

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 25th August, 1964

CONTENTS

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : NINTH DAY—	Page
Speakers on Amendment to Motion—	
Mr. Brand	539
Mr. Court	532
Mr. Graham	528
Mr. Hawke	537
Dr. Henn	546
Mr. Mitchell	545
Mr. Rowberry	543
Mr. Tonkin	526
Speakers on Motion—	
Mr. Bickerton	562
Mr. Dunn	559
Mr. W. A. Manning	547
Mr. Toms	553
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Albany Highway : Widening between Verna Street and Fremantle Road, Gosnells	520
Borrowing on Land Mortgages : Legislation Covering Minors	521
Crosswalks at Schools : Standards for Guard Control	521
Dairying Industry—	
Economic Position	518
Imports of Butter and Cheese for 1954-64	518
Production Figures for 1954-64	518
Education—	
Alma Street School, Fremantle—	
Depth of Underground Water Supply	519
Water Consumption and Cost	519
Guildford State School—	
Cold Water Units	520
Improvements to Playing Ground	520
School Ground Improvements : Departmental Assistance	516
Electoral—	
Districts : Area of Assembly Electorates and Council Provinces	523
Legislative Council By-elections : Adoption of Adult Franchise	519
Legislative Council Members : Legislation Governing Retirement	523
Gold Mines—	
Annual Production	516
Number Closed	516
Number Still Operating	516
Government Boards, Trusts, and Commissions—	
Ages of Personnel	517
Policy on Retiring Ages	517
Government Offices at Kalgoorlie : Location in Old Maritana Hotel	519
Housing—	
Aged People's Homes : Provision in Kalgoorlie and Country Areas	521
Carnarvon : Number to be Built in 1964-65	518
Esperance : Provision and Applications	524
Kununurra : Building of State Rental Homes	519
Migrants : Priority in Allocation	524
Swan Electorate Areas—	
Applications and Vacancy Rates	520
Building Programme	520

Midland Fire Station : Staff and Water Pressure	521
Motor Vehicle Insurance in the North-West : Review of State Government Insurance Office Premiums	515
North-West Development—	
Connection between Companies	521
Paid-up Capital and Principal Shareholders of Companies	522
Rural and Industries Bank : Details of Loans to North-West Companies	516
Standard Gauge Railway : Kewdale-Kwinana Section—Decision re Rail and Road Junction at Kenwick	522
Supreme Court Penalties and Offences : Determinations by Individual Judges	520
Totalisator Agency Board : Agents and Managers—	
Number Engaged	517
Termination of Engagements	517

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

King's Park Restaurant : Provision of Liquor License	524
Rural and Industries Bank : Details of Loans to North-West Companies	524
Supreme Court Penalties and Offences : Determinations by Individual Judges	525
Water Rates—	
Amounts Previously Paid and to be Paid	525
Basis of Rating in Kalgoorlie and Boulder	525

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST

Review of State Government Insurance Office Premiums

1. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Labour:
 - (1) Is he aware there is an insurance company offering to insure motor vehicles in any part of the north-west at the same premium as those operating in the farming areas?
 - (2) Is he also aware that in Carnarvon the State Government Insurance Office is losing clients as its premiums are too high?
 - (3) As other insurance companies are able to offer premiums on the insurance of motor vehicles lower than the State Government Insurance Office will he take steps to have a review made of the premiums charged by the State Government Insurance Office?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I understand that the R.A.C. Insurance Pty. Ltd. insures vehicles garaged within the townsites of

Carnarvon only, at rates lower than those charged by the State Government Insurance Office and it is possible that some clients of that office may have transferred to the R.A.C. Insurance Pty. Ltd. for that reason.

- (3) As far as is known other insurance companies do not offer premiums lower than the State Government Insurance Office (Carnarvon townsite excepted) for comparable policy conditions. The fixing of premium rates is the prerogative of the general manager, who informs me that they are examined regularly to ascertain whether any increases or decreases are justified. Like most motor insurers the world over, S.G.I.O. has a record of deficit underwriting for the last four years, and 1963-64 is no exception. This does not support the suggestion that State Government Insurance Office premiums are too high and should be reduced.

HOUSES AT CARNARVON

Number to be Built in 1964-65

2. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware of the acute housing shortage at Carnarvon?
- (2) How many houses does the commission intend to build at Carnarvon in 1964-65?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The 37 outstanding applications, after allowing for wastage of 24 per cent., will be progressively met from vacancies at 18 per year or by the completion of the two houses under construction, and the finalisation of a contract for a further five houses. In addition to the foregoing and the two houses just completed, tenders will be called for seven more houses. This programme should prove adequate.

SCHOOL GROUND IMPROVEMENTS

Departmental Assistance

3. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) In connection with what schools, if any, has his department assisted the local parents and citizens or shires with—
 - (a) fencing school grounds;
 - (b) clearing and levelling playing areas;
 - (c) landscaping and planting of gardens?
- (2) What was the amount or type of assistance given in each case?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) Not any.
- (b) There is no general policy to assist parents and citizens' associations or shires in the clearing and levelling of playing areas.
- (c) The department does not subsidise the landscaping and planting of school gardens; but loam and gardening equipment are provided on application, and plans for the landscaping of school grounds are supplied when requested. However, the department does subsidise parents and citizens' associations to the extent of 50 per cent. of the cost of bringing water to the surface. Information as to the schools so assisted is not readily available and could only be obtained by an exhaustive perusal of the files for each school.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

4. This question was postponed.

GOLDMINES

Number Closed

5. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What mines having a gold production in excess of 300 oz. per year have closed down during the years 1934-64 inclusive?

Annual Production

- (2) What was the annual production in each instance?

Number Still Operating

- (3) What mines producing 300 or more ounces per year are still operating?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (3) The information requested over the 30-year period will take a considerable time to prepare. It is suggested that the honourable member contact the Under-Secretary for Mines, as the department has published information which might meet his requirements.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK

Details of Loans to North-West Companies

6. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What is the total amount of finance involved in loans by the Rural and Industries Bank to Drove Pty. Limited, and Broome Freezing & Chilling Works Pty. Ltd., particulars concerning which

appeared under "Debentures, Mortgages, Charges, etc.," in *Weekly Trade Gazette* No. 32?

- (2) Is the margin of security provided by the mortgagor equal to or greater than that normally required of a borrower of comparable sums?
- (3) Has there been any prospective borrower who was refused a loan during the last 12 months by the Rural and Industries Bank who offered a greater margin of security than that provided by the mortgagors mentioned above?
- (4) Was the interrelationship existing between Drove Pty. Limited, Broome Freezing & Chilling Works Pty. Ltd., Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd., Yeeda Station Pty. Ltd., and Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. known to the Rural and Industries Bank when financial accommodation was provided?
- (5) If "Yes," was this taken into consideration at the time?
- (6) Had the mortgagors tried unsuccessfully to obtain the financial accommodation required from the Development Bank or any other bank?
- (7) Were the advances made by the Rural and Industries Bank in the normal course of business?
- (8) Were the advances made because of direction from the Government or some Minister of the Government?
- (9) If a Minister directed that the bank advance the money, who was the Minister?
- (10) Would an adverse judgment on the writ issued by Aquaplas Expanded Plastics Pty. Ltd. against E. S. Clementson Pty. Ltd. for £6,487 16s. 4d. have any effect on the securities held by the Rural and Industries Bank in respect of loans made to companies in which E. S. Clementson has a substantial interest?
- (11) Which of the loans, if any, are backed by a Government guarantee?
- (12) How much of the total of the money advanced is secured by a bill of sale over Leopold Downs Station?
- (13) Are there any other charges on Leopold Downs which would be entitled to rank in priority to those held by the Rural and Industries Bank?
- (14) If "Yes," what is the total amount of such prior charges?
- (15) Have the transactions between the Rural and Industries Bank and E. S. Clementson's interests

involved any increase in indebtedness to the bank with respect to the properties mortgaged?

- (16) In what way will the transfer of indebtedness "speed the repayment of what was owed" as claimed by the Minister for the North-West?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (16) It would be highly improper to divulge the information asked for.

Mr. Tonkin: What nonsense!

Mr. BOVELL: This would disclose private and confidential transactions between the bank and client, which would be contrary to accepted banking principles and ethics, and undermine public confidence in the bank.

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you say you are not game to answer it?

Mr. BOVELL: Rubbish!

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD: AGENTS AND MANAGERS

Number Engaged

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many agents and managers, respectively, are at present working for the Totalisator Agency Board?

Termination of Engagement

- (2) How many agents have had their engagements terminated during the six months ended the 31st July last?
- (3) Of those agents how many voluntarily terminated their agreement with the board?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) 120 agents and 31 managers.
- (2) Six.
- (3) Three.

GOVERNMENT BOARDS, TRUSTS, AND COMMISSIONS

Ages of Personnel

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

- (1) To his knowledge or belief, how many persons who have been appointed by the Government to boards, trusts, commissions, committees, and any other bodies whatsoever, and are still occupying such positions, are the age of 69 years or older?
- (2) What are the names of those persons?
- (3) What positions do they hold?
- (4) What are their ages respectively?

Policy on Retiring Ages

- (5) What is the policy of the Government respecting retiring ages?

- (6) Does this policy differ from that of the Minister for Agriculture?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) to (6) I have nothing to add to my reply to the honourable member on this subject on the 11th August. The question of fixing a retiring age for appointments of this nature is being examined by the Government.

Mr. Graham: You are not game to answer.

Mr. BRAND: Again, rubbish!

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Production Figures for 1954-64

9. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the Western Australian production and value of both butter and cheese in the years 1954-64 inclusive?
- (2) What number of whole-milk quotas were in operation in each of the above years?
- (3) How many producers operated in the same span of years in butter-fat production?
- (4) What was the annual production of butterfat in each of the years?

Imports of Butter and Cheese for 1954-64

- (5) What amount of both butter and cheese were imported in W.A. during the years 1954-64 inclusive?
- (6) What was the value in each of the years?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1)

Year ended March 31st	Butter		Cheese	
	Production	Value	Production	Value
	lb.	£	lb.	£
1953/54	13,757,468	2,561,648	2,699,534	322,339
1954/55	10,005,090	2,949,481	2,426,524	293,563
1955/56	16,584,601	2,940,626	1,708,439	196,271
1956/57	16,716,523	1,946,741	2,647,935	296,430
1957/58	15,247,884	2,545,504	2,277,385	234,001
1958/59	13,812,718	2,512,933	2,644,853	306,852
1959/60	16,521,610	3,058,199	3,231,796	383,267
1960/61	17,160,334	3,073,536	3,025,354	374,428
1961/62	10,761,850	2,977,989	3,055,856	379,133
1962/63	16,596,382	2,772,386	3,223,011	409,027
1963/64	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available

	Quotas
(2) 1954/55	476
1955/56	476
1956/57	492
1957/58	507
1958/59	520
1959/60	527
1960/61	537
1961/62	549
1962/63	560
1963/64	561
1964/65	552

Since the adoption by the board on the 27th August, 1962, of a policy permitting the combining of contracts subject to certain conditions, approval has been given to 43 applications to combine and the total number of quotas since that date is accordingly less than it would otherwise have been.

- (3) The only figures available are for producers running 20 or more dairy cattle (collected by the Bureau of Statistics from 1958-59 onwards).

Year	Producers
1958/59	2,808
1959/60	2,758
1960/61	2,760
1961/62	2,788
1962/63	2,756
1963/64	Not available

(4) Year ended the 30th June	Total Butterfat Purchased lb.
1953/54	11,436,198
1954/55	13,252,919
1955/56	13,625,419
1956/57	13,721,446
1957/58	12,360,109
1958/59	11,351,013
1959/60	13,560,392
1960/61	14,143,599
1961/62	13,756,080
1962/63	12,779,515
1963/64	12,793,993

- (5) and (6) Imports.

Year ended March 31st	Butter		Cheese	
	lb.	£	lb.	£
1953/54	4,230,933	813,745	2,387,168	416,035
1954/55	3,353,984	630,703	2,300,564	400,589
1955/56	2,643,896	532,427	2,487,729	442,757
1956/57	996,692	201,703	2,724,010	503,024
1957/58	2,417,512	491,588	2,915,188	556,736
1958/59	3,680,934	809,489	2,756,995	534,298
1959/60	1,486,963	334,179	3,128,060	573,430
1960/61	408,648	97,105	2,725,435	499,550
1961/62	1,146,043	266,169	3,290,881	582,482
1962/63	3,279,087	769,377	3,094,423	518,235
1963/64	2,550,176	550,774	4,416,763	739,008

Economic Position

10. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he satisfied with the economic position of the dairying industry in this State?
- (2) Would he know the number of producers who earn less than the basic wage?
- (3) What initial milk quota is granted to dairymen when they first obtain a license?
- (4) How many quotas are in excess of—
 (a) 250
 (b) 200
 (c) 150

(d) 100

(e) 50

gallons?

- (5) How many quotas at present are under 50 gallons?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The general position of the dairy-ing industry is satisfactory, but the returns to individuals vary with the extent to which overall development on their properties has been effected.
- (2) No.
- (3) 47 gallons daily.
- (4) (a) 6
(b) 20
(c) 58
(d) 164
(e) 503.
- (5) 31.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BY-ELECTIONS

Adoption of Adult Franchise

11. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) In view of the fact that the amendments to the Constitution Act Amendment Act of last session have been proclaimed and are now law, is it a fact that if a by-election were now to be held for a Legislative Council province it would be held under adult franchise?
- (2) If so, why is the Electoral Department still accepting Legislative Council enrolment cards?
- (3) If not, what is the position?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) No; because the necessary amendments to the Electoral Act, 1907-1962, to give effect to the amendments to the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899-1963, and the Electoral Districts Act, 1947-1955, passed last year have not yet been passed; but a Bill, which was foreshadowed last session of Parliament, to do so has been drafted and will be introduced into Parliament shortly. The intention of the Bill to amend the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899-1963, which was passed last year, was that the then existing provisions for Legislative Council enrolment were to continue until the new 15 electoral provinces came into existence on a date to be proclaimed in December, 1964, and a Bill to clarify this intention and to remove any uncertainty has been drafted and will be introduced into Parliament shortly.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES AT KALGOORLIE

Location in Old Maritana Hotel

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Premier:

- (1) What Government departmental offices are intended to be housed in the building previously known as the old Maritana Hotel, Boulder Road, Kalgoorlie?
- (2) When is it expected that such offices will be open to the public at this new address?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Forests Department; Department of Agriculture, Child Welfare Department, Department of Native Welfare, Education Department, and Public Works Department (Architectural Division).
- (2) At the end of 1964.

HOUSING AT KUNUNURRA

Building of State Rental Homes

13. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to build State rental homes in the town of Kununurra?
- (2) If so, how many?
- (3) If not, what is the reason for the Housing Commission not building homes at Kununurra?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) To date, the Government has considered housing as being part of the overall project at Kununurra and has met all urgent and essential needs by building 62 rental homes and having a further 20 under construction. Regular reviews are made of demands for all classes of accommodation at Kununurra.

ALMA STREET SCHOOL, FREMANTLE

Water Consumption and Cost

14. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the water consumption of Alma Street State School, Fremantle?
- (2) What is the cost of water to the department?

Depth of Underground Water Supply

- (3) What is the approximate depth to an underground water supply?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) 1963-64 813,000 gallons.
- (2) 1963-64 £82 5s. 6d.
- (3) 15 to 20 feet at the corner of Alma Street and South Terrace.

GUILDFORD STATE SCHOOL*Improvements to Playing Ground*

15. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it expected sawdust will be removed from the State school playing grounds, Guildford?
- (2) Have plans been finalised for an extended playing ground at the same school?
- (3) What is the current position with regard to the school grounds extension?

Cold Water Units

- (4) Will cold water units be available for school during next summer?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department has recommended that instead of being removed the sawdust should be covered with soil. This has been approved and work will commence in the near future.
- (2) Acquisition of an additional 2½ acres of the river flats area has been approved.
- (3) Negotiations to finalise the purchase are in hand by the Public Works Department.
- (4) No. Priority for the installation of cold water units is given to schools in inland areas.

HOUSING IN SWAN ELECTORATE AREAS*Applications, and Vacancy Rate*

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many outstanding applications for Midland, Guildford, and Bassendean areas are filed at the State Housing Commission?
- (2) What is the vacancy rate for the same three areas?

Building Programme

- (3) What is the building programme for the three areas?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) As at the 24th August, 1964, the applications outstanding were—
Midland 39
Guildford 4
Bassendean 66.
- (2) The annual vacancy rates are—
Midland 80
Guildford Nil, as there is no commission rental housing in this area.
Bassendean 18.

(3) The building programme is—

Midland area: 20 in addition to the 5 houses now under construction.

Guildford area: Nil.

Bassendean area: 30 in addition to 4 now under construction.

SUPREME COURT PENALTIES AND OFFENCES*Determinations by Individual Judges*

17. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Would he supply a list of penalties and offences as dealt with by each member justice of the Supreme Court during the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964 to the present?
- (2) Which of these were first offenders?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Over 1,500 cases are involved in the question; and, in order to supply the information as to the first offenders, it would be necessary to peruse this number of files, most of which are held at the repository. The answers supplied both as to penalties and as to first offenders would be valueless without knowledge of the whole of the circumstances of each particular case and of the antecedents and character of each particular offender.

If the honourable member desires to press the question, it would take considerable time to collate the necessary particulars in order to provide the answer.

ALBANY HIGHWAY*Widening Between Verna Street and Fremantle Road, Gosnells*

18. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) In connection with that portion of the Albany Highway between Verna Street and Fremantle Road, Gosnells, is it proposed to widen the highway between these points?
- (2) If so, will he indicate particulars and when it is anticipated work will commence?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No widening is proposed on that portion of the Albany Highway between Verna Street and Fremantle Road, Gosnells.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

CROSSWALKS AT SCHOOLS*Standards for Guard Control*

19. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Are there any standards to be met for "guard controlled" school crossings?
- (2) If so, what are these standards?
- (3) Who decides whether such crossings are warranted?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) Requests for the appointment of special officers to control school pedestrian crossings are investigated by a committee representing the Education Department, the Main Roads Department, and the Police Department. This committee inspects the site and considers all aspects of the matter, including traffic density, possible risk to which children are exposed, and number of children who would avail themselves of such crossings if provided.

- (3) The Minister.

AGED PEOPLE'S HOMES*Provision in Kalgoorlie and Country Areas*

20. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) What accommodation is available in Kalgoorlie for aged people who, although not invalids in the true sense, are nevertheless incapable of looking after themselves?
- (2) Does the Government provide funds towards the establishment of homes for geriatrics in country centres?
- (3) If so, on what basis is this done?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) A home conducted by the Goldfields Aged Pensioners Welfare Association with accommodation for 15 women and 14 men.

The district hospital and St. John of God Private Hospital also accommodate a number of aged people, but these mostly need nursing care.

- (2) and (3) Under the Commonwealth's Aged Persons Homes Act, the Commonwealth Government will subsidise local effort on the basis of £2 for £1 for capital work. The State will assist on a pound for pound basis for furniture and equipment up to a maximum of £10,000 in any one year.

MIDLAND FIRE STATION*Staff and Water Pressure*

21. Mr. BRADY asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is the Midland Fire Station fully manned?
- (2) What increase (if any) of staff has been made in the last ten years?
- (3) How are staff numbers arranged?
- (4) Are local water pressures in all areas in Midland, Greenmount, and Bellevue satisfactory?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Permanent staff increased from four to seven in 1955 and from seven to nine in 1957.
- (3) One officer and two firemen to each of three shifts.
- (4) For fire-fighting purposes—Yes.

BORROWING ON LAND MORTGAGES*Legislation Covering Minors*

22. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Has the Government considered introducing legislation to amend the law relating to infancy and land dealings so as to provide that the age limit for borrowing on mortgage of land might be reduced below 21 years in the case of young married couples and people about to be married?
- (2) Is it intended to legislate accordingly this session?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Since October, 1963, at the invitation of the Government, frequent discussions on this matter have been held within the Law Society of W.A. and the results are expected shortly. The matter has also been discussed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.
- (2) No recommendation has yet been made to Cabinet.

NORTH-WEST DEVELOPMENT*Connection between Companies*

23. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) What is the distinction, if any, for all practical purposes between Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. and Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.?
- (2) Which company actually purchased Broome Freezing and Chilling Works Pty. Ltd.?
- (3) What is the connection between Drove Pty. Ltd. and Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.?

- (4) Are Yeeda Station Pty. Ltd., Drove Pty. Ltd., and Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd. inter-connected?
- (5) What is the name and business address of the Western Australian representative of Mr. E. S. Clementson, Managing Director of Norwest Development Corporation Ltd.?

Mr. COURT replied:

Most of the information requested by the honourable member has not yet had to be filed with the Companies' Office, Perth. The company has, however, supplied information on request which shows the following position in respect of the honourable member's questions:

- (1) Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd. (previously Broome Freezing and Chilling Works Pty. Ltd.) conducts the operations of the meat works. The position of Norwest Development Corporation Ltd., a company registered in Canberra, is that it is the major shareholder in Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.
- (2) Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. on the basis that it is the major shareholder of Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.
- (3) The only connection is that the directorates are similar. The major shareholdings are differently held.
- (4) As for No. (3) above.
- (5) Mr. Clementson has no personal representative in Western Australia officially known to the Government. Mr. A. Ferguson whose business address is 47 St. George's Terrace, Perth, is the general manager and a Director of Norwest Development Corporation Ltd.

Paid-up Capital and Principal Shareholders of Companies

24. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What is the paid-up capital and who is the principal shareholder of each of the following companies:—
 - (a) Kimberly Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.;
 - (b) Drove Pty. Ltd.;
 - (c) Yeeda Station Pty. Ltd.;
 - (d) Norwest Development Corporation Ltd.?
- (2) Who is managing director of the abovementioned companies?

- (3) Is E. S. Clementson Pty. Ltd. a shareholder in any of the companies?
- (4) If "Yes," which company or companies?

Mr. COURT replied:

I preface my reply by referring the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the previous question, which explains why some of the information on the present question is as supplied.

The following information has been extracted from the documents filed with the Registrar of Companies, Perth.

- (1) (a) £10,005—Dermot Thomas Farrell.
- (b) £5,500—Mrs. Ada Morgan and Graeme Francis Millington.
- (c) £1,260—Thelma Elliott and Joseph Thomas Elliott.
- (d) Not registered in companies Office.
- (2) (a), (b), and (c) Not recorded.
- (d) See 1(d).
- (3) (a), (b), and (c) No.
- (d) See 1(d).
- (4) Answered by No. (3).

**STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY:
KEWDALE-KWINANA SECTION**

Decision re Rail and Road Junction at Kenwick

25. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) In connection with that portion of the standard gauge section between Kewdale and Kwinana, has a definite decision been reached respecting the rail and road junction at Kenwick?
- (2) If so, would he make available particulars of the mentioned design?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes, in principle, assuming that the honourable member is referring to the junction of the new standard gauge railway and Albany Highway.
- (2) Albany Highway discussions are still taking place between the Railways Department, the Main Roads Department, and the Town Planning Department; and at present it is proposed to install boom gates at the level crossing at this point until a grade separation can be provided in conjunction with the future controlled access highway and Albany Highway deviation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS*Legislation Governing Retirement*

26. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to introduce further amendments to the Constitution Act Amendment Act this session to effect the retirement of the senior half of the Legislative Council with the Assembly members if a Government elected after 1965 General Election fails to run its full three years?
- (2) If not, what safeguard will be instituted to co-ordinate the election dates if an Assembly fails to run its normal three years' term?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) It was never intended to alter the existing provision of the Constitution Act Amendment Act in respect of the period of time for which members of the Legislative Council are elected.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS*Area of Assembly Electorates and Council Provinces*

27. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

What is the area of—

- (a) each of the existing 50 Legislative Assembly electorates;
- (b) each of the proposed 15 Legislative Council districts?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (a) The area of each of the existing 50 Legislative Assembly Districts:

METROPOLITAN AREA		
District		Square Miles
Balcatta	20.3
Bayswater	15.1
Beeloo	11.8
Belmont	14.8
Canning	70.0
Claremont	7.1
Cockburn	99.0
Cottesloe	5.9
East Melville	11.2
Fremantle	4.8
Karrinyup	7.1
Maylands	5.1
Melville	6.4
Mount Hawthorn	..	3.7
Mount Lawley	3.4
Nedlands	7.5
Perth	5.3
South Perth	5.9
Subiaco	3.4
Swan	25.8
Victoria Park	4.4
Wembley	12.9

AGRICULTURAL, MINING, AND PASTORAL AREA

District		Square Miles
Albany	90
Avon	4,622
Blackwood	2,569
Boulder-Eyre	90,733
Bunbury	8.9
Collie	1,498
Dale	686
Darling Range	205
Geraldton	163
Greenough	16,014
Kalgoorlie	6.9
Katanning	3,063
Merredin-Yilgarn	28,778
Moore	11,010
Mount Marshall	14,101
Murchison	333,034
Murray	2,021
Narrogin	3,670
Northam	1,125
Roe	22,013
Stirling	5,928
Toodyay	3,184
Vasse	1,449
Warren	3,745
Wellington	1,171

NORTH-WEST AREA

District		Square Miles
Gascoyne	68,325
Kimberley	268,350
Pilbara	88,284

- (b) The area of each of the proposed 15 Legislative Council Provinces:

METROPOLITAN AREA

Proposed Province		Square Miles
Metropolitan	29.2
North Metropolitan	44.0
North-East		
Metropolitan	64.2
South Metropolitan	121.4
South-East		
Metropolitan	92.1

AGRICULTURAL, MINING AND PASTORAL AREA

Proposed Province		Square Miles
Central	19,848
Lower Central	8,231
Lower West	3,200.9
South	28,031
South-East	119,517.9
South-West	7,763
Upper West	27,187
West	4,075

NORTH-WEST AREA

Proposed Province		Square Miles
Lower North	401,359
North	356,634

HOUSING AT ESPERANCE

Provision and Applications

28. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many houses have been constructed this year at Esperance for—
 - (a) superphosphate works employees;
 - (b) Government employees;
 - (c) all other applicants by the State Housing Commission?
- (2) How many applicants who are not yet housed applied more than 12 months ago?
- (3) Will he supply the monthly application figures of applicants not yet housed for the preceding 12 months?
- (4) Will he indicate his department's house building programme in this area for the ensuing 12 months?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) 21.
(b) 4.
(c) 14.
- (2) Five. Of these, two have declined houses offered; one is approved and awaiting an offer; and two applications are from married couples.
- (3)

September, 1963	2
October, 1963	—
November, 1963	3
December, 1963	—
January, 1964	8
February, 1964	2
March, 1964	3
April, 1964	1
May, 1964	8
June, 1964	11
July, 1964	5
August, 1964	6
- (4) There are 14 houses under construction, contracts being finalised for a further 11, and additional contracts will be progressively arranged for 20 more houses.

HOUSING FOR MIGRANTS

Priority in Allocation

29. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

Relevant to *The West Australian*, of the 19th August, comment on British migrant tradesman drive by the Western Australian Employers Federation:—

- (1) Will he assure the House that the Mr. Darling mentioned will not receive a number of State Housing Commission

homes for allocation to migrants as was done in the case of the Lonnie mission migrants?

- (2) As the questioner has certain knowledge that Lonnie mission migrants in hostels received State Housing Commission allocation previous to the normal waiting period and prior to local applicants, will he assure the House that this will not be the practice in the future?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) It has already been said that migrants referred to will be the responsibility of the nominators to ensure availability of both employment and accommodation. There is nothing to prevent any eligible applicant from applying to the commission for assistance, but such applications will not supplant existing local and outstanding applications.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK

Details of Loans to North-West Companies

1. Mr. TONKIN: This afternoon the Minister for Lands refused to reply to question 6 on the notice paper on the grounds that the question referred to business between the bank and a client and therefore should not be discussed. I ask the Minister how No. (8)—

Were the advances made because of direction from the Government or some Minister of the Government?

and No. (9)—

If the Minister directed that the bank advance the money, who was the Minister?

fall within the category of being business between the bank and a client?

Mr. BOVELL: It can truthfully be said that I have had some experience in banking practice. The overall question involved confidential information, and I repeat: Business between the bank and a client, and the question involved is secret and not subject to discussion with other parties. I am amazed at what I would term the effrontery of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in asking this question.

2. Mr. TONKIN: At the risk of amazing the Minister still further, I ask him were the advances made because of direction from the Government?

Mr. BOVELL: The information has not been made available to me, nor do I intend to ask the bank to make it available to me.

Mr. Tonkin: Then we can assume it was.

KING'S PARK RESTAURANT

Provision of Liquor License

3. **Mr. HEAL** asked the Minister for Lands:

Will the Minister introduce legislation during this session of Parliament to overcome the objection of the State Licensing Court and to permit it to grant a restaurant license to the King's Park restaurant to enable it to serve liquor for certain hours?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I wish to thank the honourable member for some notice of this question. The reply is as follows:—

The Government has already decided to submit amending legislation to include the word "restaurant" in relation to premises in King's Park now described as "tearooms", which will clearly define the purpose for which the said premises function.

Mr. Oldfield: Hands off the park!

SUPREME COURT PENALTIES AND OFFENCES

Determinations by Individual Judges

4. **Mr. JAMIESON** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

In view of the fact that the information relative to the final answer to question No. 17 is of vital importance will he request the Minister for Justice to have the information correlated so that it can be supplied when that has been done?

Mr. COURT replied:

I will discuss the matter with the Minister for Justice and advise the honourable member either direct or in the House as he thinks fit.

WATER RATES

Basis of Rating in Kalgoorlie and Boulder

5. **Mr. MOIR:** I have given the Minister for Water Supplies some prior notice of the following question:—

- (1) Is it the intention of the Water Supply Department to adopt for rating purposes the latest valuations as recently determined by the Taxation Department valuers in Kalgoorlie and Boulder?

If so—

- (a) Will he indicate the range of percentage increase on the previous valuation?
- (b) If not at present adopted, is their adoption contemplated in the future? If this action is not proposed, what is the reason?
- (c) Were the valuations requested by the Water Supply Department or the local government authorities, or both?

Amounts Previously Paid and to be Paid

- (2) What amount will be paid by a domestic consumer by way of rates and for water consumption where the annual ratable value of the property was £70 and the water consumption 100,000 gallons?
- (3) What amounts would be paid by such a consumer under the previous system?
- (4) At what rate were mining companies charged previously?
- (5) What was the cost of water to the largest goldmining company for the last ratable year?
- (6) What will be the cost to the company under the new system for the same amount of water?

Mr. WILD: The answer to the question is—

- (1) Not for the present rating year.
 - (a) In Kalgoorlie 3,758 assessments were increased and 551 showed a decrease. Overall percentage increase was 14. In Boulder 1,386 assessments showed increases and 252 decreased. Overall percentage increase was 3.2
 - (b) Yes.
 - (c) By the Water Supply Department. I understand the local authorities are adopting the taxation valuations.
- (2) £16 5s.
- (3) £17 5s.
- (4) (a) Kalgoorlie-Boulder—
Trust Mines—5s. 1d. per 1,000 gallons.
Other Mines—7s. per 1,000 gallons.
(b) Norseman—7s. per 1,000 gallons.
(c) Coolgardie—
Other Mines—5s. 1d. and 7s. per 1,000 gallons.
State Battery—4s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons.

- (d) Ora Banda—7s. per 1,000 gallons.
 - (e) Southern Cross—6s. per 1,000 gallons.
 - (f) Bullfinch—5s. 1d. per 1,000 gallons.
 - (g) Marvel Loch—7s. per 1,000 gallons.
 - (h) Cue—First 100,000 gallons at 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons. Balance at 3s. per 1,000 gallons each month.
 - (i) Meekatharra—5s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons.
- (5) £47,025 13s. 3d.
(6) £50,880 4s. 6d.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed, from the 20th August, on the following motion by Mr. O'Connor:—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver to Parliament:—

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

To which Mr. Jamieson had moved an amendment:—

But we express our regret that under the cloak of privilege the Premier is permitted at will to make a statement in Parliament derogatory of, and offensive to, a member of Her Majesty's Opposition in breach of Standing Orders 125 and 131.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.59 p.m.]: The Minister for Industrial Development took the adjournment of this debate, but I am not at all surprised that he has declined to go on with it; because this is one of those cases where it is impossible to find an argument in support of the action of the Government. Even the ingenuity usually displayed by the Minister for Industrial Development could not help him in this case.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier rose in his place and proposed to make a statement. You know there is no provision in our Standing Orders for a ministerial statement, but usage has decreed that ministerial statements may be made; and we find reference to it in the

15th edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* at page 359 where it says—

Ministerial Statements and Obituary Speeches

Explanations are made to the House on behalf of the Government regarding their domestic and foreign policy; stating the advice they have tendered to the sovereign regarding their retention of office or the dissolution of Parliament; announcing the legislative proposals they intend to submit to Parliament; or the course they intend to adopt in the transaction and arrangement of public business. These explanations are now usually elicited by arrangement in reply to a question.

Or to put it in the vernacular, by a Dorothy Dixier. To continue—

But the old practice under which they were volunteered spontaneously is often followed.

It is perfectly clear from that explanation what a ministerial statement is. It is certainly not a reply to a debate. Our Standing Orders make provision for one other type of statement that can be made. I refer to a personal explanation. I quote Standing Order 118, which states—

By the indulgence of the House, a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House: But such matters may not be debated.

By no stretch of the imagination was the Premier's statement a personal explanation; nor did he seek the indulgence of the House to make it. He could not make a personal explanation without the indulgence of the House. So the statement the Premier purported to make was a ministerial statement which is not provided for in our Standing Orders: nor is the type of statement he made provided for in *May*.

It was public knowledge before the Premier made his statement that he intended to reply to a debate. I have here a cutting from the *Daily News* which was issued on the day the Premier made his statement. The heading is, "Government Plans Judge Reply." It continues—

The State Government is taking a serious view of Labor M.L.A. H. E. Graham's allegations in the Legislative Assembly last night that a Supreme Court Judge had dealt too harshly with a young sex offender.

It then continued to state what Mr. Graham had said in the House; and after mentioning what the *Daily News* understood about Mr. Griffith spending his busy morning, it stated—

Premier Brand said the State Government felt any reply to Graham's criticism should be made in Parliament.

So the Premier came here; and, under the cloak of parliamentary privilege and ministerial statement, he deliberately got up to reply to a debate.

The Premier cannot plead urgency, because a member on his own side had a right of pre-audience on the Address-in-Reply debate; and it was a simple matter for the Premier to arrange with the member who had the right of pre-audience to take his place. The Premier could have stood up and spoken in the debate on the Address-in-Reply and said precisely what he said in his statement; and much more had he wanted to do so. But no! He sought to prostitute the justice of this House by deliberately contravening the Standing Orders, and by making a statement which he had no right to make as such. He had no right or justification whatever to make the statement the way he did. As the Premier of the State he should have set a better example.

Mr. Graham: I am not very proud of the Speaker, either.

Mr. Court: I do not think we are very proud of you, either.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: Not only did the Premier make a statement he was not entitled to make—because there is no provision anywhere for that type of statement to be made—but he contravened Standing Orders in referring to the amendment in the Address-in-Reply. Standing Order 125 says—

No Member shall allude to any debate of the same Session, upon a Question or Bill not being then under discussion . . .

There is no question or Bill under discussion by a statement being made by the Premier as a ministerial statement. The whole of the Premier's statement alluded to the Address-in-Reply debate, and to the remarks by the member for Balcatta.

Accordingly, the Premier was permitted, despite my opposition, to proceed to contravene Standing Orders—the Premier of this State, and the Leader of the House, was permitted to do that. He is one who could be expected to set other members an example in the observance of Standing Orders; and yet he had the temerity to refer, in his statement, to democracy. Indeed, he is the leader of the very Government that had to be forced by the courts to carry out the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act; and yet he talks about democracy.

Mr. Brand: I knew that had to come into it somewhere.

Mr. Graham: Very properly, too.

Mr. TONKIN: If we wish to preserve democracy we must obey the rules of democracy.

Mr. Brand: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. TONKIN: And the rules of democracy in Parliament are that we must obey Standing Orders unless they are suspended. But that did not mean a thing to the Premier. He merely rode roughshod over the Standing Orders; made a statement that there is no provision for him to make, and contravened Standing Orders in making that statement. If that is not a disgraceful example to set anybody, I have never seen one. Had it been some newcomer to the Parliament who was not conversant with Standing Orders and the necessity to comply with them, one could have excused it.

I do not deny that the Government would feel obliged to make an early reply to the statement which had been made; but why did not the Government use the proper form in which to do it? The Premier took the member for Balcatta to task for not using the proper form for his protest; he implied that he should move a substantive motion. But in doing so the Premier was doing the very thing himself for which he was criticising the member for Balcatta; because he was not doing it in the proper way and in the proper form. It is little wonder that the Minister for Industrial Development got out from under.

Mr. Court: We were anxious to hear you.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister will be pretty hard put to it to give any justification for the course of action taken. There is not a shred of argument for it.

Mr. Court: That is only your opinion.

Mr. TONKIN: The only possible argument that might have been used in those circumstances would be an urgency matter which could not brook delay. But if the Premier had followed the proper course provided by Standing Orders he would not have been delayed 60 seconds. So how much argument is there in support of its being urgent, and its having been got on with without delay? So what excuse is left?

The Premier would not have been prevented from making his statement, because the vehicle was there to enable him to do so. But no; he chose to contravene Standing Orders, and to do something he had no right to do—he had neither the legal right nor the moral right—because he is the Premier. In other words, it is a case of going back to the Stuarts, and the divine right of kings. It is a question of, "The law says I cannot, but divine right says I can."

That is what brought about the end of the reign of the Stuarts—telling Parliament what it had to do, by divine right; imposing a decision by divine right in spite of what Parliament said. So I assume that is the Premier's argument. He did by divine right what nobody else could attempt to do; he did so because he is the Premier. There is no room for that in a democracy; no room whatever.

If a Premier holds himself up as being the head of a democratic government, the very first responsibility upon him is to obey the law; to obey the rules; and not to ride roughshod over them. Let us examine his statement to see if it conformed in the slightest degree to what a ministerial statement ought to be. He expressed himself as being gravely concerned at the statement made in the Chamber last night by the member for Balcatta. He was obviously dealing with a debate to which Standing Orders say he is not allowed to refer. Then the Premier talked about this vital principle of democracy, saying that public confidence should be maintained in the judiciary.

It is also a vital principle of democratic government that the rules of debate shall not be overridden by divine right; that the laws of the country shall be obeyed. That is also a democratic principle. So this savours very much to me of the devil quoting Scripture. The Premier said—

The member for Balcatta said that he did not want to move a motion about the judge, but this did not prevent him from making an irresponsible and intemperate attack.

In doing that the Premier contravened the Standing Orders.

Mr. Graham: Just a lot of words.

Mr. Brand: They are more favourable than some you have made this year.

Mr. Graham: Why don't you stand up like a man and make a speech?

Mr. Brand: I will. I thought you interjected.

Mr. TONKIN: Finally the Premier said—

I deplore these attacks made under parliamentary privilege . . .

While the Premier was saying that, he himself was abusing parliamentary privilege. The whole of the time he was making his statement he was abusing parliamentary privilege, and I challenge anybody to prove otherwise. There is the situation.

Mr. Bovell: You cannot deny the member for Balcatta made a scurrilous attack.

Mr. Graham: Tommyrot!

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister should talk about denying things after his performance this afternoon!

Mr. Bovell: It was at least ethical.

Mr. Graham: You had better stick to your noisy scrub birds.

Mr. TONKIN: Accordingly, the amendment to the Address-in-Reply is completely justified as setting out the true position. I would like to know whether this is the sort of conduct we are to expect whenever it suits the Premier to override Standing Orders; to abuse privilege. Are we to accept that situation, or are we as a Parliament going to determine that that is not democracy at all? If

there are to be rules they must apply to the Government the same as they do to the Opposition. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I say that you would not have hesitated to prevent any member of the Opposition from trying to make a statement.

Mr. Graham: He prevented me.

Mr. TONKIN: And yet the Premier had no more right to make the statement he did than any member on this side had the right to make a statement. He had no more right at all. We will concede that the Government, when it has a statement to make in connection with policy, may, under parliamentary practice and in accordance with parliamentary usage, make that statement; but we will never concede that a Minister on the Government side has the right to speak twice.

The Premier could now get up and take part in the Address-in-Reply debate, and reply to the member for Balcatta. So he gets two opportunities to deal with the one question. Parliamentary practice does not provide for that; nor do the Standing Orders. It was a disgraceful performance coming from the head of the Government, under the circumstances while talking about democracy in the same breath.

We want to know whether the Standing Orders are to be enforced without fear or favour on members of the Government, as well as members of the Opposition; or whether the principle of divine right is to apply on that side, and they may break the Standing Orders whenever they choose to do so. I hope in future we will be able to say with confidence that the rules will be obeyed, irrespective of the party, of the Government, or of the Opposition. If we do not intend to do that then the sooner we scrap the Standing Orders the better. Let us have Rafferty rules then!

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [5.17 p.m.]: I waited patiently in vain for somebody to speak on behalf of the Government in defence of the action which was taken last week, unfortunately under your patronage, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fletcher: The Government hasn't any defence.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated that it has not, and he proceeded to prove that point. In my view the silence of those opposite would indicate that the Government—our political opposition—has not a leg to stand on in connection with this matter. Accordingly the Premier should do the decent thing: he should stand up and apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, because you could not have anticipated what remarks were to be made until the damage had been done. I suggest that you, Mr. Speaker, are not completely without blame since protests were made during the reading of the statement by the Premier.

The amendment seeks to add words to the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech. Whether these further words are directed particularly against you or against the Premier, it is somewhat difficult to say. But this much is at least certain: The proposed words derived from the fact that the Premier engaged in a gross abuse of privilege, initially unknown to you, because I understand that you had no preknowledge of the tenor of the Premier's remarks. It is all right for the Premier and those who sit behind him, to adopt an attitude of "holier than thou" in connection with this matter, when it becomes obvious that this was a Liberal Party picnic.

Not only was it sufficient for the Premier to do what he did in this Chamber, but in the Legislative Council where there was no mention of the subject whatsoever, the Minister for Justice went through the same sort of procedure.

Mr. Brand: In answer to a question.

Mr. Jamieson: A Dorothy Dix question.

Mr. GRAHAM: As the member for Beeloo suggested, a Dorothy Dixier, when the Minister there read from a prepared statement in identical terms with that read by the Premier in this Chamber; in other words, the Government cares naught for jury systems, and this was a glorious opportunity for it to score politically, so it thought.

May I, in connection with the statement made by the Premier, which led to the amendment before us, put this to the Government through you, Mr. Speaker: Does this Government stand for sneers, abuse, and criticism of members of juries at the hands of the presiding judge? Does this Government feel it has no responsibility to protect those people who are conscripted for jury service?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think you are going away a little from the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely the amendment makes reference to the statement of the Premier!

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier was talking in great dudgeon about public confidence being maintained in the judiciary. I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Is it not of equal importance that public confidence should be maintained in that body, which is set up under the law, and which has to decide whether a person is guilty or not guilty of an offence, including a capital offence; or is this jury system merely a pretence, and a cat's-paw in the hands of the Government?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I do not think that is the point at issue. The wording of the amendment does not involve the question of the jury system. The question is whether the Premier has contravened the Standing Orders.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier, in contravening the Standing Orders, made a certain statement; and in that statement—because the Government thought it was having fun in playing party politics—he referred to the position of the judiciary, with which I agree. But I also state that our system of justice is not reposed in one man.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): That may be perfectly true; but the point is that the Premier did not, to my knowledge, mention the jury.

Mr. GRAHAM: How did he enjoy the privilege to speak about the judges when there was no motion before the House? At the present moment there is an amendment before the House referring to the Premier's statement.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): That is so; and that is the point of the debate.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine I was dealing with the position which was before you—the situation being the statement of the Premier, and particularly the wording of the amendment referring to the derogatory and offensive statement of the Premier.

Mr. Rowberry: That is the one.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely if the amendment refers to the derogatory and offensive statement of the Premier, then I should be allowed to make some reference to his statement, which arose from an address I made; in other words, it deals with the subject of the system of justice in operation in Western Australia.

For political reasons, the Premier has decided to ally himself with one aspect of justice. I am suggesting that, as leader of the Government, he has a bounden duty and responsibility to shield and protect the other aspect of our judicature. Indeed, as head of the Government it is his place to do something about that, and it should not be necessary for a private member of this Parliament to have to bring that aspect before his notice; but the Premier is apparently not the least concerned.

The member for Beeloo has already expressed himself on this amendment; in fact he was the mover of it. We find that the Premier has taken words from somewhere and attributed them to the member for Beeloo. I suggest the Premier should stand in his place and apologise to that member. It may or may not be news to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are five versions of what the member for Beeloo said. One was the original, taken down by the Press and subsequently amended. There

was the original taken down by the *Hansard* reporters, which was subsequently corrected. There was the statement attributed to that member by the Premier. Whilst it was difficult for me to tell what was said, as I was on my feet and speaking at the time, I have a hunch that none of the five versions was absolutely correct. Yet the Premier was prepared to go into Press, and use his spokesman at the other end of this building to traduce the member for certain words being used.

Mr. Brand: You have a hunch that none of them was correct. What then did the member say?

Mr. GRAHAM: If I were to give my interpretation it would be the sixth version of it. As I have stated, I would probably be in the least favourable position to give an accurate word by word account of what was said, because I was speaking at the time. Believe it or not, I am giving some thought to what I am saying.

If the Premier and the Government were fair in this matter they would be entitled to disagree with the subject which I introduced, but they took exception, perchance to certain of the words I employed. I suppose none of us is so word perfect that upon reflection he would not make some modification or adjustment in his language. But the sense and import of my remarks stand just as firmly now, as ever they did. The Law Society protested, but the president of that society is or was—if he is not still—president of a branch of the Liberal Party in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Connor: That is all to his credit.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is all to his credit that he is playing a game of party politics.

Mr. O'Connor: He is playing a game of justice.

Mr. GRAHAM: Justice to whom?

Mr. O'Connor: To the people to whom you have not been handing out justice.

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Mt. Lawley is very verbose; perhaps he can be more explicit.

Mr. O'Connor: I thought you remembered.

Mr. Hawke: El Cantro is not galloping well over there!

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the member for Mt. Lawley is sorry that he has stuck his neck out.

Mr. O'Connor: I think you are sorry you stuck your neck out.

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Mt. Lawley should not express such an opinion. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that it is 17 years since I have received so much fan mail—if I might use that term—including telephone calls and persons approaching me ranging from Q.C.s., to lawyers and other professional men. In not one single case has a person

—telephonically, on paper, to my face, or to my friends whom they have asked to convey the message to me—done anything other than agree with my point of view. I am saying that honestly from where I stand.

Mr. I. W. Manning: The disagreement was over the way you did it.

Mr. GRAHAM: All of them have passed complimentary references, and said it was high time somebody spoke, or something was done in the matter.

Mr. Fletcher: Is not Parliament the highest authority in this State?

Mr. Hawke: It used to be, before this Government came to office.

Mr. GRAHAM: Apparently No. 1140 Hay Street is all that counts. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has demonstrated beyond doubt that the Premier had no right or justification whatsoever to employ the tactics which he did.

During the Address-in-Reply debate an opportunity is afforded to discuss any subject nearest the heart of a member of Parliament, including a Minister of the Crown; and we are aware that you, Mr. Speaker, have ruled on occasions that it is not possible for a member of Parliament to raise questions of urgency or import, because of the opportunity provided during the general debate on the Address-in-Reply. Yet the Premier stoops to this tactic when neither he nor the other seven Ministers who sit in this Chamber had spoken on the Address-in-Reply, and any one of the eight, therefore, could have quite properly stood up and disagreed with me, and abused me as far as you would allow; in other words, behaved themselves as they wished within the compass of the Standing Orders of this House.

But they did not do that. I suggest it was a confidence trick, to give this a greater importance than would otherwise be the case; to ask your permission to make a statement to the House and then make an attack of generalities and insinuations against a member of Parliament who had used his rights under the Standing Orders; because at no time was I impeded by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You got away with it, too; and you knew you were getting away with it, because you left the name until the last moment.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. GRAHAM: This is the member responsible for the disturbance last session when he occupied the position of Chairman of Committees.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You should not be proud of your performance on that occasion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I have already expressed my opinion of the member for Wellington. I think his attitude is contemptible. The only thing that counts is

the majority on that side of the House, which is contemptible. I wonder what the purpose of the Government is? Must no member raise a point which is controversial? Must no member debate a matter which does not conform?

Mr. Hawke: That's it!

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the purpose of Parliament if it is not to enable members to express themselves with regard to matters of public concern and interest?

The judges—yes, I want every respect for the judges who preside over our courts in Western Australia. But equally, and just as emphatically, I want it for the other section of our instrument of law—the jury—and that was my plea. A certain incumbent, in my view, was not being fair to these people after they honestly and conscientiously had gone through the processes of listening and weighing evidence and directions; and I do not think that is right. I did not last week; and neither do I now. If I have committed some breach of etiquette, then all I can say is that that is just too bad!

I say it is a shocking state of affairs that what has occurred and is going on should be allowed to continue, and it was the job of someone to express himself—if not the member for Balcatta, then, perhaps, the member for Greenough, or somewhere else.

Mr. Brand: Even if he breached Standing Orders in doing so?

Mr. GRAHAM: Are we to stand with arms folded and allow this sort of thing to continue? There was no breach of Standing Orders by me.

Mr. Court: Not much!

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier and the Minister for Railways know perfectly well that there are devices which are used for the purpose of meeting a situation.

Mr. Court: And which you said you were not prepared to use!

Mr. GRAHAM: That is why, when a member in this House wishes to make remarks derogatory or otherwise concerning the Legislative Council or what transpires there, he uses the term "another place" instead of "Legislative Council." Every member in this Chamber is aware of that; and if one cared to be precise and pernickety in regard to the matter one could say, I suppose, that the term "in another place" is a device used for the purpose of defeating Standing Orders. Therefore, if I offended in that regard, there is nothing new or novel in connection with it, because nearly every member does so nearly every session of this Parliament.

So it will be seen that this was a party political stunt on the part of the Government. Its feelings for the sanctity of the court were overridden by other considerations; and so eager were the Government

and the spokesman in this House and the spokesman in the Legislative Council, that they went to the excesses they did; in other words, participating in debate and arguing against and condemning a member under privilege, when there was every opportunity available to them. The Premier, or the Minister for Railways, who is always ready to make his contribution, no doubt would have welcomed the opportunity of delivering to us his homily one day last week as he has done on so many scores of occasions during the years he has been a member of this Parliament.

As there has been no explanation, withdrawal, apology, or even a bleat from the Government or its supporters, we surely are entitled to assume that they agree they have offended against the principles and procedure of this Chamber and that the Premier did something he should never have contemplated.

When the House rose on Thursday I went very carefully through Standing Orders, including some which you, Mr. Speaker, outlined; and to me it is palpably obvious, as outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that there is no Standing Order and no ruling that has ever been given by Erskine May which would entitle the Premier—the head of the Government and the head of this House, subject only to you, Sir—to engage in the political diatribe that he did; and that the only concern of the Premier was that here perchance was an opportunity of knocking a member of the Opposition.

To support the institution of our judiciary was something that ran second place. But at no time has the Premier or those who have been so silent, but who have from time to time interjected, expressed themselves with regard to the right of jury men and women—men and women who have no right of criticism, no right of reply, and no protection whatever.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The member for Balcatta must get back to the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought I could get in that plug, and thank you for your indulgence.

Mr. I. W. Manning: Cunning as cunning can be!

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not. It is a matter of values; and if there is an instrumentality that has the importance which our system of justice has, then it should be protected and defended in all its aspects; and it does the Government less than justice to play up to one section of our British justice and forget entirely—indeed, wipe its boots on—the other, because the Government has shown no concern for the people I mentioned before you, Sir, called me to order just now. It apparently has no intention whatever of doing its utmost to ensure there will be no repetition.

I agree wholeheartedly with the amendment which is before us; and I venture the suggestion, as I conclude, that whether the Government likes or dislikes what I said last week, those few words of mine will have the effect that there will not be a repetition in Western Australia of the matters about which I made complaint last Wednesday.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.40 p.m.]: In considering this amendment to the Address-in-Reply one has to have full regard for the background which brought about this situation; but firstly we should reread the actual terms of the amendment, because they make very interesting reading when examined in a dispassionate way. The amendment moved by the member for Beeloo was—

But we express our regret that under the cloak of privilege the Premier is permitted at will to make a statement in Parliament derogatory of, and offensive to, a member of Her Majesty's Opposition in breach of Standing Orders 125 and 131.

There are virtually three parts to this amendment. One is that the Premier was permitted at will—and I am using the words of the mover of this amendment—to make a statement in Parliament. Now that is not in accordance with facts. The Premier made a statement in a time-honoured custom. He made it with the permission of the Speaker, a custom acknowledged in this House as well as in the House of Commons.

Mr. H. May: The Speaker did not know what he was going to say.

Mr. COURT: If members want a precedent in our own House, we could go back to that illustrious figure, once Speaker, The Hon. Thomas Walker, who had to decide on this particular matter in the case of the then Minister for Lands, one Alex McCallum.

Mr. Hawke: He was never Minister for Lands.

Mr. COURT: Minister for Works, then. I am sorry. On one occasion, as reported in *Hansard* of 1926 on page 3167, the then Minister for Works (The Hon. A. McCallum) representing South Fremantle said—

The Premier recently laid on the Table certain papers relating to the district which would be served by the projected Kondinin Eastward railway.

After the Minister had continued for a considerable time, the late Sir James Mitchell interjected and asked, "Can we all speak on this?" The Minister proceeded to say—

I merely wish to lay on the Table certain papers.

He went on further, after which Sir James Mitchell again interjected as follows:—

I do not think the Minister should make a statement of that kind without members being permitted to discuss the proposal. The Minister had not the permission of the House to make a statement.

The Speaker said—

At this late hour of the session I allowed the Minister to explain the position. It is not usual to debate a statement or an explanation, and I think it would be irregular if I allowed a discussion now.

Then there were further interjections by the Opposition, after which the Speaker said—

It is the custom of all Parliaments to permit Ministers a certain latitude that is not allowed to private members in making explanations.

Then the then Minister for Lands wished to deal with another matter.

Mr. Hawke: Who was he?

Mr. Rowberry: What bearing has that on this case?

Mr. COURT: It has a lot.

Mr. Hawke: It is about time you started to show it.

Mr. COURT: Following a request by the then Minister for Lands to make a statement, and some Opposition interjections, the then Speaker said—

The privilege has been extended to Ministers from time immemorial to make explanations. Ministers owe a duty to the House to make explanations. Until an explanation is made, honourable members will not know whether permission should or should not be granted. The Minister for Lands is in order.

Mr. Tonkin: The Premier was not making an explanation.

Mr. H. May: He was making a speech.

Mr. COURT: The Opposition is just splitting straws because it is in a dilemma. It is in a dilemma because one of its members has well and truly blotted his copybook both in this Parliament and in the eyes of the public.

Mr. Graham: Which section of the public? Liberal Party headquarters!

Mr. COURT: The Opposition is trying to find some way to get out of the dilemma, firstly by trying the other day to cast a reflection on the Speaker; and now by trying to cast a reflection on the Premier.

Mr. Graham: Quote the Standing Orders!

Mr. COURT: I wish to deal again with the first part of the amendment I have already referred to, because the Premier was making a statement by proper

authority and therefore was not in any way breaching the Standing Orders of this Parliament.

Mr. Graham: What authority?

Mr. COURT: The authority of the Speaker—an authority which has been acknowledged, as one of your own Speakers said, from time immemorial, both in this House of Parliament and in the House of Commons.

Mr. Tonkin: Does that mean the Speaker can contradict Standing Orders whenever he likes?

Mr. COURT: It does not; but he has some discretion in these matters by virtue of his office, and he used his discretion on this occasion in a full and proper manner and gave the right to the Premier, as head of the Government, to make a statement on a matter which was of some urgency.

Mr. Tonkin: Who held the gun at his head?

Mr. COURT: That is an allegation you make so often.

Mr. Tonkin: With some justification very often.

Mr. COURT: Only in your own idea.

Mr. Tonkin: We will see!

Mr. COURT: The next part of the amendment goes on to say it was—

a statement in Parliament derogatory of, and offensive to, a member of Her Majesty's Opposition in breach of Standing Orders 125 and 131.

I think we can dismiss Standing Order No. 125 without further comment, because the Premier was making his statement with proper authority.

Mr. Hawke: That is dodging the issue.

Mr. COURT: He was making his statement with proper authority.

Mr. Tonkin: In other words, he could say what he liked so long as the Speaker allowed him.

Mr. COURT: I am trying to speak to the amendment—

Mr. Hawke: And you are making a poor job of it.

Mr. COURT: —and have it analysed, because the matter complained of is outlined in the amendment, and it is up to us to analyse the amendment and deal with it. The wording of it goes on and refers to something being derogatory of, and offensive to, members of Her Majesty's Opposition. I have not heard a member of the Opposition yet take the trouble to explain to us what is offensive and derogatory. Some of the language used by the member for Balcatta tonight, when he referred to the member for Wellington as being contemptible in his attitude in this Parliament, was to my mind offensive.

Mr. Graham: Wasn't he?

Mr. COURT: That is a reflection—the true reflection of the member for Balcatta.

Mr. Graham: He broke all the rules in the book last session.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. COURT: The honourable member wants to be able to use the most insulting and character-assassinating language he can find, and no-one is to take exception to it. He goes on year after year doing this. I remember well the language he used in respect of our Premier last year—a disgrace to the member for Balcatta; and there was no apology.

Mr. Graham: What are you referring to?

Mr. COURT: When you referred to the Premier by an insulting name in respect of a case that was in the news at the time.

Mr. Graham: When I asked for information, he said I was sadistic. Were they the words of a gentleman?

Mr. Brand: The questions were sadistic.

Mr. Graham: Of course he was.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member is very sensitive. He wants to throw these adjectives around at will year after year.

Mr. Graham: So can you.

Mr. COURT: And he wants no-one at all to take offence.

Mr. Graham: Not through a privileged statement.

Mr. COURT: I find it difficult to see anywhere in the Premier's statement something that the member for Balcatta could regard as derogatory and offensive.

Mr. Graham: "Irresponsible and in-temperate."

Mr. COURT: If, however, there is something, why did not the honourable member, who now wants the full protection of Standing Orders, avail himself of the Standing Orders?

Mr. Tonkin: I tried to.

Mr. COURT: The member for Balcatta is one of the most experienced members in the House when it comes to debates of this nature, and he well knew that if he wanted to take exception to any word in the Premier's statement, then was the time.

Mr. Graham: As soon as he resumed his seat I wanted to make a reply, but was not allowed to.

Mr. COURT: I cannot find anything anywhere in the report of the proceedings; and it is as well that we go over it because it

shows how the amendment was drummed up by the Opposition to get itself out of a dilemma.

Mr. Graham: You will convince yourself in a moment.

Mr. COURT: Come in; because you are just putting yourself further into the mire every time!

Mr. Graham: Talk about Comic Court!

Mr. Tonkin: Are you saying I never objected?

Mr. COURT: If one looks at the report of the proceedings on the day the amendment was moved, one finds the honourable member never took advantage of the Standing Orders if he felt those words were offensive. But I suggest he did not think them offensive at the time. It was when the seriousness of this dawned on the Opposition that they tried to find some way of switching the spotlight off the member for Balcatta's scurrilous attack on a judge, on to some question of procedure.

Mr. Graham: Nice vocabulary!

Mr. Oldfield: He rose five times but had to sit down.

Mr. COURT: The Premier's statement reads as follows:—

I am gravely concerned at the statement made in this Chamber last night by the member for Balcatta to the effect that Mr. Justice Virtue has shown that he is not fitted for his position.

I interpolate that the member for Balcatta made it clear to the House that he was not prepared to deal with this thing in a constitutional way, because he went on to say he was not prepared to move a motion in connection with the matter in a constitutional way.

Mr. Graham: To do what?

Mr. COURT: To criticise a member of the judiciary, a substantive motion should be moved.

Mr. Graham: Do you want a motion to sack him; or what do you want?

Mr. COURT: If the honourable member has any objection to this judge, there is constitutional procedure laid down; but he told the House he was not prepared to use it.

Mr. Graham: I suggested he could be transferred to other duties.

Mr. COURT: This Government does not believe in policing its judges.

Mr. Hawke: What about the arbitration commission?

Mr. COURT: You have made it clear that if and when you become the Government you intend to police the work of the judges. This strikes at the very heart of the judicial system.

Mr. Hawke: You have been policing the arbitration system pretty closely lately.

Mr. Graham interjected.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. COURT: The Premier went on to say—

It is a vital principle of democratic government that public confidence should be maintained in the judiciary and that judges must be free to carry out their judicial responsibilities free from political interference or restraint.

If a judge is considered not fitted to carry out his duties, the law provides Parliament with the appropriate remedy.

Again I interpolate—a remedy which the member for Balcatta said he was not prepared to use. Continuing—

The member for Balcatta said that he did not want to move a motion about the judge, but this did not prevent him from making an irresponsible and intemperate attack.

Mr. Graham: That would not be derogatory of a member—a statement like that!

Mr. COURT: If we take the language of the member for Balcatta tonight in reference to the member for Wellington, it makes it pale into insignificance.

Mr. Hawke: That would have been all right in general debate.

Mr. COURT: The only two words I can find—and apparently those on which the honourable member pins his case, or his supporters pin their case—are "irresponsible" and "intemperate." We can dismiss "intemperate" with a mere wave of the hand, because that type of language in this place is very mild when I think of some of the language used in respect of me by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the other night; it also makes the Premier's comments pale into insignificance.

Mr. Tonkin: There may be more to follow about this bank matter.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member and the Minister for Lands can work that one out between them.

Mr. Bovell: I have given my decision and I am sticking to it.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Tonkin: Were you not there when the transfer arose?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. COURT: Therefore, we come back to the word "irresponsible." Having regard for the background of this very serious matter that arose in our House, is the word "irresponsible" either derogatory or offensive?

Mr. Hawke: It depends when it is made and in what circumstances.

Mr. COURT: I heartily agree; and that is why in this case it was very moderate language.

Mr. Hawke: No.

Mr. COURT: Perhaps it is just as well that the matter raised by the member for Balcatta was not dealt with as a continuation of the Address-in-Reply, or as a separate motion.

Mr. Graham: Why?

Mr. COURT: Because it would have been possible for members on this side to use much stronger language, in order to express themselves more forcibly, than was permitted the Premier.

Mr. Graham: Go and do it! You are welcome to do it.

Mr. Hawke: Why not have a dash?

Mr. Graham: Chicken!

Mr. COURT: The member for Balcatta took no exception to this at the time, except that he said, "Cut out that tripe!"

Mr. Hawke: He described it very accurately.

Mr. COURT: If it is tripe, I do not know why there is all this hullabaloo from your side all of a sudden when you find yourself in a public jam because of the indiscretions of one of your members. The report of the proceedings continues—

Point of Order

Mr. TONKIN: I desire to know under what authority or Standing Order the Premier has a right to make a speech in order to attack a member on this side of the House.

Mr. Tonkin: Is not that the proper objection to take: to ask what the Standing Order is?

Mr. COURT: I am not complaining.

Mr. Tonkin: How far could the member for Balcatta get if I got nowhere?

Mr. COURT: At no stage did the member for Balcatta ask for the withdrawal of those words; and he was the only one who could.

Mr. Graham: He bounced up and down five times like a yo-yo to make a reply.

Mr. Tonkin: On what Standing Orders do you base that statement that he was the only one?

Mr. COURT: He was the logical one.

Mr. Tonkin: Now you are running away from it.

Mr. COURT: Getting back to the report, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wanted to know under what authority or Standing Order the Premier had a right to make a speech in order to attack a member on his side of the House. The report continues—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): He has my permission to make a statement.

And that is the time-honoured right of the Premier with the permission of the Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not denying that, surely!

Mr. Tonkin: So long as it is a proper statement.

Mr. COURT: Continuing—

Mr. TONKIN: Does that permission allow him to attack a member on this side or is he allowed only to state the facts?

Mr. Court: That is all he is doing.

Mr. TONKIN: In a statement he is not allowed to express an opinion.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think it is left to the discretion of the Speaker to decide what is a reasonable statement.

Mr. TONKIN: Is the right to be accorded to this side to reply to the statement?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): No. That is in accordance with well-established precedents, one of which I have quoted tonight.

Mr. Tonkin: I think that is the only part of his ruling that is correct.

Mr. COURT: Well, we are agreed on one thing. The Speaker then said, "The Premier may proceed." I have traced the report right through and I cannot find where the member for Balcatta asked for a withdrawal of those words. If he wanted these Standing Orders, and Standing Order No. 131 in particular, to prevail, that was the time for him to ask for the withdrawal of those words; and had Mr. Speaker been asked, he alone would have been the arbiter of whether those words could have been considered offensive and derogatory and should, in fact, have been withdrawn.

Mr. Graham: Who is asking for the withdrawal of them? It is just the time and manner in which the remarks were made.

Mr. COURT: If the honourable member does not seek the withdrawal of those words, in effect this amendment that has been moved to the Address-in-Reply collapses to the ground.

Mr. Graham: Why?

Mr. COURT: Because the whole substance of it is that—"we express our regret that under the cloak of privilege the Premier is permitted at will to make a statement in Parliament derogatory of, and offensive to, a member of Her Majesty's Opposition" under the terms of the Standing Orders quoted in the amendment.

Mr. Graham: Your presence here is offensive to me, but I have not asked for you to be withdrawn.

Mr. COURT: I put up with you by looking the other way occasionally; but do not let us get too personal.

Mr. Tonkin: I would like you to deal with the other Standing Order.

Mr. COURT: Which one?

Mr. Tonkin: Where you cannot refer to a debate.

Mr. COURT: Standing Order No. 125.

Mr. Tonkin: It is No. 131, I think.

Mr. COURT: I have dealt with Standing Order No. 125. The Premier was speaking with the permission of the Speaker, and that gave him the right—

Mr. Tonkin: To do what he liked.

Mr. COURT: —to make a statement irrespective of the Standing Orders.

Mr. H. May: What are the Standing Orders for?

Mr. COURT: To be obeyed; and you people are trying to imply that there was a breach of Standing Orders, but there was no such breach.

We go on again to the circumstances surrounding this particular amendment, because we cannot ignore the background of it when we consider the amendment. A very serious situation had arisen, and the Premier had a responsibility, regardless of which side of politics he represented, to do something about it, because of the attack that had been made on the judiciary by a member of the Opposition, which is an attack on one of the vital institutions of our democratic way of life.

Mr. Graham: It was not an attack on the judiciary, but a criticism of a certain line of action taken by a certain judge.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member cannot get himself out of it that way—

Mr. Graham: There is nothing to get out of.

Mr. COURT: —because it is only confirming that he did make an attack on a judge.

Mr. Graham: "Attack" is a word, is it not?

Mr. COURT: I do not know what else the honourable member can call it. If he had reread his speech, I would have expected him to come here the next day and express some regret. But no! What did the honourable member do? He expressed no regret whatsoever.

Mr. Graham: Regret for what? Trying to protect juries?

Mr. COURT: The honourable member could have regretted the attitude he adopted when he made that statement. It is ludicrous for the Opposition to try to take a so-called point of order by this means when the member who has transgressed did so deliberately.

Mr. Graham: Transgressed what?

Mr. COURT: Transgressed the Standing Orders of this Parliament when he attacked the judiciary.

Mr. Graham: You are reflecting on the Speaker, who did not call me to order at any stage; and neither did you, nor the Premier.

Mr. COURT: Mr. Speaker has explained the position extremely well. He said—

The position is that last night the member for Balcatta made a criticism of Mr. Justice Virtue. It was made in such a manner that it did not really become out of order until he actually named the judge concerned at the end of his statement on the matter.

Quite a few of us were greatly concerned at the way the honourable member's speech was developing, but he very carefully kept away from mentioning the name of the judge until the end of his comments. It was not until mention was made of the name that the member for Balcatta committed a breach of Standing Orders and could be dealt with by the Speaker at that time. At the start, the member for Balcatta cautiously refrained from mentioning any name. This was quite calculated and quite clever, because he left the mention of the judge's name until the finish of his speech so that he could say his piece, do the damage he wanted to do, and then brand somebody with this particular accusation. Since then, of course, he has tried, in the public eye, to get himself out of this predicament by saying he was trying to defend the jury; but he was still attacking a judge.

Mr. Graham: Was not that my speech? That I was trying to defend the jury?

Mr. COURT: The honourable member was still attacking a judge. There was a constitutional way to do this. If the honourable member felt this judge had transgressed in his addresses to juries, and in the remarks that he made about them, there is laid down a clearly-defined procedure for the honourable member to follow so that he could have had this matter dealt with in a constitutional way and in a proper manner in this Parliament and not by the very dangerous and scurrilous method he used.

It is impossible to consider this amendment without having regard to the background of the particular problem. It started when the honourable member attacked, in this House, a member of the judiciary: and the statement made by the Premier has to be taken in its right context, and it has to be viewed in the right atmosphere.

Mr. Graham: What is that?

Mr. Tonkin: That is, with the Standing Orders suspended.

Mr. COURT: No; it has to be considered in its right aspect so that one can properly assess the words to which I presume the Opposition is taking exception.

Mr. Tonkin: Why did not the Premier say that on the Address-in-Reply?

Mr. COURT: I will answer that now if the honourable member so desires. It is true the Premier could have risen on the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Graham: And so could you.

Mr. COURT: Yes; and so could I.

Mr. Graham: And all the other Ministers.

Mr. COURT: But, firstly, had the Premier risen to his feet at that time on the Address-in-Reply, it would have been the end of his remarks on the Address-in-Reply, because he would have been denied the right of reply to the debate on that motion.

Mr. Tonkin: Has he exercised that right before?

Mr. COURT: He has that right. If something should develop during the debate on the Address-in-Reply, which calls for considered comment by the Premier, and he left his right of reply until the end, that would only be normal because we would expect the Premier to close the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. Hawke: That might happen five times in 50 years.

Mr. COURT: There is another reason why the Premier should have dealt with this matter by statement and not by way of replying to the Address-in-Reply. First of all, it was a matter of great urgency that had to be dealt with as a special issue.

Mr. Graham: Special issue in the *Daily News*, of course.

Mr. COURT: It had to be dealt with as a special issue, because it was quite proper that the Premier should confine his statement to this particular matter and no other; whereas, had he dealt with it in his speech on the Address-in-Reply, he would have had to combine it with a host of other matters, as is usual in normal circumstances. But there is a better reason: He wanted to establish this clearly in the minds of the members of the Legislative Assembly, and in the minds of the members of the public; and, therefore, he was rendering a service to this House.

Mr. Tonkin: By breaking the Standing Orders.

Mr. COURT: He did not break the Standing Orders.

Mr. Tonkin: Of course he did!

Mr. COURT: He did not break the Standing Orders. He chose the right course; because if he had spoken on the Address-in-Reply he would either have given the Opposition the chance to say that he had deliberately attempted to conclude the debate on the Address-in-Reply, or he would have given the Opposition further opportunity to enter into more acrimonious debate on this matter and further embarrass this Chamber by having an unconstitutional discussion on a subject which was unconstitutionally before the House.

Mr. Hawke: No wonder they keep on calling you "Comic Court".

Mr. COURT: The Leader of the Opposition has said worse than that in the past, so I do not take much notice of that. There has been no breach of the Standing Orders, and Mr. Speaker was quite within his rights in giving the Premier permission to make the statement he did. I oppose the amendment.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [6.7 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, I would like your permission, first of all, to say I am rather sorry my short absence from Western Australia last week seems to have resulted in the Legislative Assembly becoming somewhat upset.

Mr. Brand: Yes, because some of your boys got out of hand.

Mr. HAWKE: I would like to read this amendment, because I think it is necessary to read it again to have it clearly established in the minds of members. It is true the Minister for Railways read it; but unfortunately he smothered it up with all sorts of irrational and inappropriate references. For instance, he went back 50 or 60 years to the time The Hon. Thomas Walker was Speaker of this House. From *Hansard* he read of what happened when the then Minister for Labour made a statement, and he tried to show the situation on that occasion was exactly the same as the situation now confronting us.

Clearly, there is no comparison whatsoever between the two situations. On the previous occasion, the Minister concerned was making a statement about some proposed railway which, it was thought, might go from Cunderdin in some direction. The Leader of the then Opposition asked the Speaker whether every member was going to be given an opportunity to discuss that subject. At that time, the Minister, in making his statement, did not reflect on anybody. It was a plain, considered, ordinary statement and no-one could possibly take any offence or any objection to its contents. Obviously, that statement was vastly different from the one which the Premier made in this House last week.

Mr. Court: It was still made with the Speaker's permission.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course the statement was made with the Speaker's permission; otherwise it could not have been made at all. That is elementary!

Mr. Court: That is what I am saying about your amendment.

Mr. HAWKE: That is elementary; and I was rather intrigued—if not somewhat amused—with the effort of the Minister for Railways to sort of read into the comparison some element of strength; some element of reality. But, of course, he could not do it. It was impossible to do it because there is no reality by way of comparison between the two situations.

Mr. Court: It establishes that the Premier was within his rights in speaking.

Mr. Toms: You were battling all the way!

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Industrial Development established the Premier was within his rights after the Speaker of the House had given him permission to speak.

Mr. Court: That is right.

Mr. HAWKE: Who questions that?

Mr. Court: It has been questioned.

Mr. HAWKE: No it has not; and that is where the Minister for Railways is hopelessly out of his depth if he were dinkum in what he said—and we are always in considerable doubt about that.

Mr. Court: The Premier is permitted to speak—

Mr. HAWKE: The Premier was perfectly in order to make a statement when he obtained the Speaker's permission to make it. There is no question and no argument about that.

Mr. Court: That is good.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Railways endlessly and uselessly expressed a great number of words in trying to prove that because the Speaker had given the Premier permission to make a statement the Premier was entitled to say what he liked. That is the essence of the situation; not that the Premier had made a statement after the Speaker had given him permission, but that, in the making of it he did, in some portion of the speech, breach certain Standing Orders. That is the issue. There is no other issue. The Minister for Railways can talk till the cows come home, if they ever do come home; but he cannot avoid that. That is the issue: whether the Premier, in making his statement, after the Speaker giving him permission, did, in some portions of the statement, breach the Standing Orders. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, he did; and, in a way, I admire your indulgence at what the Premier had to say when he breached the Standing Orders.

I know you, as Speaker, would be in a difficult situation, because you do not know in advance what the Premier, or anyone else who might be speaking, is going to say in the next sentence, or even in the second part of a sentence. If you were in that position all the time, Mr. Speaker, your job would be much easier, and I think you might be able to enforce the Standing Orders better than otherwise. It is very difficult for a Speaker of a parliamentary Assembly, or for the chairman of any meeting, when a situation of that kind develops, because neither the Speaker concerned nor the chairman concerned knows what a speaker is going to say in his next sentence.

I am certain that, had the Speaker been aware of what the Premier was going to say in criticism and condemnation of the member for Balcatta, he would have prevented those things from being said. But

how can you, Mr. Speaker, prevent something from being said when it has already been expressed? There is no possibility in the world of doing that. So the issue in this amendment is not that which has been wordily put to us by the Minister for Railways. That is not the issue at all. We all agree on the issue he put to us, which is that the Premier was in order in making a statement after the Speaker had given him permission to make a statement.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HAWKE: In dealing with this matter the Minister for Railways said it had to be considered in relation to the background upon which the events last week developed. I do not agree at all that we have to have any consideration for any background, because this amendment is a completely separate thing, standing on its own. It would not matter what happened, or what was said last week in relation to what the Minister calls the background. I will read the amendment. It reads—

But we express our regret that under the cloak of privilege the Premier is permitted at will to make a statement in Parliament derogatory of, and offensive to, a member of Her Majesty's Opposition in breach of Standing Orders 125 and 131.

What could any background have to do with that? It would not matter whether the member for Balcatta said things ten times as strong as the things he might have said; it would not matter whether any other member had said things ten times as strong. The background is there; but I submit it has no possible relationship at all to the merit or otherwise of this amendment.

The amendment is related exclusively to some of the things the Premier said when making a statement, permission for which was given to him by Mr. Speaker. Therefore, the issue to be looked at, and the issue to be worked out and decided, is whether the Premier made a statement in Parliament which offended a Standing Order. Had the Premier in his statement, after he had obtained permission from the Speaker to make it, kept the statement within the bounds of the privilege which is associated with the Speaker's permission to make a special statement, the whole matter would there have ended.

The Premier, however, went beyond that point; he went beyond what was reasonable in that situation. Because he went beyond those reasonable bounds, the member for Beeloo has moved in the terms which I read a moment or two ago. What possible connection can there be with the background and the merit or otherwise of this amendment? There cannot be any possible relationship; and the background

cannot possibly have any effect or influence upon whether this amendment should be accepted or defeated.

The amendment stands on its own; it has its own particular merit, or lack of merit; and, consequently, the background issue does not apply and cannot possibly be made to apply. I was not here to listen to the speech of the member for Balcatta last week; nor was I here to listen to the statement made by the Premier. However, that would not matter. If this issue of the amendment were before a court of law, background would not be evidence; it would have not the slightest influence with any judge, with any jury, or with any magistrate, because the background cannot possibly be associated with this amendment.

For the sake of debate it could possibly be associated for the purpose of perhaps trying to score a political trick by one member as against another; or by one section of the House as against another section of the House. Apart from that, the background does not enter into this matter at all. The amendment is not asking the House to decide whether something the member for Balcatta said last week was appropriate or inappropriate, right or wrong, justifiable or unjustifiable. It does not deal with the issue in any shape or form.

So the argument of the Minister for Railways under that heading was not appropriate at all to the question as to whether the amendment should be accepted or defeated. There is only one issue in this amendment, and that is whether the Premier, in making a statement under privilege—under special permission from Mr. Speaker—breached a Standing Order in what he had to say personally in condemnation of a member on this side of the House.

As I explained before the tea suspension, the comparison which the Minister for Railways made in his speech between a statement made by a Minister for Labour in this House 40 years ago and the statement made by the Premier in the House last week was a comparison which had no application at all to this situation. The Minister concerned 40 years or more ago did not mention any other member of the House at all; he did not criticise anybody; he did not condemn anybody; he merely stood up with the permission of the Speaker and made a statement which incorporated a statement of fact in regard to some proposed railway line. That was what happened on that occasion.

But on this occasion the Premier obtained special permission from Mr. Speaker to make a statement under privilege; and in addition to making a statement which was, in that situation, within the bounds of reason, he overstepped those bounds

and breached the Standing Order by taking advantage of being on his feet to criticise and condemn a member of the Opposition. When the Premier stepped beyond the bounds of reason he did something which he should not have done; something which, perhaps, in the heat of the situation he felt he was justified in doing; something which perhaps he was unable to restrain himself from doing.

So there is a vast difference between the situation which we are discussing today and the situation which obtained in this House 40 or so years ago; there is a vast difference. From what I have been able to read of the statements of the Premier against the member for Balcatta, I think the amendment as moved by the member for Beeloo is quite justified.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [7.41 p.m.]: Having listened to the debate today, and as it was led off by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in an attack on myself as having breached Standing Orders right, left, and centre, I cannot help feeling that this was in the nature of a smokescreen, to try to hide some of the embarrassment that was occasioned by what was said by the member for Balcatta during the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. Graham: Who was embarrassed?

Mr. BRAND: There is no question about that. As we know, during that debate the member for Balcatta made reference to a certain judge. This is a breach of Standing Orders and therefore I was amazed to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition perform as he did today, particularly when he said he was astounded and amazed that the Premier and leader of the House would breach the Standing Orders.

As a matter of fact, I have never ever slow-handclapped when the Chairman of Committees came into this Chamber—never once. But the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was party to that arrangement.

Mr. Tonkin: Was he?

Mr. BRAND: I cannot say; but he was a member of the party that made the arrangement.

Mr. Tonkin: That was a bad miss, that was.

Mr. BRAND: I could, of course, point out to the House that there are many occasions on which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would have breached the Standing Orders had it not been for your direction, Sir, and the decision of the House; and evidently he considered that this was his right; he believed he was doing the right thing; he believed he was abiding by Standing Orders.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you?

Mr. BRAND: Yes; of course I did. I had the permission of the Speaker to make a statement.

Mr. Graham: Not to attack another member.

Mr. BRAND: I had the permission of the Speaker to make a statement.

Mr. Tonkin: And to say anything you liked?

Mr. BRAND: In fact, the statement I made was a very temperate one.

Mr. Bovell: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: I would like to inform the House that I believed I was speaking to, and keeping within Standing Orders.

Mr. Graham: Then you do not know them.

Mr. Tonkin: But there is a Standing Order which expressly prohibits you from speaking as you did.

Mr. BRAND: No objection was raised by the honourable member respecting the two words which he might have considered as being a breach of Standing Order 131.

Mr. Graham: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition protested.

Mr. BRAND: He protested about not having the right of reply.

Mr. Graham: No; about your statement: I wanted the right of reply.

Mr. BRAND: I believe there were only two words in the statement that could have been objected to by the other side, because the attack, as the Opposition call it, which was made was not made on the member for Balcatta, but on the statement which he had made. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in criticising me for having set such a bad example—

Mr. Tonkin: Wasn't it?

Mr. BRAND: It was not. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in criticising me for having set such a bad example in breaching the Standing Orders, was not correct; because, in fact, no-one objected to what I said under the Standing Order; and you yourself, Sir, considered that I was in order.

Mr. Toms: An attempt was made to take a point of order.

Mr. BRAND: A point of order was raised and the Speaker confirmed the permission he gave me regarding the statement I had to make. The member for Balcatta is a senior member in the Labor Party and, in fact, three times during his speech he could not resist the temptation to say, "When there is a change of Government and I am sitting on the other side."

Mr. Graham: Not connected with this question.

Mr. BRAND: He is a senior member of the Labor Party who hopes some day to be Premier or perhaps Leader of the Opposition; and I would say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he will have some difficulty in keeping him in order.

A member: The same as you have with the Minister for Railways.

Mr. BRAND: The member for Balcatta breached Standing Orders and did so unintentionally. As you said, Mr. Speaker, in referring to the honourable member's statement at the time, there was no reference to any name or any judge until the end of his statement, and it was done in such a way as to be able to sidestep and get around Standing Orders. Therefore, why should I be criticised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for setting such a bad example, because I was simply doing what the member for Balcatta did.

Mr. Jamieson: Two wrongs do not make a right—that is an admission on your part.

Mr. BRAND: I do not believe I was in the wrong.

Mr. Graham: I did not breach any Standing Order.

Mr. BRAND: I want to emphasise, Mr. Speaker, that I was making a statement with your permission—

Mr. Graham: An offensive statement.

Mr. BRAND: —but the details of the statement had not been conveyed to you. It was on your authority and with your permission that I made a statement which I believed was vitally important. As has been suggested, an arrangement could be made for a question to be asked; or I might have been asked a question, other than by arrangement; and I could have said exactly what I said without breaching any of the Standing Orders. However, I decided I would make a statement because I believed it was important enough for the Government to dissociate itself from the statement which in itself could have been termed as one not as responsible as would have been expected from a member of Parliament.

Mr. Bickerton: The statement was full of virtue.

Mr. Rowberry: That is coming down a bit.

Mr. BRAND: The honourable member was not here.

Mr. Graham: He read every word of it, though.

Mr. BRAND: It seems to me that his holiday—or for whatever he went away—has done the Leader of the Opposition a lot of good, as he was so kind in what he said; because he found, too, that this is a difficult situation. In fact, he said, "Do not let us have the background of this in; let us keep right away from it."

Mr. Hawke: I did not think that at all. I said it was not relevant; or is it?

Mr. BRAND: I want to say this: The member who initiated this difficulty and this problem was the member for Balcatta. He made this attack without notice when a constitutional means should have been followed. Perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, would not let me refer to his speech.

Mr. Graham: Go for your life!

Mr. BRAND: The statement he made was not the most responsible that could have been made, because he clearly said that the judge was not fit for his job.

Mr. Graham: What do you think of a judge who abuses the jury?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Graham: What do you think of that?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. BRAND: If you read his speech, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the question of the jury was only one of the points raised.

Mr. Graham: The principal point.

Mr. BRAND: The attack was on the judge.

Mr. Graham: For what?

Mr. BRAND: It was for this reason I asked permission—

Mr. Graham: For what?

Mr. BRAND: Because you said he was not fit to do his job.

Mr. Graham: Why was that so?

Mr. BRAND: I think the honourable member said that he was "Her Majesty's Alternative."

Mr. Graham: That is right.

Mr. BRAND: So I presume that if you were saying what the Government should do now, if you became the Government you would do this—

Mr. Graham: I suggested that it was time you did your job to protect juries.

Mr. BRAND: I am doing my job, and I feel it is very important.

Mr. Graham: You have a head as big as a football.

Mr. BRAND: Whatever the arguments and difficulties in respect of juries, it is essential in this Parliament that if the other side disagrees entirely with my statement, let them say so.

Mr. Graham: Which statement? You have made so many.

Mr. BRAND: The statement I made in the House.

Mr. Graham: You agree juries should be attacked, do you?

Mr. BRAND: The statement I made here expressing my concern, no doubt, had your support, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this House should make itself

clear on its attitude. As far as I am concerned the words "irresponsible and intemperate" fitted the bill.

Mr. Graham: That is your opinion.

Mr. BRAND: Yes; and even though the member for Balcatta and one or two others on the other side of the House talk about the use of words, "intemperate" is as mild as could possibly be.

Mr. Graham: You can use whatever words you like, but not under privilege.

Mr. BRAND: There is a Standing Order which refers to reflection on members.

Mr. Graham: Yes; and that is precisely what you did. You breached that Standing Order.

Mr. BRAND: I did not.

Mr. Graham: That is what the amendment says.

Mr. BRAND: I made a statement; not an attack like you made.

Mr. Graham: You reflected on a member.

Mr. BRAND: Reference has been made to what the member for Beeloo said; and tonight the member for Balcatta said there were five versions; and if he added another one there would be six. Each and every member in this House heard the member for Beeloo say words to the effect that "His overall record is terrible."

Mr. Jamieson: I want the exact words I said; and if the Premier refers to *Hansard* he can probably get them, but not the—

Mr. I. W. Manning: The Premier was absolutely correct.

Mr. Graham: You would not know.

Mr. BRAND: I want to read what the honourable member did say.

Mr. Jamieson: Make sure you read the original version instead of the corrected one in a transcript or you will be in trouble.

Mr. BRAND: We are always under threat here.

Mr. Graham: You can get away with murder because you have the numbers.

Mr. BRAND: Not murder. We have the numbers, and I cannot deny that. We do the same with the numbers as you did when you were over here.

Mr. Graham: Break all the rules in the book; not likely!

Mr. BRAND: We will use our numbers to govern the country in the way it should be governed.

Mr. Graham: You have a sense of humour, anyway.

Mr. Hawke: Lurching sideways.

Mr. BRAND: Mr. Hawke, before the Industrial Commission, said we were leaping forward.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Hawke: See what the industrial commissioners think of that!

Mr. BRAND: According to this transcript the member for Balcatta said—

This justice became so incensed and so irrational that he took it out of the person who was found guilty, after having expressed himself about the jury. I suggest in all seriousness that the Premier and his Government ought to look at this justice about whose fitness to occupy the important post, in my mind, at any rate, is open to extreme doubt—and I refer to Mr. Justice Virtue.

Mr. Jamieson then interjected—

Mr. Jamieson: Read the typed part.

Mr. BRAND: It has been altered, but I did not alter it. It reads, "They are not all the bad decisions he has made, either."

Mr. Jamieson: Yes.

Mr. BRAND: Then there is written in a correction.

Mr. Tonkin: Who wrote it?

Mr. BRAND: I could not say. I got this from *Hansard*.

Mr. Jamieson: Whose correction?

A member: Wonderful stuff.

Mr. BRAND: Written in is a correction. "That is not his only fault either. If you examine his overall record it is terrible." Mr. Graham then said, "I am aware of that. I pursue that matter no further." I do not want to mislead the House about what the member for Beeloo said—

Mr. Graham: Not much.

Mr. BRAND: —but we were all here and heard what was said. Whether we take a census of the people sitting here or not I do not know, but he did remark to the effect that the record of the judge—

Mr. Graham: Should be examined.

Mr. BRAND: —was such that it should be perused and looked at.

Mr. Oldfield: We all agree with that.

Mr. BRAND: I am simply saying that I will be interested to see what comes out in *Hansard* finally. I made my point.

Mr. Graham: You also said you deplored the attack of the member for Beeloo.

Mr. BRAND: This attack, I feel, is a smokescreen for the embarrassment in which a senior member of the Labor Party found himself when he breached the Standing Orders.

Point of Order

Mr. GRAHAM: Not once, but on several occasions, the Premier has said I breached Standing Orders. In fairness, I would like

the Premier to quote to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House what Standing Order it was. I defy him to find one.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): There is no point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could I ask for a withdrawal of that assertion?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Yes; that is a different matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then I do that.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): What are the particular words?

Mr. GRAHAM: Words that I breached certain Standing Orders in my references.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member wants all references to his breaching of Standing Orders withdrawn.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so; because I did not breach Standing Orders.

Mr. BRAND: I do not want to dispute your direction, Mr. Speaker, but I would refer you to your original comment at the time.

Mr. Graham: Have a look at Standing Orders!

Mr. BRAND: You had this to say, Mr. Speaker—

Order! The position is that last night the member for Balcatta made a criticism of Mr. Justice Virtue. It was made in such a manner that it really did not become out of order until he actually named the judge concerned at the end of his statement on the matter.

Mr. Tonkin: That is another error of judgment on the part of the Speaker.

Mr. BRAND: I do not feel compelled in any way to withdraw what I have stated regarding the honourable member's breaching of Standing Orders in his reference to the judge.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have made a simple request and I have indicated that if the Premier considers he is right, he should quote the Standing Order. There is not one that I breached.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): This is one of those things in which it devolves on the Speaker whether words are, in point of fact, objectionable or not.

Mr. Graham: That may be so.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): If this House is to be dictated to in such a manner that a member cannot say somebody else has breached Standing Orders, then I think we are going to have some very quiet debates, indeed. In the past—and I refer particularly to one occasion that involved the member for South Perth—there have been occasions when I have refused to uphold an objection; and I do so on this occasion.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. BRAND: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to conclude—

Mr. ROWBERRY: You still cannot find the Standing Order.

Mr. BRAND: —by saying that you have confirmed the point I was endeavouring to make. The situation is: I had in mind your reference at the point of time it was raised. Therefore, I naturally and very vigorously oppose the amendment to the Address-in-Reply censuring me—

Mr. Graham: You did break a Standing Order.

Mr. BRAND: —on two points on which I feel there is no basis whatsoever; and, in fact, what I said has been proved. I oppose the amendment.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren [8 p.m.]): I had no intention of entering this debate until the Premier told me that I was not in this. I want to say that as an ordinary member of Parliament—a very young member and possibly an inexperienced member—I am in everything that happens in this House. That is the reason I was sent here.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I was sent here as the spokesman for the people whom I represent.

Mr. Hawke: Don't be bluffed by the dictators on the other side!

Mr. Graham: Would-be dictators!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I object to the Premier saying at any time that "You were not in this."

Mr. Brand: I said that you were not here on the day.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Were you here that day?

Mr. ROWBERRY: I was not here on Wednesday. My first impressions on this debate were conveyed to me through reports in certain newspapers, which slanted the argument very much against the member for Beeloo. To the members of the Government that is just how it should be. Happily, there are other people in the community who have other ideas and who like to look at the question from both sides. Fortunately there is one objective newspaper in Western Australia, which did not publish comments or extracts from speeches but which published what the member for Balcatta said—a full account of his speech.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I hope you are going to relate these remarks to the amendment.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I am. The amendment before the Chair is, "But we express our regret that under the cloak of privilege the Premier is permitted at will . . ." I want members to note the words "at will." At whose will?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker's, I'm afraid.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I submit that "at will" does not mean any particular person at all, except the person upon whom the responsibility for making the statement rests. "At will." At whose will? At the will of the person who has been given the privilege of speaking. I consider that a direct abrogation of the Chair, if it did, in fact, happen.

I have been very disturbed that both sides of the House appear to be taking the authority of the Chair much too lightly. I think it is time that the office of Speaker in this Parliament was raised above the intrigues of party politics.

Mr. Brand: Will you let the Speaker go unopposed the next time?

Mr. ROWBERRY: It should be incumbent upon the party that elects the Speaker to determine that he shall not be opposed in a selection ballot. I make that suggestion to the Government; and also to our side of the House. It could very easily be—

Mr. Brand: We will be very easily influenced provided your side agrees.

Mr. ROWBERRY: —that at certain intervals the Speaker could come up for pre-selection by his party, and because of that he is under undue pressure at certain times.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The member for Warren had better get back to the amendment.

Mr. Brand: The Speaker was interested in the no-competition business.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I think he appreciated my words, and I hope the members of the Government will appreciate my words in future. I object to some of the phrases used by the Premier in his speech a few minutes ago.

Mr. Oldfield: He used very intemperate language, too.

Mr. ROWBERRY: He said that the member for Balcatta deliberately breached a Standing Order; that he kept the name of the judge right to the end of his speech because he was afraid that if he had interposed the name of the judge he would have been ruled out of order.

Mr. Brand: Didn't he?

Mr. ROWBERRY: If members will notice, the member for Balcatta made the following point. He said—

I am aware of that. I pursue that matter no further. I do not desire to move a deliberative motion in connection with it.

He did not say that he should have done; he said that he did not desire to do that. Continuing—

but I think it is of transcending importance that the Government should analyse the record of this judge in order to satisfy itself as to whether

he should not be posted to other duties. I hasten to add that I have no feeling of personal rancour towards that gentleman, but I am moved to say what I have from a sense of duty, because I feel that he has displayed that he is not fit for the position he occupies.

The member for Balcatta feels that sincerely; and if a member of this House feels something sincerely enough it is his duty—his bounden duty—to stand up and express his sentiments; and I say all honour to the member for Balcatta for doing something which other people would not have the courage to do in public.

Our democracy depends upon certain fundamental principles. One of them is, to my mind, that no person, no institution, no organisation, is above criticism; and if there is to be criticism of any person, institution, or organisation, then here in Parliament is the place to make that criticism public.

Mr. Brand: Do you support what the member for Balcatta said?

Mr. Graham: He supports his right to say it.

Mr. ROWBERRY: A member is entitled to speak, and in his speech to bring forward any fact that appears to be in contradiction to other happenings—in this case, that people who had had several convictions for the same kind of offence had not been publicly whipped. In fact, no-one has been publicly whipped in Western Australia for many years.

Mr. Court: Does that make the judge wrong?

Mr. ROWBERRY: That is enough to incense any member. For the Premier to say that it was intemperate, he is using words that are really intemperate.

Mr. Brand: Three judges supported the decision when it went to appeal.

Mr. ROWBERRY: In my opinion, the member for Balcatta lived up to his responsibility to the full. I too have been disturbed about certain happenings in courts of law. I fail to see why a judge has the right to castigate a member of the public who has been—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Well, I have said it.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): If the honourable member is not careful, I will have to ask him to resume his seat for disobeying the Chair.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I want to obey the Chair at all times. I know that our privileges rest in your capable hands, Sir. The reason for a Speaker being in Parliament is that he is, first of all, the custodian of members' rights.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROWBERRY: It is a member's right to come here and speak on behalf of the people; and to speak against injustices as he sees them, appreciates them, and feels them. If some of us appear to wander from what is before the Chair, it is probably because the ramifications of our minds flow in different channels from your own; so you have to give some consideration to members who take a bypath to get to the same place that you would have got to by a straighter route.

I wish to say that if the Premier had listened to the plea of the member for Balcatta and had examined the record of this judge, the affair would not have occurred. I think it is to be deplored that session after session, and sitting after sitting, there are motions in disagreement with the Speaker's ruling, or there are debates on Standing Orders. Why does this situation arise? The Premier said that the member for Balcatta had brought the matter forward merely to gain political advantage for his party. He also said—as did the Minister for Railways—that the reason for this amendment is that we are trying to save the member for Balcatta from the disapprobation of the public. Could anything be more stupid?

Mr. Brand: I would have liked to see his fan mail.

Mr. Graham: You are welcome.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Why cannot we keep these debates above party politics? If we can keep the debates above party politics, then we can keep the Speaker above party politics.

Mr. Brand: We will try to remember this.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Another matter that has disturbed me very much—I am just about as naive as the Minister for Railways, but not quite—

Mr. Graham: We should hope not.

Mr. ROWBERRY: —is the dissimilarity between the reports on what a certain member said. It was revealed during this debate that a copy of *Hansard* was brought down and that certain corrections were made in that copy in red ink which were not made by the member concerned. That is something that should be dealt with urgently. Surely what a member says in this House, of all places, should be recorded and recorded correctly. Another point is that when a member is taken to task for what he allegedly said, the truth and the real facts of what he did say should be quoted. Someone should not stand up in this House and quote a portion or section that he thinks suits his particular viewpoint, well knowing that everybody on his side of the House, or the Premier's side, will back him. It is a disturbing thought to find printed six

different versions of what a member interjected. Which one is the truth? How do we find the truth? We cannot subject *Hansard*, the Premier, or anyone else, to cross-examination.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Standing Order 121.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Standing Order 121? I do not see that Standing Order 121—

Mr. Graham: The end of it applies.

Mr. ROWBERRY: —“or interrupt any Member in possession of the Chair”; I do not see that has any relevance to what I am saying. What I am trying to point out is that there has been—and it is not the first time it has happened in the House—an incorrect recording of what has happened; of what members have said. Surely, if there are six different recordings of what a member says it is a disturbing thought. When we find people arguing about six different versions of what has happened I do not see that Standing Order No. 121 has anything to do with it.

Mr. Graham: To be fair, it was not the member's speech; it was an interjection, and they are pretty difficult to be taken down when one member is speaking and the other one is interrupting and they are both talking at the same time.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I have expressed this before: Interjections should not be recorded unless they are answered by the person who is making the speech. I think that would overcome a lot of the difficulty. However, I think the allegations made by the Premier, and the Minister for Railways, that we on this side of the House have merely moved this motion as a cover-up, as a camouflage, and as an endeavour to hide what was said from public disapprobation is far from the truth. As a matter of fact, if it were possible for most of the people connected with the law really to say what they thought, without being in danger of intimidation, I do not think we on this side would need to do what has been done.

Mr. Brand: That is not very fair.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I think the member for Balcatta is to be commended for his public spirit in bringing this matter before the House and before the public of Western Australia.

Mr. Brand: Why didn't he do it in the proper way?

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [8.17 p.m.]: I would like to have a few words to say on this amendment to the Address-in-Reply which is now before the House. I can see the Leader of the Opposition with a smile on his face, which indicates, I suppose, that he thinks it will be funny. As on several occasions I have passed the remark in this House that people should not be too choosy in their words and should express themselves if they think

the interests of the country demand it, I would like to express a few opinions on this matter.

First of all, the amendment sets out to criticise the Premier for making remarks offensive to the Opposition. After having sat here for two sessions I wonder how some members of the Opposition could imagine that anybody on this side of the House could make a remark that would be offensive to them, because I have listened to some pretty awful comments from members on the other side about members on this side. I have never interjected or taken exception to them because I know they do not know any better. You, Sir, have been very lenient, I believe—

Mr. Rowberry: That is another nasty crack!

Mr. MITCHELL: —during the debates we have had, and I hope you will extend the same leniency to me this evening in regard to the few comments I have to make as you have done to the Opposition. Oft-times I have wondered whether it was really right that you, being a member of the Government, and elected by this side of the House to act as Speaker—

Mr. Rowberry: Elected by the House and not the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know you have to be impartial, and I would say you have treated the Opposition with more than an impartial view on many occasions.

Mr. Tonkin: That is a priceless statement!

Mr. MITCHELL: I should think the Leader of the Opposition must deeply regret the fact that he had to be out of the State last week. I know that it was necessary for him to be away, but I should think he must deeply regret having been out of the State when one of his members so far transgressed the decency of this House as to call for a rebuke from the Premier.

Mr. Graham: Do you think anybody on this side of the House is worried about a rebuke from somebody on that side?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have heard some talk about the Leader of the Opposition retiring at the end of this year. I would think that would be about the worst blow the Opposition could have; because it is suggested that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Balcatta—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think the honourable member had better get back to the amendment.

Mr. Hawke: Back to it!

Mr. MITCHELL: The amendment seeks to—

Mr. Tonkin: Are you quoting from *The News Review*?

Mr. MITCHELL: —prove that the Premier has debased some member on the other side of the House.

Mr. Oldfield: No, used privilege.

Mr. MITCHELL: We have talked about things that have happened in the last 50 years in an effort to try to prove certain things; but what I am saying is that it would be rather difficult for the Premier to pass a remark which could properly describe the actions of the member for Balcatta in the comments he made about a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. H. May: He did his best.

Mr. MITCHELL: We know, of course, that one of the best things that anybody can do if he wants to break down democracy is to cast doubts on the judicial system as we have it.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I think you had better get back to the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL: With all due respect to you, Sir, I would suggest that we have had a lot of wandering tonight on the part of some members and perhaps—

Mr. H. May: You are in a bit of a fog, yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL: —it is coincidental that the gentleman whom the member for Balcatta was seeking to degrade in the eyes of the public of this State was recently appointed as the justice in charge of the Industrial Court.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think you will really have to get back to the amendment. I have been pretty lenient with you, too.

Mr. MITCHELL: Very well, Sir; I accept your ruling. However, I would say that we on this side strongly support the Premier in his castigation of the member for Balcatta for making such an intemperate attack on the judicial system of the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: If you are not careful we will put the Liberal Party on to you!

Mr. MITCHELL: I cannot imagine the Premier using words strong enough to express his opinion—not words as strong as I would have used. Had I been the Premier of this State the member for Balcatta would have had something to complain about. He certainly had nothing to complain about in the comments made by the Premier in his castigation of him the other evening.

Mr. Graham: You would be the least of my worries.

DR. HENN (Wembley) [8.23 p.m.]: I am not one of those members who rises in his seat on all possible occasions just for the sake of hearing his own voice.

Mr. Toms: Like me.

Dr. HENN: I usually try to address myself to Bills where I feel I can contribute something worth while, and I usually only speak on matters which I consider important. However, I must confess I feel constrained to speak to this amendment because I look upon it as an attack on the Premier. I think I had better keep a close eye on the amendment, Mr. Speaker! As regards the Standing Orders, I perused them very carefully last weekend; and, possibly, although I have been here 5½ years, I would still not be an authority on them, although I know more about them tonight than I did last Thursday evening.

Not being an expert on Erskine May or on the Standing Orders, I still believe that over the years the Standing Orders have been evolved for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, and for that of any other member who may occupy the high office you now hold. I believe also they are a guide to members; and so it seems rather queer to me when one or two members of the Opposition get excited about two Standing Orders which are mentioned in the amendment; because, quite frankly, if one takes a lenient view about the interpretation of them I do not think they have been contravened by the Premier.

Mr. Tonkin: What is your view of Standing Order 125?

Mr. Graham: He has never heard of it.

Dr. HENN: In the past there have been one or two vile and rather vicious attacks on the Premier from one or two members on the other side of the House—that is, in the last 5½ years. They have been made by only one or two members and I am certain other members opposite have not appreciated the attacks that have been made on members of the Government front bench, and particularly on the Premier. I do not think these vicious attacks do the members who make them any good; nor do they do the reputation of this House any good.

Mr. Hawke: You will be getting back to the amendment one of these days.

Dr. HENN: There are some people with inadequate personalities and character deficiencies who would project these defects on to other people, and they usually select as their victims people whose characters are far superior to their own. They attack them regularly, relentlessly, and maliciously with the ultimate hope, of course, of assassinating the character altogether. These tactics are followed by individuals throughout the world, and by some countries in the world which do not follow the democratic way of life. I leave the member for Balcatta there and just say I deplore the efforts he makes to blacken the characters of good men.

Mr. Graham: Profound!

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—19

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Molr
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
Mr. Kelly	

*(Teller)***Noes—20**

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Guthrie	
Mr. Hart	

*(Teller)***Pairs**

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Runciman
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Hall	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Sewell	Mr. Williams
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Mitchell

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [8.32 p.m.]: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. At the outset I would like to mention one matter which I noted prior to the discussion we have just concluded; that was a suggestion that the Standing Orders Committee should examine our Standing Orders to ensure that they are up to date, and in a more satisfactory form. It seems that they will have to be put into words which members understand.

Mr. Oldfield: It would make no difference. You would still disobey them.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is time that was done. I consider that an overhaul of the Standing Orders is overdue. We have been in session for about four weeks but we are still engaged in the Address-in-Reply debate. It makes one ask why we are here as members of Parliament. I would say we are here to legislate for the people and the Government of Western Australia; yet after four weeks we have not got very far in the Address-in-Reply debate.

I realise that towards the end of the parliamentary session complaint will be made that legislation is brought in during the dying hours when there is little time left for discussion. Something could be done quite easily to facilitate the progress of legislation, without delays of four to six weeks spent in debating on the Address-in-Reply, during which countless amendments are moved—and these can go on indefinitely, if it is so desired. I make the suggestion it would be a very good move for the Standing Orders Committee to examine our standing orders.

Mr. Rowberry: Without obeying them.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I wish to refer to the subject of decentralisation. There are one or two aspects I want to deal with at this moment, and one is the cost. Some people claim it costs something to implement decentralisation, but I raise the query as to what it would cost if we did not decentralise. Many cities in the world have been faced with tremendous expenditure, as a result of the concentration of people in them; and Perth is no exception. We should make some move along these lines.

Recently industrial seminars were held in Narrogin, and these were provocative and interesting. Such seminars could produce results, as the people in the community came to understand the objectives. I have before me a comment which was made by the Minister for Industrial Development, and perhaps unknowingly he supported my view. Recently he made the following comments when he was speaking on industrial development in Albany:—

If the inhabitants within a town or region were complacent, lethargic, timid, non-aggressive and uninformed the stimulus of growth from within the region would be small.

No amount of external stimulus, in particular from the government, would permit widespread growth within the region if the spirit of that town or region was dead.

I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. Rowberry: What made it die?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: As far as I know, nothing made it die. The suggestion of the Minister was that unless the people were progressive the region would not progress. There is another angle to this. What if a town were so progressive that the opportunities for work and employment in many spheres were so great that the housing in the area could not accommodate the potential number of employees? Where does decentralisation start—with promoting industries, or with the provision of housing? That is a very difficult question to answer. How can a person go to a job in a region where there are no houses available for him to live in?

I suggest that one of the easiest ways to decentralise is to provide houses in the country for people who can find work there. I noticed a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 24th July, in which the Premier was reported as having stated under the heading, "Government Plans More Homes in Country"—

The Government would put greater emphasis on home building in country areas in its housing programme this financial year.

In addition to stepping up the rate of building outside the metropolitan area it wanted to meet the increasing

accommodation demands of Government and semi-government employees in the country.

They include school teachers who experience very great difficulties in finding houses in country areas. I cannot stress too greatly the need for some provision to be made for them, and for others, who are transferred, not always with their consent and often against their will.

I was interested to hear a point raised by the member for Swan in this debate, when he complained about some people in his electorate being chronically out of work. If that is the case, those people are occupying houses in an area where insufficient work is available. Why can they not go to other areas where there are houses and work available? If a person is after employment he should go where it is available. On the notice paper to-day the member for Swan had a question about the building of houses in his electorate; yet the evidence he has given shows there are more people than there are jobs, and therefore there are more houses than there are work opportunities.

We are attacking this matter along the wrong lines. There is plenty of work in the country, yet those who desire cannot obtain houses to live in. There is a certain reluctance on the part of the Housing Commission to build houses in the country, for fear of building too many and finding no applicants for them. I would have no hesitation in guaranteeing the rental for three months on any house built by the Housing Commission in centres like Pingelly, Narrogin, Williams, and Wickepin. Although the commission is doing a very good job, it is not providing sufficient houses, and the principle adopted by it is entirely wrong. The policy of the commission is that a person has to live in a town for a certain period before he can make application for a house to be provided. But how can a person live in a town when no house is available to him? This principle is entirely wrong, and the Government should take steps to rectify it. We should face up to decentralisation by building houses in places where work is available.

There is another aspect of housing to which I wish to refer. Many people in country towns purchase houses built by the Housing Commission, but in four to six years' time they might be transferred elsewhere. These owners have a certain equity in their houses. I have a case before me concerning a person who has £900 equity in his home in a country district. This is a Government employee who has been in that district for a number of years. He has been transferred in his employment, but he has been unable to quit his house. In these days not many people have as much as £900 to lodge as a deposit, and take over a house. In many cases difficulty is experienced.

Under the existing legislation the availability of houses is restricted to people who earn up to a certain income, and those earning above that amount are not eligible. These things need looking into. In the case I am referring to the person who wishes to take over the home is in receipt of a salary approximately the same as the salary of the owner who has been transferred. Although the owner was eligible originally, as the years passed his income exceeded the limit. He has been transferred back to Perth, and he cannot sell his house, because the person who desires to take it over is not eligible. When Government employees and other people contract for the purchase of homes in the country they should be allowed to sell to any willing buyer should they be transferred. This matter should be attended to immediately, because many sales are held up, and this one has been held in abeyance for three weeks. Neither party can move, and the house is empty.

I now wish to speak on the use of the land in Western Australia. I hope the Minister is listening.

Mr. Bovell: I am.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: There are many areas of land in the country which are reserved for one purpose or another, and there are Crown lands of various types. It is a complicated system to have such lands released, or to have a decision made on an application. An application has to be made to the Under-Secretary for Lands, and he refers it to the Conservator of Forests, to the Fauna and Flora Conservation Committee, and to the Mines Department. There is also a Crown Lands Tribunal which I shall deal with shortly. I have received letters which show the complicated process when cases are put forward.

In one instance an application was made for land, and on the 24th January, 1964, the applicant was advised that the matter was receiving attention, and a reply would be sent as early as possible. On the 11th March he was advised that although the area as per the sketch submitted by him was vacant, it was not available at present. He was told he would be advised further in the event of the land being released for selection. On the 16th July he was advised by the Under-Secretary for Lands that should the land be made available he would be advised by that office.

I refer to another case dealing with reservations. In a letter to me, the Under-Secretary for Lands stated—

This location is set apart as reserve No. 21830 for the purpose of "Timber-Settlers' Requirements."

The question of releasing this land for selection has been referred to the Forests Department; Mines Department, and the Shire of Cuballing. When replies have been received from

these authorities and a decision reached on the future use of this land, I will advise you further.

In another case the Under-Secretary for Lands advised that the Conservator of Forests had advised that the greater portion of the area concerned was either carrying mallet timber, or was potentially mallet planting country, and he was therefore not prepared to excise those lands from the State forests for alienation. Accordingly, the application was refused. Of course what the conservator opposes is opposed.

I would like to state that this particular area has 156 acres with somewhere about five to 10 acres of mallet. There is definitely no more. It has already had a fire through it and everybody knows that once mallet has had a fire through it is no good. There are already four reserves on the boundary of the farm and three more within two miles. The following is another letter:—

These reserves are set apart for the purpose of "Timber and Conservation of Flora and Fauna" and the Conservator of Forests has advised this Department that both these areas include a high proportion of mallet country consisting mainly of granite outcrops with very little arable land.

I would like to mention in regard to this one that there is no more than 10 acres of mallet in the whole area, which is 800 acres. The area of non-arable land referred to is somewhere between 50 and 100 acres, and even that would be good grazing. Most peculiar of all is the fact that there is no access road; and yet it cannot be made available to adjoining owners. The following is another one:—

Reserve No. 17115 is set apart for the purposes of "Timber and Conservation of Flora and Fauna", and Locations 9170 and 10283, together with Location 15361, are set apart as Reserve No. 21067 for the purpose of "Timber (Mallet)".

Notice the similarity here again—

The Conservator of Forests has previously advised that these lands include a high proportion of mallet country, consisting mainly of granite outcrops with very little arable land, and he is opposed to the alienation of these lands.

The typist must know these off by heart. The following is another:—

I have to advise that the Mines Department has informed this Department that it has no objection to the release of these locations.

However, no advice has been received from the Forests Department, and verbal enquiries at that Department have revealed that a reply is awaited from the Narrogin Depot. Until such

advice is received from the Forests Department it is not possible for this Department to give consideration to the alienation of these locations.

And still another—

A decision on the alienation of the above mentioned land may not be known until the views of the Chief Warden of Fauna have been received.

From the reading of those letters members must realise that there is a tremendous amount of work done in the Lands Department; because, when an application is made, the Lands Department has to refer it to all these different authorities and receive their answers. If any one of them objects, the Lands Department says "No."

Mr. W. Hegney: Has the Minister made any decisions on those?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Not that I know of. These are departmental letters. I have not quoted any from the Minister at all.

Mr. W. Hegney: I don't know that you would get anywhere at all, anyway.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am merely trying to point out that the volume of work done by the department is getting nowhere, because the replies received are all in the negative.

Mr. Bovell: I would not say we are not getting anywhere. One million acres is made available yearly for agricultural development so we are making progress.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: All credit is due for that. However, this occurs in the midst of well developed areas where there is road access, rail access, sometimes power, and water. There is no difficulty with regard to water because their own supply would be sufficient. Nevertheless, these applications are held up because one out of all these authorities objects.

I feel there should be a better overall plan. There does not seem to be any system. It is a matter of, "Oh, yes, we can let this one go; but not that one." One of those applied for is within two miles of the huge Tutnang reserve for fauna and flora east of Pingelly. There are several thousands of acres and yet a few acres two miles away has to be kept. It does not make sense.

There should be a co-ordinated effort to decide what land should be kept. It cannot all be thrown open; but let us have a plan. I asked a question last year in regard to the Crown Land Tribunal, and I ascertained that this tribunal cannot act unless the item is referred to it by the Minister. Therefore it has to get to the Minister before anything is done. That means that his departmental officers have to approve before it can be alienated.

I feel the scope of the tribunal should be widened or another tribunal set up to examine these areas shire by shire. I suggest as a starting point that the Cuballing shire would be a good one because it con-

tains a lot of forests and reserves. I feel that if a committee or tribunal of some sort were established to visit the shires and decide which lands should be kept and which should be released, we would begin to get a little bit of sense and save a tremendous amount of book work. Some of the departmental files are huge because the matter has been going on for years. The fathers of owners or previous occupiers of these lands have applied, and so it has gone on and on; and it will until doomsday unless we do something about it.

I suggest we have one shire as a trial and see how it works out. I feel something could be done along those lines and there would not be the argument and trouble which exists now, because it would be all worked out on a fair and reasonable basis.

Talking about the use of land still, there are large areas which are being held privately. We are on the other side of the subject now. Land which is being held privately is not being used, and I think we ought to be concerned about this. There are thousands and thousands of acres in some shires. Some of it is cut over timber land and some is part of farms or vacant lands being held. Some time ago I discovered there was a Closer Settlement Act, and in 1958 I asked the following question of the Minister for Lands:—

Who are the members of the Land Acquisition (Closer Settlement) Board appointed under the Closer Settlement Act of 1927?

The reply was—

There is no record of the appointment of any members of the Land Acquisition (Closer Settlement) Board pursuant to the Closer Settlement Act of 1927. The Act still remains on the Statute book, but has never been invoked.

On page 1744 of *Hansard* the same year I asked the following question:—

Is there any reason why the Closer Settlement Act of 1927 has not been invoked?

The answer was—

Yes. The Governments from time to time over the past 31 years have not considered it necessary and/or desirable to invoke the provisions of the Act.

The second question I asked was—

Does he consider that it is desirable to inquire into the suitability and requirement for closer settlement of any unutilised land which is defined in Clause 3 of the Act . . .

The answer was "Yes."

Still nothing is done. I suppose there are not many who know the Act is there, but this House must have known it was there, because strangely enough although the Act has never been invoked since 1927, an amendment was made to it in 1945,

and another in 1953. The amendments must have been made for a purpose, but the Act has never been invoked from the day it was passed until now. I hope something will be done to see it is invoked. One or two amendments might be necessary because some of the names there would not apply today. I think the Agricultural Bank is mentioned and one or two other things which are out of date. However, the principle is still there. The following are one or two points which are contained in the Act:—

Land shall be deemed unutilised within the meaning of this Act, if the land, having regard to its economic value, is not put to reasonable use and its retention by the owner is a hindrance to closer settlement, and cannot be justified.

There is a board under the Act, and if it is decided that land is not being put to suitable use the owner has two choices. He can put the land to the use prescribed in the *Gazette* and to which, in the opinion of the board, it should be put; or, secondly, he can subdivide that land and sell it. At a recent meeting of the Central South Regional Council this matter was discussed, and it was decided that the terms of this Act should be invoked. I hope this will occur because it is high time that some of this land which is holding up development, was used. We in these days are accustomed to acquiring amenities which depend on the distances between farms and towns. These include school bus routes, telephones, and S.E.C. power. There are many things we like to have through the farming areas, but if there are several miles of country not being used, what chances are there of getting any of these amenities? It is high time we looked into these matters and got busy on the basis already set down.

While on the Lands Department, I would like to bring up one other point, and that is to deal with the long delays that there are when small subdivisions are made—in town lots in particular. I have one at the present time. A half block was sold last November, and the one buying it was anxious to build. He had his plans all ready when he agreed to buy the land. The diagram, which is the final point of the subdivision, was received at the Titles Office at the end of July, 1964—eight to nine months after the agreement to sell. There were no complications, because approval had been granted by the Town Council in Narrogin, and yet that is the time it took. If there is not sufficient staff it should be increased. Something should be done. Why should a person desiring to build a house, be held up for all those months because of delays which are unnecessary? The case to which I refer was as straightforward as it could be.

Another instance occurred at Pingelly. A contract was let, but the builders could not proceed for many weeks. The matter

has just been resolved. But in the former case it has not even been resolved yet because the title has not been issued.

I know a lot of these cases are being dealt with. For the year ended June, 1963, there were 25,302 real estate transactions, and for the year ended June, 1964 the number was 29,295. However, it has been a steady increase, and there should be sufficient staff to handle it. Therefore I hope something will be done.

Another matter to which I wish to refer concerns, this time, the Minister for Health. I refer to an article which I know was not written by him. It appeared in *The Sunday Times* of the 22nd March, 1964. Portion of the article reads as follows:—

HOSPITAL HOSTEL TO HOUSE RELATIVES

Royal Perth Hospital is planning a hostel for healthy people.

It will accommodate close relatives of seriously-ill patients.

Country outpatients also will stay there.

The hostel will be built near the hospital.

It will be the first of its kind in Australia.

Well, this is great.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It has not the approval of the Minister.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I know the Minister did not write the article and I am not attributing it to him at all. However, I am mentioning it. He will think it is a grand idea, and such ideas catch on. When we have all the hospitals we need and all the schools built and houses provided for all Government employees and teachers, and plenty of accommodation in the country, we will say, "Good luck to these people. Let them have their home for friends and relatives". What a glorious thing it will be; and I hope it will come soon if it means that all these other facilities and amenities have been provided first.

Mr. Gayfer: It is the only thing your hospital in Narrogin is lacking, isn't it?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It hasn't even a kitchen.

Mr. Brand: It didn't look too bad the last time I was there.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The next subject about which I wish to speak is the need to do something about Western Australian industries. A few years ago a folder was issued indicating the goods which were made in Western Australia. I do not think it was a very good list, because it included a lot of names of those items not made in Western Australia. The packet or carton of such goods was made in Western Australia, but not the goods. It was deceptive in that respect. Something should be done to enable people to know whether

the goods they are buying are made in Western Australia. The average housewife does not know and there is no means of her knowing. Western Australian manufacturers do not plaster the fact all over their goods.

It is a certainty that something must be done because for the year ended June 30th, 1964—these figures are right up to date—we imported into this State from the Eastern States £161,385,195 worth of goods. Therefore I think it is time we did something. How are we going to do it? It is not an easy matter.

Many of the following items are things which could be made in Western Australia:—

	£
Sox and stockings	1,116,075
Other apparel—	
Male	3,722,145
Female	6,678,956
	11,603,481
Infant apparel	202,480

The figure for sundries brings the total to £12,994,187. On the other side we have these figures—

	£	£
Cheese	680,169	
Table Margarine	410,240	
Other Margarine	266,711	
Butter	550,774	
		1,907,894
Toiletries, Dental, Hair, etc.		1,751,205
Confectionery		1,795,759
Footwear		3,145,871

All these items could be made in Western Australia, and the grand total of these and all other goods amounts to more than £161,000,000. Surely we have to do something to stop these goods coming in from the Eastern States! I know we cannot stop them coming in; we have to compete with them. We must have a campaign which will promote the sale of Western Australian goods so that people will buy goods that are made here.

I want to touch on a matter of great importance to us—water. In 1952 a committee was set up—namely, Messrs. Hutchinson and Curlewis—and their main term of reference was—

To investigate and report on the practicability from a financial and technical aspect, of a proposal to introduce uniform water charges in respect to all Government controlled Town Water Supply undertakings throughout the State.

At page 2 of their report, published in 1953, they said—

For the reasons quoted, a uniform price is not considered practicable.

I do not intend to deal with their reasons. At that point the matter rested.

Another report—the Stapleton report—came forward in 1954. He made a full report which did not suggest a change

of system, but he gave two alternative charges for rebate water at either 6s. 8d. or 10s. per 1,000 gallons with a 3s. rate on the annual value of land, and 1s. per acre on farm lands. That was his proposal to get over the water difficulties; and all his proposals were based on the idea of eliminating the loss on water by paying for the running expenses as well as the overhead expenses; and that is where the 10s. per 1,000 gallons came in; and if it was only to cover the operating expenses, the charge was to be 6s. 8d. throughout the State. That suggestion was not received too well, and consequently his report, as well as the other one to which I have referred, did not receive much attention.

Another report, which was made by departmental officers in 1960, was brought forward. This report recommended rates which were called uniform in certain areas only, and the result was to be achieved mostly by raising the charges for water. Rebated water was to be at 6s. 8d. per 1,000 gallons, and excess water was to be charged at from 3s. 4d. to 9s., and country land rating was to be increased to 9d. per acre. This report did not get very far; nothing was done about it.

Then there was a committee of Government members appointed in 1961, and I was a member of that committee. I wish to quote one or two extracts from the report, as follows:—

It has been said, and there is no doubt a great deal of truth in the statement, that neither primary nor secondary industry can develop to a much greater extent in this State unless during the next few years our water supplies can be greatly increased in volume, and that which is now available conserved and used to the best advantage.

Some means must be adopted which will prevent wastage and encourage conservation, and this can be brought about by a method of selling by measure.

There was a time when the Water Supply Department encouraged the use of water because it wanted the water sold in order to increase its revenue. This principle has carried forward to the present day and has given rise to the huge number of anomalies in water supply charges.

Another committee, which was called the Pay-as-you-use Committee, was appointed, and it reported on the 6th September, 1960. On page 2 of the report the committee had this to say—

The committee takes the view that in built up areas, the State, within reason, accepts the responsibility for ensuring an adequate supply of wholesome water for drinking, hygiene, health and other household purposes and in addition, that sufficient water

is available for fire-fighting and prevention. Thus as the bulk of the cost is associated with providing rather than using the service, the Committee is of the opinion that no practicable and equitable scheme of rating for water can be devised which will enable all ratepayers to be charged only for water actually used.

The following is a comment made by a committee that just recently made its report; and effect has been given to that report—

We have overcome the difficulty mentioned by suggesting that a very low water rate be charged for all services but that no rebate be allowed in return for this rate. In fact the amount paid by way of rates would be a recognition of the value of a water service as set out in No. (6) above. Following on the above decision it necessarily follows that all water used must be paid for.

There was a certain amount of risk in this matter, because if we give away a good deal of the rating value of a property, the guaranteed revenue to the department drops accordingly; and by guaranteed revenue I mean the revenue that comes from rating. This means the department must accept a large proportion of its revenue from the sale of water instead of from rating as was previously the position. However, it is suggested that the risk involved must be taken because of certain advantages in the new scheme; namely—

1. Conservation of water because of a natural desire to economise in costs.
2. It eliminates the faulty system of giving "free" water under the rebate method.
3. It is a more equitable proposition to all because it is controlled to a greater extent by the user of water.
4. The existing catchments will either be sufficient for more years or will enable extension of water to other areas.

Having arrived at those conclusions, the price to be charged involved an estimation by the extraction of voluminous examples of the amount of water that would be used under the changed conditions. Surely there would be fewer hoses running to waste and forgotten, and surely there would be fewer dripping taps. In this connection there was an article published by the Water Supply Department a few years ago which stated—

Don't be a drip, use water wisely.

In that article it was estimated that a dripping tap could waste 20,000 gallons of water in a year if left dripping for the whole time; and that is the basic idea of this report.

The anomalies I referred to in regard to the previous rating were very extensive; there was a tremendous list of them, and the prices ranged from free water to water at 10s. a 1,000 gallons—a tremendous range in prices: and all those are to be covered under the new plan whereby the water is to be charged at a standard rate for different sections of the community. As a basis, however, a generous estimate was made for household use; and this provides water to the extent of 60,000 gallons at 2s. and 40,000 gallons at 2s. 6d. for the domestic consumer. Beyond that, rates have been fixed at an equitable level resulting in an estimated reduction in revenue of £31,000 a year.

The net result of all this is that it should not only restrict wastage but should encourage conservation of water by whatever means might be available to individual persons—such as putting down bores or dams, etc.

As to the future, I feel this is a tremendous step forward because the report sets out quite clearly a new basis for water charging. It is a break-through by a system which is going to be a tremendous help to the country areas, and later on to the city areas; because I hope it will be adopted in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Norton: It is more expensive to the householder.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I say this scheme will not be by any means the final one, but it will be a break-through and will provide a means of meeting our future commitments and of bringing all consumers into a State-wide system of water charging for water use, and then possibly a service charge instead of rating. If we get rid of rating, we get rid of the difficulties associated with valuations, and the costly process of assessing valuations. The position might ultimately be that we will have a service charge and a charge for the water that is used.

It would be fair to mention the tremendous help this committee received from the secretary, Mr. Bruce Okely, and also Mr. Carmody, who was an officer head of the Water Supply Department and is now with the State Housing Commission. They rendered valuable assistance in preparing and collating the figures that were made available to us.

Finally, I wish to raise the matter of education and ask: How much educational time is given to subjects dealing with citizenship in its every aspect which should produce good citizens?

It is hard to say what subjects might be included in this question, and at what age the tuition might commence. Would it commence at an early age? This has been brought to my notice by some of my electors; and I feel it is important that our school system should train boys and girls for citizenship. How many of them know anything about what goes on in this

place? Perhaps it is just as well at times that they do not know what goes on here; but they should know what the objective of the House is. They should also know all about their local governing bodies, and how to control themselves in moral ways. They should be able to fill in their leisure time. There is more leisure time than work time these days. How much are the children taught to use their leisure? These are some of the thoughts put forward by people who have gone into this matter—

- (1) Youth should be educated to make use of its increasing leisure time. Education at present is too technical and secular.
- (2) The cause of hooliganism is purposeless living.
- (3) The problem with a section of our community arises because they have ample leisure but little knowledge of how to use it wisely and constructively. They must be taught to do something positive with their spare time.

Every member will agree that not enough of our youth know how to use their leisure time when they leave school. They give up their studies and take on work, and then find they have leisure time; because a tremendous number do not continue their studies at night school or technical school. That is a pity because they do not know what to do with their spare time. We should, by our education system, seek some way of providing these people with better means to cope with their leisure periods. If it were commenced during their school careers it would carry on into their after life. I thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Toms drew attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

MR. TOMS (Bayswater) [9.16 p.m.]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker: I thought it might be just as well if I brought the state of the House to your notice, as apparently previous speakers have nearly emptied the gallery. This is the time, during the Address-in-Reply debate, when members bring various aspects appertaining to their particular electorates before Parliament, and when they also take the opportunity to speak on State matters.

I join with other members in stating that I regret the way one member in the House last week cast aspersions on members on this side of the House. I refer to the statement that was made alleging that members on this side of the House had been drinking beer in the car park during last session. This incident made headlines. The member who made the statement subsequently said that he had not referred to members of Parliament; but, unfortunately, this part of his speech was not conveyed to the public, because

apparently the Press intended the matter should be made known to the public in the way it wanted it made known; namely, that members on this side of the House had indulged in beer drinking in the car park, outside Parliament House.

I repeat that although the member in question eventually said that he had not mentioned it was members of Parliament who had been drinking beer in the car park, this part of his speech was not printed in the Press. I consider that the Press should have published the corrected statement at a later stage, but apparently the original report was intended to embarrass the party on this side of the House.

I, for one, took a dim view of the matter, mainly because I believe that never before in the history of Australia or of any other nation has it been so necessary as now for people to be united. Despite this, we have these little incidents being reported in the Press which tend to drive a wedge in here or there with a view to splitting the public viewpoint further and further apart. I refer to the tendency to create the impression that there is anything but a reasonable air within the ranks of the Labor Party. This is to be deplored because, as I said previously, if ever a country needs to be united it is in the times through which we are now passing. I trust this method of attempting to upset the Labor Party—which will never be upset—will give way to something that is based on better lines.

Before touching on some district matters I would like to mention something that has caused me a great deal of concern, because it has a great bearing on my electorate, and no doubt affects the electorates of other metropolitan members as well. I wish to refer to town planning as we know it today.

I believe that, in its zeal to get, perhaps, a really good public image, the Government has a tendency to forecast and plan the development of the city and its environs 10, 20, and 40 years ahead. In some instances this may be a wise move, but with the town planning of some districts and some electorates in many cases it is not. In my electorate it is proposed that a regional road shall go through as part of the Beechboro-Gosnells Highway. Only last year I brought to the notice of this House the case of a young Italian which I have been trying to sort out for four years; and now, after this long period, we are starting to see some daylight. This year this unfortunate individual had to write cheques hoping that the bank would honour them so that he could purchase the chickens necessary for the restocking of his poultry farm.

I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, have had a similar case placed before you, but to my mind it is a crying shame that

one has to deal with two or three different departments, and with one fobbing the case off to another. For instance, there is the Town Planning Department, the Metropolitan Regional Planning Department, and the Main Roads Department, all of which are involved in the construction of a regional road. This young Italian to whom I have referred had an acre of land for which he was offered £7,000. He has built a nice home on it, but because of his honesty he has lost the opportunity to obtain that figure for his property. The reason is that when he knew the set-up relating to his area he told the prospective buyer what was going to happen. He knew he was going to have a freeway rising some 10 or 12 feet high right in front of his home. Opposite to this there was going to be an accessway going up to the overpass, which meant that he had built his home in a spot which would be useless to him or to anyone else who occupied the home.

He had obtained a subdivision of his block to separate that part which would eventually become a main road. This plan was subsequently withdrawn, and it would have been necessary for the Main Roads Department to have his block subdivided in another way in order that the road might be put through. I have spent quite a lot of time on this particular case, and we have now reached the stage where the department has decided that it needs his property and will resume it. When it does I only hope it will have regard for the original price that was offered to this young Italian instead of its depressed value if this scheme comes to fruition. I have been told that he was offered £7,000 for the block this year and that is the figure to which he is entitled. I only hope the department does not offer him a sum of about £5,000 for the depreciated value of the property.

I did mention that we should not plan so far ahead in regard to town planning, because here is an example of a man who could have been left on his property for 25 years waiting for something to happen which I say now might never happen. How can any town planner say that in 20 or 25 years a road is going to pass through a particular district? How does anyone know what the traffic will be in any particular section of the metropolitan area in approximately 20 years' time? Therefore the Town Planning Department in this State should have a second look at the future town planning of this city. No development should be planned further ahead than five or seven years, because in doing so we would give the people in the affected areas an opportunity to vacate their properties and re-establish themselves within that period if the Government went on with its project. I ask members of this House to put themselves in the position of people who are now about 50 years of age and who are advised

that their property will be resumed in about 20 years' time. How will those people be able to re-establish themselves when they are about 70 years of age?

I hope the Minister in charge of town planning will have another look at this set-up to see if he cannot restrict, if not himself, the officers of his department in an effort to resume land only within the period I have stated, and thus, as I have already pointed out, give the owners of such property an opportunity to acquire land somewhere else and re-establish themselves.

I have here a letter from the Main Roads Department addressed to the Shire of Bayswater, and it reads as follows:—

Re. Gosnells-Beechboro C.A. Road

With reference to your letter of the 2nd June 1964, you are advised that it has been adopted as a matter of policy by this Department and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority that freeway reserves should be of six chains width wherever possible.

That is the part I want members to note well; namely, "should be of six chains width wherever possible."

I wonder if members realise the immensity of this proposition now being put forward by the Main Roads Department for the reservation of land for the construction of freeways? This actually means that through the district of Bayswater a six-chain strip of land could be reserved for the construction of a freeway. I think a full appreciation of the position can be obtained when it is realised that the Kwinana Freeway, extending from the Narrows Bridge to Canning Highway is from 2½ to three chains wide. Members know that there is a dual carriage-way with one-way traffic on each. They also know that there is a wide natural median strip between the two carriageways and quite a wide natural verge on the edge of each carriageway. Further, each carriageway has ample provision for two lanes of traffic.

We have now been informed that the policy of the Main Roads Department shall be that, wherever possible, a strip of land six chains wide shall be the width required for the construction of future freeways. Members may have read in the supplement of *The West Australian* last week that on the local shire I made the comment that it is now the intention of the Government, or the Main Roads Department, to grab as much land as possible apparently with this thought in mind: "If we do not need it all later on, we will at least have enough." I looked at it from the viewpoint of the shire; namely, that it is something which may happen in 20 years' time or may not happen at all. This strip is to extend right through the Shire of Bayswater for a distance of five or 5½ miles. With the strip

being six chains wide, this means the local authority is to be deprived of land on which at least 100 houses could be erected, taking into consideration the extra three chains to each mile of territory.

The particular local authority of which I speak will be deprived of revenue from 550 homes, each with an average rating value of about £16 per year. Is the Government, or the Main Roads Department, to reimburse the particular authority for its loss of revenue, or is it going to retain this land and prevent development of it for many years to come? I think the only road likely to be built—and I have had a talk with the Town Planning Commissioner for the benefit of those people who may be affected and who realise that it could possibly be 20 to 25 years before the Beechboro-Gosnells freeway is constructed north of the river—is the one at Welshpool because of the construction of the marshalling yards and the standard gauge railway in that area. These are the things that are going on today.

Naturally, people are becoming upset by this planning too far ahead. Therefore I am appealing to the Minister to request the officers of his department not to let their heads go by planning too far ahead and upsetting the people in the areas concerned as they have done for quite a long period to date. If any other member has had the same experience as I have had in order to obtain justice in one case, possibly he deserves the praise that was expressed by the head of one department; namely, that the people living in this particular district are fortunate in having a member to represent them who has kept his teeth firmly into a matter that has gone on for so long.

There is another matter for which the Government is responsible, and for which it must take the blame. In the Press for the last two or three years we have seen, repeatedly, reports of the shortage of tradesmen in this State. It is terrific! Every reason but the real reason has been given for the shortage. Eight days before the election in 1959 this Government came out with its little screed saying it would sack nobody. Members will recall that. Yet we see the 1,500 strong day-labour force that was building houses for the State Housing Commission has gone, as has the Public Works force which was built up over the years and which was doing an efficient job and constructing buildings of good style and character.

The Public Works Department, and the Public Works day-labour force, was the ground where apprentices were trained. Before this Government saw fit to dispose of the day-labour force in the Public Works Department there were 220 apprentices training annually, but the last figure shows that there are now only 40; and this will no doubt dwindle as time goes

on. We now see a fulfilment of the short-sighted policy of the Government in leaving everything to private enterprise.

We have had such experiences as the trouble over the King's Bridge in Melbourne; the new Government offices on the hill; and the science block which has been criticised by the member for Geraldton, and which was built at the Geraldton High School. They are only the beginnings. I wonder whether members realise how long it takes to train a tradesman. It is difficult to appreciate from an office desk what a tradesman does. Apart from anything else, the conditions that have been imposed on tradesmen are responsible for the shortage of tradesmen in Western Australia.

I have written out references for tradesmen who have left the building game to join the Police Force. Members of various unions have joined the Police Force. Some have become salesmen or shop assistants, or found other types of employment out of the trade.

There are plenty of tradesmen in Western Australia who, because of the low wages they are paid—and I say that determinedly—have left their trades. A professional man who had served at least five years in training would be looking for more than £20 a week; he would not expect to travel to and from work in all sorts of conditions. That is what building tradesmen are expected to do. It is little wonder that these men are leaving their trade and taking up other avocations. Would the members of this Government do this particular work at the salary given to tradesmen, when they could pick up an easier job on 40 hours a week, instead of being forced to do 60 hours a week, because of the subcontracting that has developed as a result of the Government's policy?

Apart from that, it is necessary for tradesmen to work at weekends to try to make up a reasonable wage. If these men had stood together, united, they might possibly have got better conditions, but they allowed themselves to be led along this inglorious road and have been taken in by this leap forward we have heard so much about; and, as a result, they find themselves in this plight today. The Government's policy will not redound to the benefit of the State. The Government should wake up and take stock of what is going on, or it will find its castles crumbling about its ears. I am not referring to the ivory towers about which members have spoken from time to time.

I had the experience when I went to Geraldton of seeing the science block that has been built at the Geraldton High School. If tradesmen saw that building they would weep. It is not yet completed, although it should have been finished months ago. The old high school was beautifully built, and had the science block been built along the same lines further beauty would have been added to it. But it

has completely spoilt the whole effect of the present structure. I invite members to go and view this building. It was proposed in the first place that the boards should be so set that when the concrete was poured they would show their natural grain. That would have been all right, but as things are the whole effect has been spoilt. It is the shoddiest bit of work I have seen for years; and if the department does not finally render this building over and paint it with some decent paint, I am not so sure that the Minister will be proud to open the building.

This is typical of the work that is being done. I have previously brought to the notice of the House the downright robbery of young couples who are entering new houses and who are paying £5 a week. They will never own their own homes. They barely enter them when they are faced with maintenance bills. I remember quoting a case in Dianella where 22 homes were built, and within a short time 17 of them had to be treated for white ants, and for repairs.

The Government appointed a commission headed by a chairman from the university to inquire into the apprentice position. A fairly thick report was submitted which was of very little use, because all the trouble began here; it all stemmed from the Government's policy of doing away with the day-labour force. The Government could have set an example for other States to follow; but in its zeal it left everything to private enterprise with the results I have mentioned. As I have suggested, the Government should take stock of itself before it is too late.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn mentioned the other evening that he felt there should be some standardisation in education. Perhaps the Minister for Education could take some notes here. If the member for Merredin-Yilgarn can get anywhere with this one he is a better man than I am. I think it was in the first or second year of representing my electorate, that I spoke on the necessity for having some reasonable standardisation of education. To my amazement, and to the amazement of one of the Ministers of the day, I received a letter from the Deputy Director of Education at the time informing me it was not necessary for a child in Cairns, Melbourne, Perth, and Carnarvon to have the same type of education.

I do not know whether the implication there is that a person who is born in a particular area stays there for the rest of his life. But the inference is there to be drawn. There should be standardisation of education throughout the States of the Commonwealth. A child living in Carnarvon or Cairns should receive the same advantages as one living in Perth or Melbourne; and this is the sort of thing we are dished up with. I am sure the Minister will agree that there should be

a basic standard and that every child should have an opportunity to learn under that standard. Both the member for Merredin-Yilgarn and I are hoping that something will eventuate, and I hope we will both live to see the day when there is greater standardisation than there is at the moment.

Mr. Lewis: If we are further advanced would you hold us back because of the other States?

Mr. TOMS: If we are further advanced we should co-operate with the other States and bring them up to our level.

Mr. Lewis: What happens if they are not prepared to bring themselves to our level? Do you suggest we mark time?

Mr. TOMS: That is a negative approach.

Mr. Lewis: Yours is the negative approach.

Mr. TOMS: Is the Minister suggesting that if a State saw its chance of improving its educational conditions it would not provide the children in that State with the improved conditions?

Mr. Lewis: Would you suggest we are not doing that?

Mr. TOMS: No; but when I get a reply like this it makes me wonder. A child in Carnarvon should receive the same advantages as a child in Perth.

Mr. Lewis: They work to the same curriculum and the same standards.

Mr. TOMS: It is little wonder we are getting nowhere.

Mr. Lewis: You cannot have high-school teachers in every town.

Mr. TOMS: I want to draw attention to a letter I received from a parents and citizens' association. It reads as follows:—

We have received from the Busselton Parents and Citizens' Association, a letter requesting support in their campaign for improved financial aid to primary schools. This letter was read at the last meeting of our association and received unanimous support of our association members.

The points set out by the Busselton Parents and Citizens' Association are of course ideals. I would not be surprised if the Minister for Education has not already seen the screed.

Mr. Kelly: He got one from his own electorate.

Mr. TOMS: For the benefit of members I will enumerate the points set out by the Busselton Parents and Citizens' Association. They are as follows:—

- (1) Sufficient classrooms for present and future needs.

- (2) Replacement of "temporary" classrooms (Bristol Prefabs and Monocrete's) by permanent structures.
- (3) One room in each large school to be set aside and equipped for a Special Class or Remedial Class, and a trained teacher to be supplied.
- (4) More equipment for new schools.
- (5) Replacement of antiquated and worn out furniture or stock.
- (6) Improvement in standards of equipment, to equal that in High Schools.
- (7) Provision of more and better shelter sheds. And enclosing of exposed verandahs.
- (8) Improvement of ventilation, and heating and cooling arrangements for exposed classrooms. And fly-wire screen to all doors and windows.
- (9) Further increase in the number of teachers and classrooms to allow for smaller classes for:—
 - (a) Teachers in their first year of teaching.
 - (b) "C" classes, remedial classes and other backward classes.
 - (c) Grade 1 classes.
- (10) Extensions to bus services to reduce the distance walked by children to meet the bus.
- (11) Reconditioning of toilet blocks to bring them up to modern standards. And installation of electric light where supply available.
- (12) Improvement of staff amenities to bring them up to High School levels. This includes wash and changerooms and toilets separate from the children's toilets.
- (13) Extension in scope and amount of the present P.T. subsidy to help in the purchase of sports equipment.
- (14) A subsidy to aid the H.M. or P. & C.A. to improve the appearance of the school grounds.
- (15) The elimination of delays in present periodic benefits such as Repairs to schools, Medical Examinations, Dental Services.
- (16) More itinerant specialist teachers for advising and demonstrating in country schools.

They are some of the ideals at which we all no doubt aim; but money, of course, is the governing factor.

In the planning of some of these schools I believe more consideration should be given to the area in which they are erected. For instance, in regard to the enclosing of verandahs, I do not know whether that would be applicable to the north-west and other hot places unless they had adjustable

louvres. I am afraid they may make an extra good target for stones, and it could be quite a job replacing them.

Mr. Brand: Some of the schools in the north have been particularly planned for the climate.

Mr. TOMS: I believe that is so; but the list I read out was sent in by the parents and citizens for the betterment of the school children and their education. In recent days quite a lot of play has been made in the Press that school teachers in the country are not obtaining proper housing. I think all Governments are to blame in this regard, and I am not blaming this particular Government. I believe that when we do plan schools in the country we should give some thought to the residences for the headmasters and make provision for the teachers who have to go there. We have heard all sorts of terrible cases of young people going to the country under conditions that should not pertain.

Mr. Brand: What about the rental level?

Mr. TOMS: That would have to be worked out on the overall cost of the school, and I think it could balance itself out, as young people go to country towns and have to look for hotel accommodation.

Mr. Brand: Do you think an economic rent is reasonable, just the same as the Housing Commission?

Mr. TOMS: I think that could be worked out. I do not think any man minds paying for what he is getting, so long as he is getting something reasonable; and I think the Premier and any Government would find out and that the particular problem could be easily overcome.

Last year I asked questions about the Ashfield Primary School. I am concerned that the school has now reached its maximum student capacity and there is a need for two or three more classrooms. It was only last year that the Government erected 70 new homes in the area, and naturally the majority of these homes were for young married couples. An influx of 70 families must crowd the school. The headmaster was worried at the time, and I believe there are further houses to be erected in that area. Therefore I would ask the Minister to make sure that his officers keep their eyes on this locality so as to make sure a class does not once again have to resort to using the washroom.

I am pleased to see the Minister for Works in his place because I now wish to refer to drainage. I have been wondering whether we do not tinker with the problem of drainage in the wrong way. In the western section of Perth, drainage has been practically overcome, even though there are a few odd lakes. However, east of Perth seems to have been the Cinderella section with regard to drainage. I particularly have in mind the Bayswater, Belmont, Dianella, and Bassendean area; and

whilst I appreciate that money is something which has to be found, east of Perth we have the spectacle of open drainage.

I am not condemning or attacking the Minister for this, because some of these works have had to be done urgently. However, a reasonable time only should elapse before a lot of these drains are piped. We have miles of drainage going into Bayswater—some by the local authority and some by the Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department—and it is not right that one district should have so much open drainage. Therefore I appeal to the Minister to give consideration, as soon as possible, to the piping of those areas which can be piped. I am appreciative of the fact that some of the areas cannot be piped. There must be some portions with open drainage; but I would ask the Minister to give consideration, as soon as possible, to the piping of these open drains which can be piped.

This brings me to what I started out to say in connection with drainage. There are only two places to which drainage can go—to the ocean or to the rivers. I feel that before very much more drainage goes into the rivers—particularly in the upper reaches of the Swan River—consideration will have to be given to the dredging of the river. On the files of the Bayswater Shire Council there is a record, made in 1951, that the dredge would be up the river then doing dredging work. It is now only 1964, so I do not suppose we can be in too great a hurry! It is only a matter of 13 years.

I believe that with the clearing of various areas for housing, we have altered the courses of nature and water. I have said before in this House that in Bayswater there are places with water where we have never seen it before; and there are other places previously affected with water that are dry. In a supplement last week the Perth Shire Council, said that local authorities should anticipate where building should take place and not allow it where water is likely to appear. But who is to anticipate where water is likely to appear? We are chopping trees down and clearing for housing, and I am led to believe that a gum tree will absorb 400 gallons of water per day. This only adds to the other water in the area.

Bayswater is in the unfortunate position that it lies lower than Tuart Hill and the housing area there and at Bedford Park. Therefore, by increasing the drainage into the river, we are only aggravating the position because it cannot take the winter flow. Last year a chap who took over a poultry farm along the river at Bassendean had 700 of his birds drowned; but this year he had them transferred to a place in Beechboro, because of flooding.

The Government will have to give consideration to the bringing of a dredge right up the river, and place the soil on

to the lowlying areas to form a levee. I believe that could be done to help get the water away quicker. It is no good pouring more water into the river unless we have the means to get it away. When the new Causeway was built—the old Causeway now—two channels went through, and these assisted appreciably. From Garrett Road on, the *Vlaming* has to travel along the bridge around mud banks.

I believe the silting from the river could be utilised in the reclamation of a lot of land along the flats on the river foreshore. This would enhance the area concerned. The Government could resume this swamp land, deal with it, and then sell it for residential purposes to recover the cost of resumptions and dredging. These things have to be done before we start pouring more water into areas like Bayswater and Bassendean and, indeed, through to Midland. Housing projects are under way; and once we have houses, there is a need for drainage.

Mr. Gayfer: The more land that is cleared in the agricultural areas the more water you will get in the city.

Mr. TOMS: Thank you; you can have all the water up there. I have a petition here from the residents of Dianella bringing to my notice the conditions under which they are now living. These are all beautiful brick homes; and members can see this photo which was taken in September, 1963. This year, the floodwater is six inches higher than it was at that particular time. In addition to Bathurst Street and Bailey Street, there are lovely homes in Alexander Drive that are surrounded by water. I received a letter from a lady there who, during the last 12 months, came here from the West Indies. She is suffering from arthritis, and this water problem is not helping her complaint.

Mr. Wild: Do you think local authorities should have allowed building in this area before drainage was effected?

Mr. TOMS: Apparently the Minister was not listening to what I said before. It is difficult to control. The last occasion on which the local authorities tested the water levels was in 1946-47, but there has since been a lot of housing development. As I have already mentioned, water has appeared in Bayswater in places where it never appeared before. I believe the courses of the water have been changed to different places and a local authority may inadvertently allow people to build in those areas. Usually, there is a level to which local authorities work in conformity and in liaison with the Public Health Department. If a block is low and the local authority knows it is subject to flooding and that a septic tank system will not work, that local authority does not permit the erection of a house without a certain

amount of filling. I believe that local authorities cannot always be blamed for things that happen.

There was an article in last Thursday's Press dealing with the drainage problems of shire councils, and it referred to the area contained in the photograph which I show to members. That article indicated that we should not allow people to build on those areas that are too low. However, it is no good locking the stable door when the horse is out. The people have built there. A building permit has even been issued for a house in the middle of the street. The rafters are being put on the roof now, despite the fact that sand is being carted in and placed around the house.

These things go on in the areas represented by myself and two or three of my close colleagues, and I believe that more thought will have to be given to drainage. As a prerequisite to drainage, I would ask the Government to give most serious consideration to the purchase of a dredge in order to dredge the river and so allow the water to flow from various drainage schemes into the river.

There have been quite a few comments made by people who have come from the Kununurra area. I would draw the attention of the Minister for Works to the fact that everything is not as sweet as it should be in that area, and I would like his officers to have a look at it. I believe some of the men are not contented. I am afraid that perhaps we may have the same sort of trouble that was experienced at the cape. A friend of mine went up and got out of the place within a week because he could see trouble coming. I believe things are not going as well as they might be so far as the Public Works Department is concerned. There does not seem to be the co-ordination there should be, with the result that the department will lose men who are now working in that particular area.

That is about all I wish to say at the present time, except that I hope the Government will take note of the various comments I have made. I have not set out to be destructive in any way, but to be constructive; and I believe that any criticism made, provided it is fair and just, should be heeded by any Government, irrespective of its colour.

MR. DUNN (Darling Range) [10 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words in support of the Address-in-Reply motion. I intend to address myself in the main to the matter of town planning. In case any member might feel that I am being critical of this Government, or of any previous Government that has had anything to do with town planning, let me make it quite clear that that is not the case.

Mr. Graham: Whatever you do, don't be critical.

Mr. DUNN: I wish to be entirely constructive, and I hope that those members who are prepared to listen will learn something. It would be fair and truthful to say that town planning has exercised the minds of all public spirited people throughout the ages, and it is only right and proper that we, as public representatives, should be fully aware of our responsibilities in regard to this matter. Over the years our approach, in the main, has been positive and constructive.

The problem of town planning is one of the greatest that can be tackled by any public body. We realise, when we pause to think about the matter, that the subject of town planning covers every facet of our lives; and to legislate to the satisfaction of everybody would be almost impossible. Therefore it appears that we have to legislate to the best of our ability and to the best advantage of those who are affected by town planning.

When the interim development order was introduced into this House, I gained the impression from reading the debates that those who were responsible—on both sides of the House—for passing the legislation were, to all intents and purposes, in wholehearted agreement with the problems of town planning.

As evidence of that I propose to read the remarks made by the then Minister for Housing, The Honourable H. E. Graham, when he moved the second reading of the Town Planning and Development (Metropolitan Region Interim Development Powers) Bill. He said—

As is well known, the greater metropolitan area has long suffered because of a lack of a co-ordinated plan. As a result, our metropolitan area has grown by fits and starts, and there is no semblance of order in its growth and development. The previous Government made a very important start by appointing a well-known and qualified town planner and charged him with the responsibility of developing a regional plan for the greater metropolitan area and, as a consequence of that, certain legislation is necessary.

Mr. Rowberry: Nothing irresponsible about that.

Mr. DUNN: As so often happens, we are hearing pearls of wisdom from the member for Warren; and I have no doubt that we shall hear more later on. I wish to convey to the House that there are major problems in regard to this matter of town planning, and it has to be tackled in a very sensible manner. It should not be regarded in any shape or form as being a political issue between both sides of this House. That is my fond wish and I venture the opinion that it is the wish of all members in this House.

There has been a terrific amount of criticism levelled at the Government over the years in regard to some of the problems associated with town planning; but I wish

to pay tribute to those who have been responsible for administering the legislation. Their task has not been easy; in fact, it has been a most difficult one. We are now experiencing many of the problems which have projected themselves because of the need for town planning. Many problems affect individuals who own properties, and many of the people who are involved are in a position whereby they suffer. This problem must be solved to the satisfaction of everyone. We have to consider the practical aspect, and in doing so some of us perhaps have to pay for the majority.

Let me deal firstly with land prices. Areas throughout the length and breadth of the metropolitan area have been zoned as urban, deferred urban, rural, industrial, light industrial, and so on. When we look at some of the deferred urban areas we find that many of them are isolated areas. I am referring to those areas in the hills, where around Kalamunda an area has been zoned as urban and the area alongside it has been zoned as deferred urban. If we go up the other side we get separate urban areas. There is Darlington and Greenmount; then there is a break; and then we go on to Mundaring.

In order to avoid having reticulated services installed all over the place, the town planning authority exercises, through the Minister, its prerogative of maintaining the areas in what it considers to be sensible proportions. We therefore have urban areas which are under the control of private owners who for reasons best known to themselves have decided not to subdivide. The Town Planning Authority, in its wisdom, is not in favour of opening up deferred areas; and we have, in effect, a situation of inflation. Owners of private properties are not prepared to subdivide their land and the Town Planning Authority is not in favour of opening up further areas; and so there is a shortage of residential lots.

This inflation is becoming more marked every day and I fear that unless a more realistic approach is made a situation will be created whereby the prices of residential blocks in selected areas will be almost prohibitive. This will certainly curtail development. We will, in consequence, have to press for a broader approach to the problem on the part of town planning personnel.

Let us look at the situation which pertains with regard to rural zoning throughout the metropolitan area. Last week I asked the Minister for Town Planning how much land was zoned as rural within 20 miles of the G.P.O., and how much land was zoned as rural in the Darling Range electorate. The reply was 450 square miles and 45 square miles respectively. That is a lot of country in the metropolitan area in anybody's language. If we understand that rural zoning means a minimum subdivision of five acres, it becomes quite apparent

that the economics of reticulating services throughout the rural zoning areas is impracticable, particularly if we consider doing it on a paying basis.

Somebody has to make a decision on what to do about rural zoning. Not only does this apply to land that has not yet been opened up, but it applies also to certain acres of land that are already inhabited. The owners might have 10, 20, or 30 acres, but they are restricted by the requirements of the Town Planning and Development Act to a five-acre minimum. If we approach the department that is concerned with the reticulation of services into uneconomical areas, we are butting our heads against a difficult problem.

I should like to read a letter from the Manager of the State Electricity Commission, addressed to one of my electors. I suppose that the properties concerned in the letter would not be more than 12 miles from Perth by road, but they exist in an area which is clearly defined by the town planning authority as rural and they are therefore restricted to a five-acre minimum. Consequently, no matter how much the owners desire to subdivide their land for reticulation purposes, the simple fact is that any application to the Town Planning Department is rejected. Many landowners have families—they are raising children—and they are not asking a great deal when they seek the advantages of electric light.

The general Manager of the State Electricity Commission addressed the following letter to the residents in Sultana Road, Forrestfield:—

Your petition requesting an extension of the mains to the above address and to Lots 8 and 9 Sultana Road, Forrestfield is acknowledged.

Unfortunately, because of the distance from an existing transformer, the short low tension extension due to be erected to supply Lot 4 Apricot Road, does not assist your application for an extension.

To supply Lots 8, 9 and 10 Sultana Road would require the erection of a transformer, and an extension of half a mile of high tension mains and 10 chains of low tension mains. The cost of this work cannot be justified by the anticipated annual consumption of the three properties to be supplied, and I regret therefore that I am unable to give you any idea as to when supply will be available.

All these problems are connected with the five-acre minimum subdivision in rural zones. When one remembers that there are 450 square miles of this type of country within a 20-mile radius of the Perth Town Hall, and that in my electorate alone there are 45 square miles, one will appreciate that somewhere along the line something has to be done to solve the problem, if not in regard to the vacant land

then at least for those who are requiring the normal services which today are expected by all reasonable people.

A difficulty also obtains in regard to the supply of water in these areas, but I must confess that wherever possible the Water Supply Department has done its utmost to satisfy the requirements of my area. I feel that department's approach to the matter has been quite positive, but it would be safe to say that it has a big problem in meeting all requirements.

I do not want to say anything more about the town planning aspect, except that it should be made quite clear, and I think it can be established positively, that the problems associated with town planning are as great as any the Government is likely to be asked to face. I think the people concerned, and the Government, are to be congratulated on the way the problem has been shared, and I am sure that by and large we will gradually progress towards a solution to those problems in the future, and we will probably reach a stage where everything will be as near to perfect as we can possibly get it—possibly we will not be alive then, but it only shows how important the problem is and the necessity there is to tackle it.

I now want to refer to the question of supplying water for use on high school ovals and public playing fields. In view of the fact that our Government has in its term of office seen the achievement of interlocking all of our main dams I think it is well to remember that we are now enjoying a period when we do not have to worry—or at least there is no indication of the need to worry at the moment—about water restrictions. However, I am wondering whether somebody could be charged with the job of ascertaining the possibility of establishing a safe level in our dams so that we can use as much water as we like, so long as we do not waste it. By "wasting it" I do not mean in the use of the water but the amount of water flowing over the tops of the dams at the moment.

I think if possible we should establish a safe water level to which we can draw our water so that we can use as much as we like on school ovals and public playing fields, so long as the level does not fall below what is considered to be the safe level. If something could be done along those lines I think it would be of great assistance and we would be able to use a lot of the water that is at present flowing over the tops of our dams.

Mr. Brand: Do you think the walls should be raised?

Mr. DUNN: No; I was not thinking of that so much as of asking our engineers now that we have the dams interlocked, to work out a safe level to which we could draw water—say three quarters of the way up the wall of the dam—so that school ovals and public playing fields could have

an adequate supply of water. Once the level reached what was considered by the engineers to be the minimum safe level the drawing of the water would have to stop. There would need to be an allowance for a reasonable safety margin, but I think if something was done along those lines it would obviate the waste of water there is at the moment with all the water that is flowing over the dams and this water could be put to good use. However, if the engineers cannot work out what they consider to be a safe level, then I am afraid my proposition would not work.

I think the provision of playing fields, particularly for high schools, would be of great assistance to children; and water seems to be the main problem in establishing these ovals, and particularly keeping the grass growing during the summer months. If something can be done about it I am sure it will receive the blessing of people throughout the length and breadth of the State.

Mr. Brand: Of course the problem is you start public ovals and when the summer comes, and water is short, you have to cut it off. That is when the problem begins.

Mr. DUNN: I think the engineers could establish a safe level and water could be used for the purpose I have mentioned. If it is possible to provide a solution it would be something worth while.

Mr. Davies: I think you would need a crystal ball.

Mr. DUNN: The honourable member can have one, too, if he likes. At times I think he has one. Those are the only remarks I wanted to make in support of the motion and I hope that both matters I have raised, in regard to town planning and the supply of water, will receive attention.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [10.23 p.m.]: I think most members when speaking on the Address-in-Reply debate open up their remarks by saying that this is one of those occasions when everyone has an opportunity of discussing any matter that he thinks may be of importance to him; in other words, it is one of those occasions when one can go all of the way around the world. I have no intention of doing that as there are only a couple of countries that I know something about and so I will stick to them.

First of all I would like to take this opportunity to thank members of this Parliament for last year electing me as their delegate to the C.P.A. conference in Kuala Lumpur. I can assure the members of this Parliament that I was proud to represent this State. It is an experience one would never have an opportunity of enjoying again, and I am sure all other members who have gone on similar journeys would say the same thing.

Malaysia is a most interesting experiment in democracy and I would like to take this opportunity, for the benefit of

members—I know we are all members of Parliament and perhaps it is interesting to have some idea of what goes on in other places—to outline very briefly the constitution of Malaysia; because it is a country that has a lot of potential so far as Western Australia is concerned, and there is the possibility of our having quite a lot to do with the people there in regard to trade.

It is a young country, bursting with energy, and I feel Western Australia has lots of opportunity in the direction I have just mentioned. I think perhaps we would get much more value out of our Agent-General if he were domiciled at a place like Kuala Lumpur rather than having him in England, although I must admit he does a good job over there.

Malaysia is a federation of 14 States; 11 of those States constitute Malaya itself and the other three are made up of Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah, which at one time was North Borneo. It is interesting to note that possibly the reason why these countries came together was that all the territories that constitute Malaysia have a broad community of interests. They have a similar historical and cultural heritage and they share similar political and administrative traditions. I think this is derived partly from their subjection, or common subjection over many years by the British system of colonialism, and partly perhaps from their common history. It may be said that they possess similar forms of legislative, executive, and judicial institutions; and perhaps one could say they speak much the same political language, even taking into consideration their diversity of language, religion, and race.

Malaysia is a member of the British Commonwealth by free choice. It is a constitutional monarchy and the sovereign of Malaysia is the head of state of the federation, and the monarchy is elected by the rulers of all States throughout Malaysia.

In view of our system of British monarchy it may seem rather strange that the sovereign is elected, but I suppose if one looks at it from a democratic point of view it is a rather democratic way of going about having a king; and his term of office is five years. I take it that if he does not come up to scratch he goes out along with the Government.

Malaysia is a member of the United Nations; and under its present constitution it has unfettered control over its foreign and domestic affairs and its fiscal policies. Malaysia defines its own citizenship laws, it controls immigration, negotiates and signs treaties, maintains its own diplomatic service, and decides, wholly and solely from its own point of view, on issues of both peace and war.

The constitution drawn up by Malaysia lays down the legislative and executive competence of the central government, and also lays it down for the governments of the various States; as I mentioned before,

14 in all. Malaysia is, in fact, a federal authority with a central government and various State governments, not unlike our own constitutional set-up. There is a head of state, as I said before, for the whole of Malaysia, and there is a head of state for each of the individual States within Malaysia. Again it could be compared with our system of Governors and Governor-General.

Malaysia has a common foreign policy, a common defence policy, and a common judiciary; and whatever concerns the nation as a whole is decided by the central government. Any matter which is not common to all the States remains in the hands of the individual States. The individual States do have a certain amount of local autonomy, and that is rather necessary owing to their geographical situation and their constitution.

Malaysia maintains that the federation was set up by a free choice of the people. When one studies the constitution one is inclined to agree that that statement is, in fact, correct. Malaya was a sovereign State, prior to the formation of Malaysia. The other three States—Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah—received their independence when they joined Malaysia. Malaya agreed to the formation of Malaysia in September, 1961, and its Legislative Assembly gave consent to that formation.

In the case of Singapore the Legislative Assembly, only a few months later, also agreed to the formation of Malaysia. Later on a referendum was held in Singapore of all the people on the question of joining Malaysia, and this referendum was carried by a 71 per cent. majority of the people.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association came into the matter to a large extent, and a conference arranged by it in Singapore was responsible for bringing together the States of Sabah, Sarawak, Brunei, Singapore, and Malaya. At this conference they came up with a unanimous memorandum for the formation of Malaysia as a federation.

It will be recalled that there was at the time, and there has since been, much publicity to the effect that the people of the Borneo States did not have the choice that was meant for them. I do not think that was correct, because after this meeting the memorandum was handed over to the Cobbold Commission, which was set up by the British Government to obtain the feelings of the people of the Borneo States. That commission agreed that the feeling of the people in those States was for Malaysia, and not against it.

The Legislative Council in both those States also voted to join Malaysia, and at the following elections in those States the main platform of the political parties was the formation of Malaysia, and this was carried by the people. So the contention

that the federation came into being by the free choice of the people of the countries which now constitute Malaysia would, in fact, be a true statement.

The territory is approximately 127,000 square miles—it is not much by our standards—and Malaysia has a population of about 10,000,000. It may be of interest to note the actual constitution of its Parliament. The central Parliament consists of the sovereign and two Houses of Parliament—the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House of Representatives consists of 159 elected members, 104 of whom come from Malaya, 15 from Singapore, 16 from Sabah, and 24 from Sarawak. The members of Malaya and Singapore are elected by the people. The members of Sabah and Sarawak are elected by the Legislative Council in those two States from among their own members.

I think it is the intention, as those two States progress, that adult franchise will be handed on to the people, but it would be extremely difficult at this stage to do so, because it is rather an under-developed area and illiteracy is on a high level. It will take some time before they will appreciate the full significance of voting in many parts of the area.

The Senate consists of 50 members, 22 of whom are elected—that is, two from each State, making 28 in all and the other 20 are appointed by the head of the State.

Mr. Brand: Are the two members from each State elected on adult franchise?

Mr. BICKERTON: They are as far as Malaya and Singapore are concerned. I am not sure about North Borneo and Sarawak, but I presume they would be appointed by the Legislative Council, in the same way as members of the House of Representatives are appointed; that is, they are appointed by the heads of the various States, but how they go about that I do not know.

The object is that in the early stages some form of stability would be maintained, or some members who the heads of the States consider could assist in the early stages of formation would be appointed. No doubt it was the intention from then on to have those also elected by the rank and file of the people.

Mr. Guthrie: You only refer to Sarawak and Sabah. Is Brunei completely non-existent as a separate State?

Mr. BICKERTON: Brunei got to the stage of agreeing to the formation of Malaysia, but did not go on with it. Many reasons were given, and one was that the head of Malaysia had to be elected by the various sultans or rulers of the individual States. One story was that the Sultan of Brunei said he was prepared to join Malaysia provided he was elected king. He was told that he would not be, so he refused

to join. I do not believe that story. I think the refusal had something to do with the oil concessions in Brunei, and that State does not feel at this particular stage that it will get as much out of the federation.

Mr. Guthrie: Brunei is not in Malaysia at all.

Mr. BICKERTON: It is not at this stage. The capital of Malaysia is Kuala Lumpur, where a new Parliament House—which outdoes ours in chandeliers and many other amenities—has been built. The total cost was about £16,000,000 Australian, so the Government there does not mess about when it starts building. I was told that by the time Parliament House was completed the total cost would be more in the vicinity of £24,000,000.

As a member of the Rights and Privileges Committee I assure members that in Kuala Lumpur the members of Parliament are well looked after. They even have the equivalent of the Chevron-Hilton Hotel built alongside Parliament House solely for the accommodation of members.

One gathers the impression we should do everything to assist in maintaining the Malaysian set-up. If it is a success and if it does work—it really has not proved itself as yet—then it will be a lesson to the whole world and will prove that it is possible to have a federation and a central government, even when there are so many different people of different classes and creeds, speaking many different languages, and carrying on so many strange and weird occupations, involved. If, in fact, it is a success, surely it will be a lesson for many countries throughout the world to join together for their own mutual benefit.

I hope eventually Indonesia and many of the other countries will join the Federation of Malaysia. That would be a good thing, particularly from our point of view. I previously mentioned the matter of trade with them. I know that we do not exactly have a trade commissioner there, but a trade representative. I could not help but feel that we could perhaps do a lot more than that. It strikes me that if one wants to impress the Asians, one has to put up a front. I have just mentioned Parliament House. They would not consider a Parliament House like ours; it would have to be something costing £24,000,000 or nothing. I think that if we want to sell them goods we will have to go about it in the same way. If Western Australia had a trade centre there I would think it would have to be one that would impress the Asian mind.

Mr. Guthrie: Would that cost £24,000,000?

Mr. BICKERTON: No, I think we would get away with about 23½ million with what I had in mind. In Canada or in London a little back room

can be used, and provided the goods are up to standard and of good quality you can get away with it. So the whole thing seems to be one of presentation. The fellow that puts on the greatest act undoubtedly seems to get the greatest trade.

They did look after delegates particularly well; and as the Western Australian delegate I would like to thank them officially in this House for the way they treated us. I would say that the members of this House who go to a C.P.A. conference are very fortunate, indeed, to have the opportunity.

I have a few other matters with which I would like to deal and one that is very important to Western Australia at the present time concerns iron ore. We have plenty of iron ore and apparently it is of the right quality and seems to be in the right place as far as shipping it away is concerned. But for some unknown reason we have not yet got to the stage where we have sold it. The companies operating on this mineral have done a lot of research in the area and I think they are to be congratulated from that point of view; but it does concern me—and I suppose it concerns the Government—to find that we have not yet reached the stage where we have actually sold this iron ore.

I remember mentioning in a previous debate on this matter that I felt I would rather see the Government of this State make a contract with the Government of Japan for the supply of iron ore and then call tenders to actually have the commodity mined and shipped. As it is at the present time, it strikes me that here in Western Australia we have a number of very efficient companies with large mineral leases all vying for position on the Japanese market; and on the other hand we have the Japanese clubbing together. The steel interests in Japan have clubbed together and sent out one purchaser to deal with all of our various sellers. The Japanese is a pretty bright fellow; and he is shrewd. Good luck to him! He is a good businessman; and I can understand him saying that if all the foundry and steel people get together and deal as a united body with all the separate sellers it will be better for them.

I can quite understand the Japanese going to the Rio Tinto group to see what they can get the iron ore for; and then going to the Mt. Goldsworthy group, and the Mt. Newman group. Therefore, I was rather interested in an article by Frank Devine in *The West Australian* of the 3rd August, 1964. After a visit to Japan, he had much the same idea. In portion of this article he says—

Japan holds all the good cards in its impending deal for West Australian iron ore.

The fact that there is a world-wide oversupply of ore does not matter so much, because Japanese steel executives do not deny that quality and proximity make the Australian ore an attractively competitive proposition.

The Japanese advantage is based on two strategic ideas that have already enabled the steel industry of this country to secure Australian coal at favourable prices.

First, the Japanese industrialists have sensibly seen to it that they deal with a diversity of suppliers, so that no one supplier can feel secure enough to become obstreperous at contract time. Secondly, the steel manufacturers combine with one another for their major purchases, presenting a united front against fiercely-competing mining companies.

The purchase of about 60 per cent. of Japan's iron ore needs is arranged by the Committee for Overseas Iron and Steel Making Raw Materials, which is made up of representatives of the ten major steel companies of Japan. This organisation receives annual estimates of the ore needs of the individual companies and fixes the price range within which the industry is prepared to negotiate.

The suppliers have little or no contact with the steel companies. The committee uses trading companies for the actual wheeling and dealing—17 trading companies, for example, to negotiate with the mining corporations of India, one of the biggest supplying nations.

About another 25 per cent. of Japan's ore supplies are bought through what the industry calls "partial joint ventures," from two to half a dozen steel companies putting their corporate heads together to make a deal.

Little more than 15 per cent. of the millions of tons of ore engulfed by Japanese furnaces each year is bought by individual steel companies venturing naked and alone into the world.

I agree with that; and as I mentioned before in this House, I think we have made a blunder in allowing the private negotiation to go on with the companies in Japan. I think it would have been a much better proposition for Western Australia had the Government endeavoured to arrive at a deal with the Japanese Government. I know the Government did send representatives to Japan, but what happened in those negotiations I do not know. However, I do know that the Japanese now have us in a position where we are divided; and I am sure they are in a position where they can dictate the terms on which they will purchase iron ore.

Mr. Brand: Would not the Japanese Government, if it were in this, be in a position to do the same thing?

Mr. BICKERTON: This Government would be dealing with the Japanese Government; and with supervision of the two Governments, the Japanese Government could fan the iron ore out to its steel industries, just as we could fan out the supplying of the iron ore to our suppliers. However, as it is now, the Japanese companies are in a position to deal with individual companies in Western Australia which are placed in a position in which no keen seller would like to be. When purchasing a commodity, if there is more than one supplier—say, a dozen suppliers—so much the better because that commodity can be bought at rock bottom price. I do not blame the Japanese for going about things in that way.

I wish to refer to another portion of this article. After discussing where iron ore quantities in the world come from in the main to the Japanese steel organisations, the article goes on to say—

About 70 per cent. of Japan's ore is bought on long-term contracts—that is, on contracts of two years or more. These contracts are another barrier to the West Australian companies edging their way into the Japanese market—their only possible market at the moment—because Japan's foreseeable needs are well taken care of for the next five years.

I do not know how authoritative that article is; but if, in fact, that is so, and if it means that we will not be supplying iron ore to Japan for five years, I do not think it would hurt if the Government notified the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Brand: Western Mining is exporting—

Mr. BICKERTON: That was something which was signed some time ago. I was referring my remarks more to the northern or Pilbara deposits. If that is so, I do not see there is anything wrong in saying so. I find a lot of people in Western Australia have the idea that all the problems of the north are over. They say, "You have plenty of oil and iron ore". Western Australia has both, but it cannot do anything with either of them at this particular stage.

The iron ore could be there for another five years before anything goes, if indeed it goes at all. This was a matter I brought up when the agreements were being made with the companies. I asked why we should at that stage agree when we did not know whether the companies could sell it or not. Perhaps the Premier can put me right, but it has been rumoured that the next provisional agreement, as I refer to them, is to be made with Mt. Newman which is a vast area of ore, and that another company is involved. If this company gets the same type of agreement as Rio Tinto, B.H.P., and Mt. Goldsworthy, we are going to have another "if" agreement, which will depend entirely on when the Japanese buy the ore—if, indeed, they take it at all.

I am concerned about too many of these agreements being made without some of the ore actually moving. I think we have enough of them made now.

Mr. Brand : Do you think we should, for instance, give B.H.P. a license to export ore from Yampi?

Mr. BICKERTON: If B.H.P. requires a license to export ore from Yampi, I do not see why it should not get it.

Mr. Brand: There is an amendment to the Act necessary.

Mr. BICKERTON: I have nothing against that. If there were a possibility of our becoming short of iron ore, as perhaps there might have been a few years ago, then I think we would have had to take another look at it.

Mr. Tonkin: I think they ought to pay more royalty than now if they are going to export it.

Mr. Brand: I am only asking.

Mr. BICKERTON: The only provision I would make would be that iron ore at Yampi is something which can be produced very cheaply, and that would naturally have an effect at this stage on the price of our steel if it were to be exported at a similar royalty and we had to pay a greater price for inland ore, and so boost up the cost of steel. In that case we would have to have another look at it. However, assuming that it is not the case, I cannot see why B.H.P.—or anyone else within reason—should not receive a license.

Mr. Grayden: They should not be permitted to export from Yampi under any conditions.

Mr. BICKERTON: If the Government brings in something of that nature, I will look forward to hearing your objections to it.

Mr. Tonkin: You will look in vain.

Mr. BICKERTON: If it does not interfere with the cost of steel produced by them, let us sell some iron ore.

There is another matter with which I wish to deal, and that is the basic wage. This has been a subject discussed in this House fairly fully this session, and over the years a great controversy has always taken place whenever a rise in the basic wage has occurred. I suppose some people may look at this matter differently from the manner in which I view it. Personally, I feel a "rise" in the basic wage is really a misnomer. I think the term should be an "adjustment" of the basic wage.

We have a basic wage arranged in accordance with the cost of living. The cost of living rises so it is necessary then to adjust the basic wage so that the *status quo* is maintained as far as the proportion of the basic wage to the cost of living is concerned. But, whenever this

takes place, everyone seems to be in somewhat of an uproar, and they say we should not have a rise in the basic wage because it will put up the cost of living.

Of course, if we look at it the other way, the cost of living has already gone up, and the purpose of the basic wage adjustment is to bring it into line with the cost of living which is essential if we are to have the *status quo* maintained.

Mr. Brand: What puts the cost of living up? I am only asking

Mr. BICKERTON: I suppose there would be many things. The cost of living could rise as a result of increased costs of machinery and things of that nature. It does not always have to be labour.

The point is that basic wage adjustments are caused by the increase in the cost of living. The increase in the cost of living does not cause the basic wage adjustment initially, so if we can get a standardisation between the two, it is the only answer to it.

Mr. Brand: That's right.

Mr. BICKERTON: I do not see why so many people, newspapers, and so on, should be so quick to criticise and, for that matter, throw up their hands in horror when the basic wage appears as though it is going to be adjusted to meet the cost of living.

As I have said, perhaps the only answer to this is a fixation of both wages and prices. But then, of course, we get the people who will not have price fixation on any account. They say "Oh, no; that is against the principles of private enterprise." Of course, wages constitute a price also in any set of costs; but they do not mind advocating the fixation of wages. I believe that if we do not advocate fixation of prices, we should not grizzle when wages are adjusted to maintain the *status quo*.

Mr. W. A. Manning: One is a maximum and the other is a minimum.

Mr. BICKERTON: The other point I want to make is that when this cost of living goes up, bear in mind that the unions and other organisations do not just race in and say, "We want so much in the basic wage." They have to prepare a case which must go before a properly constituted body which should be—and we hope is—unbiased in all respects, and prove to that body that the cost of living has risen to an extent where a certain rise in the basic wage is necessary to maintain the *status quo*.

However, when the price rises take place, no such complicated procedure is necessary, and that is why to a big extent prices get ahead of wages. It is only a matter of possibly a conference of manufacturers in a certain line of business deciding their commodity has to go up, and the rise is automatic. But it is many months before a case is heard, in

some instances, on the basic wage issue, so that by the time the basic wage is adjusted to bring it into line with the cost of living, the cost of living is on its way again.

The old similarity which is used as a rule is that of a dog chasing its tail. That is not a bad similarity. That is just what takes place; but it is the cost of living which puts the itch on the end of the dog's tail which causes the head to turn around and try to get at it. The anatomy of a dog is such that when he gets into that position he keeps going round and round. If we could cure the itch on the tail the whole thing would straighten itself out; and the only way, so far as I can see, that we can do that is by a system of fixation of both prices and wages.

The Premier said, in reply to a question on price fixing a few nights ago, that he would not have a bar of it; that it was not his Government's policy, and so on. I speak to a lot of people who are interested in private enterprise and I find that more and more of them are coming around to the idea that some system will eventually have to be worked out by which we can have a fixation and a standardisation to save this metaphorical dog from chasing its tail.

All businessmen are interested in profits. They have to be. They have to make the thing pay. If we could reach the stage where the reputable businessman knew that he would have a standard profit for a long period of time, he would be much happier about it. He would feel more secure than if he had an up and down set of circumstances. I do not see why we should give the unscrupulous businessman any consideration at all, particularly the unscrupulous businessman who is in business for a short period of time to make a big profit and then to get out. He might not agree with price fixing; but I do not think that he comes into it.

It is my view that the big reputable firms are getting around to the idea that something by way of standardisation will have to come about. It is senseless to talk about price fixing without wage fixing, or about wage fixing without price fixing. Until prices are fixed we will always have that discrepancy creeping in between the cost of living and the basic wage, and the basic wage will have to be adjusted whether we like it or not; otherwise our standard of living will deteriorate.

I wish now to deal with other matters affecting the north-west. I was rather impressed with an article that appeared in the *Daily News*. The article was published while the sale of the rocket range at Talgarno was proceeding. Apparently the correspondent had interviewed a number of north-west people and he had no doubt

asked them what was the best method of overcoming the problems in the north. They seemed to agree unanimously as follows:—

Stop treating the north-west as a forgotten foreign country and concentrating on long-range schemes, but straighten out the urgent problems such as roads, accommodation services, need for publicity, etc. Then the north-west will blossom without help.

I have contended for many years that the way to develop the north-west is, firstly, to look after those people who are there. I have nothing against long-range planning, because it is necessary. We can have all our iron ore, and the rest of it, but that is something that has to come in the future. The answer at this particular stage is to look after those people who are there and to give them decent facilities.

One of the towns that comes to mind almost immediately is Onslow, which was struck by a cyclone. We had all the problems about whether the town should be rebuilt or whether it should not. Those things require a prompt decision. A lot of Onslow has still to be rebuilt. A number of State Housing Commission homes that were destroyed have not been replaced. People are clamouring for accommodation, and we are talking about populating the north-west.

Let us concentrate on what is there; on assisting the people who are there to stay. Let us make their lives a bit better in more ways than one, and I think the long-range plans will automatically look after themselves. I do not think they will be a problem at all.

We have the matter of water for Point Samson, which I have dealt with before in this House. It is some six or seven years since this matter was first raised, and we are still waiting for water at Point Samson. This is the sort of thing that annoys people in those areas. After all, water is essential. One cannot get along without it. These matters have to be dealt with and dealt with quickly. We have a somewhat restricted scheme whereby the people are supplied with water off the boats. They bring in the water as ballast and it is pumped into tanks. Investigations have been going on for some time for a pipeline.

Six years seems to be quite sufficient for any investigation, and at the end of that time surely it is possible to say, "We are going to give you water"; or "We are not going to give you water." When I put the question to the Minister recently, his reply—after this period of six years—was that there is some possibility of iron ore going to King Bay and to put a water scheme into Point Samson could be a waste of

money at this stage. That is where we get to on each occasion: There is always something that is going to happen which will prevent us from getting what we want. I agree with the viewpoint that we should look after those people who are in the north-west at the present time and then the development of the north-west will not be a problem.

Roads are of a reasonable quality, but with our air strips it is a different matter. I realise that it is a Commonwealth matter, but for years we have pressed for our air strips to be sealed so that they would be serviceable in wet weather. There are air strips in many places such as Carnarvon and Port Hedland, and they are used like bus stops. Everything comes in on them—passengers, food machinery, and the lot. These areas will never progress; they will never become places where people will want to go and stay until such time as these elementary things—and they are elementary—are fixed.

High school facilities are another matter which I have mentioned on so many occasions. People just cannot afford to send their children south. These are matters which will have to be fixed up before we have people who are prepared to remain in the north-west and to do something about keeping it going.

I turn now to electricity charges. As I tried to point out to the Minister for Works, electricity facilities were put in at Roebourne, but this shows how silly it is: We are charging people 1s. 9d. a unit as a flat rate for electricity. I think the suburban rate is 2.1d. or 2.2d. or something like that. I wonder how long we could get away with charging 1s. 9d. a unit in Perth. No Government would be game enough to try it; but when we come to an isolated area, then those are the people who are hit and hit hard. Unless we are prepared to put in these utilities—and they are essential—and to charge a reasonable price, then why not leave them out? We would be much better off.

People cannot use their electrical appliances. I mentioned in this House once before that to cook a meal in a Sunbeam fry pan would cost about 9s. One cannot afford that for cooking sausages or a piece of roast pork. It is just ridiculous and it gets to the stage where we say to people, "Here is a facility; look what we have done for you", and the moment someone switches on a light he has an overdraft. That is the way it works out.

On top of that, the meters are read monthly. The Public Works Department—I have had arguments with them—tell one that there is a sliding scale; that after one gets above 25 units it drops down to 1s. 6d., which is a terrific concession, I must say. But, of course, the meters are read monthly and the average

householder cannot afford to use more than 25 units so he never gets below the 1s. 9d. rate.

These are administrative matters that could be overcome so easily. They are petty things that annoy people. They say, "If we are prepared to put up with this climate and are prepared to live in the area, what the dickens do you do this to us for?"

Mr. Brand: I presume that the price of 1s. 9d. is based on the cost of producing power there.

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes. However, I do not think we can work that way. I think it would be better to leave it altogether. I honestly do. I have been told by the people who calculate these things down here, "Give us 12 months. After 12 months we may be able to reduce the charges." Three years have passed and the rates are still not reduced. I have tried to point out that when people are restricted, through the price, to a low consumption, it will never be a paying proposition.

There are a couple of small industries that would normally use that power but they cannot afford to buy it. They generate their own, and it costs them 5d. or 6d. a unit. If the local power were reduced in price they would use it and the greater consumption and larger turnover would benefit everybody. I do not know how I will ever convince those people who handle these things on that point. I have tried for a long time and it seems to me that the only way will be by some form of direction, and I hope that direction will come from the Minister.

Mr. Brand: Would the S.E.C. do a better job if they were to go into this?

Mr. BICKERTON: Of course. But the S.E.C. will not come to the north-west; it stays where it can sell plenty of power. The S.E.C. should be running the power supply up there. Surely it is a big enough organisation to take a few spondulicks from somewhere else and so even up the charges a little. I suppose I could run a power organisation down here.

Mr. Rowberry: The north-west is not the only place without electricity.

Mr. BICKERTON: That is so; it is not an isolated case. I daresay that in the Premier's electorate some of the charges are somewhat similar, but that does not alter the case. It is not good enough. I will have more to say on this subject during the Estimates.

Another matter I want to mention, and which has been discussed by other members, is the procedure of Parliament. I did ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, during a debate, but you did not have an opportunity to reply. When discussing the appointment of the House Committee—there were other committees being appointed at the same time—I inquired just

what was the purpose of the Standing Orders Committee, and how often it met over the last 12 months. Also, what it had achieved.

I think the Standing Orders Committee could have a look at the Standing Orders, and I feel sure it could come up with quite a number of suggestions for improvement. It would be worth while if an all-party committee were set up to suggest changes to the Standing Orders; because, without a doubt, some of them have cobwebs. It would not matter if the examination took two or three years.

Take such things as three readings of a Bill. To my way of thinking, two would be quite adequate. I do not know the purpose of the first reading, and I do not think it is ever used for discussion. Surely the second and third readings would be quite adequate.

Another procedure is where someone says, "I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole for the consideration of this Bill." You, Mr. Speaker, then get up and say that the motion is that you now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole for the consideration of this Bill. Could not someone just say, "I move Committee" and someone else say "I move the motion be agreed to", and away we go?

Mr. Jamieson: That would be too simple, and we would not be Parliament any more.

Mr. BICKERTON: Then let us be simple!

Mr. Brand: I think we could take a lead from the Commonwealth on that point.

Mr. BICKERTON: There is also the matter of two sessions of Parliament. I have always been an advocate of two sessions, and I think the two periods should be stated—when we sit and when we rise being determined well in advance. There has always been some mystery surrounding the date on which Parliament will meet, and I can never work that out. I do not say we should sit for 12 months solid, but have two definite sessions. Two sessions of Parliament would make things ever so much easier for members representing the north. Under the present system we are tied to Perth for a long period, usually four or five months. With the one long session, by the end of it members have, without a doubt, to use an old Australian expression, "Had it". Why this period could not be worked over two sessions having definite sitting dates and rising dates, I do not know.

The debates on Bills and other matters should be worked into those periods, the same as is the case in Canberra. If the system works over there—and in other States—there is no reason why it should not work here.

Mr. Brand: There is no prospect of a change here unless, of course, we do work to a set period.

Mr. BICKERTON: I agree with the Premier that if we had two sessions they would have to be during set periods. We could not have one session merging into the other. I do believe it would lend itself to greater efficiency. No-one could run a business the way Parliament is run—with all due respects. We should not have members sitting in Parliament until 2 a.m., 3 a.m., or 4 a.m. in the morning, rushing through legislation, particularly during the last three or four weeks of the session. It is no good always blaming the Opposition; it changes from time to time. The procedure should be set out so that the long hours are not necessary. I cannot see why, in these modern times, we cannot get down to daytime sittings. There is no reason why a sitting should not start at 10 a.m. and finish during the late afternoon.

Mr. Jamieson: South Australia gets away with it.

Mr. BICKERTON: I know other States get away with it. I do not think that Ministers have to be in their offices; they have their staff. Surely when the Ministers are stationed in the new Government offices we should be able to get away from sessions dragging on and on until 3 a.m. and 4 a.m. in the morning. No-one can give his best to the job when working those hours. The Ministers have my sympathies. They have to be back in their offices at 9 a.m. in the morning. Even the Army, as much as it tried to work people to death, saw that the men got some sleep.

Mr. Brand: Do you think that all the Ministers should sit in the front benches during all debates?

Mr. BICKERTON: No. You have my permission to leave now. My time must nearly be up.

Mr. Jamieson: The member for Pilbara has all the Ministers present. They must be interested in his speech. There is a full attendance.

Mr. BICKERTON: The next matter I wish to talk about is prayers, and it is a difficult subject to discuss. I do not know whether prayers are necessary at every sitting. I suppose they are; but sometimes it seems strange to me when you, Mr. Speaker, say your prayers and then the bullets start to fire across the Chamber and everybody is scratching and fighting. It always seems to me not to be as sincere as it ought to be. I would request that you allow a little pause between the passages, "Forever and ever, Amen," and "Are there any notices?"

I have used prayers on a number of occasions and I must admit there has been a lot of one-way traffic with them as far

as I am concerned. When I first came to this House I heard, "Forever and ever, Amen. I have a message." I thought the Speaker was on the right frequency that time.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): You have another five minutes.

Mr. Bovell: It has been said that when the Speaker enters the Chamber he looks at the members and prays for the people.

Mr. **BICKERTON**: Yes; the Minister might have something there. I will use the remaining five minutes on one other matter. I have thrown plenty of brickbats, but I would like to thank the Premier concerning the question of air fares. I have mentioned the matter in this House before, and I have grizzled enough about it, because north-west members used to get only two air fares paid each year; and of course, it was extremely difficult to make them go around. The Premier did increase the number to three—and recently to five—a year, for which I am grateful, and I am sure all other north-west members are grateful for it, too.

The application we made through the Rights and Privileges Committee was for 10 each year; but personally I sometimes think—and I have discussed this matter privately with the Premier—that a member should not be denied access to his electorate at any time.

Mr. Jamieson: Hear, hear!

Mr. **BICKERTON**: The number should be unlimited; but I realise that all sorts of problems could be involved with that idea. However, I would like the Premier to know I am grateful for the increase that has been made. Also, the member for Beeloo brought up the question of air fares for other members of Parliament when he spoke to the Address-in-Reply the other evening. That was another matter brought forward by the Rights and Privileges Committee—that members of Parliament should be able to obtain air fares to go to certain parts of the State, even if it was only one trip a year. I think it is essential that members of this Parliament see other people's electorates and get some appreciation of the State as a whole.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. D. G. May.

House adjourned at 11.22 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 26th August, 1964

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Administration Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	571
Criminal Code Amendment Bill—2r.	572
Damage by Aircraft Bill—2r.	575
Evidence Act Amendment Bill—2r.	575
Justices Act Amendment Bill—2r.	574
Local Courts Act Amendment Bill—2r.	572
Mining Act Amendment Bill—2r.	574
Public Trustees Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	571
Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act Amend- ment Bill—2r.	571
Wills (Formal Validity) Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	571
QUESTION ON NOTICE—	
Sheep from Eastern States—	
Infestation with Burr	571
Shearing before Consignment	571
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Flooding in Wolseley Street, Morley :	
Remedial Measures	570

The **PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

FLOODING IN WOLSELEY STREET, MORLEY

Remedial Measures

The Hon. R. F. **HUTCHISON** asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Will the Minister treat as urgent the plight of residents in Wolseley Street, Morley, due to flooding?
- (2) If so, what steps will the Minister take to relieve the distress of the families concerned in view of the apparent health menace due to septic systems being flooded?

The Hon. A. F. **GRIFFITH** replied:

- (1) and (2) There is at present no metropolitan main drain within reasonable distance of the affected area which would provide an outlet for immediate temporary alleviation.

There is at present under construction a main drain which, when complete, will provide a suitable outlet to whatever water may be pumped. However, this would involve the local authority in the area constructing a considerable length of open drain and providing a pump.