, and had Evatt been in the position where the Senate was attempting to stop supply he would undoubtedly have opted on the score that this was not a function of the second Chamber. It is not a function of the Chamber which is not elected as representatives of the people.

Mr Young: Who would not—Whitlam?

Mr JAMIESON: We are talking about Evatt.

Sir Charles Court: On what authority do you say he would have opted for that? He was a man who had a great reputation as a jurist.

Mr JAMIESON: He also had a great reputation as a constitutionalist and he would have known the difficulties which occurred in the 1909-10 period far better than the Premier does. He would also have known the salient fact that the House of the people is the one where there are elected representatives. The members in the Senate at all times are at best party hacks. One cannot get at them; one cannot vote them out and one cannot vote them in.

Mr Young: You are saying the Prime Minister is a hypocrite.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not saying that.

Mr Young: In 1970 he said this was a perfectly justifiable thing to happen.

Mr JAMIESON: Different circumstances prevailed. He was not faced with a situation where an endeavour was being made to manipulate the Constitution to force Government to an election each time it had served half its term. He was faced with a hypothetical situation to which he was giving thought. The Legislative Assembly in this State is elected for three years and the House of Representatives is elected for three years, and while they retain the confidence of the people they are

entitled to remain, subject to their carrying out the normal lawful requirements under their oath of office.

Sir Charles Court: I do not think we will ever agree on the point but the fact is we do have a bicameral system and if we follow your thesis in the matter the upper House will just do what we tell it to do.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it will, as the Legislative Council has always done with Liberal-Country Party Governments.

Sir Charles Court: Members of the Legislative Council did not withhold supply when I asked them to.

Mr JAMIESON: That was one occasion when they opted out for some reason best known to themselves.

Mr Young: How many times has it been asked? We have had 100 per cent failure.

Mr Sodeman: Be consistent.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Pilbara is always the know-all about the place, so what he says does not matter very much.

While I am on my feet I would like to take the opportunity to mention the Telethon which took place over the weekend. I compliment those associated with it and those who did the hard work in getting the funds together. However, I sound a warning on two features of it. One is that the methods of collection of money from the community are inclined to be a little lax. I hope nobody is taking advantage of them but there is always an opportunity for the smart people to do so.

On the talk-back programmes in the last few days many people have been offering compliments but some people have said they had as many as five callers in one day in their street asking for donations for Telethon. We must do better than that. If the funds are collected in this way we must ensure they go to the cause. I have no objection to people calling but I hope we can find some way to ensure it is all above board. I have not had any reports that it is not above board but Telethon is too big for any person to have the overall picture and know that nobody is cashing in on it. Some smart people are inclined to do this in other fields and I do not think they would except Telethon. We should ensure in the future that this aspect is covered so that donations are made available to the cause for which they are collected.

Mr Coyne: Would they not be made by cheque?

Mr JAMIESON: No. Donations given in door-to-door collections are in cash. The collectors were taking bucket-loads of cash. The public are very happy to be associated with the appeal.

There is another aspect of Telethon about which I want to warn the Premier. I saw him making his speech on Telethon and in the attitude he adopted he went

very close to raising objections. I have seen the closing of all the Telethon appeals—perhaps I missed one or two while I was overseas. Various Premiers have spoken and I have seen no cause to raise an objection. They have just complimented the people associated with the appeal. However, the Premier went very close to doing what he usually does; that is, involving the Commonwealth Government.

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr JAMIESON: He went very close to it. As a result, the television station received telephone calls from people objecting on this score.

Sir Charles Court: I did not mention the Commonwealth Government. I mentioned the comment made in the Federal Parliament.

Mr JAMIESON: In an abstract way the Premier was getting into the party-political arena, which has no place in the Telethon appeal. I warn the Premier that if he adopts this practice in the future I will protest very loudly.

Sir Charles Court: Many people were upset about the unfair allegation which was made. The allegation was made in a general way, and you know that in this State we have been free of the practice of charging overhead expenses in these projects.

Mr JAMIESON: That was clearly indicated by the executive of Channel 7 at the beginning and the end of Telethon.

Coming to a matter of local interest, some time ago I asked a question about the cancellation of buses which were to be used for school functions. I was concerned when it was originally brought to my attention by headmasters that the MTT had initiated a cancellation fee when buses were booked for various sporting and other activities and it was found necessary for the school to cancel them. When I made inquiries of the MTT I was told some schools booked buses haphazardly and cancelled them just as easily. As a consequence, the MTT felt it had to impose a monetary penalty.

I do not know whether this is desirable or whether the Education Department should not be brought into the matter to take some action when this occurs. However, I do object strongly to the penalties when it is necessary to cancel buses due to inclement weather which is beyond the control of the school authorities. The answer to my question was that no action would be taken to drop this charge because full wages have to be paid to drivers and many cancellations involve overtime penalties. When we consider the number of times that inclement weather causes cancellation, only a few hundred dollars a year would be involved, which is an insignificant amount when the MTT is losing \$X million a year. I suggest the MTT is being very petty in not being

prepared to carry as a State responsibility genuine cancellations of buses when inclement weather causes the postponement of a swimming carnival or a sports meeting. The Government should have another look at this matter. It will not cost very much at all.

Before I conclude I want to deal with the recent Australian Constitutional Convention, our delegation to which was in effect cancelled by the action of the Premier in going along with the Queensland Premier who had no good reason other than that he was not getting everything his own way and wanted to take the ball home because the game was not being played as he would like it to be. After all the shenanigans which took place at the previous meeting, and despite the fact that some polarised political views were expressed during the course of the convention, the last meeting went along reasonably happily because some of the greatest protagonists in this game of party politics were not present, and those who were present were prepared to reconcile their views and get down to the job before them. Indeed, they got through a considerable amount of work.

It was said at the close of the convention that had all the convention delegates attended, the decisions which were reached would probably have been the same. On looking at the divisions which took place, I have no doubt they would have been the same because, the way it developed, the extra numbers from the various States would not have made any difference to the final determinations, except perhaps in one decision where there was a dead heat and it was resolved in the negative. That matter would have been of some advantage to the States; it was the proposal to allow the States to initiate referendums. That would have been passed had there been present only one of the Government representatives from this State. There would have been no increase in the number who voted against it but several could have voted for it. However, that is an opportunity they missed by not being present.

It is proposed that the convention will reconvene in Tasmania next year, and I hope at that time this State will be fully represented so that we can put forward our arguments in a proper way as a delegation, even though I realise we cannot reconcile party-political differences. Prior to the recent meeting the Premier did not bother to call this State's delegation together before moving that it withdraw from the conference. At the meeting before that, when Premier Tonkin was present, we had a discussion and formulated ideas about how we could develop the activities of the delegation. If in the future the Premier expects co-operation from the Opposition in matters which affect the States—and there are a number of them—he must be prepared to call the delegation together to have some preliminary talks.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes more.

**Mr JAMIESON:** In those five minutes I would like to make mention of the amounts proposed to be raised by the Budget. From reference to the Budget papers it appears there will be increases in most spheres, if not by direct increases then by inflation or activities of the community. We see that taxes—stamp tax, land tax, pay-roll tax, and third party insurance, to say nothing of the proposed tobacco license—will bring in much more revenue than in the previous year. As my leader said, the Budget is more renowned for what it hides than for what it proposes.

Indeed, even with the increase in the Estimates, I would say that many of them—the betting tax, the royalties for mining, and matters of that sort—have probably been well and truly underestimated on this occasion. The mining royalties did not quite come up to what was expected last year because of the many troubles in the industry, but that does not mean they will not exceed the mark this year. I hazard a guess we will be well in advance of the estimated amount and the Budget will certainly balance. In fact, I believe we will have a surplus, if the departmental estimates of wage rises are at all reasonable. Having due regard to these facts, I believe that next year we will see all sorts of promises put forward because the money will be there to carry them out. If the money is not there directly, it will be hidden away so that it can be used for the purpose of a good Budget before an election. I believe that this Budget was introduced for that purpose, rather than to do something for the people.

It must be realised that many charges have been increased but the Government introduced them at different times rather than bring them all in together in the Budget. When we consider the increases in electricity and water charges, it is no wonder that there was no need to increase greatly the various other taxes imposed by the State Government. In many ways this is a false Budget, and history will prove this to be so.

**MR NANOVICH (Toodyay) [8.47 p.m.]:** To speak in the Budget debate enables a member to cover a wide range of subjects and also to refer to some of the problems and benefits that will flow from its presentation. Of course, a member can emphasise any difficulties in his own area.

Firstly, I must compliment the Premier on the introduction of such a fine Budget under the extreme difficulties created by the people in Canberra.

**Mr May:** Oh, come on!

**Mr NANOVICH:** I have 45 minutes and—

**Mr McIver:** What is their name?

Mr NANOVIICH: —I can put up with it. We talk about democracy, but that was killed and buried in May, 1974.

Mr May: We are talking about the Budget.

Mr NANOVIICH: That is correct.

Mr McIver: Give us some stringed music.

Mr NANOVIICH: If the Liberal Party had been in power in Canberra—

Mr May: It had been there for 23 years.

Mr NANOVIICH: —I am sure the Premier would have brought down a finer and better Budget.

Mr May: Finer, anyway.

Mr NANOVIICH: The dark shadow which the Commonwealth Government has cast over Australia today is not a joke. We have reached the situation where the damage is practically irreparable. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Prime Minister moved a vote of confidence in his Government last week, then over the weekend he passed a vote of no confidence in it by stating that if he went to the people, he would lose government. A Western Australian senator also said that if the present Commonwealth Government goes to the people, it will be in Opposition for a further 20 years.

Mr May: That is so with the State Government.

Mr NANOVIICH: We have had the loans scandal, and the sackings of Deputy Prime Ministers and Treasurers. We see that the four "Cs"—Crean, Cairns, Cameron, and Connor—have gone—

Mr Bryce: Our boys are honest!

Mr NANOVIICH: —and the next one to go will be Cough—the Prime Minister will change his name to Cough and then he will go. I would like to read a little from this Press article. It says—

This Labor Government has been the most incompetent and disastrous Government in the history of Australia. Although Australia has basically one of the strongest and healthiest economies in the world, in three years it has been brought to the brink of disaster by incompetence and irresponsibility.

Mr Bryce: Who said that?

Mr NANOVIICH: To continue—

We now have the highest unemployment since the Great Depression of the nineteen thirties. Our young people will start their working life on the dole.

Mr May: Since when may you read your speech?

Mr NANOVIICH: What a disgrace! It continues—

We now have the worst and most prolonged inflation in our history.

Savings accumulated through decades of effort have been destroyed by this Government.

Mr Davies: Ooer!

Several members interjected.

Mr NANOVIICH: I wish to tell members how the Government in Canberra went about bringing the country to the crisis confronting us at the moment. I will quote from portion of a letter that was written to the Press.

Mr McIver: How is the hospital at Wanneroo?

Mr NANOVIICH: The author had been accused of having no experience or association with the trade union movement and he states—

I have had 20 years' experience and was, in fact, the sole founder, secretary and treasurer of a militant union branch in the United Kingdom.

I am completely in favour of the ideals, principles and need for trade unions. They are an essential means of obtaining fair pay, fair play and fair conditions for workers in any industry.

However, when the trade union movement becomes politically obsessed, the result is strikes with political implications.

Many workers today feel they are being used, not to achieve improvement but to implement the political power aims of people using the labour force to achieve their own ambitions.

Mr May: Just as well you can read, or you would not be able to make a speech.

Mr NANOVIICH: To continue—

Should the TLC wish to prove its sincerity it should legislate for secret ballot paper elections—

Mr T. H. Jones: Who wrote that?

Mr NANOVIICH: It goes on—

—with third party supervision, the outcome of any election being subject to say a 90 per cent poll.

Strikes should be subject to a similar majority of members' ballot, not by a show of hands by those present at a mini-meeting outside the works gate.

That is the way our country has been run. Militant left-wing people were prepared to ruin the country.

Mr T. H. Jones: Look under your bed tonight.

Mr Jamieson: That is a nice red tie you are wearing.

Mr NANOVIICH: While this continues, the situation will not improve. I had a phone call at my home from a very dear old lady. She is an invalid pensioner, and one of the people the Commonwealth Government claims to be assisting.

Mr May: You are going to stop their pay.

Mr NANOVIČ: This dear old lady said to me, "Why don't you come forward with the slogan, 'Don't rubbish Australia; don't corrupt Australia; vote for the Liberal Party'—bless her soul.

Mr T. H. Jones: Where did she live?

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. Jones: What a mother-in-law!

Mr NANOVIČ: I would like to endorse the remarks of the member for Moore when he spoke about the choice of Miss Jane Fisher as Miss Western Australia. It will anger the Opposition a little further, because I had the privilege of sashing the girl when she became "Miss Avon".

Several members interjected.

Mr Jamieson: I bet she did not like that.

Mr T. J. Burke: I think it is a term in square dancing!

Mr NANOVIČ: I would like to refer to the situation of land tax, particularly as it concerns the people in my electorate. Many of them will benefit from the announcement that a person who builds a house on his own five acres will be exempted from land tax. This is a tremendous breakthrough.

Mr T. H. Jones: What about the increases in charges for electricity and water?

Mr NANOVIČ: In his second reading speech the Treasurer said—

The Road Traffic Authority has now taken over control of traffic in all but eight Local Authority districts and aims to complete the takeover by early next financial year.

Fifty-nine Traffic Inspectors have been inducted as Patrolmen with the Authority and a number of other Local Authority employees have been found civilian positions.

The Opposition criticised the Government—

Mr T. H. Jones: And rightly so.

Mr NANOVIČ:—and its members said that the people who had been employed as traffic inspectors would be out of work.

Mr T. H. Jones: They are hiding behind trees at Armadale. Do you condone that?

Mr NANOVIČ: Many people are employed also on the clerical side—

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. Jones: They are hiding behind trees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr NANOVIČ: I am sure that eventually all the traffic inspectors will be employed in the Road Traffic Authority.

Mr McIver: It sounds as though you are applying for a job.

Mr NANOVIČ: I feel I must devote some of my time to my electorate. I will

commence with the southern boundary of it; that is, the Wanneroo area.

Mr May: What about a bit of a change—get on to Canberra.

Mr NANOVIČ: The population is increasing at a tremendous rate, and the problems are multiplying continuously. One particular source of concern is the entrance to and the exit from Wanneroo. Wanneroo Road goes on in the north to Yanchep, Quinns Rock, and Two Rocks.

Mr Barnett: What about Girrawheen?

Mr NANOVIČ: I feel—

Mr Jamieson: He doesn't even know where it is!

Mr NANOVIČ:—that the construction of the Mitchell Freeway should be proceeded with as quickly as possible: I know that finance is a problem, but the planning stages should be completed now and then State money could be used together with funds from Canberra—if we can still squeeze something from there.

Mr May: How about doing something yourself?

Mr NANOVIČ: What about the complete wastage of money on the RED Scheme?

Mr McIver: What a great scheme! The best ever invented.

Mr NANOVIČ: One afternoon I was sitting in my office and I looked out of the window. I saw a man sitting on a small tractor cutting the lawn, and six men were picking up the grass with their hands. If that is good economy, I certainly cannot understand it.

Mr Jamieson: How did you have time to look out of the window?

Mr Bryce: That is a reflection on the Wanneroo Shire, if that is how it operates.

Mr NANOVIČ: The construction of the main arterial road through Wanneroo should be considered urgently. It is now nearing completion as a dual carriageway to East Road. At the present time the Minister and the Main Roads Department are considering a suggestion to bypass the town.

Mr Davies: Don't have any money on them!

Mr NANOVIČ: Another important road is the continuation of Uganda Road known as Alexander Drive. I believe this is a road which should be given serious consideration, and be constructed on an alignment adjacent to the forest land.

Mr McIver: You have hypnotised the member for Bunbury.

Mr NANOVIČ: The majority of the land in this area is owned by the Crown, and it should be considered seriously in conjunction with the development envisaged in the north.

I was pleased to receive information from the Minister for Education that at

long last a high school is to be established at Wanneroo.

Mr May: Commonwealth Government?

Mr NANOVIH: Planning is in progress, and it is hoped that the school will be open for students at the commencement of 1977. Of course, this is still subject to funds, but I am sure the Minister will show good heart and continue with the tremendous progress he has shown in this portfolio. I am sure Wanneroo will see a high school at that time.

Mr Skidmore: What about Swan View?

Mr NANOVIH: Just because the member for Swan made election promises, he need not expect the Government to implement them. I cannot help him on that one.

I should also like to stress the need for a district hospital within that region. I believe only a week ago members of the Public Health Department and the local authority inspected the site and came to the conclusion that a hospital should be constructed within the Joondalup area. I hope every thought is given to the provision of such a hospital because it is urgently needed.

I also hope that development in the Joondalup area is not to the detriment of the surrounding district. Planners are inclined to think everything should be concentrated into one locality, eliminating other types of development which may serve the community to better purpose.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister for Water Supplies the small area in Mullaloo which requires the provision of water. I ask the Minister to make every possible dollar available to provide a water supply, thus satisfying the needs of some of my constituents.

I refer now to the area of land north of Sorrento to Mullaloo which is referred to as the Nodes, a piece of land to the west of West Coast Highway. I am pleased to see that some progress has been made in the setting aside of this area. Discussions have been held between the Minister and the various landowners, who are prepared to relinquish their land, subject to being adequately compensated. Continuing discussions will be held between the developers, Government departments, and the local authority and I am sure that this land eventually will be set aside.

I refer now to land known as the Goollelal-Joondalup area. The Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill currently is before the Parliament, and provides for an amendment to section 33 of the principal Act which will enable this land to be set aside for recreational purposes. At one time, it was envisaged that approximately 3 500 to 4 000 acres of land would be set aside but, after negotiations and meetings, it has been reduced in size to about 2 000 acres. I agree with this decision because

many businesses and homes in the area would have been affected had the original proposal been carried out.

The matter of compensation is not proceeding as well as one would have hoped. Many owners who have not developed their land have been bought out by the MRPA, but the people who are working their land—the vegetable growers, the poultry growers, the winemakers and others—are being left in the background because of the valuations arrived at by valuers employed by the MRPA.

A great deal of dispute has been caused by these valuations, because the people know they are not permitted to further develop their land by the construction of a home, sheds, or any other buildings which may facilitate their businesses. The situation has reached a deadlock and I hope that further representations on the part of the Minister will encourage the authority to act more speedily in this matter.

One area which has been set aside, but which is not to be acquired is the caravan park on the corner of Hocking and Wanneroo Roads. I believe the reason for this decision is that a resumption would be too costly and that this type of development would not affect the land set aside for recreational purposes. However, other properties of a similar value to the caravan park are to be acquired and I cannot see why these people should not be permitted to continue working their properties.

I understand it will cost in excess of \$250 000 to acquire some of these properties. This is public money and the matter should be further examined with a view to allowing these people to remain on their properties and operate their businesses. Having set the precedent of allowing a caravan park to remain, I hope the Minister gives sympathetic consideration to my request and ensures that a speedy solution is arrived at.

Many of these people have extended themselves by purchasing other properties and taking on further commitments, and it could be anything up to 10 years before they are compensated, should their land be acquired.

In addition, I say in all seriousness that the method of paying compensation should be reviewed. At the moment the MRPA pays on the basis of present market value. However, many of the people forced off their land and out of the area will be out of pocket. I strongly believe the Act should be amended so that compensation is based on replacement value.

Mr Skidmore: Hear, hear!

Mr NANOVIH: I have four local authorities within my electorate, and I turn now to the Shire of Swan, which includes the grape-growing and wine-producing area. The matter I raise concerns the Minister for Agriculture and relates to a report which was supposed to have been completed some months ago and presented

to the Town Planning Department for review and a final report. As it has to do with the future of the Swan Valley, I ask the Minister to follow up the matter and ensure that the report is made available at the earliest possible opportunity. I have been requested to raise this matter with the Minister by the viticulturists who are anxious to know the contents of the report.

I should also like to bring to the notice of the Minister for Water Supplies the situation relating to water supplies throughout the valley. The service urgently requires upgrading because at times the tanks become completely empty, and when they commence to refill, all the water is drained from the mains, immediately creating problems.

In addition, domestic consumers pay a lower rate than people working their properties. When a domestic consumer flushes his toilet, he pays about half the rate paid by the person growing vines or melons on his property. This matter should be investigated with a view to implementing a new scheme and providing a more adequate service.

I turn now to the Bullsbrook area, which urgently requires a fourth and fifth-year high school. At present, students must travel up to 100 miles a day to further their education. Of course, this becomes a burden on the students and their parents and in many cases the students must live away from home. Despite what the Opposition seems to think, the people living in the region are not all millionaires but are good, honest, hard-working citizens trying to develop the State of Western Australia.

I was pleased to see that the Minister was prepared to introduce a pilot scheme on a trial basis through correspondence. I believe this will be the thin end of the wedge and I hope that a fourth and fifth-year high school will become a reality in the Bullsbrook area in the near future. This would also assist students in the Gingin area, which is represented by the member for Moore (Mr Crane), who has also expressed concern about the long distances some of the students must travel to school.

I move now to the Toodyay area. Last year, some 72 000 tourists visited the area, which represented a tremendous shot-in-the-arm for the district. As long as this number continues to travel there, I am sure the confidence of the local people and businesses will continue to grow. I emphasise the importance of the Goomalling Road leading into Toodyay. Many requests have been submitted by the local authority and I have made various representations to upgrade the road from the T-junction of the Great Northern Highway, up along the western boundary of the Shire of Toodyay and into the township.

Subdivision of the land into smaller parcels in the district of Toodyay

is now permitted, thus encouraging people to buy the smaller lots. Eventually, these people will tend to settle in the area, and this is why we see as an urgent requirement the upgrading of the Goomalling Road so that motorists may be able to travel in safety.

I believe the rating system should be examined. I am sure the local authority has this in mind, because the township of Toodyay needs another 1 000 residents to make it really viable. If tourists are to continue to visit the area, the Government must step in and assist the authority in some way or another because it is rather a unique town and should continue to exist in its present form.

The lush pastoral area in that district is of tremendous importance. In time a larger number of holdings will be subdivided into smaller lots. I am sure that will be in the best interests of Toodyay.

I hope I have brought before the House the problems which exist throughout my electorate. I again compliment the Premier on his presentation of the Budget and I draw attention to our opponents, the Government at Canberra. If it had functioned more efficiently, shown better sense, and provided better government, I am sure the people of Western Australia would have benefited more from the Budget which has been introduced by the Premier.

**MR SKIDMORE** (Swan) [9.16 p.m.]: In my contribution to this debate I wish to take up the question of the Budget that has been presented. On listening to the debate tonight I have drawn a fairly firm conclusion that the Australian Government is under attack from the members opposite; but I might be wrong in my assumption. It would appear to me that the general tenor of the contributions from Government members is one of denigration of what I believe to be one of the best Australian Governments this country has had.

People might tend to look at the Australian Government in a narrow-minded, parochial, and political way, and in doing so endeavour to score points off the Australian Government; but I repeat that this is one of the best Governments we have had in Australia.

The question of principle has been discussed. I pose the question as to whether the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Fraser) is right in principle in what he is doing, or whether the Prime Minister is right in principle in what he is doing, when it comes to deliberating on the destiny of the Australian Government.

Mention has been made by many members of the alleged statements by the present Prime Minister in 1970 as to what he would do under a certain set of circumstances. I would like to comment on the statements that have been made by

members opposite who have tried to draw a political conclusion from what was stated by Mr Whitlam in 1970, because at that time a completely different set of circumstances existed, compared with the circumstances which now exist.

People who argue on values and who discuss the question of principles should do so in a relevant way. In speaking to these matters it is easy for one to score politically, because one does not have to stand up and be counted for what one says. Half the time no-one reads in *Hansard* the comments of a person who argues in that way. Maybe interjections and the nonsense that is spoken about the question of principles will go over the heads of the readers.

The Whitlam Government has been challenged by the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Fraser), the Press media, and the capitalist system to hold a general election. The media and the capitalist system have dictated the terms to the Federal Leader of the Opposition for the holding of an election, and they have said, "You go to the polls whether or not you like it. The issue is that nobody cares." Yet Mr Fraser has stated time and time again that he did not wish to go ahead with an election of any kind. He said the Government would have to act reprehensibly to bring about a double dissolution.

Let us see what the media has done. It has grabbed hold of the statement of the Federal Leader of the Opposition, and pressure has been put on that Opposition to create the present situation. To their discredit members of the Federal Opposition have decided to take up the gauntlet and say to the Whitlam Government, "You have to resign, because we will not grant you supply except on the term that you bring about a double dissolution."

The present good Australian Government has in turn said to the Federal Opposition, "You can please yourself what you do, but we will remain the Government because we have a mandate."

Mr Clarko: It has lost its mandate.

Mr SKIDMORE: It has not lost its mandate. The honourable member should not utter such rubbish. Could he tell us how the Australian Government has lost its mandate? If he tries I will tell him how it has not lost its mandate. The Australian Government is in control of the House of Representatives, and the Senate is supposed to be a House of Review. Surely the honourable member does not claim that a House of Review, which preys on the dead by not appointing replacement senators in accordance with normal practice and precedent laid down by past Parliaments so as to ride to power, can bring down a Government. If members opposite are of that opinion they

have another think coming to them, because their action has inflicted harm on the Australian public.

Let us see what happened to the Federal Leader of the Opposition when he visited Hobart recently, where he thought the right-wing reactionary forces would welcome him as the Messiah to lead them out of the wilderness and make this a great country! What actually happened? Some 3 500 people poured scorn upon him, and rightly so, for being a political opportunist.

Mr Clarko: They were stirrers.

Mr SKIDMORE: I say to the member for Karrinyup that it is just as well we have them. It would appear we have many of them in the so-called bastion of right-wing politics in Tasmania. They are the people who believe in democracy. They are the people who said that we had no right to be in Vietnam, and they are the same people who contended that we should get rid of cadet training for the purposes of warfare. They are the same stirrers who have been prepared to stand up and be counted. I am proud of their being classed as stirrers when they act in that manner: I say that deliberately. If they have stirred against political opportunists like Fraser and Lynch they should be applauded.

Mr Clarko: The Senate has the law on its side.

Mr SKIDMORE: I will take up that point because I have about three quarters of an hour. The honourable member says the Senate has the law on its side. I do not argue with that.

Mr Clarko: That is what you have been doing.

Mr SKIDMORE: The honourable member should allow me to answer his interjection; if he continues to interject I will not do so. He has raised the question of the validity of the right of the Senate to reject supply. I say that under the Constitution it has the right to reject supply, but by the same token the Government of the day has quite rightly said "The Senate wants the Australian Government to be brought down and removed from office: therefore the Senate should answer to the people at the polls." However, the Opposition in the Senate has not refused supply. It has said to the Government, "You will bring about a double dissolution, and here are the terms." The Senate has not rejected supply, and it has not operated under its constitutional rights. It has said, "We will pass the Bill if you will concede to political blackmail." Mr Whitlam has said to the Federal Opposition, "I will not be blackmailed into that situation."

Mr Clarko: It is the law; it is not blackmail.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is blackmail of the first order.

Mr Clarko: It is in the Constitution.



Mr SKIDMORE: It is the sort of thing the Liberals have written into their system for years and years, and it is able to operate only over the bodies of dead people. The Premier of Queensland carried out an exercise of futility when he appointed a replacement senator who had a very slender affinity with the Australian Labor Party, and opposed the nominee of the ALP. If the Liberal-Country Party had not appointed the replacement senators in the Senate I bet peanuts to nothing there would not have been any thought of standing up against the Australian Government. That is all I want to say on that aspect.

Mr T. D. Evans: The Prime Minister will be here in a few weeks' time and he will stir up members opposite!

Mr SKIDMORE: We should bear in mind the challenges that have been made to the Australian Government by the State Government, and the way the latter has treated the Australian Government. I have sat in this House for a couple of years, and I have heard the Premier slate, castigate, denigrate, and pour scorn upon the Australian Government, because of its alleged failure to bring about economic recovery. Yet, to the Australian Government it has said, "We as a State are in dire straits, and you have to do something about the economy." At the same time its counterpart in Canberra has said to the Australian Government, "You will not get the money under the Supply Bill."

The present State Government has said, "What is wrong with the Australian Government? It has taken away our funds." Yet, for months and months it has been telling us the Australian Government is an irresponsible Government; it is a Government that cannot handle the international situation; it is a Government that is not aware of the problems confronting the farmers; and it is a Government that is not aware of the problems confronting the iron ore companies. The State Government has asked why the Australian Government has not developed all the natural resources that Australia has.

Let us have a look at the position. When the Commonwealth Government puts its foot down and asks Western Australia, every other State in Australia, and the workers of this country to act responsibly to see whether we can at least achieve economic stability, the Western Australian Government denigrates it. It says, "We are not getting our share of the spoils." Who is being nice about all this? Let us see, in all conscience. I doubt very much whether members opposite can in turn stand up and say we are not getting a fair crack of the whip and that this State has been badly treated, because the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Mr Young: That's right!

Mr SKIDMORE: I will not quote all the references because time will not permit

but I will give some details from copies of the "Australian Government Weekly Digest". I will refer to Volume 1 Number 24 because it indicates the degree of financial responsibility which the Australian Government is undertaking on behalf of the people of Australia.

Mr Young: This will be good.

Mr SKIDMORE: It will be good all right; there is no question about that. The member for Scarborough would be the greatest denigrator Australia has seen.

Mr Young: You would have to be ambitious to prove any financial responsibility.

Mr SKIDMORE: The financial assistance given by the Australian Government in the field of education surely could not be denied by any State in Australia. How much more do States want from the Australian Government when it comes to subsidies for school requirements? How much more do members opposite expect to squeeze out of the lemon? Do they want it all for Western Australia and to hell with New South Wales and Queensland? Is that what they want? I do not believe it is. I do not think responsible members in the Government adopt that attitude, but those who shout the loudest by interjection should bear in mind the criterion upon which the Australian Government has acted in connection with education. I will mention only one issue concerning libraries.

On the 14th September the Australian Minister for Education (Mr Kim Beazley) said that research had shown definite relationships between improved access to well-stocked school libraries and educational achievement. He said that the funding for school libraries was over and above that made available by any other Government previously. This statement can be proved by studying the number of books put into libraries by the Australian Government throughout the State. The number is staggering in the extreme. The following in round figures, represents the amount of library funds which have gone to State departments—

	\$
New South Wales	13.4 million
Victoria	9 million
Queensland	3.8 million
South Australia	2.3 million
Western Australia	2.4 million
Tasmania	1.1 million

In the digest Mr Beazley went on to indicate that by the end of 1975 the Schools Commission expected to make a considerable improvement in the appallingly low number of library books available to primary schools.

If we like to continue the exercise on which I have barely touched, and study further digests, we will find that that improvement has been achieved. The appallingly low number of books in libraries available to schools has been overcome by the Australian Government. This is the denigrated, irresponsible Government, the

Government which has no right to stand up and continue to be the Government of Australia today because the Liberal Party, pushed by the capitalist media, has said that the Australian Labor Government must go.

I say to the Australian Government: Stop there. I take my hat off to it. I say to the Government, "If you see a head, kick it, if it is a Liberal, because that is all it deserves."

Let us consider another point. The Government primary schools have had more than \$4.5 million allocated for library staffing since January, 1974. I have a number of figures here, but I will not weary the House by quoting them to indicate what the Australian Government has done for the people of Australia.

I wish now to refer to the field of social security and the Australian Government's assistance programme for handicapped people. In December, 1974, the Australian Government raised the rate of subsidies for sheltered workshops, training centres, and hostels for the handicapped from \$2 for \$1 to \$4 for \$1. It also introduced more generous staff salary subsidies and other forms of assistance. These increases caused expenditure in this area to rise—and I want members to bear in mind that this is the Government which has done nothing—from \$7.5 million in the 1973-74 financial year to \$14.9 million in 1974-75. That is almost double; it is just short of double by about \$100 000. Yet the Australian Government has done nothing!

Mr Sodeman: And what was the deficit in that year?

Mr Young: They could have quadrupled it, but their Budget would not have balanced. You can spend any amount of money if you do not mind a deficit.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to refer to some other projects undertaken by the Australian Government.

Mr Sodeman: By deficit budgeting.

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Pilbara can talk about deficit budgeting. If he thinks there is anything wrong with deficit budgeting he is asking for a quarrel with half the countries of the western world. He does not know what he is talking about and should go back to his school books.

On the agricultural side—

Mr Laurance: This will be good.

Mr SKIDMORE: Be patient! Regarding agriculture, the Australian Government has been aware that there is a need for research into the problems associated with agriculture and primary industries. The research progress is set out in a statement made by Senator Wriedt (the Minister for Agriculture), on the 19th September, 1975.

Mr Laurance: He is not the Minister.

Mr SKIDMORE: Well, he was then. It seems, Mr Speaker, that every circus has to have one clown but we have about six of them, and the member for Gascoyne is the leader of them all.

The then Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) stated that expenditure on research progress in 1975-76 would total \$18.2 million compared with \$13.2 million in 1974-75. That is just one item—agriculture—which the Australian Government has undertaken to research. It is a very important matter. For a long time we have heard Government members opposite denigrating the Australian Government on the question of its responsibility to primary industries in Australia, and the terrible things it is supposed to have done to those industries.

Referring again to the question of education, which I raised earlier, I will go forward only one week and mention educational grants. The Australian Minister for Education (Mr Beazley) approved of Schools Commissions grants amounting to \$830 000 over recent weeks for library bookstocks to be provided to 300 primary and secondary non-Government schools. An amount of \$610 788 had been allocated to 155 secondary schools in six States for bookstocks. A further amount of \$205 639 had been allocated to 145 primary schools in five States.

Members opposite should not try to tell me that is not a record. The figures appear in the weekly digest of the Australian Government, which is reproduced from *Hansard*. Why do members opposite denigrate the Australian Government?

Mr Young: We do not denigrate it.

Mr SKIDMORE: Time and time again I have heard members from the Government benches opposite denigrate the Australian Government. It has gone on, *ad nauseam*, until I felt I had to get up and defend the best Australian Government we have ever had.

Mr Young: When the Liberal Government was in power it had the guts to say it did not have the money.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SKIDMORE: I now wish to take to task a profession which has concerned itself with an issue in Western Australia. I have had occasion to take umbrage at some of the circulars which have been sent to me. I refer to Medibank. I have been plagued with circulars, as no doubt other members of this House have been, from the General Practitioners' Association and the Australian Medical Association regarding the sins and evils of Medibank. On many occasions I have taken to task the secretaries of the associations, and I have written to them telling them that I could not understand how they could say so piously that the relationship between the patient and the doctor will be destroyed under the Medibank scheme.

Those doctors who are opposed to Medibank say they will not go into Government hospitals, and that unless their patients agree that they will be private patients they will not be treated. Those doctors say that, of necessity, patients will become members of medical funds for the purpose of becoming eligible for higher reimbursement as private patients. The doctors will then treat the patients.

The doctors who have circularised me have said that the Australian Government, and the Labor Party, are destroying the relationship between the patient and the doctor. However, I ask who is destroying the relationship? Who is telling the patients that they will not be treated? It is not Medibank. Neither is it the Australian Government.

A person can go into a Government hospital but the doctors have stated that they will not treat that person unless he imposes upon himself the additional burden of paying for something which does not come under the Medibank scheme.

I heard the member for Gascoyne interject and say that it happened in Britain. He should carry out some research into what has happened in Britain, the same as I have done. I will not canvass that research tonight, but I am not unmindful of what has taken place in Britain. When I get up to speak I like to be sure of my facts.

Mr Laurance: What you are saying is not fact.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is claimed that because there are faults in the British system, those same faults will appear in our scheme. I might just as well say, without any valid reason at all, that because something happens in Iceland, in South Africa, or in any other country it will happen here.

The point I want to make is the doctors were given an opportunity and in this same circular which was sent to me they admitted that at that time they were having discussions with the Australian Government about Medibank and they wanted to fall over backwards and work in with the Government to ensure Medibank was a success; yet on 3½ pages they vilified the scheme. When I asked them to make a comment, all I got was a tirade of abuse from a Dr Hayward, the Secretary of the Australian Medical Association.

Mr Coyne: He is not a doctor.

Mr SKIDMORE: At any rate, he represents the doctors. He simply said to me, "Why don't you go away and learn something about doctor-patient relationships", as though in my lifetime I had been so remote from hospitalisation that I would not know what it was all about. It is hypocrisy in the extreme. When one is sent a circular by doctors and one asks them to answer it, all one gets is vilification and

a heap of abuse because one dares to stand up and be counted on this issue.

Mr Laurance: There is no place for doctors in your health scheme.

Mr SKIDMORE: I say there is room for doctors in our health scheme. There is no question about that. We need doctors; the people of Australia need them. The doctors are doing a disservice to their profession and to the majority of doctors in Australia who are refusing to do what their association tells them to do. Many doctors are going into hospitals and working amongst public patients, to the detriment of the supposed policy of their association. That is well known. Many doctors are bulk-billing under the Medibank scheme. They are responsible people who are showing the way to the renegades who think the Medibank scheme will fail because it will prevent the rip-off that has been taken by doctors over the years in this country.

Mr Shalders: That is nonsense.

Mr Young: While you are doing your research, check on the number of your constituents who have been paid when they have put in a mail claim on Medibank in the last few months.

Mr SKIDMORE: As usual, I get all this nonsense about checking up with my constituents. I would like to deal with the general concept.

Mr Young: Tax refunds, too.

Mr SKIDMORE: I think there is an irresponsible element in the medical profession in Australia which is endeavouring to destroy Medibank. Likewise, there is also a great number of medical practitioners who have agreed that Medibank is the greatest health scheme which has ever been proposed in Australia. It will be a success, despite those people who try to sabotage it.

I would like to leave the Australian scene, which always upsets members of the State Government who, in their parochial attitude, can see no good in the Australian Government.

Mr Sodeman: Especially when it is represented by the member for Swan.

Mr SKIDMORE: If my presence upsets the honourable member, he can leave, although if he stayed he would probably receive an education which is badly needed in his case.

On the question of safety and funding by the Western Australian Government, on numerous occasions I have challenged the Minister to indicate to me how much finance is to be provided for safety. I have at all times said that workers who are injured—not because they wish to have their legs or arms broken or to suffer hernias or heart attacks, but because that is part and parcel of their occupations—should not receive only dollars and cents

by way of compensation but should receive something over and above that. I have repeatedly asked the Minister and this Government to provide finance to make effective that section of the Workers' Compensation Act relating to the prevention of accidents, training, rehabilitation, and the return to the work force of people who are injured. The Minister has repeatedly said, "You will be agreeably surprised." I am still waiting.

On looking at the Budget this year, I find that a sum of \$20 000 is being allocated by the Government for the purpose of industrial safety. It is scandalous in the extreme that the lives of people can be placed in jeopardy and that injury should not mean one iota to the Western Australian Government. It provides \$20 000; and where will it go? It will go to the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention which over the years has trained supervisors, industrial officers, and safety officers—the top echelon in industry—and has ignored the guy at the bottom who keeps those people in their jobs. I am beginning to wonder at the validity of that expenditure and whether it is a genuine effort in relation to industrial safety. It is not, and it is time this Government undertook something better in the interests of safety.

It is surprising to me that this progressive Government which is interested in safety, as the Minister has said, should see fit to do nothing whatsoever about safety until the Australian Government put out a booklet which is called *Occupational Safety and Health in Australian Government Employment—Code and General Principles*. The booklet enunciated many principles which the Australian Government felt should be followed throughout Australia, and was published in 1974. The code applies to the Department of Labour, the Public Service Board, the Department of Health, and so on. Among other things, it deals with obligations and arrangements for joint consultation with employees on safety matters. Let us have a look at that one. For how long have I been saying in this House that safety is an issue between the employer and the employee? The Australian Government has said it. I will come back to that.

The book also deals with machinery, plant, and equipment, safe working methods, training for employees, fires and explosions, personnel, protective equipment, medical and first aid equipment, and accident records, statistics, and investigation. I would like to deal with statistics.

In one year this Liberal Government in Western Australia could not produce accident statistics; yet the Minister for Labour and Industry says the Government is adopting a responsible attitude. The booklet produced by the Australian Government was brought to the notice of the Western Australian Government by a member of the Trades and Labor Council who is on the

Safety Committee. What happened? The Government put out a booklet entitled *Department of Labour and Industry in Western Australia—Occupational Safety and Health in Western Australian Government Employment*.

All the Government did was to alter the word "Australian" to "West Australian", but the code of general principles is exactly the same. Inside the book the information is more or less the same, apart from the necessity to alter it to fit in with State Government instrumentalities. This is our Government's contribution to industrial safety; this is its great step forward—\$20 000 worth of step forward. To hell with the dignity and suffering of workers; we will not spend one cracker on industrial safety unless we are forced to. I will continue to speak in this House in an endeavour to convince the Government that it has an obligation to the work force, at least to give it more than the pittance of \$20 000. I believe the Western Australian workers are making a tremendous contribution to the economic stability of the State and it is time the statistics about work safety were recognised by this Government. If I could just make my point to some Government members, they may do a little more than follow the lead of the Australian Government like little puppy dogs.

Mr Sodeman: Who copied someone else's book?

Mr SKIDMORE: Of course the Australian Government followed the pattern set by countries like Canada, and there is nothing wrong with that. The question of industrial safety has been one of importance in the ILO conventions since 1954, when a code of ethics was laid down. The member for Pilbara should not enter the arena with me and attempt to denigrate the Australian Government because he is of the opinion that it is following someone else. I am concerned that the Government of Western Australia should pay a little more than lip service to industrial safety.

Sir Charles Court: Hasn't your side heard that we have an outstanding record for industrial safety? What about the company that achieved one million hours of industrial safety, all under our system.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to delve further into this subject, but my time is fairly limited. In a broad sense I believe I have established a case—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr SKIDMORE: I feel I should ask for an extension of time—I have nine more subjects to discuss. In all sincerity I say that we have followed other countries and I do not quarrel with that.

Mr Thompson: You only quarrel about it if we follow the Australian

Government. It is all right for them to follow us.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not quarrel with the fact that we follow the Australian Government. However, I say to the member for Kalamunda: For God's sake do a little more about industrial safety than spend \$20 000 on a booklet.

Mr Sodeman: You are blind.

Mr SKIDMORE: I may have to wear glasses, but I am not blind.

Mr Sodeman: Of course you are—you distort the situation every time. You have nothing else to talk about.

Mr SKIDMORE: The honourable member is a shining example of a really genuine person.

Mr Sodeman: That is right. I pay accord to something that has already been achieved.

Mr SKIDMORE: I have yet to hear the member for Pilbara get up to castigate the Government for its inattention to safety matters.

Mr Sodeman: Because it is doing something.

Mr SKIDMORE: Oh come on—\$20 000?

Mr O'Neil: The allocation is to the Industrial Safety Foundation purely for administrative purposes. You distort it.

Mr SKIDMORE: What else has the Government spent money on? I ask the Minister to find it in the Estimates for me.

Mr Thompson: Each one of the departments spends money on industrial safety.

Mr SKIDMORE: So does every Government, every country, and every private institution. I am speaking about training people in safety matters. The member for Kalamunda may rant and rave about money spent in Government instrumentalities for safety, but it is no more than should be spent.

Mr Sodeman: Then acknowledge this is being done.

Mr Thompson: He will not acknowledge it because it does not suit his argument.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am speaking about training in industrial safety.

In the last few moments remaining to me I will be able to touch on another matter only briefly. I am glad the Minister in question is in the Chamber, because I wish to touch on the Swan Valley. The member for Toodyay referred to the Swan Valley very lightly, but he indicated some concern about the purposes for which this valley should be retained in the future.

Along with the Swan Shire Council I have been engaged in a fight in regard to the preservation of the valley and the removal of loam. I approached the Mines

Department to inquire whether it had undertaken any research into the loam needed for the moulding of castings in Western Australia. The answer I received from the officers concerned was that very little research had been undertaken. The subject had been touched on, but no definite conclusions had been reached and they could give no information about any deposits of loam suitable for castings.

Mr Thompson: Are you speaking about brass castings?

Mr SKIDMORE: All types of castings—brass, nonferrous, and steel. I raised this issue also with the Railways Department. I was told that the department had approached the Swan Shire Council because it would have to close down its moulding section if it could not secure a suitable type of loam. The shire was informed also that all the men in the workshops would be out of work and the whole railways system would come to a grinding halt because it would not be able to cast brake shoes. This was a political story put up to the council with a view to raping the valley.

Mr Thompson: A lot of nonsense!

Mr SKIDMORE: I tell the honourable member to drive up the Toodyay Road and he will see this for himself. He should get off his dung heap to have a look.

Mr Thompson: The problem is that the department needs 500 cubic yards a year specifically for brass castings. You are misrepresenting the whole problem.

Mr Sodeman: As usual!

Mr SKIDMORE: The Railways Department stands condemned again, because when I asked a question of the Minister about how much loam it needed in the workshop, the answer was, "Five thousand tonnes of loam a month."

Mr Thompson: They are talking about two different things.

Mr May: It depends which answer you want to use.

Mr SKIDMORE: The honourable member is not going to confuse me.

Mr Thompson: You are misrepresenting the situation.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not misrepresenting the situation. I am saying that I was misled by the Railways Department because we were told that there would be 2 000 employees out of work. The truth is that in the workshop there are 25 men, including two fitters and a few trade assistants. At the moment loam is being obtained from Byford.

Mr Thompson: Of course.

Mr SKIDMORE: Yet the department approached the Swan Shire Council and said that it could not use the loam that was available. The Mines Department was then referred by the council to a booklet it had prepared which set out the deposits

of loam in Western Australia. I was told this booklet was not available and that no research had been carried out.

I say in conclusion that whilst I have breath in my body I will not allow any further rape of the Swan Valley such as has occurred over the past years. If the member for Kalamunda would like to come with me, I can show him a property just off the Middle Swan Road which was mined for loam to a depth of between eight and 10 feet. This land is owned by the husband of a councillor of the Swan Shire. Recently it was flooded to the extent that a three-foot sandbag levy was necessary. Do members know what was done to get rid of the water? A bank of the Swan River was cut so that the land could dry out in the summertime. I will not allow that sort of thing to happen again.

**MR McPHARLIN** (Mt. Marshall) [9.59 p.m.]: Several speakers in this debate to-night have referred to the problems of the beef industry which have arisen over the last 12 months or so. Some criticism was levelled at the Government about what was claimed to be its lack of effort in allocating money from its funds to assist the beef industry. An amount of \$800 000 was allocated to the industry from State funds after a thorough investigation by representatives of the industry. A recommendation was made to the Treasurer for an amount of money to help the industry in the initial stages to overcome the immediate problems. This matter is to be reviewed if the need arises for further amounts to be allocated.

I had the authority of the State Government to assure the Federal Minister for Primary Industry—or the Minister for Agriculture as the portfolio is now—at a meeting in Melbourne of the Agricultural Council that we would increase that amount if the Federal Government was prepared to meet it on a dollar for dollar basis. The case was put on behalf of the State Government, but it was flatly refused; as the State Government had allocated \$800 000 at that time the Federal Treasury, through the Minister, would not agree to increase the allocation. I had authority to advise the Federal Minister that we were prepared to go to a figure in the vicinity of \$1.5 million if the Federal Government were prepared to meet that on a dollar for dollar basis. However, it was refused.

The annoying thing was that the State Government, along with several other State Governments, had attempted to do something to assist the industry at that time, and it had arrived at a figure which was about as much as it could provide from State funds; and yet at the same time the South Australian Government had done nothing about allocating funds to assist the beef producers but came forward later and without making any contribution from State funds received an allocation of \$1.5 million. As much as one may wish

to be as fair as possible and say that action was not politically oriented, it makes one wonder very much whether that was not the case.

That is an instance of the Federal Government not helping the beef industry in Western Australia to the extent that was necessary. It did not until later when the industry was in very great trouble offer better arrangements to provide a lower rate of interest and further assistance. Therefore I think it is fair to criticise the Federal Government for not coming to the assistance of the industry. When originally the Commonwealth came to its assistance, that Government allocated \$20 million through the Commonwealth Development Bank at an interest rate of about 12 per cent; and the producers could not take advantage of it to any great degree. It was not until later when the industry was in more desperate circumstances that the Federal Government saw fit to make further assistance available.

On that basis it is fair to criticise the Federal Government for not providing more assistance earlier on a dollar for dollar basis and at a lower rate of interest, as it had been requested to do many times.

To proceed a little further, we have heard a great deal of criticism of that Government in respect of the removal of the superphosphate bounty. This, of course, has increased the cost of production in many areas of agriculture and is something which has had a very direct impact on those who are endeavouring to develop their properties.

**Mr May:** Such as Malcolm Fraser.

**Mr McPHARLIN:** Such as all the farmers in Australia, and all the farmers in Western Australia. There are roughly 15 000 farmers in Western Australia alone, so why pick out one man?

**Mr May:** Would he be developing his property?

**Mr McPHARLIN:** Let us take for example the wheatgrowers of Western Australia, of whom there are roughly 9 000. I suppose at the moment the wheat industry is as substantial an industry as any in the primary field, because the price and the returns are reasonable. However, what is worrying the farmers is the ever-increasing cost of production and the uncertainty of future markets. Of course, the latter is something with which farmers are always faced.

However, the cost of production is the most worrying factor. The price of superphosphate has increased in 12 months from approximately \$14 a tonne bulk to approximately \$55 a tonne, and after freight is added it increases to \$70 a tonne landed; then one has to transport that from the railhead to one's property.

Therefore the removal of the bounty has had a direct impact on the cost of production. It has been estimated that the

cost of production in the wheat industry has increased by something like 78 per cent in 12 months. It is all very well to say that the price of wheat is quite good at the moment, but with a 78 per cent increase in production costs it does not take much of a calculation to work out that a farmer can be in real trouble if there is an adverse season with poor yields and returns.

The superphosphate bounty was a definite help to many farmers to keep their cost of production to a reasonable level; but the action of the Federal Government in not reintroducing the bounty after recommendations by the Industries Assistance Commission makes it fair criticism for one to say that Government is not greatly concerned with the primary industries and country people as a whole.

The State Government considered the problem of costs incurred at abattoirs in respect of killing charges, etc.—a matter with which I was very closely associated. It is pleasing to see that a decision has been made to alleviate the overhead costs of the Midland Junction Abattoir by making an annual grant of \$275 000 to the board in reduction of the burden of debt charges. Not only is the State Government contributing that sum as a debt subsidy, but also it is making provision for a recoup of losses, which is estimated to be \$780 000 in 1975-76. I think that is a reasonable amount to be allocated by a State Government to assist a service industry. Of course, being a service industry, abattoirs must provide a service at all times to the farmers who wish to send their stock to them.

Another matter I wish to bring to the notice of the Government concerns the establishment of high school hostels. Upon looking at the Estimates I find that the Country High School Hostels Authority had an expenditure in 1974-75 of \$434 104 and the estimate for the current financial year is \$491 000.

The town of Wyalkatchem in my electorate needs a hostel to accommodate students attending the district high school. For years now I have been endeavouring to obtain a hostel, but I have not been successful. The district high school services a large area north and east of Wyalkatchem. Residents from all the areas involved have formed a committee and are very anxious—and have been urging for years—to have a hostel established there.

I suggest the allocation from State Government funds to the Country High School Hostels Authority for the construction of hostels could be increased considerably in an endeavour to provide hostels in areas such as the one to which I refer.

It is easy to say there are other hostels which perhaps do not have their full student numbers, but some of these are considerable distances away and the

travelling costs involved would be substantial. It would be far easier to construct a hostel in the vicinity, even if it were only a four-night hostel, where the students could arrive on Monday and return home on Friday. I bring this once again to the notice of the Government, hoping that consideration will be given to the problem.

Another matter which has always concerned me is the freight costs involved in moving goods to and from country areas. We all know freights have a great impact on the cost of living in country areas. If one compared the figures relating to railway expenditure and expected revenue contained in the Budget papers, one would see that the anticipated revenue always appears to exceed expenditure. The railways pay their own operating costs.

However, an examination of the document titled "Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure" reveals that an amount of \$10 305 536 was expended in 1974-75 on interest on loan capital. This year the amount has not reduced; in fact, it is to increase to \$10 886 000. One wonders whether the servicing of this debt will ever begin to reduce, thus enabling some adjustment in freight rates.

Commonwealth general revenue grants, which could have an application in this field, include an amount called "Debt Charges Assistance". Perhaps this could be used to reduce some of the interest burden to which I have referred. In 1974-75, the amount allocated was \$5 527 672; however, this year apparently the Commonwealth is not offering debt charges assistance.

Mr May: Are you sure you know what you are talking about?

Mr McPHARLIN: According to the Estimates, this is the case. I had hoped that some of this allocation could have applied to a public utility like the railways in order to bring about a lowering of freight rates.

Mr May: Would not this be a good case for the Commonwealth taking over the WAGR?

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not know whether that would help the freight situation.

Mr Watt: It would have the opposite effect; it would put them up.

Mr May: Not any more than they are now.

Mr Watt: The user must pay!

Mr McPHARLIN: At any rate, my hopes were dashed when I saw that no allocation was to be made in this area.

The Government is often taken to task for criticising the Federal Government. However, I believe we are justified in criticising a Government which behaves in the way the Federal Government—or for that matter, any other Government—has behaved of late. One does not know what will happen in the near future with the present situation obtaining in Canberra,

but whatever happens I hope that early consideration is given to the requirements of the State Government in some of the fields to which I have referred.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

## FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Council's Amendments*

Amendments made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) in charge of the Bill.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments made by the Council are as follows—

#### No. 1.

Clause 23, page 16, line 5—Delete the word "and".

#### No. 2.

Clause 23, page 16, line 8—Delete the passage "words "wildlife officers";" and substitute a new passage as follows—

words "wildlife officers"; and

(iii) by adding after paragraph (b) a new paragraph as follows—

(c) Where a wildlife officer enters upon or searches the enclosed garden or curtilage of a dwelling house the owner or occupier of that dwelling house may make a complaint on oath before a justice of the peace alleging that in his opinion there had been no reasonable grounds for the exercise of that power, and thereupon the justice shall cause the matter to be inquired into and shall make his findings known to the complainant and to the Minister.

Mr P. V. JONES: I move—

That the amendments made by the Council be agreed to.

The Committee will recall that considerable discussion ensued during the Bill's previous passage through Committee relating to the clause providing the power of entry without warrant. During the course of that debate, I outlined in detail the circumstances which would prevail, enabling this power to be utilised. I also indicated that only in the most exceptional circumstances would wildlife officers enter

and search the places described in the legislation.

The amendment moved by the Council will not minimise or take away from the powers we are seeking to invest in wildlife officers. It will provide only a statutory recognition of the fact that should one of these wildlife officers in the execution of his duty cause any form of hardship or personal inconvenience which could be the subject of a complaint, the owner or occupier of the premises which the wildlife officer entered is entitled now to make a complaint before a Justice of the Peace, who is then responsible for having the circumstances of the complaint inquired into. I commend the amendments to the Committee.

Mr BARNETT: The Opposition does not object to the first amendment which proposes merely to delete the word "and" from clause 23; in our view, it will neither add to nor take away from the Bill. However, I should like to make a few comments in regard to the second amendment. The Minister told the Committee that in his opinion it will not take away from the operations of the Bill.

In my opinion it does nothing for the Bill. Members will recall that when I spoke on the measure before it went to another place I was concerned that wildlife officers were to be given authority to enter a private person's garden or curtilage—and this means a person's own backyard. In other words, a wildlife officer, without a warrant, will be entitled to enter the property of any person and conduct a search without a warrant.

When the Bill was previously before this Chamber I pointed out that I was concerned that the civil liberties of the people of Western Australia were gradually being eroded by this type of legislation. I must agree that the Bill has been returned from another place with a slight improvement; it will now give people an opportunity to complain after their civil liberties have been impinged upon. This will, perhaps, make a wildlife officer think twice before doing something which may be entirely wrong. To that extent the measure is better, but only to that extent.

I and other members on this side of the Chamber say that the onus should be on the wildlife officer to show reasonable grounds for his entering the property of a private person. The onus should not be on the property owner to prove that a wildlife officer should not enter his property, especially, say, on a Sunday afternoon. In my electorate the sun always shines.

Mr Nanovich: Yes, and in my territory it always rises in the east and sinks in the west.

Mr BARNETT: In my electorate it hardly ever rains, and I am sure that many of my constituents enjoy lazing



around in the privacy of their own backyards with the minimum of clothing, and perhaps with no clothing whatsoever, and they have every right to enjoy that privacy. Here we have a situation where the Liberal Government is passing legislation that is gradually eroding the civil liberties of individuals.

Several members interjected.

Mr BARNETT: Obviously many members on the Government side of the Chamber are too old to get their gear off and enjoy lazing around in their own backyards. I can assure them that many of my constituents enjoy doing that and they do not want their privacy being disturbed by a wildlife officer. I would point out, too, that this provision will also permit an honorary wildlife officer to enter the property of a private person. Some clauses of this Bill grant honorary wildlife officers practically the same authority as a fully-fledged wildlife officer, and we must not forget that a fully-fledged wildlife officer has had no training at all. All an honorary wildlife officer has to do is to say to the Minister, "I want to be an honorary wildlife officer." There could be many people around Western Australia who want to take the opportunity of prying on people in the privacy of their own backyards.

Mr P. V. Jones: This does not apply to honorary wildlife officers at all; they have no right of entry whatsoever.

Mr BARNETT: The Minister can give me that assurance, can he?

Mr P. V. Jones: This provision does not apply to honorary wardens, but only to wildlife officers who are permanently employed. At present they number 20 in all.

Mr BARNETT: So there are only 20 wildlife officers in the State now, as well as other officers who come under the provisions of other legislation, who will be allowed to enter the property of a private person?

Mr P. V. Jones: There are 20 to whom this power will apply.

Mr BARNETT: They will be allowed to enter private property and watch people sunbathing in the nude.

Mr Old: What an attraction!

Mr BARNETT: The Minister probably gets his tan by streaking or something like that.

Mr Thompson: If anyone does any streaking it will be the inspector.

Mr BARNETT: It is obvious the Minister will not accept any amendment, because he would not accept one when the Bill was previously before this Chamber. The Legislative Council has seen fit to make one small amendment. I would remind members opposite that the fourth

amendment of the Constitution of the United States reads—

The right of people to be secure in their persons' houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, they shall not be violated and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

I will also quote the old English adage that an Englishman's home is his castle. Obviously in Western Australia no notice will be taken of this adage or of the fourth amendment to the United States' Constitution. This Liberal Government will apply this legislation which will gradually erode the civil liberties of the people of Western Australia. I would point out that this erosion is increasing month by month.

I knew full well that the Minister would not take any notice of what I have been saying, but I wanted to take the opportunity to force my point home.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—20

Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Neill
Mr Cowan	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Stephens
Mr McPharlin	Mr Thompson
Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Nanovich	Mr Young
Mr Old	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

#### Noes—16

Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr May
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moiler

(Teller)

#### Pairs

##### Ayes

Dr Dadour  
Mr O'Connor  
Mr Laurence  
Mr Sibson  
Mr Blaikie  
Mr Coyne

##### Noes

Mr Carr  
Mr Hartrey  
Mr Bateman  
Mr Farnan  
Mr J. T. Tonkin  
Mr Taylor

Question thus passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

#### Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### DOOR TO DOOR (SALES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

##### Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee*

The Chairman of Committee (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr Grayden (Minister for Consumer Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

The amendment made by the Council was as follows—

Clause 7, page 7, lines 15 to 18—Delete the passage—

"after a statement has been posted to a purchaser or bailee pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, the vendor or dealer has contacted the purchaser or bailee",

and substitute the passage—

"at any time after a credit purchase agreement has been made at the place of residence of the purchaser or bailee, the vendor or dealer contacts the purchaser or bailee in any manner (other than by posting a statement, or a statement with an explanatory letter, pursuant to and in accordance with subsection (1) of this section)".

Mr GRAYDEN: I move—

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

As members are aware there are certain circumstances which make it desirable to waive the cooling-off period in respect of credit-purchase agreements. For instance, if a person requires curtains for his home urgently, he might not be prepared to wait until the cooling-off period has elapsed. Obviously curtain makers will not manufacture curtains and install them if there is a possibility that credit agreements entered into will be waived.

We did write into the Bill a provision to prevent a vendor or dealer from making overtures to, or putting pressure on, a purchaser to waive the cooling-off period. The Council's amendment goes further. It will prevent any contact between a vendor or dealer and a purchaser, from the time the goods are agreed to be purchased until the period has elapsed. This provides further protection to the consumer.

Mr SKIDMORE: We on this side of the Chamber debated the Bill at length when it was dealt with here. Whilst we have some reservations about the Bill, we agree to the Council's amendment. It will provide a little more protection to the purchaser of goods under the circumstances outlined by the Minister; therefore we on this side do not oppose the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

*Report*

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

**TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Council's Amendment*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr Rushton (Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

The amendment made by the Council was as follows—

Page 2, line 19—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following paragraph—

(b) by adding after subsection (3) the following subsections—

(4) A town planning scheme, or an amendment to a town planning scheme, made or adopted before the coming into operation of the Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Act, 1975 or any act or thing done pursuant to such a town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme shall not be regarded as invalid by reason only of one or more of the following reasons, namely—

(a) that, in the notice of that town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme, as the case may be, the date specified by the Board as the date on or before which objections to the scheme or amendment could be made was a date earlier, but not more than seven days earlier, than the proper date;

(b) that the responsible authority did not accept for consideration an objection to that town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme, as the case may be, being an objection that was made on or before the proper date but was not made—

(i) on or before the date specified in the

notice of the scheme or amendment; or

(ii) more than seven days before the proper date;

(c) that a copy of the notice of that town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme, as the case may be, was displayed in the offices of the responsible authority for a period, shorter, but not more than seven days shorter, than the prescribed period.

(5) In subsection (4) of this section—

“notice”, in relation to a town planning scheme or an amendment to a town planning scheme, means the notice notifying persons of their entitlement to make objections to that scheme or amendment;

“prescribed period”, in relation to a notice notifying persons of their entitlement to make objections to a town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme, means the period prescribed by the regulations as in force at the time that notice was displayed;

“proper date”, in relation to a town planning scheme or an amendment to a town planning scheme, means the earliest date that the Board could lawfully have specified as the date on or before which objections to that town planning scheme or amendment to a town planning scheme could be made.

Mr RUSHTON: I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

This amendment conforms with the undertaking I gave to the member for Cockburn. Whilst I was not concerned with the Bill as it was presented, the member for Cockburn projected the view that a limitation should be placed on the number of days that should be permitted in respect of what I might term as transgressions of the past.

I referred the matter to the Crown Law Department, and the suggestion that has come forward is that a limit of seven days should be applied. That would take into account the conditions that might be applicable. I have mentioned to the member for Cockburn that a period of seven days has been decided on, and he is agreeable to it. This amendment gives effect to the point which was raised in this Chamber.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

### Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

*House adjourned at 10.39 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 22nd October, 1975

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

### QUESTION ON NOTICE

#### TRANSPORT

##### *Karawara Bus Service*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it the intention of the MTT to provide a bus service into the new State Housing Commission development at Karawara?
- (2) If so, would the Minister advise—
  - (a) when the service will be commenced; and
  - (b) what will be the route of the service?
- (3) Are any problems likely to delay the implementation of such a service, and if so, what are they?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.