

this is a desirable course to adopt. I say honestly and sincerely that I hear more talk every day about the extra police on the roads and the fines which are being imposed. I do not think the extra police have brought about a reduction in the number of road fatalities because there are more fatalities this year up to this point of time than there were for the whole of last year.

Mr O'Connor: Did you say that there are more fatalities now than there were for the whole of last year?

Mr BATEMAN: I believe that that is the case.

Mr O'Connor: I think there have been the same number, as of today.

Mr BATEMAN: I did not know that; if that is so, I stand corrected.

Mr O'Connor: Bear in mind that there are more vehicles on the road today than there were last year.

Mr BATEMAN: I fully appreciate that point and this is why we must examine the situation much more carefully to—

Mr O'Connor: There has been a substantial reduction this year in fatalities in the metropolitan area. I think that fact is worth noting.

Mr BATEMAN: As far as I am concerned, anything is worth while that will reduce the carnage on the roads. I do not give a hang—I would go to the extreme length of taking cars away from offenders. They deserve to have their cars taken from them.

Mr O'Connor: There is a problem in that direction. Say, for instance, your son borrowed your car and was caught for drunken driving. You would lose your car. We must take all these things into account when trying to assess penalties.

Mr BATEMAN: Yes, I agree that problems exist; I do not know the answers. I am sure that if the Minister knew the answers he would rectify the situation tomorrow.

Mr O'Connor: Yes, I would.

Mr BATEMAN: It is a difficult problem and I do not know where we are going to finish up. I did not expect to speak for long tonight and, with those few words, I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Coyne.

*House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 8th August, 1974

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### TRANSPORT STRIKE

##### *Emergency Action*

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Will the Government take some emergency action in regard to the current transport strike?
- (2) Is the Government contemplating legislation to deal with emergency situations like the one caused by the current state of industrial unrest?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

I am grateful to the honourable member for giving me some preliminary notice of this question. In reply I state—

- (1) The ramifications of the strike and possible action to minimise its effects are being closely examined. The Government will take whatever action is open to it within its legal powers.
- (2) The matter is being kept under review.

### QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

#### ROADS

##### *Closing: Prosecutions*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have any prosecutions been launched by shires or the Main Roads Department against users of roads in the Lower North Province when they have been declared "CLOSED"?
- (2) If so, how many during the last two years?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) To the best of my knowledge, four by the Shire of Shark Bay.

2.

#### TOWN PLANNING

##### *Central City Car Parks*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

In order to reduce the congestion on surrounding roads, does the Government propose to take action

to restrict private investors from operating private car parks on vacant land in the central city?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

No. However, a car parking survey is scheduled to be completed in the near future, and consideration will be given to any appropriate Government determination.

### 3. HEALTH

#### *Medical Treatment: Country Residents*

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Health:

In view of the hardships suffered by many people living in country areas who are forced to seek specialist treatment either for themselves or their children, for disabilities such as cleft palate, requiring specialist treatment from birth, mental retardation in children, eye, ear or nose problems, etc.—

- (1) What aid is available, financial or otherwise, where hardship can be proved in—
  - (a) transport;
  - (b) accommodation; or
  - (c) any other subsidies or allowances?
- (2) In cases of proven hardship, is equal aid given to all people regardless of colour or creed?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "No", will the State Government give consideration to rectifying this?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) North of the 26th parallel the Medical Department provides air travel for all persons provided that:
  - (i) Specialised treatment is required.
  - (ii) The treatment has been recommended by the local doctor.
  - (iii) The treatment is approved by Commissioner of Public Health.

South of the 26th parallel assistance is also provided by the Medical Department with transport where school aged children of the needy families require medical treatment in the city. This is normally arranged through social workers at Princess Margaret Hospital and bus/train passes are issued and may also include escorts, where required.

Where satisfactory evidence of financial hardship is established then assistance is also available from the Department of Community Welfare for children or their parents and may be available to persons living in those parts of the State where travel concession is not provided for by the Public Health Department.

- (b) Facilities for provision of accommodation for persons requiring out-patient medical treatment are rather limited. Many are able to arrange private accommodation with relatives, but where extreme situations arise, the Department of Community Welfare will endeavour to assist financially.
- (c) In extreme circumstances, assistance may also be provided by the Department of Community Welfare with bus-train fares, etc. in the metropolitan area to enable attendance at treatment centres.

(2) Yes.

(3) Not applicable.

### 4.

### MENTAL HEALTH

#### *Hostels*

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that on the 5th April, 1974, an industrial magistrate convicted "Rosetta Lodge", a hostel under the Mental Health Act, of failing to comply with the provisions of the relevant award governing conditions of employment of workers employed by that institution?
- (2) As Rosetta Lodge is in receipt of a subsidy from the Government, pursuant to the provisions of the Mental Health Act, and as this institution has been convicted on four occasions since the 5th April, of underpaying wages, will the Minister ensure that breaches of awards of the Western Australian Industrial Commission by this establishment will cease?
- (3) As the majority of hostels under the Mental Health Act are not complying with the terms of industrial awards by which they are bound, and as the administration of the Mental Health Act is the

responsibility of the Minister, will he take steps to ensure that these institutions are forced to comply with the law and abide by the terms of industrial awards by which they are bound?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) The Minister is aware of the decision of the industrial magistrate on April 5, 1974, convicting Rosetta Lodge. The "hostel" is not subject to the Mental Health Act.
- (2) Rosetta Lodge is in receipt of a subsidy from the Government but not pursuant to the provisions of the Mental Health Act. The Minister is not in a position to ensure that breaches of the award will cease. This is a matter between the management of Rosetta Lodge and other similar establishments, the appropriate union and the Industrial Commission.
- (3) The hostels referred to in the question are not subject to the Mental Health Act and, therefore, their administration is not the Minister's responsibility. The Minister is very interested to ensure that adequate facilities are provided and standards of care maintained. Mental Health Services is considering possible legislation to require these hostels to become registered.

## 5. HILLMAN SCHOOL

### *Tenders*

The Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was the building of a primary school in the suburb of Hillman scheduled by the previous Government for construction in the current financial year?
- (2) What was the estimated cost of this project?
- (3) What was the lowest tender received?
- (4) To what factors can any difference between estimate and tender price be attributed?
- (5) Was any tender accepted?
- (6) What further action will be taken in this matter?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$300 000.
- (3) \$512 200.
- (4) Escalation in building costs.
- (5) No.
- (6) Tenders are to be recalled.

## 6.

### HEALTH

#### *Travel Concessions: Isolated Areas*

The Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What travel concessions are available from—
  - (a) Public Health Department;
  - (b) Department of Community Welfare;
 to people who live in the North West, Eastern Goldfields, and the South West, when they are referred by their doctors for specialist medical and surgical treatment to Perth?
- (2) (a) Does a means test operate for these concessions; and
  - (b) if so, what are the conditions?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) The cost of appropriate transport from the North West to Perth of patients requiring diagnostic and/or treatment facilities not available in the area is covered by the Medical Department. The transfer must have been advised by a local doctor who has seen the patient and the patient must not be travelling to Perth for other reasons.
- (b) Eastern Goldfields and South West.  
School children referred by the school medical officer for specialist treatment at PMH may receive a rail or bus voucher for the child and escort.  
The Department of Community Welfare assists with the cost of transport for certain categories of persons needing specialised medical or surgery treatment living in those areas of the State where such travel concessions are not provided for by the Public Health Department.
- (2) (a) No means test applies to patients referred for specialist treatment from the North West.  
In relation to those cases dealt with by the Department of Community Welfare, a precise means test does not operate, but satisfactory evidence of financial hardship must be established.
- (b) South West and Eastern Goldfields.

Approved where hardship established through PMH Social Welfare Worker.

## 7. BUILDING SOCIETIES

*Interest Rate*

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Has the Minister for Housing recently approved an increase of  $\frac{1}{4}\%$  to 1% in the management fee charged by building societies who make advances from funds guaranteed under the Housing Loan Guarantee Act?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", what is the justification for such an increase?
- (3) Will existing home loan instalments be further increased as a consequence of this decision?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Yes. The management fee now will be 1% as compared with  $\frac{3}{4}\%$  previously existing.
- (2) The Building Societies Advisory Committee has had this matter under review for about 18 months and societies have proved to the committee's satisfaction that increased costs warrant the adjustment.
- (3) Yes.

## 8. TOWN PLANNING

*Perth City: Committees*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What committees and/or authorities are concerned with the planning of the City of Perth and the Perth City Centre?
- (2) What is the membership of these bodies?
- (3) Has any other person been engaged to advise on planning for this area?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) and (2)—
  - (a) Statutory authorities—the Perth City Council and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. Membership is as provided in the respective Acts.
  - (b) Advisory committees—Perth Central Area Design Study Co-ordinating Committee comprising the Hon. Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning, the Lord Mayor, a councillor representing the Central Ward and the Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. The committee is assisted by a Technical Advisory Committee comprising the Town Planning Commis-

sioner, Principal Architect, City Planner, City Engineer, Deputy Under Treasurer, a representative of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, representative of Royal Australian Planning Institute, representative of Chamber of Commerce.

- (3) Yes. Professor Gordon Stephenson is consultant to the Co-ordinating Committee.

### REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ORDINANCE AMENDMENT BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and read a first time.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

Debate resumed, from the 7th August, on the following motion by the Hon. J. T. Tozer—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

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

**THE HON. S. J. DELLAR** (Lower North) [2.43 p.m.]: Mr President, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as President of this Chamber. I believe your appointment is a fitting reward for the years you have served the Government and the people of Western Australia in this House. To the Hon. Neil McNeill on his appointment as leader of the House, and to the Hon. Norm Baxter and the Hon. Graham MacKinnon on their appointments to the Ministry, I would also offer my congratulations. I congratulate also those officers of the Parliament who have been elected to various committees and positions.

I prepared most of my speech for the debate on the Supply Bill, but as I missed the opportunity to speak on that Bill last week it may be that my speech is now a little off the track. However, my leader has indicated the attitude of the Opposition to that Bill, which has now been passed by this House; so there is no need for me to dwell further on that aspect.

I felt that the Supply Bill was an unusual one in my experience in this Chamber because it was the first occasion since I have been here that the fate of the Government did not hang on the passage of the Bill. However, be that as it may the Bill has now been passed.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The fate of the Government did depend on the passing of the Bill.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Bill provided a great deal of money to the Government to enable it to carry on with the business of governing the State. During the debate the Hon. A. A. Lewis mentioned that the present Government would be a good Government, because it has the management expertise to conduct the affairs of the State in a very businesslike manner.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is pretty right.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I only hope that the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Charles Court) has the ability to manage the affairs of the State in the interests of the people of Western Australia.

Was Mr Lewis referring to the type of management that allowed the State Shipping Service to run onto the rocks so that it had to be salvaged by the Tonkin Government? The previous Government restructured the State Shipping Service to provide a modern fleet of ships to serve the north-west of this State in a better and more efficient manner.

The Hon. N. McNeill: How were they financed?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Is this the management expertise which entered into salt export agreements totalling 12.5 million tonnes annually based primarily on a Japanese annual requirement of 7 million tonnes at that time, bearing in mind the competition from other countries such as Peru? Is this the management expertise which claims to be solely responsible for the development of the Pilbara iron ore deposits and other developments which have occurred in that area and in other areas of the State? These are a few isolated cases which I mention to illustrate that if that is the type of management we can expect in future then the people of Western Australia are in for a very sorry time in the next few years.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I think it is the type of management which the people supported on the 30th March; that is the type of management it is.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The honourable member has had his say.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I have not.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Well, we will await his comments with interest.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Don't get upset about it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Mr Lewis has not been here for long, otherwise he would know that it takes a great deal to upset me.

Is the good management referred to by Mr Lewis the type of management which produced the pipeline we heard so much about, and which was gushing with goodies ranging from apples to iron ore?

The Hon. N. McNeill: It didn't do a bad job, either.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Is this the pipeline that was designed, engineered, constructed, and operated by the present Premier?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It wasn't the same pipeline that the Labor Party used for three years. I can tell you that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Is this the same pipeline that was empty when the Tonkin Government was elected to office? It was as empty then as were the election promises made by the present Premier; promises which he now cannot fulfil and this leads him to place the blame on the Australian Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: How do you know he cannot fulfil them? He has only been there for three minutes.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Well, in that time he has not done a bad job as far as increasing charges is concerned.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Is this the pipeline which is taking the gas to the Eastern States?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is fixed up now.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: A pipeline must start somewhere and end somewhere. I suggest the pipeline started in Canberra under the then Federal Liberal Government. When did the pipeline start? I think perhaps that can be ascertained in the answer to a question asked by the then member for Pilbara (Mr Bickerton) in another place on the 22nd August, 1962, as recorded at pages 635 and 636 of *Hansard* for that year. He asked the then Minister representing the Minister for Mines in the Legislative Assembly (Mr Bovell) a series of questions, one of which was—

(7) On what date did the Commonwealth consent to allow certain export of iron ore from W.A.?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: At least in those days we got some consent from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The answer given by the Minister was the 2nd December, 1960. So the approval to export iron ore from Western Australia was given by a Federal Liberal Government on the 2nd December, 1960; and we may recall that the Brand Government was elected early in 1959. So less than two years—possibly only 20 months—after the Brand Government was elected to office the then Federal Liberal Government lifted the embargo on the export of iron ore.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Obviously, they have faith in the measure.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: For years the then Labor Government had made approaches to the Commonwealth Government for iron ore to be exported. The Commonwealth Government did not grant its approval then; it waited for the Liberal Government to assume office in Western Australia and then granted its approval. This was an approval for the export of iron ore from deposits in the north which, at that time, were claimed to have been found only a few years previously and, further, claimed to have been developed by the Brand Government. Yet this was a commodity that was known to have been in existence since 1895. It had been mentioned many years before in a geologist's field book. Also it had been mentioned in the log books of the early sailing ships of Western Australia.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It must have upset their compasses.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Yes, the compasses, being of a primitive nature, would no doubt have been affected and the masters of the sailing ships would no doubt have recorded in their log books that, at a certain latitude, some element inland of a very strong magnetic nature had upset their compasses. The iron ore deposits in the north have been in existence for years, and it was only a question of the Commonwealth Liberal Government, on the 2nd December, 1960, granting approval for the export of iron ore in order that the deposits could be developed.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That was the first Government capable of doing something about them.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Recently, I read in the Press a report about the first 100 days of the Court Government in Western Australia. What a 100 days it has been! Of course, the Court Government has been in office for more than 100 days now and further increases have been made in freight charges. Mr Withers has also mentioned increases in water and electricity charges, and in the near future the price of milk and butter will be increased.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How long is it since the last rise in freight rates?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Not since the last Labor Government.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: May I continue, Mr President? I find myself in an awkward or invidious position in that I am only one Labor member among several Liberals who represent about two-thirds of the State. I find myself in a rather lonely atmosphere.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You should come out my way one of these nights.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You have a lot in common.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I represent an area where freight charges and other charges reflect greatly on the cost of living and the cost of production in that area. For the last three years Mr Withers has been expounding his ideas on these points and for his information I can assure him that I agree entirely with him.

The Hon. N. McNeill: A very good member!

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We have now heard Mr Tozer speaking along similar lines. For years that honourable member was associated with the development of the north in his capacity as Assistant Administrator of the North-West and, latterly, as Administrator. If he does not know the north-west thoroughly then all the years he spent up there were wasted. However, I do not think that is the case because I have known Mr Tozer for many years.

In referring to the North Province alone, we have a situation now where four members of the Liberal Party—the Hon. W. R. Withers, the Hon. J. C. Tozer, the Minister for the North-West (Mr Ridge), and the member for Pilbara (Mr Sodeman) in another place—represent that area. Two of these members were loud in their criticism, one in this Chamber and one in another place during the period of the Tonkin Government. They were extremely critical of the various steps that Government was taking and how it was operating at the time. I only hope they will continue with this criticism during the regime of the present Government.

Unfortunately I was not present in the House the other evening when Mr Withers was speaking, but I was able to obtain a copy of his speech.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He performed three somersaults.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I understand that he said he had made an approach to the Premier for a reduction in State Shipping Service freights. As representatives of areas in the north the four Liberal members I have mentioned will, if they combine, be able to make a far greater impact on the Government than has anyone else—particularly in relation to certain changes being effected in those areas. They would certainly have a better chance than I would as a lonely voice crying in the wilderness. How does that affect members?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You make my heart bleed!

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: One of the wild statements made, and one of the election gimmicks produced by the present Premier before the last State election, was the statement that he would stop indiscriminate rises and increases in Government charges and taxes. I had hoped to speak on the Supply Bill last Thursday,

but unfortunately time ran out and as I have been absent from the Chamber for the last two days I was unable to avail myself of the opportunity to speak on that Bill. However, last Thursday we saw another increase in State charges. I understand this has been mentioned by Mr Leeson. I am referring to the crushing charges made by the State Batteries. The increase was 200 per cent. The State Batteries have been in existence for many years and are controlled under the Mining Development Act of which you, Sir, would have a sound knowledge.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That would be an indiscriminate charge.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why? How can you make a comment such as that?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Under the Mining Development Act the charges for crushings at a State battery are set by the Minister; they are not set by regulation. Therefore we do not have an opportunity to challenge them if we so desired.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: When were they last increased?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I will come to that if the Minister will be a little patient.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I am quite patient.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Minister was anxious to hear me and this is his opportunity to listen.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I tell you what—I hope there is a vast improvement in the next couple of hours.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: This is my first contribution to the debates this session and I am just feeling my way a little. The first inkling given that the battery charges were to be increased was when the Minister for Mines indicated such a move to the executive of the Prospectors and Leaseholders' Association at Kalgoorlie. He advised the members of that association that the Government intended to look at the crushing charges of State Batteries and said they could expect some increase, but the amount of the increase was not known at the time. Naturally, the members of that association did not expect an increase of 200 per cent in crushing charges.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: At least the association was notified of the charges and apparently discussions were had with that body.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Yes, apparently discussions were had with that organisation but it was told that the Government did not know by how much the charges would be increased. The Government said that it would have to set up a committee to inquire into the matter.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You should talk about the Labor Party setting up committees and commissions.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Your Government never talked to anybody. One would get up in the morning and read in the Press about the vicious increases in some charge or another, particularly of increases in freight charges on goods transported to where you live.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: In the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 4th July, 1974, the following appears—

#### PROSPECTORS TO PAY MORE FOR CRUSHING ORE

Charges for crushing gold bearing ore have been increased for the first time in more than 70 years.

State Cabinet approved the increases on Tuesday.

The Minister for Mines, Mr. A. Mensaros, said yesterday that State batteries charges had remained substantially the same since the height of the gold rush at the turn of the century.

I could not agree with the Minister more; that is a straightout statement of fact. He then goes on to list the increased charges, and the article continues—

Mr. Mensaros said the Government had increased the charges for a number of reasons, including higher operating costs.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Does the honourable member call that indiscriminate?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not disagree with that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is quite reasonable.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The article states—

The increased charges would not unduly affect small operators as the price of gold had recently remained consistently over \$100 an ounce, triple the price received for decades.

The Minister then referred to the saving to the Government, which works out at an infinitesimal sum.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Where is the bit which made you laugh?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I had a giggle when I read the article but perhaps the honourable member opposite cannot see my point. To continue—

Despite the higher charges, State batteries would remain a heavily subsidised service to prospectors.

This has always been the case, and it has been done for a reason.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is right; that is why it is continuing.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: To continue—

Mr. Mensaros said Kalgoorlie prospectors were most understanding about the possibility of higher charges when he foreshadowed the increases at a meeting in Kalgoorlie last month.

The prospectors had raised no queries regarding the proposal.

I find that hard to believe. The earlier statement that the charges would not unduly affect prospectors is a lot of hot air.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Will the honourable member qualify his remark that he finds it hard to believe?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The prospectors have been responsible for opening up the country and bringing industry to the stage of production with regard to all the major mineral finds in Western Australia. The comment that gold had been at \$100 an ounce for a long time is hard to relate to the fact that the increase will not have any effect; that is something which I cannot understand.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I am still waiting to hear what the hardship will be.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I will probably talk about that matter in the next part of my speech.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: In the next hour or two!

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The fact that the price of gold has remained high has permitted prospecting to recommence in some areas where shows were marginal and where the value of the gold in the ore was such that it was not economical to mine at a lower price. With the subsequent increase in the price of gold some areas have been able to be reopened on a very marginal basis. Any increase in charges will have an effect on the future of those shows, and on whether they will continue to operate or close down again. However, the Minister (Mr Mensaros) said that the prospectors were understanding.

Subsequently, on the 8th July, another meeting was held in Kalgoorlie and it was attended by over 50 prospectors and leaseholders. Those who attended the meeting agreed that a deputation would call on the Minister for Mines and discuss the recently announced increased charges for battery crushing. Those 50 prospectors and leaseholders strongly criticised the new rates at the meeting which was held in Kalgoorlie. Yet the Minister says they were quite understanding and happy to accept the increase.

Of course, it is unfortunate the Minister did not attend that meeting. He sent the member for Murchison-Eyre to represent him. Had the Minister attended the meeting himself I believe he may have been a little more sympathetic to the deputation which subsequently waited on him in Perth.

The deputation saw the Minister and asked for a deferment of the increased charges for a couple of months to enable a proper submission to be presented. However, the Minister was not prepared to accede to the request and, as a result, as from last Thursday the charges at the State Batteries have been increased by 200 per cent.

When the Australian Government announced the withdrawal of tax exemptions for gold producers a lot of concern was felt at that time. Concern is still felt because no definite decision has been made. The then Leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Court) visited Kalgoorlie at the same time as did many members of Parliament—including the then Premier (Mr J. T. Tonkin). Sir Charles Court attended a meeting of gold producers in the area to discuss the removal of the taxation concession.

At that time Sir Charles Court described the industry as one which was in a delicate situation, and which had to be nursed, handled with kid gloves, and protected. He said he was concerned with the industry, and particularly with the prospectors. However, he is so concerned that we now have a 200 per cent increase in battery crushing charges. If that is an indication of his attitude of concern for an industry which, some eight months ago, he said needed looking after and protecting, I would hate to be in an industry for which he had no concern.

Another problem confronting the outback—and many other areas of the State—is the question of inadequate medical facilities and the lack of doctors. We had the situation over the last 18 months where Mt. Magnet was without the services of a doctor, and since about January of this year Meekatharra has been without the services of a resident doctor except for a period of one month when two doctors—a husband and wife team—were in the town.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: As the honourable member would know, Mt. Magnet has a doctor at present.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am aware of that fact because the Tonkin Government made the necessary arrangements.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The department arranged for the appointment.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: With quite a lot of prompting. I would know more about that appointment than would the Minister.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The department is on the job all the time, the honourable member would know that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Of course.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: On the job, trying to get doctors.



The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I realise that and I am expressing concern. I know it is difficult to get doctors to go to the remote country areas of the State when they can enjoy better facilities in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Thank you very much.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am not saying that is not the case. I appreciate the situation as much as the Minister. I am rather concerned that Meekatharra does not have a doctor. The people from Meekatharra were concerned to the extent that they organised a petition bearing over 400 names. The petition was presented to the Minister for Health in his office in Perth by myself early in June. The petition requested the Government—

- (a) to act immediately to ensure that a qualified medical practitioner is appointed to the Meekatharra District Hospital; and
- (b) that the Government enact Legislation to ensure that isolated areas such as yours are never denied the services of a permanent qualified medical practitioner whilst adequate facilities are available to them.

That petition was signed not only by the townspeople of Meekatharra, but by those living in the surrounding pastoral and mining areas, and also by the people of Wiluna.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: By some people from a long way away too.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I will get onto that shortly, too. After I presented the petition to the Minister we talked about the problems associated with getting doctors for these areas. I agree with the Minister that there are problems in this field. However, it appears to me that the Minister is more concerned about the wording and the presentation of a petition than he is with the feelings of the people within the area from which it comes. Incidentally, this petition was initiated by the Meekatharra branch of the Australian Labor Party. The Minister's reply sent to the secretary of the ALP branch at Meekatharra on the 14th June reads as follows—

Dear Sir,

The Hon. S. Dellar, M.L.C. has presented a petition from residents of Meekatharra petitioning me

- (a) to act immediately to ensure that a qualified medical practitioner is appointed to the Meekatharra District Hospital; and
- (b) that the Government enact Legislation to ensure that isolated areas such as yours are never denied the services

of a permanent qualified medical practitioner whilst adequate facilities are available to them.

With reference to (a), I would point out that qualified medical practitioners in the persons of Doctors Turner and Shalala have been appointed, and are practising in Meekatharra at the present time for a temporary period, and Officers of my department are making every endeavour to obtain a qualified practitioner on a permanent basis.

In reply to (b), we have not yet reached the stage where by enacting Legislation we would force medical practitioners or any other person be he, a labourer, plumber, electrician, etc., to go to any specific place or area to carry out his occupation, as this would be tantamount to communism, and directly in opposition to the policy of the Government of which I am part.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They do it with schoolteachers and policemen.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a different case altogether—schoolteachers are not forced to these places.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: To continue—

I would suggest, that when you prepare a petition in future that it is properly worded and authentic, as it is evident from names on some of the sheets that the signatures are not those of the persons thereon, and I think it is an affront to your Member whom you asked to present it and myself as receiver.

Let me assure the Minister, if it was an affront to him to receive a petition from the people of Meekatharra, as their member of Parliament it was certainly not an affront to me. If they like to do the same thing next week I will again receive the petition and present it

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The only conclusion I can come to is that you did not study the petition.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not think the Minister had a good look at it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Too right I did. I even got a reporter to look at it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I will come back to that later. The Minister is more concerned about the correct wording and presentation of the petition than about its content. It is all very well if one has ready access to a solicitor in St. George's Terrace, that solicitor can be asked to draw up a petition to set out one's complaints. These people have acted in good faith because they are concerned about the district in which they reside. They have little knowledge of legal terminology—no lawyer is available in the town.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Aren't you around there to give some help?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am no lawyer.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a member of Parliament—you are supposed to know these things.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: This petition was placed outside the post office in Meekatharra for a few weeks.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Did each sheet of the petition set out what it was all about?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: No, it did not.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: How many sheets in the petition told what it was all about?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: From memory probably about two or three.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was about a dozen.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The situation is that over 400 people were concerned about the possibility of not having any medical facilities available to them, and so they signed the petition. I would like to reiterate it is certainly not an affront to me to present a petition on behalf of the people I represent, regardless of whether or not the wording is correct.

Subsequent to the presentation of the petition and the reply forwarded to the secretary of the ALP in Meekatharra, I wondered what the reply would have been had the petition been prepared by a group representing a different political party.

In *The West Australian* of the 24th June, 1974, under the heading, "Baxter rejects plea for doctor" the following article appeared—

A petition urging the State Government to legislate to ensure that isolated areas were not left without permanent qualified doctors has been rejected by the Minister for Health, Mr Baxter.

The petition, organised by the Meekatharra branch of the ALP, was signed by about 400 residents of the district.

It asked Mr Baxter to act immediately to secure the appointment of a qualified doctor at the Meekatharra district hospital.

Mr Baxter said yesterday that the wording of the petition was ridiculous.

No democratic government could enact legislation to force people to go to certain places, whether they were doctors, plumbers, electricians or labourers.

Ron Parsons, said it was true that some people had signed on behalf of friends and members of their families.

"This illustrates the real anxiety that is felt in the community on this issue," he said.

The petition had been placed outside the Meekatharra post office, in the town's main street, for two weeks, he said.

The Minister forgot about the policemen, school teachers, and other Government employees.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What about your Government?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: To continue—

The petition had also been rejected on the grounds that some of the names included were not authentic.

"There are four different names on the petition that were very evidently written by the same person," he said.

"Another instance concerns a lady who is a relative of mine. Her name appears on one page in her own handwriting, but it also appears on another page in someone else's writing.

"This type of thing has not helped the petition."

The article goes on to say that the Minister is aware of the fact that there is no doctor in the area.

Without naming names, it is interesting to note that in the electoral roll for the Murchison-Eyre electorate, we see that three people living in Meekatharra have the same surname and the same initial.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Is that the name Mr Baxter complained about?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I believe it is, but I do not want to mention names at this stage, and I am sure the Minister understands the reason for this. It is quite obvious that if there are three Tom Smiths on the electoral roll and two of them elect to sign a petition, the name "Tom Smith" could appear in two places in the petition. This is the Minister's complaint, but I am sure the explanation is as simple as I have explained it to be.

The reply sent by the Minister was an affront to me, if he considers that my presenting a petition to him was an affront to him. Whether or not one likes the way a petition is organised and presented, providing the people are prepared to sign the petition, it should receive due consideration. The contents of this letter are well known to everyone in Meekatharra. The Minister mentioned communism and other similar matters, and I believe the Minister himself owes an apology to the people of Meekatharra.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: What legislation would you suggest?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Mr Baxter said that we cannot force people to go to certain places, but he did not let it stay at that. In *The Sunday Times* of the 7th

July, 1974, we find this article under the heading, "Doctor plan for country"—

The State Government is considering a plan to use medical interns to relieve the serious shortage of doctors in outback areas.

Last night the Minister for Health, Mr Baxter, said the plan was still in its early stages.

He had asked his officers to make initial investigations and set up discussions with the parties involved.

Under the plan, medical students would be able to spend six months of their internship at country hospitals.

"We have only just put our feelers out to see if the plan can work," Mr Baxter said.

"It will take a long time before a scheme like this can begin."

I can well imagine it would take a long time to work out a scheme of this nature.

I do not know whether legislation would be required to enable this to be done; I should imagine it would. Somebody suggested that the proposal smacked of communism and the Minister then said he was considering doing this type of thing. So, who is the "commo"?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is no suggestion of "commos." There is no suggestion that anybody will be forced to go anywhere.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The reply of the Minister for Health to the organiser of the petition was that its wording smacked of communism.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: So it did. I did not see your Government introducing any legislation to force doctors or anybody else to go anywhere.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We were not asked; perhaps had we been asked we would have considered it. The Government is considering a scheme now where interns are to be used. Is the Government going to tell them they will be sent to the country? Of course it is not.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: How do you know? What legislation would you bring into force to do what you are proposing?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: My answer is: No, they are not to be made to go to the country.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: In other words, this scheme will operate on a voluntary basis.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Certainly, I said this yesterday.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not think the Minister will get volunteers for this scheme, unless they want a holiday.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: By what means will this be achieved?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: By petitioning the Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That will not help you to get a doctor in Meekatharra. That does not help anybody.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The attitude of people often has something to do with it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is what I am saying. If the petition had been organised by the Liberal Party or the Country Party in Meekatharra it would have been examined more closely.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: At least it would have been efficiently organised. You appear to have made an awful mess of it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Members opposite are always saying that petitions should be presented in the right way and with the correct wording. Well, if this is their attitude, we will organise another petition and get a lawyer to draw it up. As a member of Parliament, I should be able to do it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Of course you should be able to do it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should have made sure that the petition was drawn up properly and that the signatories were all genuine.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Well, the next time we will make sure we do not have three people with the same name as signatories.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There were three people with the same surname but different initials, and in one case there were five people with the same name but with different initials.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The President would reject the receipt of a petition like that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I had not intended to use the name of one of the signatories to the petition because I believe the person involved is entitled to privacy, but—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Then respect his privacy.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I will, but somebody wants to know about addresses and other details. They are all contained on the electoral roll.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Should not the addresses be on the petition?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Perhaps they should, but they were not. However, that does not mean to say that somebody has signed the petition twice.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I am not saying that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Minister has said that.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I say that if the addresses are shown, it is sufficient evidence of the bona fides of the signatories.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not think there is much point in my continuing my remarks.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you are making rather a mess of it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That may be the opinion of the Minister. Having made those few points, I conclude my remarks by supporting the motion.

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [3.23 p.m.]: It is my duty and honour to say a few words in respect of my predecessor, the Hon. Leslie Charles Diver, who is the immediate past President of this House.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is this your maiden speech?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: If the Minister wants to interject, he may do so. When I made my maiden speech the other night, the normal processes of the House were reversed and I was interjected upon. I ask members to leave me alone on this occasion because I am sincere in what I say. I would have thought that members on both sides of the House would have allowed me to extol the virtues of a previous President of the House in the manner in which those who served with him would consider appropriate. Mr Diver had the respect not only of everybody in this Chamber but also in the Parliament. He was extraordinarily well known throughout the Commonwealth and, indeed, in many places throughout the world, not only because of his work in this House, but also because of his high standing in the fields in which he served prior to entering Parliament and through the various connections he made while a member and President of this House.

I believe that the Hon. Les Diver would like it recorded that he is the son of the late J. W. Diver who was at one time secretary of the Trades and Labor Council of W.A. and President of the Primary Producers' Association of Western Australia. Les was always very proud of this point because he had lived with a family which came up the hard way. He then decided that he would leave this form of politics and enter a more conservative form of politics, which he considered the Australian Country Party to be—conservative inasmuch as it dealt purely and simply at that time with the problems of farmers.

Les Diver was educated at metropolitan and country State schools. He never had the advantage of a higher education. For the record, he was born on the 4th November, 1899. In 1910 he assisted his father when his father moved to Yorkrakine to establish a farming property in the district.

In 1924, which happens to be a year before I was born, the Hon. Les Diver was out there cutting out his own farm from the forest. This he succeeded in doing, and eventually he built up a very fine property in the Yorkrakine area. His property is extremely well known. He advanced to become a stud merino sheep breeder and acted as official judge of that breed in many agricultural shows throughout the State.

When he had built his first home and his family had been established, Mr Diver became a member of the political wing of the Primary Producers' Association in 1932. Indeed, he served on the executive from 1942, as well as serving on the executive of the Farmers' Union, when the amalgamation of the two bodies took place. He was appointed a justice of the peace in 1946. Prior to entering Parliament, the same worthy gentleman was actively engaged in local government for 13 years. He was a member of the Kellerberrin Road Board and was unopposed at elections during that period, including six years as its chairman.

Mr Diver was elected to the Legislative Council in 1952 as a member representing the Central Province. In 1956, he was elected Chairman of the Honorary Royal Commission into matters relating to the retailing of motor spirits and accessories, and was a member of the all-party parliamentary advisory committee on town planning. He was re-elected unopposed to the Legislative Council in 1956 and elected President of this Chamber in July, 1960. He was re-elected to this position when he was returned unopposed in 1962 and again in 1968. Mr Diver was Chairman of the Sixth Australian Area Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Perth in April, 1961, and represented the Western Australian Parliament on a town planning advisory committee for the control of the external appearance of buildings.

He was not a returned soldier, but he was very proud of his appointment as warden to the State War Memorial in 1967 and 1968. Mr Diver is now in retirement with his wife. He has a son and two daughters. There was another fact of which he was proud, although I could never agree with his thinking on this point—he was the patron of the Perth Football Club from 1966 to 1969.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: A very good club.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am afraid I disagreed with his choice. I should have thought he would have chosen a club like Claremont. However, that is the history of a man who has put 60 years into farming and public life; a history I am rattling off in a few moments. I guarantee that, to a lot of new members who have recently come into this Chamber, his name will be just a slender memory in a few short years.

Those of us who knew and worked with him will not forget him. He was a man of great tolerance. Although I did not serve under him in this House and although I know that many fine Presidents have gone through these portals, I do not think he would have his peer as far as justice and propriety were concerned.

In respect of this Legislative Council, he was a man who at all times considered his position and no matter what happened to him personally and despite his own personal views, what was best for the Legislative Council was what counted with him. In fact the whole Parliament was something he revered to such an extent that he would put it in front of his own personal desires.

I pay a tribute to him. As we all know, in his latter years here he was more companionably known as "Daddy Diver", and subsequently, if we wanted to be more polite, we called him "Father" because he was the father in this place. He still comes back here fairly frequently and he tells me he is sick of digging the garden because he finds, in his seventy-sixth year, that he is more active than he has ever been before and he does not know why he got out of public life, because he does not know what to do with himself at present. However, I do not think that boredom will be with him for very much longer now because the sun will soon shine and once more he will resume bowls in which he has a great interest.

The tributes one could pay to him are many. However, I would like to say that in his own province—the one I now represent—he was truly a great and honoured gentleman and, having been elected the first time, he did not ever again have to fight an election over all the years he served in Parliament.

Functions have been held in his honour in various parts of his old province and I have been present at some of them. The words of praise expressed at them have been deserved by that gentleman. I wish to place on record the thoughts and sentiments I have in particular, and the pleasure and honour I have in following Mr Diver into this Chamber.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr McNeill. While I called Mr Diver "Father", I cannot address Mr McNeill in the same way. I can remember that on one occasion I was caned by Mr McNeill at a certain school I attended where he happened to be a senior and I was a rather fractious new boy. However, we have forgotten that over the years, and although I called him names then, I respect him now in the position he holds and I will keep to "Neil" or "Bluey".

Likewise it is interesting to have Mr Norman Baxter, my colleague in the Central Province, as the Minister for Health. I have known him for many years, too; in fact, since long before I came into Parliament. He is a man who is dedicated in

the pursuits of the party he represents and certainly in the electorate he has served over many years.

Likewise, to Mr MacKinnon, who is no newcomer to a portfolio in this Chamber, all I can say is that if he acquits himself in the education portfolio as well as he acquitted himself in the health portfolio we are in for a very fine time in the education field in this State. There is no doubt about the fact that he was an excellent Minister for Health. He has tenacity and a very good memory and I believe he will go far in this sphere.

The province I represent is somewhat larger than the Assembly electorate I served formerly. I will not repeat the remarks I made when I was in another place concerning how hard the Assembly members work and how little the Council members work, because I find now it is almost impossible to get around my province whereas when I was representing an Assembly electorate it was possible, regularly, to get around the six towns it comprised. Now I find it extremely awkward, because whereas previously I represented six shires virtually on my own it would appear now that with my colleague I am representing an area containing 26 shire councils.

I have not added up the number of schools or the miles of road in the province, but I can see that in the next six years my home, bed, and everything else will be in a motorcar. As a matter of fact, in all the 12 years I have been a member of Parliament I have never stayed in as many hotels as I have during the last few months as the member for the Central Province.

My province covers an area from the southern part of Yalgoo; it takes in the major towns of Northam and Narrogin, goes down to the boundaries of Darkan and Collie, takes in the area of Boddington, and goes out through Kulin to the Lake Varley area. If one studies the area one will see it involves a terrific amount of travelling. Although it was reasonably easy to get around my electorate previously, now I find it is extremely difficult, and almost an impossibility to accept the invitations and perform the duties one is expected to perform for all the organisations in the 26 shires, to say nothing of the scores of smaller towns within this large area.

Certainly Mr Baxter and I represent the same area and I wish currently that he was not a Minister because I would then possibly find it a little easier. Nevertheless I sympathise with him in his arduous responsibilities and I realise that in my new position I will have to go at the gallop a little harder.

I find my new work extremely interesting, mainly because it involves an area of wheat and sheep. In fact the province is almost entirely devoted to these pursuits which are the ones I enjoy the most as

I have followed them, in the main, all my life. I hope to remain in them for many years to come. I have never left my farm. I still live there and my wife is up there all the time, and we have no intention of ever leaving that life. As a matter of fact, when I no longer have to visit the city once a week, no-one will be more pleased than I to go back to the country and, at that age, enjoy a bit of golf and a few of the other things enjoyed in a nice country town from time to time.

I am not saying that members of all other provinces are not in the same position, but I have found the pressure on me as a member for the Central Province is rather an eye opener. I only hope my new colleagues do not crack up under the strain so that they live to a ripe, merry age despite the fact that they will have to do about 50 000 miles a year in a motor-car. At least it looks as though that will be the mileage for those who must cover these big provinces.

For a long time one of my main concerns has been the expansion of the comprehensive water scheme in that part of the State which I still represent and which I previously represented. Before I go into the various ramifications of the comprehensive water scheme, I would like to say that its present boundaries were based on a plan put forward in 1946 by the then Minister for Works—the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke. As far as I am concerned it was one of the greatest ideas and schemes—though it is still not entirely a scheme—that any Minister for Works has ever put forward to service the agricultural areas.

At no time have I ever given anything but credit to the Government of that day for its attempts to introduce the necessary legislation. At the same time I have never, ever, done anything but criticise the three Country Party members of the Upper House who, unfortunately, had pressure brought to bear on them from several different directions; particularly from farmers who did not know what the scheme was going to cost. They were frightened. In those days they were mainly using horses and running very few sheep; nor was the clover established. As I have said at the time they were frightened as to what the scheme would cost.

The three members of the Upper House to whom I have referred crossed the floor of the House and virtually voted the Bill out. Both Mr Baxter and I are well aware of the actions of the farmers who called the various meetings in those days. The meetings were called throughout the country and the farmers concerned were most irate in what they said to members of Parliament about the scheme. I daresay some of those members felt they must take heed of the advice given by the farmers or suffer severe repercussions.

We realised only in later years that the opposition shown in the scheme at that time was not lasting opposition; it was op-

position based largely on the Jack system—those farmers who had sufficient water did not want the scheme, while others alongside, who did not have sufficient water, were all for it. However, the latter took heed of all the points that were raised in connection with waste and costs involved, and so on, and, as a result, they were a little unsure and felt that they could possibly run into trouble if they voted for the scheme.

However, as the years have passed—and not many of them either—the farmers concerned have realised they should never have cast their black marbles against the proposition; particularly as the sheep carrying capacity of the land has increased threefold and cattle raising has also taken on a new significance. These things were, of course, all envisaged by the officers of the department of the day, who advised the Minister at the time as to the great benefits which the scheme would bring in its wake.

Because of the action taken by the farmers who voted against the scheme their sins are now being visited on those who have succeeded them. It is a fact that there are very few farmers in those areas now who are not continually making submissions to have their properties connected to the reticulation scheme within the bounds of the original 1946 comprehensive water scheme.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.*

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: In spite of the objections that were raised because that was being considered as the area of the comprehensive scheme, in 1946 it was decided to go ahead with a modified scheme. I think I should say here that during the period of the Hawke Government, when this scheme was considered to be a necessity to the State, the boundaries were drawn up and it was estimated that the projected reticulation would include the rich central grain and wheat-growing areas of Katanning, York, and Dalwallinu, and extend east nearly to the boundary of Bruce Rock, through Kulin and Gnowangerup—all those solid areas of the State. It was envisaged that it would cover 11 607 000 acres. In 1946 the anticipated cost was \$9 330 000.

When the first modified scheme was suggested and put to the Commonwealth Government for assistance, the area was in the vicinity of 4 million acres. It was finally considered in the light of its necessity and as a start to the original comprehensive scheme in 1949, and it was envisaged that the reticulation of the modified area would take place over the next seven years. Anybody who is conversant with the scheme will know it is explained in a booklet, known as "the green book", which in fact became the bible of the Public Works Department over the next few years.

I show to members a map which will give an indication of the comprehensive water scheme to which I refer. It can be seen it embraced a considerable area of country. The original comprehensive area has remained, extending in the south to Borden and Katanning, and in the north to Dalwallinu and right out to Mukinbudin. That is the area that was being considered.

In 1962, when the first modified scheme came into being, instead of costing \$9 330 000 for the lot it was envisaged this portion would cost \$20 million. Spread over the period in which it was to be brought into being, it meant the State would have to contribute \$10.5 million towards it and the Commonwealth would grant the rest.

Subsequently, that part of the scheme was put under way and was virtually completed in 13 years. When it was nearing completion, it was decided to embark on yet another scheme—the second phase of the modified comprehensive water scheme. For two years haggling took place between the State and the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth agreed to the second modified scheme but would not contribute on the basis of a grant; it would make a direct loan to the State. This scheme was to cost in the vicinity of \$20 million. It was commenced in 1965 and is to be completed this year.

To date, it has cost \$40 million to bring water within the boundaries of the comprehensive scheme, and 4.1 million acres have yet to be serviced. It is now envisaged that on present-day costs it will cost in excess of \$100 million for the entire comprehensive water scheme. Nevertheless, I say the work should proceed and the cost is justified.

In 1965, together with officers of the department we worked out the third phase of the comprehensive scheme, which was to take in an area known as Greenhills, in the vicinity of York, and an area between Corrigin and Wickepin known as the Bullaring area. This was to comprise 627 000 acres—considerably less than had previously been contemplated, but nevertheless it was considered to be most important because of the salinity problems that were being experienced in this part of the comprehensive area as compared with other areas that had not yet been serviced.

In other words, an order of priority for service was established. The Government of the day agreed that this scheme should have No. 1 priority, and the then Minister for Works (Mr Ross Hutchinson) presented the matter in book form, in which he clearly stated the case for extension of the modified comprehensive scheme, which in fact involved only two small areas in comparison with the huge area that is as yet unserviced. This was estimated to cost \$6 250 000.

If members follow the figures as I have stated them since I started speaking, they can easily see why some apprehension about the comprehensive scheme is creeping into departments and into State and Federal financial circles. Under the Hawke Government it was envisaged the total reticulation would cost in the vicinity of \$1.60 an acre. The first phase of the comprehensive scheme was carried out at a cost of in the vicinity of \$5 an acre. By the time the second phase had been completed, the cost had risen to about \$8 an acre. When the third phase went forward, the figure that was mentioned was in the vicinity of \$10 an acre. One can see there is reason for Governments investigating and being very sure the money is spent in the right direction.

However, the Government of the day listed the scheme as having top priority in the water extension work which was to take place within the State. Mr Ross Hutchinson wrote to Mr Fairbairn, who was at the time the Federal Minister for Works. The matter was again queried and examined. It was taken up with Mr Schwartz, a subsequent Federal Minister for Works, who, on the recommendation of his department, said, "No, we will not proceed with it; we do not think it is warranted."

There is nothing new about this kind of exercise. The previous extension to the comprehensive water scheme had been queried and returned to the State, and the State in turn had to keep going back to Canberra in order to have it finally agreed to.

Soon after Mr Schwartz knocked back the scheme, a Labor Government came into office, headed by a chap called Whitlam, and after six months he appointed a Minister for Water Supplies. It is well known that the internal water supplies handled through the Commonwealth had been more or less missed out when the Prime Minister was allocating the portfolios. In my opinion, therefore, little importance was placed, in general, on water in inland areas. Any member who wishes to argue on this matter has only to check back through the files of the Public Works Department to find that it was not known for six months who would be the Minister in charge of the Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That happens with all Governments. The present Government here did not appoint a Minister for Railways.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Dr Cass was not aware that he was the Minister for Works and Water Supplies. In fact, I was rather surprised at his appointment because he is the Minister for Environmental Protection and I would have thought that was far removed from works and water supplies. However, he finally became the Minister and was told he would have to

deal with the representations being made to him and decide whether to assent to them.

While the Labor Government was in office in this State, Mr Tonkin and the Minister for Works (Mr Jamieson) did in fact take the proposition back to Dr Cass. Mr Tonkin also wrote a letter to the Right Hon. E. G. Whitlam. At the time the Western Australian Government was looking for two sums of money—\$8 million to cover phase three of the comprehensive water scheme, as it was then known, and \$2 million to make up the leeway for finishing phase two of the comprehensive scheme, which, because of escalation of costs, was costing more than the original \$20 million. The Government was also looking for \$3.5 million towards sewerage in the metropolitan area.

The \$2 million to complete phase two of the comprehensive water scheme was agreed to, as it had to be, because it could not be left uncompleted. The figure granted for sewerage development was very close to the one claimed, but that was not the case in regard to the extensions to the comprehensive water scheme.

Since that time, from repeated questions and letters it appears not much movement has taken place between the Western Australian Public Works Department and its Federal counterpart. In fact, the proposal was vetoed and thrown out. The point I am making is that the officers in this State gave the project No. 1 priority.

It was referred to Canberra for the same type of assistance, or for the type of assistance that had been given to other projects which were being carried out within the bounds of this comprehensive water supply scheme; a scheme which in fact had been recognised many years previously by the Federal Government.

In my opinion the latest approach was knocked out by one group of people: public servants. I am positive we will continue to experience this type of procrastination every time we make a submission to Canberra for works to be done in this State. It is fairly obvious to me that when a project such as this is put forward—and this State has not suitable taxing rights to enable it to complete such a project on its own—we will experience such procrastination. Even though Canberra sends over men to verify and examine the figures presented by the State—and I do not argue with that—and spends money for that purpose, we are still faced with the fact that someone in a department 2 500 miles away from Western Australia has made up his mind and has advised the Minister accordingly. This has been the experience during the life of Governments of different political colours, so I am not arguing about that.

However, I do see a distinct possibility that all this may be leading us in a certain direction. Shortly before the last elections

in this State it was agreed that certain areas outside the modified comprehensive water supply scheme would be reticulated. Those areas had a bearing on the Merredin-Yilgarn electorate, and they bordered the area to the east of the scheme in a couple of other electorates. I have no objection to those areas being served with water. However, I thought it was a very strange decision that they could be serviced almost immediately out of State moneys and yet the long awaited and much submitted plan slid down the list; in fact the people concerned were becoming nonentities as far as the Government was concerned. Submissions seem to have ceased to be made in respect of this project.

The Hon. R. Thompson asked the other night whether I could give him an example of a project which has not received support from the present Federal Government but which previously received support. I replied by referring to the comprehensive water supply scheme. I challenge him now with the facts. I refer to the amounts of money received from the Commonwealth towards the extension of reticulated water in the scheme. I will not go back over many years, but starting in 1968-69—and bear in mind this is only Commonwealth money which was matched equally by the State—we received \$2.05 million. In 1969-70 the amount was \$2 million and in 1970-71 it was \$1.792 million. In 1972-73 we received a contribution of \$158 000 up to the 20th February 1973. So last year we received almost nothing and it seems likely that next year we will receive nothing.

In the meantime this State has put towards the scheme an amount of \$1.165 million, and a further \$112 000 of State moneys will have to be put into it next year.

I think it is high time that two things happened. As the Brand-Nalder Government had phase three at the top of the list for extensions within the comprehensive scheme, and as this was as a result of the advice of the Public Works Department—which should prevail now as it did then—that phase should be put back where it belongs; that is, it should enjoy the No. 1 priority it enjoyed previously.

Having done that, I think it is the responsibility of the present Government to present a submission once again; and instead of standing and being beaten off as evidently the previous State Government was, it should keep on hammering the Federal Government until it realises the necessity to supply finance to enable this State to enjoy reticulated water in areas as vast as some of the areas which are currently reticulated in the Eastern States.

I think it is criminal that a project which once had top billing should now have been virtually forgotten and others



brought in in its place. I speak for many others who are familiar with the subject; for many who cannot understand why this has happened.

I speak for those who cannot understand why, after the State engineer of the day (Mr Parker), the Under-Secretary for Works (Mr Jim McConnell), and the then Government of the State all agreed that this phase should have No. 1 priority in the State, the State Labor Government for some reason allowed it to slip down the list and instead went ahead with further works outside the comprehensive scheme. If this area is not completed we will never see the completion of the dream which first came into being in 1946.

The area in question is most dependent on water to cater for the stock it can carry. It is also a shame that the two areas suggested in phase three are presently suffering from extreme salinity problems as far as the old deep wells and dams are concerned, being in the upper reaches of the Avon. It is an absolute necessity that these areas receive water from some other source to replenish the water supply that is being depleted by salt encroachment. The salinity is not so great that the soil is affected; it is not on the surface. Nevertheless down deep there is encroachment by salt into the underground streams. This is well known.

We are faced with the fact that at present \$50 million would need to be spent to complete the whole of the comprehensive scheme. If I were in private enterprise I am darn sure that \$50 million could be raised to get water to these areas. It is not that long ago that the farmers of this State agreed to spend \$50 million on the construction of a grain terminal at Kwinana. If that sort of money can be raised and guaranteed—and of necessity it will have to be paid back over many years—for the construction of a grain terminal, I see no reason why the State should not by some means borrow the money to complete the scheme if the Federal authorities will not wear our submissions.

At one time the people in the areas concerned were quite annoyed about the work taking place at the Ord River. They were of the opinion that many of their farms had been established for over 100 years—over 140 years in some cases—and yet they were bypassed in favour of the Ord River scheme which was under way to service something in the future at a very high cost—I do not know what it was; it could have been something like \$90 million or \$100 million. However, the farmers then realised that criticism could not be levelled against the Ord River project because they were aware, as we all are, that it was necessary if development of the Ord was to take place. On the other hand, they could level their criticism

at the Federal authorities for not supplying money for the advancement of their own scheme.

We are talking about vast areas when we refer to places like Katanning, York, and other old settled regions which have been battling for water for a long time. My plea at this time is directed mainly at the Government of Western Australia because if it does not set to and establish its case and keep on hammering it in Canberra it will never get anywhere. In my opinion it was a weak policy to take a blank, first-up refusal from the Federal Minister (Mr Cass). This is something which will need to be followed up with great tenacity and drive in order to wear down the attitude adopted by the Federal Government towards the extension of reticulated water within the comprehensive water supply scheme.

If reticulated water is not extended into the two areas of phase three then it cannot be extended beyond those areas in the present scheme, and especially into the old areas of Beverley, Brookton, York, and others.

Every year deputations come down from those areas which are not included in that phase but which about it or are beyond it. I have submissions here from places such as Wamenusking; nobody would know where that is, but I tell members it is south of Quairading. I have another from an area known as Bally Bally, an old established area in the Beverley district. Many farmers there have made this submission. I could go on through all the submissions I have before me by farmers within the bounds of the comprehensive water supply scheme who want reticulated water to run past their farms.

Unless we do something now about serving with water the 4 million acres of country which has been developed to the present time it is my estimation that it will be something like 200 years before we can expect the scheme to be completed; and to me that seems to be a pretty horrible state of affairs. However, I will not deal further with that subject. I trust that whilst members will certainly work to obtain water in their own areas, they will spare a thought for the areas to which I refer.

In other areas funds should be provided, even if it is on a rotating basis, to encourage farmers to mine water from depths of 900, 1 000, and even 10 000 feet where we know the water lies. To use the words of Roosevelt way back in 1933 when the Tennessee River Valley project was commenced: "To country people water and electricity are no longer a luxury, they are a necessity."

Yet in Western Australia many people are still living without water and electricity. They are still without water in

spite of a plan brought forward in 1946 to provide them with it. We know that they can get by without electricity, but they cannot get by without water.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [4.30 p.m.]: Like other members, I offer my congratulations to you, Sir, on being elected as President of this Chamber. I know that during the time I have been here, your long experience makes you a fitting candidate for that position. There would be few among us who would have a greater knowledge of Parliamentary procedure than you, Mr President. I would hope—and I am sure it will be so—that you will preserve the spirit of impartiality in the same way as it was preserved by your predecessor.

I also congratulate the new members who were elected at the last State election. It has been interesting to hear their maiden speeches. It is a reflection upon ourselves, as older members, to think that they are being, perhaps, a little brash and full of ideas which they believe are very important and which should be implemented. Experience, of course, is a great teacher and in many instances we find it necessary to adjust.

To those members who were successful on being re-elected to this House I also offer my congratulations.

This is a very trying time for my party; that is, for it to have lost the last election after having been in office for only a three-year term, and now to find ourselves occupying the Opposition benches. We would like to have seen many of the developments we implemented brought to fruition. We accept the will of the people, but there are some explanations that can be given to show how events took the course they did, and perhaps I may spend a few minutes talking about those events during the speech I will make this afternoon.

To the Minister for Health I would like to refer again a point I raised during the debate on the Address-in-Reply. That was the conditions in the Anglican homes in Mt. Lawley. If the Minister has not had those conditions brought to his notice, I now ask him to examine what I had to say because, in this area, I think he could bring his influence to bear to bring about some remedy.

**The Hon. N. E. Baxter:** In tonight's paper did you read the report on what the Public Health Department is doing in this matter?

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** If whatever that department is doing is resolving the problem I will be satisfied.

**The Hon. N. E. Baxter:** It does appear that it is reasonably resolved.

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** That is very satisfactory. Provocative speeches have been made by members who support parties different from mine, but first of all, I would refer to the remarks made by the

**Hon. Grace Vaughan.** She referred to a group of people as WASPS—that is, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants. For many years such people held positions of privilege in former colonial lands. I myself am a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, but I doubt whether the honourable member had me in mind when she made those remarks.

**The Hon. V. J. Ferry:** Have you not any sting?

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** Not of the kind that she meant, I am sure. She had in mind those people from the established classes in the United Kingdom who re-established themselves in similar positions in the colonial territories, such as the United States of America. The territories on the eastern seaboard of that country in particular still are, to a great extent, dominated by such people. I see myself as fitting more into that stream of democracy in the Anglo-Saxon race that has been responsible for achieving advances such as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and better conditions for the working classes in that country. They are the people who have perfected the Westminster parliamentary system.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon:** Funnily enough, they were members of the Congregational Church and if they were not white Anglo-Saxon Protestants I do not know who were.

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** I doubt whether they would fit into that category.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon:** You read the history of the English Labour Party.

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** I would also refer the Minister to the history of the working classes of the United Kingdom and the type of people who were involved in the struggle for better working conditions. Quite often some of the leaders in the democratic movement in England were well educated and wealthy people and who, in the main, were at variance with others in their class.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon:** I would not class Lord Shaftesbury as a peasant.

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON:** No, that is what I am trying to imply. His views were certainly not those of the group of which he was a part. He represented a minority in that group. I think the Minister will have to agree with that, otherwise Lord Shaftesbury certainly would not have met with the many years of struggle to obtain the adjustment of working conditions as he viewed them at that time.

However, to return to the point, this is the sort of stream in which I would be caught up myself, and I hope I am not being immodest in saying that. To those who believe that we have a full expression of Westminster Government in this State and who perhaps would not believe it would be possible to create a redistribution of boundaries that would prevent a Labor

Government being elected again in this State, I offer a reminder of the situation that has existed in this Chamber ever since it was established. Never, during the whole period of its history, has a Labor Party obtained a majority in this House.

During the debates already heard in this Chamber some member made reference to the basis on which this House was established. Perhaps he has forgotten that this Chamber was based on a property franchise and not on a universal franchise, to represent the interests of property owners at that time. I hope we have gone well past that period in our history and that all members in this Chamber will be prepared to examine the matter in the concept of our time, even if it means giving some credit to the South Australian Senator (Mr Steele Hall) who went against the idea of his party in South Australia in trying to democratise the Upper House in that State.

I have spoken on this issue in the past and have made suggestions about the various ways the basis of elections for this House could be altered, and among them I suggested a proportional representation system, similar to that which has been adopted in South Australia. I think that system gives a fair representation of the differing views in the community. As things exist at the moment, it is highly unlikely, within the foreseeable future, that my party could gain a majority in this Chamber because of the way the representation is distributed.

Elsewhere in Australia I could point to examples of redistributions. I could point to one example recently, following a redistribution of Assembly electorates in New South Wales. It has been said that that represented a gerrymander of boundaries based on the voting blocks to establish a pattern of strong and safe Labor seats in that State. However, populations are distributed in such a way it is highly unlikely that, without a change of heart among the Government parties, the Labor Party would gain a majority in that State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Were you here in 1964?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister would know, of course, that I was elected to this House in 1968.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In 1964 your people were very confident when we passed the adult franchise that they would gain control of this House.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is simply demonstrating—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your lack of judgment.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —that the Minister's party has carried out its homework on a wider basis than has the Labor Party. The extending of the vote

to all adults on the common roll for the Legislative Council gives a facade of democracy, but that is only one of the elements that go towards making a democratic Parliament.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would suggest that you should go back and read the speeches made by members of your Labor Party during that debate.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They were not mine.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They were speeches made by members of your party.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They were not my speeches; I would make that clear.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you are being very wise after the event.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Of course, experience teaches all of us.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: My understanding was that the Labor Party knew it would be worse off in respect of seats, but it was prepared to sacrifice seats in the interests of obtaining adult franchise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I wish that *Hansard* could only record hilarious laughter.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I only wish the Minister would give me time to finish my speech, although I do not mind his interjections. There is danger, of course, in accepting reforms bit by bit, because one eventually ends up arguing—as I mentioned recently—on the margins. That is, where the injustices are greatest it is easier to gain support for changes. Where they are not so obvious, it is harder to persuade people that injustices do exist. That is about the stage we have reached now and I notice a smile of content on the face of the Minister for Justice.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I was just terribly interested in what you are saying.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps I should not be educating the Minister in this way. It may not serve myself or my party in doing so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Stop equivocating and admit that you got a mother and a father of a thrashing.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will certainly not admit that. I would also remind the Minister that in the 1971 elections for this Chamber my party gained something in excess of 50 per cent of the total votes. I am speaking of the general election and not the by-election for the seat in the north. However, we gained, in the State election, only 27 per cent of the total number of members elected to this House. That is, we gained only four members as a result of that election.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We do not have proportionate representation; our elections run side by side!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Had we had proportionate representation we would have done considerably better.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would the honourable member like to explain the "gerrymander" in 1971 which allowed one Liberal member and one Labor member to be elected to the same province on the same day? I refer to the North Province.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Withers would know that the result of that election depended very largely on the luck of the draw.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is always an excuse.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I was in position No. 2.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I was asked a question and I am giving my answer as I see it. The honourable member can give his opinion later. I would be the last person to try to claim that all the fault lay elsewhere. I will admit there were faults in the Labor Party campaign, but at the same time they are fairly telling figures no matter what the explanation; when a party can receive 50 per cent plus of the primary vote and gain only slightly more than one-quarter of the seats.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You cannot blame gerrymandering on the one hand, and bad management on the other.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know what the honourable member's definition is, and I do not know his definition of democracy or private enterprise. However, it certainly would not agree with my definition.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you explain the "gerrymander" in your own seat?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sure the member opposite would be happy with the result, and that his party would be happy with the result as far as the election of people to this Chamber is concerned. I am sure members opposite would not want any change at all.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would the honourable member like me to assist him with the answer to the query?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We might see a different story in the Legislative Assembly, even though it might be denied. The future will tell that. Miss Elliott has quoted the figures regarding the last election. I do not have the Legislative Council figures with me, but roughly 48 per cent of the primary vote was obtained by the Labor Party and on that occasion we gained five of the 15 seats which were contested. In other words, one-third of them.

That was a slightly improved result but not one of which the people of Western Australia could be proud if they consider

themselves to be democratic in their outlook. Certainly, members of the Liberal Party and the National Alliance or Country Party—whatever it is called—should be hanging their heads in shame because they have made no effort to adjust the situation. I do not see members opposite hanging their heads in shame and I believe they feel no remorse.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you going to tell us how the election of members to the other place is undemocratic, seeing we are on the same franchise?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have been speaking in respect of this Chamber because it is the worst affected.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: To suit your purpose.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I could go on to talk about the difference in the weighting between rural and suburban seats. It does not take very much to demonstrate that this is not a democratic system of voting. Mr Gayfer tried to explain the position by telling us stories about the distances he has to travel in his electorate but we all have our problems as far as that goes. Perhaps if the honourable member lived in a metropolitan seat he might appreciate some of the problems which we members experience in trying to serve our electorates.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You do not have the problem of distance.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am one of those who has lived in various country towns for a number of years. When I was a lot younger I spent a few months at Marley Pool, about which I reminded Mr McIver just recently. I enjoyed country life. It has certain values and provides enjoyments which the city does not. At the time it was necessary, in respect of my work, to provide permanent housing for my family otherwise I probably would have remained in the country.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They work hard and they play hard in the country!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I know many city people who do that! We have not always enjoyed the benefits described by Mr Gayfer as the difference between city and country life. Many of us pioneered our homes in the city, not many years ago. I can recall taking a bath in a 44-gallon drum which we would fill up from a well in the ground. I can remember living in a tent while we built our home in one of the suburbs. However, conditions continue to improve in the city and in many country towns.

I was disturbed by the remarks I heard from Mr Gayfer yesterday. The speech was typical of many which were made throughout the country in the time leading up to the last State and Federal elections, and they are possibly still continuing.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It could not have been me; I did not speak yesterday.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The message contained in the speech to which I have referred was the so-called difference between country and city dwellers. I do not recall having seen similar speeches made by candidates for city seats, but they certainly have been reported coming from members of Mr Gayfer's party. I think this has been deliberately designed because that has been the message which members opposite wanted to get to people in the country. Nothing has appeared to contradict the message which has been delivered. I would say that Mr Gayfer's party and the Liberal Party are well satisfied with the result of that sort of campaign because they won back the Government in this State. It was a very effective campaign: I will not deny that. I am sure members opposite will admit it was part of a campaign.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did you say it was an unfounded campaign?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would say, "Yes"; a good many lies and a great deal of misrepresentation were included in the campaign.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The honourable member is reflecting on the judgment of the electors.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Not at all. The electors placed their judgment on the information which was presented to them but, as far as Western Australia is concerned, the sorry part of it is that those people did not have the information which is available to people in the city.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Quite the reverse, in fact; the country people exercised the judgment.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I hope that when the Minister's party gets down to action it will see that a better means of communication is provided so that country people will have a greater variety of news and views expressed to them.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The reverse is true.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: People in the country should be able to arrive at a more reasonable judgment in the same way as those who live in the city.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Country people are more politically aware than are metropolitan dwellers.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Of course the honourable member would know.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: I represent country people.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Ferry has done a survey of this among city dwellers.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The public relations campaign of the Labor Party left us for dead.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Can the honourable member give us some examples of these so-called lies?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The most startling one, and the one most often repeated—and country people should be sure to hear this one—was that no farmers were carrying on in Forrest Place during the election campaign. That is a lie, and a repeated lie, because it is known there is filmed proof.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You said this happened during the State election.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I say it happened during State and Federal elections, and it very likely continues. That is what I said.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: When has anybody denied that there were farmers in Forrest Place?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In view of the interjections I am sorry I have not brought some examples of this sort of thing with me. However, it is not very difficult to locate Press reports concerning events that took place at that time.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member does a good deal towards drawing the interjections.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, Mr President, I will not disagree. To return to my subject: If an explanation is required concerning the election results I think the reason I have given is one of the most important.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: One which suits you, anyhow.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I did not expect that it would suit Mr Baxter. It is an example of the sort of campaign which was organised against the Labor Party.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: When the honourable member is really specific we will argue.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think it is an undesirable trend in politics in Australia that this sort of campaign should be indulged in. It is not really much different from the communistic fear tactics used by Mr Menzies when he became Prime Minister of Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought Mr Munday proved the other day that Sir Robert Menzies was absolutely 100 per cent right.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is taking him back a bit.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am only going by Press reports.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member said that Mr Menzies' thesis was that there were communists in Australia. So Mr Munday has confirmed that. Nobody has ever doubted that there are communist supporters in Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought Mr Munday confirmed they had practically taken over the Labor Party and most of the effective unions.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member believes the statement of one man and says that is proof of the story.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is a good indication when it comes from Mr Munday.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Are you saying there are communists in the Labor Party? Are you saying it?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: No, but I can guarantee there are none in the Liberal Party.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The only one who ought to be saying something at this time is the Hon R. F. Cloughton.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you. This very interesting thesis is being thrown up, but I do not think there is anything new about it. It is the old guilt by association.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You brought it up.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Who brought it up?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You brought up about Mr Menzies.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member referred to Mr Menzies' thesis about the Communist Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: *Hansard* will show us.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: During the week another member quoted an advertisement, but he refused to tell us who had inserted the advertisement from which he quoted so that we could check its credibility. He took the supposed statement of one member of the Labor Party who said that State Governments were no longer necessary and would disappear in the future; that is the opinion of Senator Wheelton and, therefore, it is the supposed policy of the Labor Party.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A fairly big wheel in the organisation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is the thesis he was putting up.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I could give you a quote of Mr Whitlam's

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There is an organisation in Australia called the League of Rights. It is a very right wing extremist body with well-documented extremist views. I could quote from a series of articles which appeared in *The Age* in Melbourne that members of the League of Rights had infiltrated the Liberal Party, particularly in the Diamond Valley electorate in that State. Are we to assume that because these people have been accepted as members of the Liberal Party

their policies are the policies of the Liberal Party? We must accept, however, that they would have a strong influence on party policies.

Amongst other things, this group claimed that it waged a campaign against a former member for Forrest (Mr Gordon Freeth) and that it was instrumental in his defeat.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why? Because he was supposed to have taken a soft line towards the presence of Russian vessels in the Indian Ocean.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That demonstrates their strength in the Liberal Party, and the fact that they should not be ignored. These are serious considerations, and members should be aware of the implications.

Members might also recall that during the last election a group called the Australian Heritage Society conducted a campaign in support of "God Save The Queen" as our anthem. This society said that the Labor Government wished to proclaim a republic and do all sorts of dreadful things. The Australian Heritage Society is another one of the front organisations for the Australian League of Rights—they are synonymous.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Is it the intention of the Labor Party to declare a republic?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Has the Minister ever seen this officially?

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am asking you a question.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I expect the Minister to ask reasonable questions. I cannot recall ever seeing this—

The Hon. N. McNeill: I asked you a straightforward question.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —in any of our policies.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I asked you whether it was.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Thank you.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Will the Minister accept that as a definite answer?

The Hon. N. McNeill: All I want is a simple answer.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Unless you want to change your mind!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This question is thrown up continually. About the time that the Australian Heritage Society was conducting its campaign, a committee was formed in Melbourne called the Committee for Constitutional Monarchy in Australia. Perhaps we should really question whether the Liberal Party has any association with this group. This organisation was promoting its views as widely as it could, and it claimed to have

very influential supporters. It listed its chairman as Brigadier R. T. Eason, MED, and office bearers as Brigadier Sir William Hall, CBE, DSO ED, and John Turner, MBE Ed. Perhaps Mrs Vaughan may say there was very WASPish control of this organisation. We are not sure what this organisation is, but it solicited funds. I do not know whether the funds that people may have been influenced to donate to it were ever accounted for.

Obviously this group was designed to work against the Australian Labor Party, spreading what cannot be regarded as anything else but a lie, since it has never appeared in any of our policies that we wish to create a republic in this country. This was shortly after the Australian Government had created Queen Elizabeth also Queen of Australia. Along with the Queensland Government, our Premier suggested that we should declare Queen Elizabeth Queen of Western Australia. Perhaps we should wonder what the links are between the Liberal Party and this so-called Committee of Constitutional Monarchy in Australia.

It is also rather interesting to read another publication, the *Rhodesian Commentary*, vol. 8, No. 1, January, 1974. A brief statement appears here, and it appears to support some sort of link between The Australian League of Rights and the Liberal Party. It reads—

The previous Australian Government did not condemn the racial policies—

That is, of the Rhodesian Government. It continues—

—it merely condemned the Rhodesian Government for its unilateral declaration of Independence . . .

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: What has its racial policy got to do with the Australian Government, for God's sake? What has it to do with us what they do in Rhodesia? What business is it of the Australian Government?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The previous Liberal Government apparently thought it was our business.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Only in regard to the unilateral declaration. Their racial policies have nothing to do with us, and neither do South Africa's.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I can understand the honourable member trying to defend his party in this way. I am quoting from this paper which says it is the opinion of this group that the previous Australian Government did not condemn the racial policies—

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: What has that to do with it?

The Hon. N. McNeill: You want to share in the internal running of Rhodesia.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Apparently the Liberal Party thought it worth while to declare sanctions against Rhodesia.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Your friends in Britain opposed this policy.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We all have friends in Britain.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Conservative friends in Britain.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Another cause for concern by the people of Australia is the state of local government. At the time of the Federal election in 1972, and in the lead-up to the Federal election early this year, a great deal was said about the need for financial support for local government. The Australian Labor Government was very sympathetic to this view, and made the offer that in order to give a clearer expression of its views, it would have a representative at the Loan Council. As well as this, the Australian Government is organising regional grouping to allow local authorities to put forward their viewpoints.

The Australian Government made allocations of funds for local authorities. At the time that local authorities were saying they were very short of funds, the Premier saw fit to take money from an unstated source to tide local authorities over to the new financial year. The Premier was urging the local authorities to refuse the funds made available to them by the Australian Government. I find this an almost incredible state of affairs.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: When they give it straight to the States.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: One can hardly believe it is the act of a reasonable man.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: All they are doing is to create another body.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I believe that the various Liberal Governments in this country are attempting to break down constitutional government within Australia—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Come off it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What rubbish.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —and particularly the Commonwealth Constitution.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: The Commonwealth tried to change the Constitution.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This was made evident in the Liberal Party policy speech.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I will admit I tried to subvert some of the Australian Constitution concerning loan allowances.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Here is a piece under the heading "The Liberal Alternative". It reads—

It will be free to align itself with the other free States—Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, in a successful confrontation with Federal Labor's centralist policies.

I do not know quite what is meant by "free States". This is a deliberate act to bypass the provisions of the Constitution.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Tell me how.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Many years ago, there was a necessity for the States to act together and the Constitution was designed to allow them to do just that. Yet here we see the Liberal Government doing its very best to bypass that principle and, indeed, to cause a breakdown in Federal-State relationships.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It is doing its best to protect the rights of the States.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We are trying to maintain the Constitution of Australia.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister might fool himself and obviously his party has been able to fool a great number of other people in this country, but the platform of the Liberal Party refers to the question of power. It does not refer to the question of people, but to power. That is all the Minister and his supporters are concerned with. They are not concerned with people or the lawful provisions of the Constitution and the way it might be improved; they are concerned only with the control of power in this country.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who is using that power in Australia today? Is it Mr Whitlam and his colleagues or is it somebody else?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The present Australian Government is a democratically elected Government which the people have put in Canberra to exercise its powers.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The Labor Government is getting away from democracy by holding a joint sitting. Do you call that democracy?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is contained in the Constitution and the principle has been approved by the High Court of Australia.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The provision for a joint sitting is one of the democratic processes provided for under the Constitution. It is a pity that we do not have a similar provision relating to our State Parliament.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What section of the Constitution are you quoting? Read it to me. You cannot, because it is not there.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you saying that the High Court acted illegally? That is what you are implying.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Do members opposite think that a joint sitting would have been allowed to proceed after a challenge to the High Court had been upheld? Or do members opposite believe that the judges of the High Court are in collusion with the Australian Government to defeat the Constitution?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I still say that the joint sitting is unconstitutional. You cannot quote where the provision for a joint sitting is contained in the Constitution.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We have the opinion of the Minister and we have the opinion of the High Court judges.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I know which I would accept.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You have an opinion on a point.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: On the basis of democratic principles and in consideration of the number of people affected, will you please explain how the ALP pledge which allows a Caucus decision to become the ruling decision is democratic?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps we should sympathise with the honourable member for asking that question.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you know the ALP pledge? It is on page 24 of your constitution, just in case you do not know.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, and I signed that pledge.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You signed the pledge knowing that you could not vote for the benefit of your electors?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The basis of a democratic system is majority rule.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But you signed a pledge which states that a decision of Caucus is binding.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is that principle that the Liberal and Country Parties are trying to defeat. They are not prepared to accept that a Federal Labor Government is now in office in Canberra. Members opposite will do all in their power to see that it is not able to govern this country effectively. I can appreciate why Mr Withers wears that smile on his face.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I am smiling because you have signed a pledge which means that you cannot vote for the benefit of your constituents.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The sort of tactics that have been adopted in the Senate in regard to the Labor Government's legislation also applied during the term of the Tonkin Government, but we had no way of resolving the disagreements between the Assembly and the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Your definition of democracy is "majority rule".



The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know what definition Mr Williams places on democracy; I suppose it is minority rule.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Not at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Well, certainly, the honourable member is in agreement with the basis upon which members are elected to this Chamber.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You cannot understand anything; that is your trouble.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will please address the Chair.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I should like to raise a number of other matters, but the one to which I wish to make particular reference is a matter which, like my speech on the Anglican Homes recently, I would approach in a more serious tone than the one we have just been adopting. Over a number of years and on various occasions I have raised matters relating to the City of Subiaco which, essentially, is not within my district. However, I believe that by having raised these matters some good has been achieved. I asked several questions of the Government relating to a lot in Onslow Road, Subiaco, and the building approval which applied to that land. The answer conveyed to me by the Minister was that, because there was an existing approval for the development of that site, it would not be easy to change it. Members would know that during the debate on the development of the Perth Medical Centre things became heated in this Chamber; some members of the Liberal Party became quite upset and protested about the increase in traffic which would be caused by this centre. A similar situation will exist if this development is permitted in Onslow Road.

Although I raise the matter now, I feel that the need for protest on our part is not as great as it was because I believe the Subiaco City Council is taking a lot more care now in this direction than it did previously. However, I raise the matter because the problem still exists. If further development in Onslow Road is permitted there will be an increase in traffic which will transgress upon and disturb the surrounding residential area. As members opposite would know, this is already a problem and is increasing. If this development is allowed to proceed, we would expect the Subiaco City Council to take some action to reduce the extra traffic which will be generated on the surrounding suburban roads. I believe that the best thing to do is to rescind the approval and allow the land to remain as a residential property. This is not an impossible thing to achieve. Perhaps it would require the payment of compensation, but if the proposal is permitted to proceed the amenities of the residents will be reduced

because of the extra traffic which will be generated and the question of compensating the people who live in the area for the reduction in their amenities could arise. No reasonable method exists by which this compensation could be assessed, whereas compensation could be paid upon rescinding the approval which has already been granted.

Apart from this, there is also the general problem of diverting traffic from Subiaco itself. I would hope that the Subiaco City Council achieves a little more than it has been able to achieve in the past six years since I first raised this question in Parliament. That is a fairly long time and still no solution has been found. The council has not even set down a plan to route traffic away from the residential areas. This brings me again to the question of Commonwealth-State relations. The Labor Government in Canberra has been criticised for what has been called its intrusion into local government. However, one of the things it is doing and for which grants of money have been allocated is to provide funds to preserve the amenities of residential areas and to see that roads such as we have in this area can be altered to prevent a through-flow of traffic. Subiaco is not the only area where this problem exists. Recently, two petitions were presented to the City of Stirling authorities which complained of similar problems arising from the Stirling Hospital in Mt. Yokine.

The existence of the Stirling Hospital is generating traffic through the area and the parking of cars is also causing serious problems to the people who live in the district. Traffic hazards have been created to the extent that the people have been moved to present two petitions and make representations asking the local authorities to do something about it. They have requested the creation of a cul-de-sac.

A similar situation exists in Woodlands, which is much nearer to my home and which also is in my electorate. Traffic flows through the residential area of Woodlands, past the primary school, on its way to the Churchlands High School, the teachers college or elsewhere. Often people take this route to their place of work because it is less busy than other roads in the area. The case of Woodlands represents a design problem. How do we design an area so that traffic is routed around it? I know that the City of Stirling has been trying for a long time to overcome this problem, but this matter has been brought to my notice on a number of occasions since I have been a member of this Chamber. I know that this is a difficult problem, but it is a matter of spending money to change the existing road pattern to ensure that traffic does not flow through residential areas.

A real need exists to preserve the streets in which people live, and to keep them apart from the main traffic arteries and the commercial and industrial areas in order that people are able to live under less stressful circumstances. This would make for a more efficient community in terms of community health and would lessen the incidence of neuroses in the community so that the people will be better able to face their work the next day and perhaps create what we hear members on the other side continually talking about; namely, increased productivity.

It reduces the traffic conflict which prevents accidents and this again is a saving in repair costs and the expenditure involved in the hospitalisation of injured people. Therefore it is money well spent for these purposes.

I hope that the City of Subiaco, the City of Stirling, and other local authorities the Premier has urged should not accept Commonwealth funds will be a little more responsible about the situation and will appreciate what that Government is attempting to do for the benefit of the people of Australia.

The Minister's answer to recent questions must have raised some doubt about the usefulness of the environment council because apparently no notice is taken of any recommendations made by it. Certainly no development is halted because of any recommendations made. The answer given by the Minister will not give much heart to people concerned about the environment in general.

I wish to spend a few moments talking about inflation. This subject has been referred to by a number of members so I feel I am entitled to my sixpenneth as well. I can vividly recall a debate Mr MacKinnon and I took part in at the community development centre in Selby Street. At the time price control was an issue in this State and we had produced legislation to do something about it, and the Australian Government was doing likewise. I can remember the marked difference in our two approaches. I am sure Mr MacKinnon will correct me if he feels I do not do him justice, but he said that price control was everything bad and that it led to a shortage of goods and to corruption because people hid things under the counter and did all sorts of other awful things.

On the other hand, I argued that if people were concerned about the increases in incomes and wages granted because of applications by the trade union movement to obtain their increased share and to gain justice for its members, then we could not reasonably expect to achieve anything without the back-up of price control.

It is not really debate useful to the effectiveness of price control itself because one is no good without the other. We need both price control and a curb on wages.

The theories I was promoting were only part of a general system of economic organisation which was necessary if we were to do anything to control inflation. The important aspect is that price control in itself is not sufficient. It can be only one of many changes which must be made.

Here I find myself—for about the only time—in agreement with statements made by the Premier who has proposed an almost similar policy to that which I was proposing at that time and I would hope that he perhaps learnt something from what I said.

It was interesting to hear one member in particular say that if we were to do anything about the problem of prices and wages we should lengthen the working day by four hours. In opposition to that, it was revealing to come across an article in *The National Times* of the 11th to the 16th December, 1972. It was a review of a book by Mark Rien entitled, in German, "4-Tage-Woch" which, in English, means "Four-day-week".

The book reports the results of a re-organisation of the working week in some German factories which also have German names. One particular company, which is a subsidiary of the American Pantasote group, found itself faced with a chronic staff shortage, because instead of seeking work in the factory, people were moving out to the attractions of nearby Munich. The company was faced with very serious problems. The solution it applied was to reduce the week to a four-day week. It did not try to increase the hours or do anything like that. It simply shortened the working week, not the hours. It operated a ten-hour day, four days a week, and although some complaints were received from unions about the length of the day, the workers involved and the company found that the productivity increased quite dramatically. In the first year it improved by 15 to 20 per cent and the average output rose from 27.8 to 33.2 units per hour.

It is possible to find solutions to improve productivity and I mentioned some of them in my speech on the Supply Bill. I consider that management expertise is lacking in many companies and I think Miss Elliott mentioned this also. The problem is not always with the worker on the shop floor but very largely today it is with the management which lacks efficiency.

I have read articles concerning the situation in Japanese companies. I think Miss Elliott referred to how their management expertise when applied to American companies achieved the same outstanding results. We need not point the finger only at the worker in this country. It is time members opposite looked seriously at themselves instead of pointing the finger at us and perhaps the people who support members opposite should look seriously at those members to ascertain whether in

fact they are efficient or whether it is possible to improve the productivity not only of businesses and workers, but also of Parliament itself.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A lot of unionists support us too, you know.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would not dispute that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am glad you don't because it is a fact.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is a fact, just the same as many business people support us.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Misguided fellows!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is what we both might say in relation to the situation. I think the working people who support the party of those opposite are probably a little more misguided than the businessmen who support us.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Probably they are some of those who have not had access to the proper information in order to arrive at the correct decision.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: We have more indentured tradesmen on this side than you have on yours.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I suppose that proves something, but I do not know what.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It sure does!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I just referred to the misguided working men. Perhaps it is because of their vote that the election turned out the way it did and the present Government is in office!

I will close by making a brief reference to the effect the presidency of Mr Nixon has had. It is no secret that the New York Stock Exchange has reached its lowest ebb since the depression and I suggest that Mr Nixon's presidency is responsible.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Our stocks are not far behind at present. Is the reason the same?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It would be the same reason I would say.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, we certainly did go all the way with Mr Nixon before the Labor Government had an opportunity to withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

The influence of the American financial situation is not confined to only America, but is felt throughout the world. Again, I would be bold enough to predict that once Mr Nixon decides he can stay in office no longer, we will see a remarkable rejuvenation of the American Stock Exchange and the money markets around

the world in general will benefit, including those in this State. Mr Nixon's residence in office has depressed American businessmen for far too long.

This Government is also fortunate to be in office when the deposit restrictions have been lifted. Mr Tonkin would have been very pleased if that had occurred before the last State election. Obviously it will have a significant effect on the opportunities to borrow funds from overseas. I think we can be pleased for Western Australia that the Australian Government feels it is possible to lift that restriction now. It had sound reason for imposing the restriction as those who have studied the economic scene would understand; but it certainly has not been lifted any too soon. It has meant this Government is very fortunate to receive the benefits that will flow, just as it received the benefits of the lifting of the iron ore embargo back in 1961.

There are many matters about which I would like to speak but no doubt there will be other opportunities to do so. I would have particularly liked to dwell for some time on the education policies of the Government. I do not think the Government needs to be assured by me that there is a great deal of consternation among those in the teaching profession as to the extent to which the Government might attempt to implement its very unwise policies.

**THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North)** [5.46 p.m.]: At the present time Perth is in short supply of bananas. This morning the Metropolitan Market report stated—

Supplies are low, values dear.

I have here two bananas which were grown in Kununurra by Messrs. C. and J. Wilford. I assure members the bananas are of fine quality, and this you may judge for yourself later on, Mr President, when I give them to you.

The growers of these bananas will never get their product to Perth unless there is a change in policy—mainly State policy but also Federal policy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think they grow bigger ones in Darwin.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Much larger ones are grown in Kununurra. The bananas which were initially produced in Kununurra were a great problem to the grower because they were so huge he had difficulty in marketing them. One family cut them into eight pieces for distribution. The grower has now solved that problem and has them down to a better size. I do not say that in jest.

Here are the reasons we need changes in policy. We are growing bananas in the north of Western Australia yet the growers will not be able to get their product to the Perth market because they

cannot compete in the face of the freight rates offered to North Queensland growers. To me, that is an unrealistic situation.

We need a form of regional growth grant, which was mentioned to me by a member today and has been suggested by other people previously; or we need a form of freight subsidy to provide return cargoes for any freight system which will allow produce to be brought from the north to the markets in Perth. Many things can be grown in the lands of the north which cannot be grown in the winter season in the south. I have dealt sufficiently with bananas.

In order to solve the problems in the north, some growers may have to turn to the field of hydroponics. The moment that word is uttered most people shudder and say it is uneconomic. This has been proved to be wrong because a company called Magic Gardens Inc., which is now operating in Phoenix, Arizona, USA, is turning out something like 3.5 million tons of produce a year under controlled climates. This might be the answer in some of the remote regions of this State which have water problems, because the controlled climate under hydroponics uses less water than normal agriculture does; and it might also solve the problem of freight rates.

However, I would like it to be known that it will require Government assistance to get it off the ground. I hope that if anyone becomes interested in hydroponic agriculture in remote areas at a later date, the Government will consider giving an equivalent grant to the out-of-season freight subsidies applying to fruit and vegetables for that particular region. The transport of fruit and vegetables from the south of the State to the north, or to remote areas, is subsidised in certain seasons.

One of the current problems of agriculture in the area is labour. In the north there is a great shortage of farm labour. Recently I heard from a man who is running an experimental agriculture project at Pandanus Park situated approximately 50 miles south of Derby on the Fitzroy River—between Derby and Broome. He found he could not obtain farm labour, even though he was paying the right sort of money as well as offering full board and accommodation. He said to me, "I cannot get labour. The Commonwealth Employment Service cannot offer me labour at this stage." I requested the Commonwealth Employment Service to tell me the number of people on unemployment relief in Derby and Broome—the number was 132.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Is that for both towns?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perhaps they are all lion tamers or glass blowers!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes, pos-

sibly 68 in one town and 64 in the other. This led me to look at the problem of unemployment relief in an area without a large variety of jobs. Of course, in the north, and particularly in the Kimberley, one does not have a large choice of jobs. I wonder whether it would be possible for the State Government to recommend to the Federal Government, with the support of the unions and the Employers Federation, that unemployment benefits be paid to a local authority, possibly a shire council. We all know that any person who remains unemployed for too long finds that he or she does not want to work at all. Such a person usually lowers his standard of living to fit in with the money paid through social services. This is bad for the nation's economy, as well as being bad for the individual.

My suggestion is that local authorities could register the unemployed people, and employers could then approach the authority when they wanted workers. It is recognised that a man must be paid an hourly rate equivalent to that paid in his trade or occupation. To cope with this principle, an unemployed person could cut out his weekly unemployment benefit by working for so many hours at the rate at which he would normally work in his trade or occupation.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That idea has a lot of worth, particularly in the Shire of Mt. Magnet.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It has a lot of worth and we need to do something now. This unemployment problem does not apply to just one ethnic group; it applies to all people in Australia who are on unemployment benefits. This would also give an unemployed person time to look for a job if he genuinely wants one. A man could choose which days he wanted to work to cut out his unemployment relief. If the local authority has a job available for a particular tradesman, a man with these skills could be used. Unskilled labourers could possibly be used for cleaning up the town, footpath maintenance, and road maintenance. In other words, these unemployed persons could titivate up the various towns, but not do any other person out of a job. It is very necessary to safeguard tradesmen and others in these towns.

I now turn to decentralisation. I am most concerned that this word is mouthed by members of Parliament and others who, I feel, do not really understand the word and know what it is all about. Unless we really start to decentralise, the people of Australia will never get the Government back where it should be; that is, back to the people.

I would like to point out that in Kununurra, the centralist policy has caused a rather unusual situation. This is the only cotton-growing area in the State, and the

Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation employed a cotton researcher at the Kimberley Research Station. The Commonwealth has now made a bureaucratic decision, under the Federal Government, that the cotton researcher must be removed from Kununurra. This man was researching tropical agriculture and the growth of cotton, and he has now gone to New South Wales to carry out his research there.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: They should have kept their cotton-picking paws off him!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: This was a disastrous move, not only for the cotton industry in this State but also for the national cotton industry. I honestly believe that the Wee Waa cotton industry in New South Wales will eventually collapse, and I will state my reasons for this belief. Whilst in New South Wales I worked for the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation as a senior cloud seeding officer. I carried out some experiments in the New England region and I found that this area had no fixed climatology—it had no climatology that could be relied upon. Rain was spasmodic, and I considered then it would be a very bad area for cotton because cotton needs a stable climate.

For the first two years after the industry at Wee Waa was set up I thought that possibly I had made a mistake because good cotton was grown. However, those first two seasons were drought years for the surrounding farmers and pastoralists. I then realised that I was possibly right because the area had been made wealthy initially on wheat and sheep. An area does not become wealthy on wheat and sheep if it continually has two successive years of drought. Since that time Wee Waa cotton has been in trouble with floods, and what the management considers to be unseasonable weather. In fact, it is normal weather because the area does not have a fixed climatology. I have asked the Minister for Agriculture to investigate the situation in an endeavour to get the cotton researcher back to this State.

Another problem in relation to decentralisation is that we thought our inland roads in the north had a high priority rating with the Federal Government. Unfortunately, in February of this year the Federal Government notified the Tonkin Government that it now considers the inland roads of the north to have a low priority rating. As members have seen from the Premier's statement and his comments in the Press, he has endeavoured to find money so that we can upgrade at least some of our inland roads.

The Federal Government, having said these roads were on a low priority, now comes to the party and says that the

Commonwealth will look after some of the roads. We are now in a state of confusion because we do not know what the Federal Government will do or how it intends to tackle the problem.

We do not know whether the Federal Government will make a grant back to the States so that the State may build these roads through its Main Roads Department, or whether that Government will do the work through its own roads department. So here we have a centralist decision which is causing us great confusion. I will be most disturbed if the money does not come back to the States to be spent by their Main Roads Departments. Our Main Roads Department has learnt from the mistakes it has made over many years in the past and it is now a very competent builder of roads in our rural areas, with the tremendous problems connected with road building in those areas.

Another problem of centralism—this time within the States; it has nothing to do with the Federal Government because it is a State decision—is in respect of the development of the Packsaddle Plains in the Kununurra district. We find again that bureaucracy—or the nebulous “they”—will make decisions to suit itself. On the one hand they will say “We must look after the environment; and we must look after the health of our people.” So when they—the bureaucrats—allocated farmlets on the Packsaddle Plains they said “To protect your health we will not allow you to live on that land. To protect you we will say that you cannot live on the land because you might be affected by the chemicals sprayed in the general area.” They completely neglected the fact that the prevailing winds in the region carry the spray away from the sprayed areas and away from the areas where the people in the farmlets would like to live.

The bureaucrats also said “We must not allow people to rape the land. We must have people regenerating the land.” So what did they do? They said “We will give you only a 10-year lease on the land; we will not allow you to own it and we will not give you a longer lease because we do not know how you will treat the land.” Mr President, can you tell me that any farmer would not rape the land under those conditions?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He would not even have time to clear it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is possibly so. He must find some way to get money out of that land to create a living for himself, and then to get back any money he has spent within 10 years. Therefore he will not spend money on regeneration under those conditions.

We find the same bureaucrats who are so keen to look after people have made a decision to drain water from the sprayed areas back into Lake Kununurra; and

Lake Kununurra happens to be a secondary water supply for the Kununurra district. I took up this matter when the last Government made an announcement in this House, as members may recall.

So these bureaucrats, although they are supposedly interested in looking after the health of people, when it suits them are quite willing to forgo this protection.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You said "the Government" last time and now you say "the bureaucrats".

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I did not say that; I said that the previous Government made an announcement, and I brought it up in the House at that time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You accused the Government on that occasion.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It was not so much an accusation as a query because I could not believe that the bureaucrats would allow water from the sprayed areas to be drawn back into the water supply. I am merely informing the House that I brought the matter to the notice of the Government at that time.

The same bureaucrats—or their ilk—whilst saying that people cannot live on the farmlets but must be protected from the spray drift, set up a household for a Public Works Department waterman slap bang in the middle of the cotton growing area, and he catches the spray drift from all sides regardless of the prevailing winds. That waterman has been living there for 7½ years. I asked him whether he had undergone any medical tests, and the following is the result of a test he undertook—

You recently underwent a blood test for cholinesterase and organochlorides. I wish to advise that the result of this test was satisfactory.

That is dated the 4th July, 1974. That man has been living there for 7½ years and coping spray drift from all sides as a result of a bureaucratic decision. Yet the same bureaucrats will not allow people to live on the farmlets they wish to take up to produce for the good of the nation.

I turn now to the confusion caused by centralism. We take this time a Federal policy.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am sure you will further confuse it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not think I will; I do not think this issue could be any more confused. I refer to the compulsory deposit of overseas capital investments. I point out that the present Federal Government insisted on a 25 per cent interest-free deposit being placed with the Reserve Bank. This was subsequently increased to 3½ per cent; then it was reduced to 25 per cent. Now it has been reduced to 5 per cent. I say that the 5 per cent requirement should not exist. It exists only as a face saver because the

Government is saying "We cannot be wholly wrong, so we will keep it at 5 per cent". Australia needs overseas capital particularly for projects in remote areas and for large-capital projects because the Australian investor firstly does not have the money and, secondly, can see better investment opportunities in the city because at the moment Government policy is forcing people away from country areas and making it harder for development to take place there. It is slightly easier only by comparison with the city.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Which Government?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The Federal Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think you should check the figures relating to the drift from rural areas to the cities over the last 10 years. They are quite shocking.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Frankly, I have not looked at them for the simple reason that the development in my region has been so high that it has been almost unreal. Development in the Kimberleys has been 6½ times the national average and development in the Pilbara has been 12½ times the national average. It is only recently from the implementation of the policies of the Federal Government that the people of the north have been saying to me, even with the great expansion we have had since the early 1960s, that they can no longer afford to stay in the north but must move to the city. Of course, I cannot say what this drift will amount to until the statisticians produce the latest figures. However, never before have so many people in my area come to me with this problem, and say that they can no longer afford to stay in the country.

I know that even the unions have problems in regard to decentralisation and I am pleased to see that this Government is doing something about it. It is looking for office accommodation in the Pilbara for the various unions. I am sure that Mr Cooley would be pleased to know this because we believe that a union should be well organised. As one of the indentured tradesmen on this side of the House I am a believer in unionism. However, what I do not like to see is union members being intimidated by their hierarchy. I am not referring in this case to Mr Cooley; it is just one of those unfortunate things that a union man can be intimidated when union members must make an open decision *en masse*. For that reason, I should like to see secret ballots come to unionism. As I have said, a union man can be intimidated by his mates, by the hierarchy or even by his employer.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I would like to see a secret ballot for the election of Liberal-Country Party Cabinets.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is a different matter altogether, but as time is getting short I will not go into that.

However, I approve of the present system where a leader can elect the Cabinet with which he must work because as members opposite would know, under secret voting systems it is possible that a group of ambitious men and women will get together and vote out the better candidates in order to get themselves in.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think that this happened recently in the Liberal Party at Federal level, did it not?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I think members opposite all know that this has happened under the secret ballot system for office bearers. I do not point the finger at any particular party; I will let members opposite make their own judgment on that.

I agree with some points made by Mr Dellar concerning charges in this State. He is quite right in saying that some of the charges which are imposed are a bit rough on the people. But I should also like to point out that the Federal Government said the State Premiers could increase their charges if they wished to finance their State operations because they were not going to receive any increase in allocation from the Federal Government. So, of course, the Treasurer was put in a rather unfortunate position and members who heard my comments in this Chamber recently would know my feelings on this matter. I have pointed out by way of interjection that if anybody in this House claims that this House is undemocratically elected—I do not believe it is—he must also admit that the other House is undemocratically elected because we operate under the same franchise.

In closing, I should like to express thanks to the Minister for Justice, on behalf of my constituents, for appointing a magistrate to the Port Hedland area. This is long overdue and as members would know, I have been seeking such an appointment since I have been in this House. On behalf of the people of Marble Bar I also thank the Minister for Mines, the Minister for Works and the Treasurer, who adopted my suggestion that the water supply should go into the Marble Bar battery.

I should also like to thank the Minister for Education, on behalf of the people of the North Province and other remote areas, for taking the unprecedented action of recognising the difference between the running costs of hostels in various areas. He has doubled the subsidy for city hostels and trebled the subsidy for the hostel in the Port Hedland region, which is the most expensive hostel to run in the State and for this I thank him. I know that the Government is also considering other ways of helping isolated students. I should like to personally congratulate the Hon. Margaret McAleer for the fine example of

decorum and commonsense she displayed in her maiden speech yesterday. It is a sample of what I think should exist in this House of Review. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

*House adjourned at 6.14 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 8th August, 1974

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (50): ON NOTICE

#### 1. POLICE

##### *Plans to Deal with Incidents*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

In view of the fact that acting Police Commissioner Sims advised me through the Minister for Police on 29th March that plans for dealing with future "police" incidents have been prepared and it is believed they would be effective, would he advise me of the new measures introduced?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The reserve task force has been organised, equipment has been supplied, and further equipment is being acquired.

#### 2. FISHERIES

##### *Nurseries: Dumping of Cars and Tyres*

Mr FLETCHER, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Is he aware of the disposal problem of dumped used cars and tyres—see *The West Australian*, page 3, of 11th May, 1973?
- (2) If so, with a view to the advantageous disposal of same and in view of the fact that Cockburn Sound, for example, is a diminishing fish nursery, will he give consideration to—
  - (a) making sure that old vehicles are free of oil and grease or other contamination before then sinking them at selected locations in the Sound or elsewhere; and
  - (b) suitably weighting tyres by pumping cement or concrete into the area of tyres usually occupied by rims and inner tubes prior to disposal in the manner suggested in