

It is stopping people who, for genuine reasons, want access to building land in the district. One particular area to which I refer is Carilla which is the townsite which serves the Pickering Brook area which, in turn, is a very important fruit-growing region in the metropolitan area. Indeed, it produces 80 per cent of the stone fruits consumed in the metropolitan area and produces 20 per cent of the export apples. If the former Minister for Agriculture were in his seat he would be now jumping up and down at that remark. Also 8 per cent of export pears are produced around Pickering Brook.

So it can be seen that it is extremely important to the State. The people concerned are finding it difficult to get access to building blocks and I urge the Government to give serious consideration to relaxing the policy of the Water Supply Department in areas such as Carilla where, for specific purposes, it is necessary for land to be available. If it is not made available those concerned will be seriously disadvantaged.

I did wish to touch on another subject, but as I desire to deal with it at length, I will leave it until a later date.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 6.09 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 6th August, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

1. INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION

Amendments to Awards

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Regulation 47 of the Industrial Arbitration Act requires parties who seek amendments to an award to prove service of a notice of motion by obtaining a signature from each named respondent to the award?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that some awards name more than 100 respondents and that considerable inconvenience is occasioned to both the staff of the Industrial Commission and the unions concerned in the processing of these documents?

- (3) Will the Minister make some arrangements of a temporary nature to alleviate this inconvenience and subsequent delay in the amendments to awards pending an amendment to the Regulation?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The Western Australian Industrial Commission is taking action to amend the Regulations concerned to alleviate the inconvenience. The amended Regulations will be gazetted as soon as possible.

2.

EDUCATION

Pupils: Transport Costs

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

- (1) Is the Minister mindful of the fact that for parents on low income, with two or more school age children, bus fares may cost in excess of \$2.00 per week thereby causing hardship and absences from school?
- (2) (a) Will the Minister give consideration as to how this cost may be reduced for these parents; or
- (b) extend the free bus service now available in most country areas to all school children?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Parents are responsible for a maximum of 50 cents per week for each child travelling to and from school by bus. The Government meets the cost of fares in excess of 50 cents per week and also subsidises students' bus travel outside school hours.
- (2) (a) The current level of assistance is the maximum that can be provided at the present time. The matter will be kept under review and should additional funds become available, consideration will be given to increasing the assistance.
- (b) Answered by (a).

3.

HOUSING

Bunbury

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) How many units have been programmed to be built by the State Housing Commission in Bunbury during 1974-75 for—
 - (a) rental; and
 - (b) purchase?

- (2) What categories of units will be built?
- (3) (a) Have contracts been let for this work;
- (b) what will be the cost of the completed units; and
- (c) when may it be expected that the units will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) (a) 50 units, including 4 units under the Aboriginal Housing Scheme.
- (b) 10 units.
- (2) Two 4-bedroom units.
Twelve 3-bedroom units.
Thirty bedsitter pensioner units.
Sixteen 1-bedroom pensioner units.
- (3) (a) Tenders for twelve (12) units have been called and will close on 19th August, 1974. It is intended to call tenders for a further two (2) units in October, and for the forty-six (46) pensioner units in February, 1975.
- (b) Completed construction cost is estimated at \$772 000.
- (c) It is anticipated that the twelve (12) units currently under tender will be completed in February/March, 1975. Completion dates for the remaining units should be within eight months of the close of tenders.

4. CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Election Promises

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

In relation to the development of culture and the arts, will the Minister advise when the Government's pre-election promises will be fulfilled of—

- (a) acquiring a city theatre;
- (b) establishing a craft gallery;
- (c) building a new central art gallery?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) to (c) At the present stage of negotiation and planning, any announcement would be premature.

TRADE UNIONS

Alleged Statement by Premier

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

- (1) Was the Premier of Western Australia, Sir Charles Court, correctly reported in the issue of *The West Australian* of the 25th June, 1974, when, speaking at the Annual Report Award Dinner of the New South Wales Division of the Australian Institute of Management, he said "I wish today's management—both Government and Private—would realise that the workers of this country know better than anyone that the real work of the nation is not being done. They know the unions are teaching them to bludge. Most of them hate this situation, but they also know that softness has gone right through to the top."?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes" is this opinion of the Premier that "the unions are teaching workers to bludge", subscribed to by the Western Australian Government?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) I am advised that the comments referred to are, of necessity, a condensation of all that was stated in a lengthy address. It is a reasonable extract. Like all extracts, it would be better if it could be read in context with the total remarks.
- (2) The Hon. Member would know that neither the Premier nor the Government has, or would assert, that all unions are "teaching them to bludge". But it would be idle to deny there are some blatant cases where workmen, because of militant union policies, are not being allowed to give the work performance they are capable of, and which they are desirous of giving.

6. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Coal Consumption

The Hon. T. O. PERRY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the tonnage of—
- (a) open-cut coal;
- (b) deep-mine coal;
- currently being used by the State Electricity Commission?
- (2) What is the break down of quantities used at the various power stations?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) (a) 42 220 tonnes per fortnight;
(b) 17 781 tonnes per fortnight.
- (2) Muja power station—42 560 tonnes per fortnight.
Bunbury power station—17 441 tonnes per fortnight.
Kwinana power station—Nil.
South Fremantle power station—Nil.
East Perth power station—Nil.

7. RURAL PETROL SUBSIDY

Federal Policy

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

In view of the inference in the reports in the ABC news of the 31st July, and *The West Australian* newspaper dated the 1st August, 1974, that the Prime Minister made a promise to State Premiers that the rural petrol subsidy will be abolished—

- (a) did the Western Australian Premier oppose the abolition of the subsidy;
- (b) did any State Premier request the abolition of the subsidy;
- (c) was the Prime Minister advised that all primary production costs would increase and further inflate the national economy if rural petrol subsidies were abolished?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (a) to (c) The Prime Minister, at the Premiers' Conference in June merely advised the Premiers of certain actions which were going to be taken by the Commonwealth Government ahead of the Commonwealth Government's Budget. These items included the withdrawal of the petrol subsidy.

There was certainly no request by any State Premier for the abolition of the subsidy and, in fact, to the best of the Premier's knowledge, all were strongly opposed to its abolition.

The Prime Minister has been advised in the strongest of terms by the W.A. Government that we oppose the withdrawal of the subsidy because it will not only increase costs of primary producers and people in remote areas, with consequential inflationary effects, but will also be a

further blow to decentralisation. It will give people in remote areas a feeling that their special needs are not understood in Canberra. The Premier is hopeful that an opportunity may arise to have the matter further discussed when the Premiers meet in Canberra on Tuesday, although the Commonwealth appears to be adamant.

8. GREAT NORTHERN HIGHWAY

Graders on Maintenance

The Hon. R. F. Claughton for the Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) How many graders are currently engaged on full-time maintenance grading of each of the following sections of the Great Northern Highway—
(a) Meekatharra—Mt. Newman;
(b) Mt. Newman—Port Hedland?
- (2) Has the number of graders engaged on this work been recently reduced?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "No" is it intended to retain the current number of graders on these sections of the highway?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) (a) Two.
(b) Two.
- (2) No, but there has been a recent change in arrangements in regard to the use of other graders on a part time basis.
- (3) Yes.

9. POLICE STATIONS AND COURTHOUSES

Number and Cost

The Hon. T. O. Perry for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) For each of the financial years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and to date in 1974-75, where have police stations and/or law courts been constructed, or are being constructed, for the Crown Law Department and Police Department?
- (2) What were the erection costs for those buildings completed?
- (3) What is the expected completion costs of those presently under construction?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Year	Project	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3	
				\$		\$	
1971/72	Mt. Magnet Police Station—Erection	91 913		
	Karratha Police Station—Erection		173 918	
	Belmont Police Station—Additions	21 189		
	Cannington Police Station—Additions	15 798		
	Victoria Park Police Station—Additions	4 032		
	Wagin Police Station—Erection	56 926		
	Lockridge Police Station—Erection	37 866		
	Kalgoorlie Court House—Erection	413 050		
1972/73	Southern Cross Police Station—Erection		173 103	
	South Hedland Police Station—Erection		208 554	
	Perth Police Headquarters—Erection		3 933 000	
	Leonora Police Station—Erection	129 860		
	Tambellup Police Station—Erection	95 070		
	Rockingham Police Station—Additions	42 269		
	Carnarvon Court House—Erection		217 170	
	Pinjarra Court House—Additions	5 991		
	Mandurah Court House—Additions	8 781		
1973/74	Derby Police Station—Additions		138 488	
	Coolgardie Police Station—Erection		142 000	
	Busselton Court House		204 082	
	Halls Creek Court-room		13 680	
1974/75	(Carry over from 1973/74 programme—now at tender) Laverton Police Station						211 000

10. SCHOOLS

Admission of Five-year-olds

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister advise when the expert committee inquiring into matters concerned with the schooling of five year olds in 1975 will submit its report?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

The committee was constituted in June and asked to submit initial recommendations to me as early as possible. I expect to hear from the committee in the near future.

(d) when a public servant has been cleared as properly dedicated, will he become part of a separate elite within the service;

(e) how is it proposed to deal with officers who suffer a lapse of dedication?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(a) to (e) The selection of suitable staff for regional offices will be carried out in accordance with normal Public Service practice which would take into account the particular attributes needed to perform the duties of the respective positions.

12.

SCHOOLS

Admission of Five-year-olds

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

Further to the reply to my question on the 31st July, 1974, regarding pre-school age enrolments, will the Minister advise—

(a) who are the members of the expert committee;

(b) which schools within the North Metropolitan Province have been advised that they may be required to enrol pre-school age children in 1975?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(a) Dr D. Mossenson, Chairman, Assistant Director-General of Education and Chairman of the Pre-School Education Board.

11. PUBLIC SERVICE

Regional Centres

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

In view of the Government's policy statement that it will set up regional centres "staffed by public servants selected for their dedication to the regional concept of administration and decision making", will the Minister advise—

(a) the method by which this dedication will be determined;

(b) will scales showing degrees of dedication be developed;

(c) will courses of indoctrination be introduced to ensure public servants are properly brain-washed with this philosophy;

Mr M. Angus, Superintendent Research, Education Department.

Mr C. R. Bridge, President of the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations.

Miss W. Froude, Headmistress of Westminster Junior Primary School.

Miss N. Harken, First Mistress of Carlisle Primary School and Vice-President of the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia.

Mr D. Hewitt, Chairman of the Bedford Park Pre-School Committee.

Mrs B. R. Jones, Director of Kindergartens, Pre-School Education Board.

Dr A. Little, Head of the Child Studies Centre of the University of Western Australia and a Member of the Pre-School Education Board.

Professor W. Macdonald, Professor of Child Health at the University of Western Australia and a Member of the Australian Pre-Schools' Committee.

Miss J. Morton, Superintendent of Junior Primary Schools, Education Department, and Member of the Pre-School Education Board.

Mr S. Palmer, Director of Primary Education.

- (b) No school has received such advice.

13.

EDUCATION

Finances

The Hon. Lyla Elliott, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) For each of the financial years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74, what was the capital expenditure on Government primary and secondary education from—
 - (a) Loan Funds;
 - (b) Specific Purpose Grants other than from the Australian Schools' Commission;
 - (c) Australian Schools' Commission Grants?
- (2) What funds have been made available to the States through the Australian Schools' Commission for the year 1974 for—
 - (a) recurrent expenditure; and
 - (b) capital expenditure?
- (3) How have the grants made available through the Australian Schools' Commission been spent

for the six months the 1st January to the 30th June, 1974, and how will they be spent for the period the 1st July to the 31st December 1974, under the following categories—

- (a) general recurrent;
- (b) general building;
- (c) libraries;
- (d) disadvantaged schools;
- (e) special education; and
- (f) in-service training (excluding teachers' centres),

specifying the number of additional teaching staff, non-teaching professional staff, and ancillary and para-professional staff under each category?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1)—

	Education—Finance	
	Primary	Secondary
	\$	\$
(a) 1969/70	7 837 244	2 432 545
1970/71	6 417 566	3 462 174
1971/72	5 288 671	4 625 051
1972/73	5 869 412	6 671 878
1973/74	Not available	

Source—Annual Reports.

- (b) (i) Science Laboratories—Secondary.
1969/71 \$530 400 per annum.

1972/75 1 870 035 for quadrennium.

- (ii) Libraries — Secondary (funds available for calendar and not financial years).

1969/71 \$503 200 per annum.

1972/74 A total sum of \$1.612 million was made available and has been fully committed but works are still in progress.

- (iii) States' Schools Grants Act (1972)—(funds available for calendar and not financial years.)
\$2 740 000.

- (c) Australian Schools' Commission Grants were only introduced early in 1974. Actual expenditure cannot be assessed until contracts have been let and progress payments made.

- (2) (a) and (b) See schedules 1 and 2 (page 47) States' Grants (Schools) Act 1973.

- (3) Certified statements of expenditure for the first six months of 1974 are not yet available. It is

anticipated, however, that the expenditure over the whole year in each of the programmes referred to, will be in accordance with the amounts specified in table 14.5 (page 143) of the report "Schools in Australia" May 1973 (Karmel Report). It is to be realised, however, that these amounts cover a two-year period and expenditure by December 1974 would be approximately half of the amounts specified.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Speech: Personal Explanation

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [4.50 p.m.]: Mr President, I wish to make a personal explanation. On page 8—

The PRESIDENT: Order, please! The honourable member will sit down and I will call him in a moment. Standing Order 74 provides—

By the indulgence of the Council, a Member may explain matters of a personal nature, although there be no question before the Council; but such matters may not be debated.

The question is that leave be granted. All those in favour say "Aye" and all those against say "No". As the voting is in the affirmative, leave is granted.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: On page 8 of *Hansard* Proof Number No. 1, in the report of my speech initiating the Address-in-Reply debate, the word "not" in the first paragraph of the second column has been omitted. In referring to the progress of the Pilbara in the last decade, I am reported as having said—

It has been a colossal achievement by any standard, but statistics do reveal that we have progressed as far as real decentralisation is concerned.

The sentence should have read—

It has been a colossal achievement by any standard, but statistics reveal that we have not progressed as far as real decentralisation is concerned.

In point of fact the draft I was given to check did include the word "not". I have discussed the matter with the Chief *Hansard* Reporter and the wording will be corrected in the bound copy of *Hansard*.

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st August.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [4.52 p.m.]: I wish to congratulate all those members who were re-elected and those who were newly elected at the last election, and these congratulations flow on to the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Chairmen of Committees, and to

those members appointed to standing committees. Such appointments have culminated in the honour bestowed upon you, Sir, by the unanimous vote of this House, of being appointed as our President.

Members of Parliament throughout the world speak at length on subjects they have studied; subjects which are in the interests of the people they represent, as well as of the State or country they represent. I feel that in some places these debates are degenerating to political backbiting without benefit being shown to the people whom we represent. Public opinion of today shows the politician or member of Parliament in a very poor light indeed. In some instances I believe people consider that Parliament has degenerated to the point where it has become an arena for "bite" and "counter-bite".

We all know that parties representing free enterprise and other parties representing socialistic policies must naturally conflict when it comes to debate in a House of Parliament. However, surely we can, if we try hard enough, reduce the degree of backbiting that members have shown in other places, and I would not like to see it happen here. I consider that debate should be healthy and strong but there should be a reduction in the degree of backbiting that has been taking place. This House should be a House of Review and I hope the Australian Labor Party will give greater consideration to allowing its members in this House to have a free vote on all subjects.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is a pity you did not show that example when in Opposition.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I can say here, on my honour, as a member of Parliament and as a man, that in my case that has not happened. I defy any member to show otherwise and to produce proof. Further, should that be suggested by any member, by way of backbiting—which I am suggesting we should reduce—I ask that proof positive be given on the floor of this House and on the same day that any such accusation is made.

We have heard already in this House our Premier (Sir Charles Court) criticised because he has dared to criticise the actions—I should say he has made constructive criticism of actions—taken by the Federal Government. He is considered, by some members, to be "anti-Whitlam"; on a personal basis. I would like to point out that it is the duty of any State Premier to defend the State in which he lives and which he represents, and if any Federal Government—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do members in this House regard him as being "anti-Whitlam"?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes, it has been said already.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would you care to name who they are?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: If the honourable member cares to go through *Hansard* he will find them.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is not so much the backbiting we are concerned about, but the back scratching.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is this sort of thing I am trying to cut out. That is the sort of comment that leads to useless debate, so I will continue. I would like to say that Sir Charles Court has already been criticised, and I would like to ask members: Can their memories be so short that they cannot recall that already this year the previous Premier (the Hon. J. T. Tonkin), and Cabinet members of the previous State Government, also criticised the Federal Whitlam Government for some of the actions it has taken. As I said before, it is the duty of every State Premier, regardless of political colour, to look after the affairs of Western Australia and its interests and to attack any policy that is not in the interests of the State despite the political colour of the Federal Government implementing that policy.

Criticism, of course, is necessary, but when it is presented it must be constructive criticism. There are two points I would like to raise on behalf of my constituents in the North Province. I consider that the policy relating to the rural petrol subsidy is one that will cause severe hardship, not only to the people in the remote areas of the State—including the North Province—but also to those in the metropolitan regions; this will be felt within approximately 18 months to two years. I say this because I believe it will, and must, increase the cost of primary production. Such a policy will also reduce the level of primary production, and its imposition, plus other difficulties, which make country living difficult, will cause country people to drift from the country to the city and thus increase the population of the cities in a nation where already the percentage of the urban population is too high. We cannot afford to have the numbers in our country areas decreasing and the numbers in our cities increasing.

I have written to the Prime Minister, as a member of Parliament representing the North Province, and have pointed out to him that this is what I consider to be the correct position, but he has not yet replied.

If we have a look at history—modern history—we find that the policies being accepted by the Australian people at the moment—the policies which are forced upon them by their own decision, of course, as a result of the last election—are almost

identical with those which were carried into force in Yugoslavia in the 1960s. Those policies were the cause of many people going from the country areas to the cities. The Government of that country, as did the Federal Government in Australia, promised it would restrain those people, and this it did. The men and women who went from the country to the cities were retrained and were given jobs in the cities.

After several years' operation of that system Yugoslavia found that it had run low on primary production and it is now trying to get the people concerned back into the country areas. We, the Australian people, through our choice of Government, are doing exactly the same as was done by the Yugoslavian Government.

That leads me to make a plea to the present State Government to reconsider an action which will cause inconvenience to people in remote areas and, in turn, will later inconvenience people living in the city. In this instance I refer to the 30 per cent increase in State Shipping Service freight rates. I do have sympathy with the Treasurer and Government Ministers because I know, as everyone else knows, that the increase in State Shipping Service freights will only cover that increase imposed by additional wages.

I have written to Sir Charles Court and I have suggested to him that he consider, in the next Budget, that instead of a 30 per cent increase it should be 10 per cent in the first year, 10 per cent in the second year, and 10 per cent in the third year. I know this will mean a greater imposition on the Treasury and that there will be a greater deficit each year. However, my reason for putting forward the suggestion is that increased freights will decrease trade for Western Australia. The people in the remote areas will increase their trade with the Eastern States, and will have their goods brought in by road and rail transport from those States.

I have previously given examples of people in the north trading with the Eastern States, and I have pointed out that this has been happening for several years now in Kununurra, Wyndham, and Halls Creek. If the State Shipping Service rates become too costly—and they are now—Western Australian suppliers will suffer because of the loss of trade to remote areas. The moment that trade is lost it will affect the cargoes carried by the State Shipping Service and they will decrease. As a result, the service will become more and more uneconomical. So we will have the old cliché of the dog chasing its tail; up will go prices to cover inefficiency.

So I have suggested to the Premier that, in relation to what I have said previously concerning the action of the Federal Government, he increase the freight rates of the State Shipping Service by only 10 per cent instead of 30 per cent. I am sure

that in two years' time the Federal Government will wake up to its mistakes and realise that the country will be verging on bankruptcy. It will be in a state of economic collapse.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does the honourable member know that the Australian National Line has not raised its freights via Brisbane?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It raised its deficit.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is no deficit with the ANL.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I thank the honourable member for that information. As I have said, the Federal Government will try to correct the situation because it will wake up to the mistakes it is making today. I forecast that in two years' time the Federal Government will be endeavouring to correct its mistakes by giving an injection, or a transfusion, of money into all services in country areas in an attempt to try to get the country back on its feet. When I refer to the country, I am referring to country areas. When that occurs the Federal Government will find that it will have to support a subsidy for the State Shipping Service because without that service the State will be in a sorry plight. Also, without trade from the north the State Shipping Service will be in a worse plight.

I hope that over the next three years members will at least endeavour to rid themselves of any pettiness which they may be tempted to bring into debate—and this includes myself—in order to correct the wrongs which are now going on in this State and in the nation. We should bring forward better legislation for the people in such a way as to allow this country and the State to develop under a free enterprise situation.

It is my policy and belief—as it is the policy and belief of my party—that a free enterprise situation suits mankind because mankind needs a challenge throughout life. Men and women need challenges, and they also need competition. I believe a free enterprise system provides that challenge, and provides it in a healthy atmosphere. With those words I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.07 p.m.]: I rise to speak to this Bill, the Supply Bill, which is traditionally introduced at this time and traditionally is given an expeditious passage through the House.

I listened to the member who has just concluded his speech, the Hon. W. R. Withers, and I have no doubt that he, and members on his side, would like to see a reduction of backbiting. I think it is a case of, "Do as I do, not as I say". In effect, it means, "Please Labor Party members, do not criticise my Government".

If the honourable member expects that to take place he is in for a disappointment. When he refers to this as being something which the public would like to see I am afraid he is on the wrong tack again. It is not a reduction in backbiting which is required; it is a reduction in back scratching.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: But the honourable member would probably be hard pressed to find any examples.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No trouble at all. One has only to look at the Liberal Party policy for 1974-77. As Mr Thompson said recently, it contains enough material to last not only through this year, but through the following couple of years also. We will wait to see how the policy will be implemented.

The policy is full of all the sorts of most humorous statements which one is likely to find in a policy speech. I am sorry that Mr Lewis is not present in the Chamber, because I propose to take up his remarks. At page 105 of *Hansard* Mr Lewis said—

I believe that the Court Government will do more in the fields of education, community welfare, recreation, and almost every other aspect of government than did the previous Government, because the Court Government is a group of managers. It contains people who are used to managing things.

Goodness gracious me; if that policy statement is an example of what management produces we could do without it, thank you very much! On the other hand it may explain, for example, the statement we see within the policy under the heading "The Four-State Alliance", as follows—

In the battle for preservation of State responsibilities and State rights, we really mean business.

I think that sums up the situation of business; to see that it gets what it wants. That has always been the interpretation of "business".

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why does the honourable member have to put his interpretation in that way?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That has always been the interpretation. I do not know what interpretation the Minister for Justice would apply, but he is entitled to it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I put the correct interpretation on it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not believe his interpretation would be the same as mine; at least he would not state it fairly.

We have a fair example of the sorts of things contained in the policy statement of the Liberal Party. Today the Minister for Justice replied to some questions I

asked relating to staff for regional centres. I do not know what interpretation the Minister places on the statements in the policy, but they indicated to me that the staff were to be picked from the Public Service and were to be people who the Government felt would be properly dedicated to regional development. There was to be some process of selection. However, the answer to my question stated—

The selection of suitable staff for regional offices will be carried out in accordance with normal Public Service practice which would take into account the particular attributes needed to perform the duties of the respective positions.

That is a very early example that the policy statements are just so many words which really mean very little. While I am referring to questions I would again point out that the Government has promised us an easy flow of information but with the few questions I have asked in this House I have had to come back and drag the information from the Government.

The Government has been operating for a short time only, and if this is to be its pattern it will not be free of criticism because we will object very strongly to this sort of process. We believe the people are entitled to information concerning the intentions of the Government. There is no clear statement on what its policy means for the people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It cannot give a clear answer if it does not have one. That is the situation; it does not know its own policy.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Why do you not let him make his own speech?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, he needs the assistance.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It was quite evident last week that Government members were very touchy about their policy. When Mr Thompson was speaking Government members made many interjections which demonstrated their concern with the programme their leader had started them on.

It is rather strange to hear the Liberal Party members ostensibly stating that their real concern is for the individual because I have in my possession a pamphlet which was put out by my opponent during the last election, and this illustrates a point. I am afraid I do not have the pamphlet with me.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It would not be worth reading because the electors did not take any notice of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The point is that the pamphlet put out by my opponent emphasised that Liberalism was concerned about the individual, but when the Liberal Party wrote the policy state-

ment, I ask: in how many parts of it was the individual really mentioned? How much concern does it really show for the rights of the individual? There is very little at all, and its main thrust will benefit what Mr Withers calls "free enterprise". In other words, business people should be permitted to do as and what they like. A policy of that type leads to disaster.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are referring to *laissez-faire*; not just free enterprise.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member must be clear about his definitions. He says there should be Government intervention. Is he contradicting his leader's statement that there should not be intervention by Government?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I am afraid you didn't listen to me, Mr Cloughton. I never said that in any part of my speech—I suggest you check *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is the second time today that the honourable member has suggested I check *Hansard*.

Mr Withers referred to people who felt that Sir Charles Court has an "anti-Whitlam" attitude. I challenged him on that point because he could not name one Labor member in this Chamber who believes that. Perhaps the honourable member is referring to people in his own party. If that is the case, I can understand his reluctance to name those persons.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You ought to read *The West Australian*.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I hope that in future the honourable member will be a little more precise in the statements he makes in his speeches, just as I feel he ought to be more precise in his definition of "free enterprise": Is it *laissez-faire* or is it Government intervention?

In the past we have seen the results of a Liberal Party Government. In Western Australia we had a land boom and people bought and sold land without restriction. It was all right because many people were making large profits. However, that sort of situation cannot continue because eventually land prices rise astronomically and people on low incomes find that a block of land is beyond their means.

I predict that a similar situation will develop again in Western Australia. With uncontrolled land prices, the prospect of home ownership is beyond the means of the ordinary person.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You did nothing about it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Gough was successful; he fixed it.

he Hon. N. McNeill: Gough will fix it all right.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I read out the list of prices for land during the term of the Labor Government—astronomical. You could not stand it; you had to walk out.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That was an old advertisement from the period when the Liberal Party was in office.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The price of some land was not controlled by the Government. Privately-owned land was put onto the market during the term of the Liberal Government under conditions which still applied at that time. I can understand that the Liberal Party wants to deny this, but it actually happened. I know in my electorate—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are not giving me a chance to get a word in.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —the price of a building block in some subdivisions went from a few thousand dollars up to \$12 000, \$14 000, and even \$16 000. Building blocks in that price range are not for the people on lower incomes. City Beach is now becoming a very select suburb.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: This happened at every land sale throughout the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member had the chance to make his speech; I am making mine.

The PRESIDENT: I wish the honourable member would get on with it then.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am going as fast as I can because Mr Clive Griffiths is trying to get into the act, Mr President.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am not fussy about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Clive Griffiths took a member of my party to task. In another place a member of the Labor Party asked some questions, and Mr Clive Griffiths commented on it. On page 198 of *Hansard* he said—

I was also perturbed to see a newspaper comment which indicates that I, and the people of Western Australia, have grounds to be concerned at the apparent desire of the Labor Party to prevent people from taking up petitions and having those petitions placed before Parliament.

It is a shame that the honourable member did not quote the parts of the item which gave that impression. I have this Press article before me, and having read it, I certainly cannot find that implications of this sort were made. It is a misuse of this Chamber for Mr Clive Griffiths to get up to make statements about a member in another place who is not in a position to defend himself.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He is in a position to defend himself.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I believe that Mr Clive Griffiths is doing what he has accused the member in another place of doing. He is trying to deny that member the right to bring matters before the public. Mr Clive Griffiths says that a member of Parliament should be permitted to use the facilities that the law provides—in this case Parliament itself—to raise these questions.

The article in the *Daily News* of last Thursday says—

Langford residents are upset by the "slum" description of housing development there, says a Labor MLA.

Mr T. H. Bateman, the member for Canning, said many residents believed their efforts to improve the suburb were seriously affected by the slum description.

I would say that is true, not only of the people of Langford—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Who used the word "slum"? You had better quickly glance at your notes to see who used it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member quoted the petition which was presented to this House. In case he has forgotten the petition—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I have not forgotten it—I have a fantastic memory.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In that case the honourable member should not have asked the question he just asked because the word "slum" appears in the petition.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is right, that is the exact point I am making.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member asked where the word was used.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is right.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member presented the petition.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The people of Langford presented it, and they used the word "slum"—the very people you say are opposed to the term.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. R. F. Cloughton has the floor.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He is not making a very good job of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not mean to restrict the honourable member's freedom to interject, although he has—

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that the honourable member address the Chair.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He keeps provoking me, Sir.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: According to Mr Bateman, the "slum" description is objected to by the people of Langford. He has a perfect right to make that fact known to the public.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: But they are the ones who used the term.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The people who spoke to Mr Bateman have the right to record their objection about the use of the term, and he has the right to make that objection known.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He asked the Minister in another place to take action to prevent it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We can see by what is happening who is really attempting to restrict the rights and freedoms of the people.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about reading out the question he asked?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Hon. Clive Griffiths referred to the people of Balga also when he was speaking.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I never referred to the people of Balga.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This is on page 199 of *Hansard*.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I know what it says.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member is now saying he did not say this.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I said it is the same type of housing development.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is there in *Hansard*.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I said it is the same type of development.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Obviously the people of Balga will object to its being referred to as a "slum" area. We have almost a pattern built up by members of Mr Clive Griffiths' party—they denigrate and speak in derogatory terms of State housing areas. I would not attempt to prevent anyone mentioning the problems occurring in these areas. As members of Parliament, it is obviously our duty to bring these problems to the notice of the people concerned. If the same sort of criticism were made about private developments, we could not object. However, we never hear any criticism of private developments. Similar problems occur in Balga, but the main complaint is about facilities in the area rather than the type of housing.

Balga lacked many community facilities—kindergartens, recreation areas, and community halls. We have heard the people of the area complain about this sort of thing. No doubt other facilities are missing, but the items I have mentioned are the chief concern. Children need areas to play in, and without organised recreation we find problems of vandalism and delin-

quency arising. If this type of criticism were made of private development as well as State housing areas, then I would support it.

As far as I am able, I have done my best to see that such deficiencies are corrected, but not only in State housing areas. For instance, in the suburb in which I live, Wembley Downs, we had no community halls, no playgrounds, in fact, nowhere for community groups to meet. Some parts of my province contain many blocks of flats constructed by private developers. It is quite wrong to create housing for so many people in areas which do not have the facilities to cope with them.

The people in the Scarborough ward of the City of Stirling were quite upset about a planned development, and they were successful in their endeavours to have the council reconsider the plans. Obviously, people do not want to be surrounded by flats. On the other hand, some people find flat life convenient, and certainly suitable for their needs while they are accumulating finance to buy their own homes. However, most of us would not choose to spend all our lives in a block of flats.

We must remember also that State housing fulfils a worthy function; that is, to provide accommodation at a rental that people on low incomes can afford. Obviously, to do this, the SHC cannot build the type of housing that most of us would prefer. This factor must be borne in mind—while it is desirable that the SHC should provide the best possible environment for the people it assists, it cannot be expected to provide housing of the same quality as that sought by people on much higher incomes. No-one would deny that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You reckon these people ought to be treated like second-class citizens just because they have no money.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We have seen what happens when the SHC attempts to scatter its developments. The commission owned some land at Greenwood, and it was felt desirable to disperse the houses it was building throughout the area. A very strong public outcry arose about this project, and the outcry was strengthened because of the criticism being levelled at the commission in respect of the problems at Balga.

So, I feel that while it is the duty of members of Parliament to bring legitimate criticism to the attention of the people, they must bear in mind the effects such criticism might have on a wider plain. I hope the Government will take note of what I now say, because I say it seriously and not in the way of making destructive criticism. This is a matter in which members opposite can use their good offices to overcome these problems being experienced by individuals.

Several years ago, I spoke on a similar matter when I referred to the Church of Christ homes. At that time, I mentioned the Carinya Village at Mt. Lawley and the problems being experienced by aged persons there. A number of complaints were made to me about the way tenants were being treated, but since that time I have heard nothing further from those people and I must assume therefore that their problems have been resolved. I do not criticise the concept of aged persons' homes, although I would like to see this scheme carried out in a different manner. A number of groups of aged persons' homes exist within the complex at Mt. Lawley. I instance the Masonic Homes, where I spoke to many tenants and asked them how they enjoyed their life there. Nobody had any complaints so, obviously, this sort of home suits elderly people and fills a real need for them when they reach an age where it is desirable that they enter this type of accommodation. Tenants from the Anglican home in Mt. Lawley have come to me with almost the same sort of complaints made by tenants in the Church of Christ homes. These complaints stem largely from a lack of understanding of the human relationships involved and it is on this aspect that I hope the Minister for Health will act. I hope he is listening to my remarks and will attempt to do something about these problems. The State does possess some small authority because it provides a subsidy towards the furnishing of these homes. However, I do not think it is necessary for the State to wield any sort of stick.

My complaint is that the conduct of these homes seems to be regarded as a business operation. I might add that inmates at James Brown House seem to have similar problems. It seems that some of the inmates of that home could be moved to Mt Lawley and that the authorities are attempting to hold vacancies for them. So, firstly, instead of being viewed as a human problem, the conduct of these homes is regarded as a business operation. Complaints have been made about the neglect of maintenance work. I have spoken only to the person making the complaints; I have not heard the management side of the story. There are always two sides to a story and the management may have a good reason why this maintenance work was not carried out. Perhaps the person who complained to me was oversensitive about the situation. One woman complained that there was a leak in the roof. Some attention was given to it, but it was not properly repaired. The complaint extended over quite a period.

A general suspicion exists relating to what happens to the initial amount paid to the charity in order to gain admittance to the home. I believe the initial fee is of the order of \$3 000 or \$4 000 and it is not reclaimable. If a person finds he is

not compatible with that sort of housing or wants to leave for any reason, he is unable to recover his initial payment to the organisation which would enable him to move somewhere else. This is a problem and has caused the inmates to lose some of their sense of independence. They observe that, often, rapid changes in occupancy take place which means that the managements of the homes are obtaining these initial sums not once but many times and the inmates feel that a profit is being made. Obviously, there must be a reasonable explanation as to what happens to this money, but no explanation has been given to the inmates; this has created a sense of suspicion which I believe has been quite unnecessary.

It has been pointed out that increases in weekly fees and in maintenance charges for the upkeep of the gardens and so on are related to pension increases and, again, the inmates of these aged persons' homes feel that they are being got at. They have received no explanation as to why these increased charges have been necessary. This is a human problem and one that should not arise within a humanitarian organisation such as the church, which manages these homes. There seems to be an inability to achieve a reasonable response from the management. Although the tenants have made efforts to talk to the management, it seems to be a one-way street for them. The tenants are willing to go and talk to the management, but they cannot establish a conversation. The inmates can get talked at but not talked with. The people in these establishments have declining powers and may be lacking in contact with their old acquaintances or their family and in this context, their need is even greater than it would be in a family environment.

A particular incident rather shocked me at the time it occurred. The husbands of two inmates of a home died, and within a few days—in fact, I believe it was only two days—of the burial of their husbands, the widows were approached by the management and requested to move from their double flat accommodation into something smaller. It is inconceivable that anyone who has any sort of concern for the feelings of other people could do that sort of thing and whoever was responsible should be severely criticised for his actions. A belief exists in some of these homes that if inmates report sick, they will be in danger of being moved from their accommodation into the hospital section of the home. In other words, there is a tendency for inmates to hide their illnesses because they believe they will be moved to the hospital section and will never return to their single flat accommodation. Again, this sort of feeling should not arise. If the management of the homes was carried out with human understanding, the

tenants would not arrive at the impression that they should not report their illnesses for fear of being shipped out into the hospital.

I have given members a condensed outline of what is going on in aged persons' homes. I will not dwell further on the matter. I believe I have given the main points and I hope the Minister for Health will discuss these matters with the management of the homes or with the church to see whether a greater element of human understanding and of improved human relationships can occur between the management and the tenants of these Anglican homes. The situation should never have arisen and, with a little understanding by the relevant authorities, the problems should be eliminated. There is no reason that inmates in these Anglican homes should not be as content as I found inmates in the Masonic Homes just across the road.

I would like to speak on a good number of subjects, but I will get a chance to speak on the Address-in-Reply debate either tonight or tomorrow. I should like to conclude by referring to the speech of Mr Lewis and his belief that Ministers of the Court Government are better managers. I saw very little evidence during the term of the previous Liberal-Country Party Government to prove his point. Just one instance which arose during the term of that Government will illustrate my point. On the 1st April, 1969, I asked a question which related to an article published in *The West Australian* in March, 1969, in which the Managing Director of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited referred to the lag in management training in Australia. I asked whether the Government had studied the provision of such training in Western Australia and, if so, what had been the results of the study. I asked further, if the Government had done nothing about the matter would it institute such a study. The answer I received was that no such study had been carried out, and that courses were provided at the Western Australian Institute of Technology which had been developed in association with employers in industry. The whole tenor of the answer was, "Look, you have no need to worry about this State because obviously everything is being attended to". That was on the 1st April, 1969.

On the 20th August, 1969, not long after I asked my question, the Department of Commerce of the University of Western Australia delivered a paper which stated—

The urgent need for postgraduate management education in Australia has led the Commonwealth Government to set up a commission to investigate the present situation . . .

What a dramatic change must have taken place in that time! We are told that there is no cause for alarm in this State and

suddenly, a few months later, we find that there is an urgent need for such education and that the Commonwealth Government is instituting studies.

That, to me, is a fair indication of the situation under the previous Government and I doubt whether any change has occurred under this one.

I regret that Mr Lewis is not here at the moment to interject on me if he does not like what I am about to say. The other day he indicated that he had been to university, but had dropped out, and obviously he did not feel there was anything wrong in that. I would say that the level of education attained in secondary school and perhaps even in the first year of university has been thought sufficient for business managers in this State; but, not knowing any better, those concerned would not realise the problems. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [5.46 p.m.]: I would like to address a few remarks to the Bill, but before doing so I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President and also to extend my congratulations to members on the front bench and to members who were elected or re-elected in March.

Like the previous speaker, I was somewhat amazed to hear Mr Withers a few moments ago adopt the attitude he did in relation to the criticism of Governments, because I know as well as a number of other members in this House that he was one of the greatest critics we had.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And he was always wrong.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: Well, yes, I agree. Nevertheless, I was looking forward to future criticism from that honourable member. As I represent a country area I thought that possibly this year I could join with him and add a little strength to his criticism of some of the actions which have taken place in the last few months.

I feel I must comment on the increase in freight rates. This increase has been mentioned previously both tonight and on other nights, but I feel I must refer to it. Freight rates have a great effect on those in my area, and when they are increased they do a great deal of harm. As most members know, over the last few years, the inhabitants of goldmining towns have had a battle to survive. At the moment things are just starting to look good, but it seems that as soon as this occurs and it appears that the people will get on their feet again, someone chops them down again. In the goldmining towns those associated with the mining industry and private industry—of course those in private industry rely on those in the mining industry for survival—will be faced with a problem. I hope that the Government will

in future give every consideration to these people when it has to increase freight rates and such-like charges.

I would like now to refer to the plight of prospectors. Prior to both the State and Federal elections several Liberal members went to the mining areas and made a number of rash promises about what they intended to do for the people of the goldfields, for the mining industry, and for prospectors in particular. Many people up there swallowed all the promises and were very happy. However, since the elections they have had the wind taken out of their sails because State Battery charges have been increased, not by 10 or 30 per cent, but by 200 per cent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I see where Mr Collard claims that the Lord himself could not win Kalgoorlie from the ALP Government.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: Yes, but he was talking about the Federal seat.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He would be a Labor man if He were here, though.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: These prospectors are now faced with the task of trying to cope with these huge charges. The other night I attended a meeting of about 60 prospectors and, quite frankly, it seems that at least 50 per cent of them will be forced out of business. It does not look as though the situation will improve because the prospectors are also faced with increases in vehicle registration fees and so on.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: The price of petrol will be up, too.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: Not in that area, but unfortunately the further one is from Kalgoorlie, the higher will be the cost of petrol. However, fortunately someone else will have to look after that part of the State.

When a Government increases charges it must, firstly, look at the amount of revenue it will derive from the increases and, secondly, it must consider what harmful effect the increase will have on industry and people. The amount of additional revenue to be gained from the increased charges is \$91 000, which is not a great deal when it is considered with the Budget as a whole. The charges have not been increased for some time, but they have been held at a particular level for various reasons. Because the price of gold has increased for the first time in many years, everyone, including the Government, feels he must get his cut.

I hope that in future the Government will take a better look at the plight of these people and give them every consideration when it contemplates an increase in charges.

Later on in the session another opportunity is given us to raise various matters and I think I will wait for that occasion to make any further comments about

problems in my province. I felt I must mention those two items at this stage. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [5.53 p.m.]: The Bill before us is concerned with the provision of finance for the Government to carry on, and it seems appropriate, therefore that I should talk about civil servants.

I want to talk about two civil servants from different spheres. Firstly, I refer to a speech made in another place by the Leader of the Opposition on the 30th July. It is found at page 72 of the current *Hansard*. The speaker referred to an officer who, as a Government employee, had the temerity to criticise the Government. I do not want to go into the details of the circumstances that led up to the criticism, but it is important that I place the record straight in some respects. The following is the beginning of a letter to the editor which was printed in *The Hedland Times* of the 31st January—

Dear Sir: I am sick and tired of reading and hearing grossly unfair and misleading statements about industrial development in the Pilbara and the people who have been associated with it.

Your front page of January 17 was virtually covered with Press statements by senior government ministers that were flagrant deceptions if not deliberate untruths.

As a government officer, I have felt obliged to refrain from making public comment, but I am also a servant of the people and now I aspire to be a parliamentary representative for the region and I am just not able to restrain myself any longer.

The letter goes on to catalogue the specific cases of deception which the writer of the letter could see. Clearly it was written by someone intimately associated with the developmental programme in the Pilbara and I feel I should let members know that it was signed by John Tozer.

In assessing the rights and wrongs of the action that I took, it is important to have an understanding of the circumstances existing at the time. I had to ask myself two questions, the first being: Is a civil servant bound to stay silent when his own Ministers are making outrageously misleading comments which are clearly designed to deceive the people? The second question is: If that civil servant is, in fact, a candidate for election to Parliament, will he permit the electors to base their judgment in the ballot box on statements which are clearly not accurate? These are the questions I asked myself at the time and obviously there was only one answer. I had to speak up.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you aware that another question was asked in another place of the Premier which was whether he

would afford all civil servants freedom of speech, and he indicated he would not?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Strangely enough the Premier was also taken to task in the same debate in another place for not disciplining officers, including the officer to whom the Leader of the Opposition referred.

I think I should point out that the letter from which I quoted was published on the 31st January, and the election took place on the 30th March. Obviously the only person who could have taken disciplinary action against the officer was Mr Tonkin himself through the Public Service Board, and not the present Premier.

The second civil servant to whom I wish to refer is Mr Charles Perkins. Quite frankly, I do not mind much what Mr Perkins has to say as a civil servant, but any public statements he makes must be fair and reasonable.

My phone has been running hot today with calls from Broome because the people there resent being labelled as a racist community. As a matter of fact it is not unreasonable to say that Broome is the most racially integrated town one could find in Australia. I admit that the President of the CWA in Broome was somewhat melodramatic in her comments in a Sunday paper a week or so ago. However, what she said highlighted a real problem which has been referred to by Mr Withers in this Chamber on previous occasions. It is a fact that concessions are made available to Aboriginal people, which are not available to people of European blood in the lower income groups; and this is developing an undesirable social schism between the segments of the community.

I repeat that the President of the CWA was overdramatising the position when she predicted inter-racial violence.

Concerning police persecution, quite frankly Mr Perkins made a surprising comment. I believe unusual circumstances do occur in any community, but one would conclude, from an observation of the situation, that the relationship between the police and the coloured community in Broome is better than it is in most towns. I was disappointed to read Mr Perkins' comments on this matter.

As far as I am able to ascertain Mr Perkins was in Broome for only a day or so and during that time he did not speak to the shire president, the shire clerk, or councillors, or to any police officer. I understand that about five months ago he spoke to Mr Tom Edgar, the elected representative on the National Aboriginal Congress, and I am led to believe that at the time he did not receive complaints of this nature. Consequently I wonder upon what evidence Mr Perkins based his criticism of the racist attitude of people in Broome.

Probably the most disappointing aspect of his comments concerned leprosy. I suggest that in this respect he has done irreparable harm. In 1973 over 5 900 of a total of 7 000 Aborigines in the Kimberley were examined for leprosy, and only three were diagnosed as having any symptoms of the disease. None of these came from Broome and, indeed, there has not been an occurrence in the Broome area in the last two years.

The leprosarium just outside Derby contains only 73 people including relatives and families of those who suffer from the disease, and when this is compared with the several hundred in the same institution a matter of seven to 10 years ago there is little doubt that a most remarkable feat has been achieved in respect of the control of leprosy in the Kimberley.

The trouble is that there are people to be seen in Broome who clearly have got damaged hands and damaged noses caused by this terrible disease. But these people are not lepers; they are those who have been cured of leprosy. Unfortunately one cannot make new hands or new noses, and this visible evidence they carry of having once contracted the disease continues to exist.

In making his comments Charles Perkins has done a great deal of harm to these people and their chances of general acceptance in the community. What Charles Perkins said was "Look at these terrible lepers;" but what he should have said was, "Look at these people who have been cured of leprosy; who are now able to come out and take their place in society."

I think it is sad that Mr Perkins should make these outrageous comments about Broome when clearly he is so ill informed on the matters about which he has spoken.

While I am on my feet I would like to comment on remarks made by two previous speakers—one on the Supply Bill and one on the Address-in-Reply. The matter relates to the question of one-vote one-value. It concerns me greatly when I hear people talking about this sort of thing, because I do not think they have any recognition of the problems that exist in the outlying and far-flung electorates and provinces.

Factors other than numbers must surely be taken into consideration in determining electoral boundaries. Clearly a province that covers one-third of a million square miles constitutes an important factor in deciding the size, and who we are going to have to represent the electorate in question.

In the one-third million square miles I represent there are 40 separate and identifiable communities ranging in size from 12 000 people to 400 people. In addition to this there are many scores of outlying stations and smaller settlements and camps. It is not possible for anyone to properly represent the region when one considers the size it is. To contemplate the possi-

bility of its being larger in area in order to get one-vote one-value is too silly for words.

In making a submission to the salaries tribunal in relation to allowances I apportioned my time over the various communities that exist in the North Province and having regard to its enormous size I am able to spend only two days in 12 months in a place like Wittenoom. The rest of my time is committed to covering the province and in carrying out my parliamentary duty.

The social and economic problems of a place like Wittenoom are enormous, and to think that I can spend only two days in 12 months in that area is just not acceptable. We want greater representation for this region, not reduced representation as has been suggested.

It is interesting to look at the complexities of the region. Activities range from cattle and sheep industries, to irrigated agriculture, the meatworks at Broome, Wyndham and Derby, and other associated activities. We must also consider the mining centres. I am not now talking only of iron ore mining where there are good solid industries operating on a well conceived plan; I am thinking of other minerals; for example, manganese, gold, tin, tantalite, lead, copper, and so on, each of which has its separate and individual problems and which must be given consideration and attention by the representative of the area. In addition to this we have the complete gamut of normal urban problems which are far greater and far more exaggerated than what we may reasonably expect in a metropolitan province.

Sitting suspended from 6.06 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: In speaking about one-vote one-value, I do not think we should be carried away with emotionalism and idealism. We must be practical in this matter. Let us acknowledge that there must be factors other than numbers alone. The area of the province is important, as is the complexity of the activities within the province and the complexity of the population following those activities.

In the North Province we have approximately 40 per cent of Western Australia's Aboriginal population. Clearly, this factor must introduce tremendous problems in the area.

In the mining communities we find people who have been born in something like 40 different countries. At places like Mt Newman and Tom Price less than half of the population is Australian born. Of that number less than 50 per cent have come from Western Australia and even these people have been transplanted 1 000 miles from their families and friends. The other half of the community comes from every continent in the world.

The people are the important factor to be considered in defining electorates. It is the living and social environment of these

people which forces me to the conclusion that the boundary of a province cannot be determined by a computer based in Canberra. A computer can only count numbers; it cannot measure the economic living and social problems, the trials, and the tribulations of the people—the real people who are doing a real job in an area which is probably the most productive in Australia. A computer based in Canberra cannot dictate that these people are over-represented.

Mr President, at 6 o'clock this evening I was about to sit down when you stood up. When these two things happen together, an immeasurable reaction takes place: the 30 members of this House wait with bated breath one and a half hours to hear the new member for North Province declare that he supports the Bill.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [7.33 p.m.]: I support the Bill, and I would not want to be associated with a party that did not support a measure such as this, which guarantees supply in order to carry out the government of the State.

It was my hope that I would make my maiden speech during the Address-in-Reply debate, but that was not to be because I am compelled to rise in this debate for the purpose of defending the attitude of the Australian Government, in one sense, and defending the workers of this country from the attack that is constantly being made upon them by the forces of conservatism.

Before I continue, I would like to take this opportunity to extend to you, Mr President, my sincere congratulations on your being elected to the very high and dignified position of President of the Legislative Council. Knowing you as I do, I am sure you will carry out your duties in a fair and impartial manner, and the experience you have gained in this Chamber over a long period will ensure your job is carried out in accordance with the long traditions of this Parliament.

I also extend congratulations to the Leader of the House and to the other Ministers of the Government represented here. I have already conveyed my congratulations to my leader and deputy leader in this Chamber when they were elected in our party room; I feel sure they will carry out their duties in the best traditions of Parliament and Opposition in Parliament.

The debate on the Supply Bill has continued the consistent attack that has been made on the Australian Government by the conservative forces in Australia, through the Liberal Party, and I think the Bill is another indication of the manner in which Conservative Governments impose charges upon the people who can least afford them.

I will confine the first part of my address to the consistent attack on the Australian Government, the work force of the country, and the trade union movement for the role it is playing in prosecuting its duties and endeavouring to obtain better wages and conditions for the people it represents. I recently read something which was written by a person who is very highly regarded by the conservative movement in Australia. He was the founder of the Liberal Party and was at that time Mr Robert Menzies; he is now Sir Robert Menzies.

Sir Robert Menzies was certainly not the founder of the Conservative Party. He was the founder of the name of a party—the Liberal Party—which has carried out the principles of conservatism for a long time. I will quote from Sir Robert Menzies' book *The Measure of the Years*, in which on page 15 there is a heading "The Gentle Art of Opposition".

Although the Government of the day is not in Opposition, when listening to the Governor's Speech one would have been led to believe that perhaps an Opposition speech was being delivered by the Governor, because so many attacks were made on the Australian Government. Sir Robert Menzies had this to say—and perhaps it will convey a message to the members of the Government of this State in respect of their attitude towards the Australian Government—

I can illustrate my view by recounting an experience I had about a year or so after I became Leader of the Opposition. Some of my New South Wales colleagues told me that there was a strong opinion in Sydney that I was not 'in the Press' sufficiently; that I ought to attack the Government, if not daily, at least very frequently. I can remember my reply as if it were yesterday: 'I'm sorry, but I entirely disagree. If I did what your friends think I should do, we would no doubt be regarded by them as a very active Opposition, but we would retain that position of honour for many years.'

This is the relevant point—

'But I want to put the Government out; if not in 1946, at least in 1949. I strongly believe that I should not be attacking them on everything. It would seem quite picturesque for a few weeks, but before long the electors would begin to say, "Oh, here's Menzies again! He wants us to believe that the Government is *always* wrong." And they would soon weary of my attitude.'

I think the people of this State are becoming very weary of the attitude of the Government which is in office at the present time because of its constant

attacks on the Australian Government, and the sooner the people who are governing this State take heed of Sir Robert Menzies' words, and get down to the job of governing instead of criticising, the better it will be for the citizens of Western Australia.

I turn now to the attack upon the workers of this country and upon the people who are least capable of meeting the savage charges levied upon them. I represent an area containing a large number of people on low and moderate incomes. They find it very difficult to sustain the necessities of life when these additional charges are imposed upon them. I am referring to the proposed 14 per cent increase in electricity charges and the 65 per cent increase in motorcar license fees. A person on a low or moderate income requires just as much electricity to keep himself warm and provide himself with the normal comforts of life as does a person who has a more affluent position in the community. The same applies to motorcar licenses. Cars have become commonplace and a necessity for people in all walks of life, and the increase has a greater effect upon a person earning \$80 or \$90 a week than on a person earning \$200 or \$250 a week or a person who receives considerable allowances for the use of his motorcar in the course of his job.

It seems the reason for these charges is to set up a smokescreen by attacking the Australian Government and saying the charges are necessary because the Australian Government is not allocating sufficient funds to the State to carry out its road programme and other matters associated with the State. Be that as it may, I believe the Government should accept that responsibility and not blame others. It is a very bad trait, and the quicker it is removed, the better.

It might have been a good policy to adopt this attitude prior to the 30th March and have the Labor Party removed from office in this State by attacking the Australian Government. No doubt those tactics succeeded and a tremendous number of people were taken in by the promises made by the Conservative Party at that time. Fear was also engendered in the minds of the people that if they elected a Labor Government the State would be controlled from Canberra. But the 30th March is now past and the conservative Government is in power. I think it should now let the matter rest and, I repeat, get on with the job of governing the State.

It might even have been fair to continue the consistent attack on the Australian Government between the 30th March and the 18th May, when a Federal election was held, but there is no reason to continue it now. Twice in the short space of 18 months the Australian people have decided they want a Labor Government in office.

There is no question about that. The Australian people have made their determination. In the first instance the Labor Government was returned with a reasonable majority. It is true the majority was reduced in the second instance, but the Labor Government was returned nevertheless.

Perhaps we can analyse why the Labor Party was first elected to office in December, 1972. The Labor Party was elected to office because the people were fed up with a Government that had become stagnant and they wanted a fresh approach to government. There can be no question that the Labor Party provided them with that. The dying years of the Liberal Administration in Canberra saw four changes of leadership in the short space of approximately five years, and it now has another leader. The previous four leaders were Prime Ministers, but if the present leader of the Liberal Party maintains the attitude he is now adopting I do not think he will ever be a Prime Minister.

In 1969 it was my very great privilege to be elected to represent the Australian Government at the International Labour Organisation Conference in Geneva. At that conference I mixed with trade unionists, employers, and Government officials, and I discussed with them the policies of their respective Governments in the field of industrial relations; and I felt almost ashamed to be a trade unionist and to be associated with the industrial relations which had developed in Australia at that time.

Whilst I was in that situation of representing the Australian Government we had the disgraceful exhibition of a trade unionist being gaoled in Australia for some act he perpetrated against the arbitration laws of this country; and nobody at that conference—from the free world, anyhow—could understand why a trade unionist should be gaoled for carrying out his beliefs in respect of trade unionism. Subsequently, when I was in England, I had a personal interview with Mr Victor Feather, Secretary of the British TUC, and he said he could not understand the industrial laws of Australia. He could not understand that an arbitration court could levy or impose awards in respect of a particular industry or calling, and then impose penal provisions upon people who may offend against the determination of the Arbitration Commission.

This situation continued for 23 long years. Despite the fact that industrial relations throughout the world were changing on not one occasion did the Conservative Government do anything to correct the situation. In fact, it set about hitting the unions around the head rather than attempting to rectify the position or endeavour to improve industrial relations. As a result industrial relations worsened—along with a number of other matters

about which one could speak for a long time, particularly the Australian involvement in the war in Vietnam and the disgraceful killing of many young Australians in an overseas conscription programme. It was this type of administration which brought about the defeat of the McMahon Government.

In 1973 I again attended the International Labour Organisation Conference, and I noticed an altogether different outlook in respect of the attitudes of the Australian Government. One could walk through the halls of the great Palais d'Nations in Geneva and hold one's head high because it was understood that the recently elected Australian Government had brought a breath of fresh air into the administration of Australia, and people were beginning to talk about this country and how it had developed better foreign policies; about how people who had a profound knowledge of industrial relations were desperately trying to improve the relationships between the work force and employers, and more particularly, between the workers and the Government.

The Australian Government was again tested because the Conservatives could not accept that Labor could govern after such a long period of Conservative Government. The Conservatives turned events in such a way that a double dissolution was brought about in order to test the feelings of the Australian people; to test whether the policies of the Australian Labor Government were sound, or whether they should be rejected. So the question was put to the people of Australia and they said "Yes, we do want the Labor Administration to stay in office." The policies which are being implemented at the moment were programmed in the Labor policy speeches prior to each of the elections. I think the Government of this State should face up to the fact that an Australian Labor Government is here to stay for the next three years, and it will implement its policies.

Perhaps in the eyes of many people, and especially in the eyes of our opponents, those policies may not be right, but at least the Australian Government is trying to implement policies to correct many of the things which Conservative Governments of this country introduced during the 23 long years they were in office.

An interjection was made the other day—I understand it was made by a person who represents a country electorate—in respect of the Forrest Place incident. Mr President, if I represented a country electorate I would want to forget that incident; and I do not concur with some of my colleagues when they say that people have a right to express their opinion in the way they did. I think it was a disgraceful exhibition and a blot on the history of Western Australia. I hope such a situation will never again occur. Those who were predominant in that demonstration were people who were protesting

against a subsidy which had been taken away from them—I understand it was in respect of the superphosphate bounty—and they were also protesting about the removal of certain taxation concessions. However, they forgot about the policy of the Australian Labor Government in respect of opening up new areas of exports for the agricultural products of Australia. For a long period of time we had a Federal Government which would not trade with a certain country because that country had an ideological policy different from its own. I refer, of course, to Red China.

The people who demonstrated in Forrest Place on that day had very short memories of the wheat that accumulated in silos for a long time and which became weevil infested because it could not be shipped out of the country. They forgot about the new outlook in the export of wheat; they forgot that a market had been found which was ready, willing, and able to take our wheat. I think people in rural areas will derive substantial benefit from that new market. The policy to establish this market was initiated before the Labor Government came into office. It was initiated during the time that the Labor Party was in Opposition in Canberra when it had the foresight to go to Red China and to open up markets. When the Australian Government is under criticism I think it is well that some of these things should be taken into account.

Upon running through the speech of the Minister for Justice when he introduced this Bill, I find that it contains an attack upon the Australian Government for granting what are said to be unbridled wage increases to its employees, and for giving its employees four weeks' annual leave and a loading whilst on that leave. This was part of the Labor Party's stated policy before it came to power; that is, that it would give to its employees four weeks' annual leave and that they would be granted a loading associated with that leave.

So it is quite wrong for the Government of this State to criticise the Australian Government for its action in that respect because this policy was clearly enunciated before the Labor Government was elected. Of course, it was necessary for the Australian Government to take some action in respect of updating the wages and conditions of its employees and of a large number of other employees throughout Australia, because for 23 years the previous Conservative Government did nothing at all in respect of those matters. Any increases in wages or improvements in conditions during that time were won by the unions against resistance by the Conservative Government. So it is no wonder that the Australian Government appeared to be a little generous when it endeavoured to rectify much of the wrong that had been perpetrated by the Conservative Government in Canberra.

The unbridled wage increases mentioned by the Minister for Justice are certainly not reflected in the average wage paid to workers in Western Australia. The minimum wage for a worker was \$69 in March of this year, and the minimum weekly award rate—and this is the rate payable for a full week's work, excluding overtime, as prescribed in Commonwealth and State award determinations and agreements—was \$75.98 in March this year. The average weekly earnings, including overtime and everything else associated with earnings, such as bonuses, etc., was \$111.80 in March.

So how anybody can say that the work force of Western Australia is overpaid and is receiving unbridled wage increases is beyond my comprehension. Perhaps some of the fat cats referred to quite frequently do have unbridled wage increases granted to them, but certainly not the workers of this country and the type of people whom I represent in the North-East Metropolitan Province.

In his speech the Minister referred to these people and to the supposedly massive increases in wages they have received. I wonder how many members in this Chamber would like to work for 40 hours a week and to live on \$75 a week. From the comments I have heard in the corridors of this place since I have been here, I would think that many members are having extreme difficulty in living on \$250 a week; so how people who earn \$75 a week can be criticised for trying to obtain wage increases is beyond my comprehension.

One does not find in any document presented to this Parliament any reference to the unbridled profits extracted from the labours of people who work for \$75 and \$111 a week; and no reference is made to the \$72 million profit of BHP this year, or to the \$1 500 million profit made by Shell International—and the day after that profit was declared an increase in the price of petrol of 1c a gallon was announced.

I have not seen a document presented in this Chamber or the other place in which reference is made to what could be termed at the very least the shady share dealings occurring in Australia, and which have occurred over a long period as revealed by the Rae report. So far only one company has come out in its own defence after the publication of that report, and that was the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. So when people are engaged in attacking the economic affairs of this country they should look at the other side of the coin to acquaint themselves with the profits that are being made and everything else associated with our industrial relations.

I wish to make one further comment before I turn to another item. An article written by a Western Australian economist (Dr Andrew Houston), appeared in *The West Australian* of the 3rd August, 1974. I think it is worth reading, and I quote an extract from it as follows—

If the Government—

He is talking of the Australian Government—

—continued to regard inflation as its top policy priority, it had no real option but to carry on with its present deflationary policies.

The report went on—

Dr Houston blamed the electorate rather than the Government for unemployment.

He said the public had been united in demanding that the rate of inflation should be reduced, but at the same time denied the Government power to introduce a viable prices and incomes policy.

The public then objected to the unpleasant but inevitable repercussions of the only alternative open to the Government.

If the Government was to succeed in achieving its target of an eight per cent inflation rate by 1975 it had no alternative but to continue its present strategy.

I think that ought to be the situation that should be accepted, because the conservatives in this country did line up in December, 1973, and strongly opposed the Federal Government's measures to introduce controls over prices and incomes. Of course, those conservatives would not entertain control over prices, and the only reason they would not agree to control over incomes was that this would mean control over prices, profits, share dealings, and incomes of all kinds derived from large investments.

The other day when one of the members was speaking in this Chamber I had a strong suspicion he was looking straight at me when he made the statement that the Australian Government had committed a terrible act by granting \$4 500 to the Trades and Labor Council to engage in an arts programme. I do not think to grant \$4 500, to be divided among 80 000 people, is a very drastic action. The reason for the grant was questioned by the honourable member. I can enlighten the honourable member by saying that the \$4 500, meagre as it is, has been granted for the purpose of bringing a little art and culture into the workshops of this country and, as I understand the position, to form a bridge between the workshops and the theatre in an endeavour to encourage people to become interested in the arts and the culture of our country. It is an

endeavour to entice people away from their television sets in the evening and get them to attend the theatre instead. In trying to achieve this, the intention of the grant was to take a little bit of culture onto the job during the lunch hour so that people could understand what it was all about and gain a better appreciation of art and culture. I do not think that was such a terrible crime to commit; that is, to give to the Trades and Labor Council \$4 500 to carry out a programme such as this.

I can only conclude on the note of again imploring the Government of the day to get on with the job for which it was elected and to endeavour, in some way, to emulate the Tonkin Government. When it took office the Tonkin Government had a bankrupt Treasury; there was a downturn in the economy, and rising unemployment. Furthermore, at that time, there was in office a Federal Government with a different political view to that held by the Australian Labor Party. Nevertheless, the Tonkin Government tackled its task and at the end of its term it had improved the economy immeasurably. It had reduced unemployment; it had developed sound industrial relations and it had substantially assisted people on low and moderate incomes.

During my long term in the trade union movement I do not think I have seen the workers of this State in better shape. The quality of their lives will improve no end. So I ask members opposite to use their influence with the people who frame the policies of their Government to recall the remarks of the founder of the party to which those members belong, because the people of Western Australia are really becoming weary of the attitude adopted by members of that party to the Australian Government. I support the Bill.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [8.07 p.m.]: I support the motion, but in doing so I would like to point out I was very distressed—to use Mr Tozer's words—to find that during the annual conference of the National Alliance our Minister for Community Welfare gave us an indication of some of the waste that may occur if we pass the Supply Bill. It seems to me that if our professional people are to be insulted in this way it will be difficult for us to recruit professional officers from overseas to serve in this State.

If I may, Mr President, I will repeat, in effect, what the Minister for Community Welfare was reported to have said. He said he was trying to knock some sense into some of the departmental officers in regard to the treatment of Aborigines. He went on to say that he had received from somewhere, a report that was third or fourth hand, because he was told by some woman in some town, who had been told by some departmental officer about a certain mode of treatment that ought to be given to Aborigines in this particular case.

The matter was in regard to some furnishings and provisions for some Aborigines in a remote area.

If professional people are to be treated in this way, and in view of what was expressed by the Minister in his reply to a question asked by the Hon. Lyla Elliott the other day about the availability of social workers in this country—namely, that we have to send overseas some of our senior officers to recruit professional people because we are so short of them in this country—we will certainly experience a high turnover of professional staff.

Perhaps I could say that the Minister was misreported, but he went on to say that if he ever heard of this happening again the officer would get the rounds of the kitchen or be kicked out. If it is to cost us a lot of money to send officers overseas to recruit to this State professional people who will be spoken to in this way, it seems to me that this expenditure, on the passing of this Supply Bill, will be an uneconomical sort of operation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you know the facts of what was said to me at the conference? I do not think you do.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If the facts are the same as those reported in the Minister's speech I can only say that departmental officers in the country are supervised by professional people and that the policy implemented by employees of the Department for Community Welfare must certainly follow the policy of the Government of the day. However, those people also have their professional integrity to consider and they make decisions on particular cases according to the conditions obtaining. They usually forward a report to the Minister for Community Welfare. A conference held by a political party is hardly the place where these matters should be decided. I mention this because of my concern about the way in which this Government will be spending the money that will be granted following the passage of this Bill.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: This was not a case of spending Government money at all.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The only way by which we will fight inflation is by good housekeeping, and I do not consider that this is good housekeeping. I believe that some of the statements made by this Government before and after the last election indicated they were hiding cowardly behind the skirts of the Australian Government in its efforts to fight inflation. Before the election the present Premier said that the State could put things right irrespective of the policies adopted by the Australian Government. In fact, I quote from the Liberal Party manifesto before the election, in which it was said—

Inflation can be beaten to a substantial degree State by State.

In tackling inflation in that way the Government seems to be making excuses for its bad housekeeping by attacking the Australian Government.

As one member has said, the Premier's job is certainly to do the best for the State, but it is hardly the best for the State to set up this kind of confrontation with the Australian Government. It is surely better for the State to fight inflation by co-operating with the Australian Government than to indulge in this trumpet blowing and mouse roaring because that is what it is.

I repeat that it is a mouse roaring because it does not fit the bill. As I said in my Address-in-Reply speech, the State power to levy income tax was lost in 1942, and a succession of Premiers has been fighting with a succession of Prime Ministers on how they will share the cake of the income tax collected by the Australian Government. Certainly we have heard members here saying that Western Australia was a very rich State and, in fact, was beginning to carry some of the other States on its shoulders. We must remember that it is only six years since Western Australia was a claimant State and the other States carried us for a long time.

Let us consider the question of carrying the other States. Certainly we are in receipt of the largest income per head in Australia, but we also spend the most per head; and, in addition, if members will avail themselves of the very good library service in this House—and I commend it to them—and have a look at the *Year Books* and a few of the publications issued by the Bureau of Census and Statistics, they will find that some 40 per cent of the receipts that this State receives is from Australian Government grants. Also, the Australian average receipts of other States from the Australian Government are only 60 per cent of what we get in Western Australia. In fact, we get more in this State per head from the financial grants made by the Australian Government than do other States.

If we look at the Main Roads expenditure, we will see that of the \$56 million spent in 1971—these are the latest figures available to me—the Australian Government supplied \$41 million. We are a big State and we have all these problems Mr Tozer spoke about, but to form the idea that we can exist apart from the Australian Government is a grave mistake to make indeed. In point of fact, just before the election in this State a statement was made by some of the secessionists—and the other night, in this Chamber, I heard a similar remark—that we ought to secede. A very well respected public servant in the Treasury Department of this State said that he would leave the State if that happened because we would be behind by \$60 million a year. That is an awful lot of

money to make up even if we stopped paying pensions and similar payments which members opposite may agree to. However, if they did, we would still be very much worse off.

There has been mention tonight of the socialist philosophy versus free enterprise. I say with pride that I am a socialist and I believe in the socialist philosophy. I wish some members in this House would use the library a little more so that they understood the socialist philosophy. They might also spend a little time learning about free enterprise because it seems to be interpreted in money terms alone. This is all members opposite are concerned about.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis, who has again left his seat, expressed his concern that we worry too much about a high level of education. He also seems to be a Philistine in not believing that a sum of \$4 500 should be given to the trade union movement in order to bring some art into the lives of its members.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What a patronising person you are.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The socialist philosophy is concerned with enterprise in creativity and not just making money. This Government seems to be determined that it will not have even a *laissez-faire* situation. At least that was honest; the poor were left to starve. However, this is a matter of the Government intervening for the good of big business. We had a very good illustration of this concerning a two airline system in Western Australia but I will not go over that argument again.

I am afraid I have to come back to the Hon. J. C. Tozer because I cannot let him get away with his statement concerning factors affecting the value of votes. For the next three years I will share with the Hon. Clive Griffiths the representation of the South-East Metropolitan Province.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: He has done very well for a number of years.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I have just worked out that if we were to combine our efforts, and concentrate on the estimated 45 000 homes we have in our electorate—homes, not people—and if we were to go without sleep, never eat, and do without the other things which bring us joy in life, we might be able to visit one of those houses each 15 minutes.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The honourable member seems to be talking about it longer than that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Transport has been a difficulty in the past, but I think we have made advances in overcoming distance and communication, more so than the advances affecting poverty, want, misery, and deficiencies which

affect many people. I will refer to some of the figures mentioned by the Hon. D. W. Cooley in regard to the average weekly earnings. As I mentioned the other night, if members refer to our library and do some mental arithmetic they might find that 65 per cent of the adult males are earning less than the average weekly earnings. So we are not just talking about most of the workers living on \$111 per week; we are talking about the 65 per cent earning less than that. If we are to talk about weighting the value of a vote, let us take into account other factors. It is a disadvantage to be born with a brown skin, or to be born slightly deficient in some way which distinguishes a person from other people. It can be a mental, physical, or social handicap.

If we are going to weigh the value of our vote then we certainly will need one of the computers referred to by the Hon. J. C. Tozer. He was talking about computerisation in Canberra and the feeding of information to that centre. I put it to members that computerisation can be done just as much in Perth or in Derby as it can be done in Canberra. It is a matter of the attitude of the people attacking the problem; it is not a matter of the machine at all.

With regard to the people in the north-west, I was very surprised and disappointed to read that Mr Tozer had advocated that the women in the north-west could do themselves a service by not having a special adviser from the North-West Department to help them. That report appeared in the north-west papers. I think that was a sad reflection on the very good work which is done by the ladies in the area. I think the ladies of the north-west showed their feelings by passing a motion which the Hon. J. C. Tozer opposed at the Liberal Party conference.

With those reservations, I support the motion for the second reading of the Bill. I trust the Government will do its homework a little better and take into consideration the disadvantages of people other than those who are in business.

THE HON. T. O. PERRY (Lower Central) [8.21 p.m.]: I support the motion and I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating you, Mr President, on your election to your office. It is a position which I am sure you will carry out with dedication and impartiality. I would also like to congratulate the Leader of the Government in this House, the Hon. Neil McNeill. I think it is possible he will not have the same difficulty in getting legislation through this House as did his predecessor during the term of the Brand-Nalder Government. I also congratulate the other Ministers on the front bench and I would also add my congratulations to the Hon. Ron Thompson.

The two most important matters concerning Australia today do not concern inflation, but centralisation by the Australian Labor Government, and the approach by the Labor parties to law and order. It is the avowed intention of the Federal Labor Government to destroy State Governments.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is a sweeping statement. I would like to see the honourable member prove it.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: The miserable hand-outs to local authorities, by way of road grants, will destroy local government. The Hon. R. F. Claughton has challenged me on the avowed intention of the present Government in Canberra to destroy State Governments. I will quote an article published in *The West Australian* on Saturday, the 11th May, 1974. Senator Wheeldon was questioned on the abolition of State Governments, as follows—

Do you support your Prime Minister who has been quoted as saying he would like to abolish all State Governments?

Senator Wheeldon answered "Yes". The next question was—

Would you like to see all State Governments abolished?

The answer to that question was also "Yes". These remarks were made on the Channel 9 programme "Newsday" on Thursday, the 20th December, 1973. So, Senator Wheeldon agreed with Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The honourable member is not saying why.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I said that the avowed intention of the Government was to destroy the State Governments and the honourable member challenged me.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I still challenge you.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are not doing much good.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is right.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: In the same article to which I have referred it was shown that the leaders in the Labor Party in Western Australia are concerned about the centralised policies of the Australian Federal Government. Mr J. T. Tonkin, when he was Premier of Western Australia, said—

He asked me if I thought it was a good idea for him to come to Perth, I told him I did not think so. I gave him a piece of my mind.

That was Mr Tonkin, himself, talking about the harm done by Mr Whitlam's visit to Perth before the State election. These remarks were quoted in *The West Australian* of the 5th April, 1974.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Mrs Grace Vaughan does not agree.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: When did Mr Whitlam say he wanted to do away with State Governments?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Referring again to the article which appeared in the paper, Mr Jamieson, the former Minister for Works in the Tonkin Government, said—

They do not know what they are talking about. I wish they would spend half a day here instead of talking in Canberra.

Coming now to Mr Don May, a former Minister for Mines in the Tonkin Government, he said he agreed with the comments made by the President of the W.A. Chamber of Mines, (Mr L. C. Brodie-Hall). The article states—

Mr Brodie-Hall said of the Whitlam Government . . . "They are the greatest mob of bloody procrastinators. They need a solid kick in the behind."

Mr Don May agreed with that.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr May is a member of the Labor Party.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Mr Bickerton doubted their ability by saying—

I have no compunction in doubting their ability to judge the situation where they don't know the area. They should rely a bit more on local opinion rather than laying down a policy for the whole of Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr Bickerton was a member of the Labor Party. Who put that advertisement in the paper?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is the honourable member opposite suggesting that Mr Bickerton did not say that?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There won't be any more trouble with regard to mining and petroleum.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: That reaction came from the Labor Government in Western Australia because of too much control from Canberra. However, the Labor Party would like to see more control given to Canberra; it would like to surrender all State control to Canberra.

We have heard quite a lot recently about equality of votes. Of course, if the Australian Labor Government gets away with its aim and surrenders power to Canberra—and it may with equal voting—I would like Mr Claughton to note that 90 per cent of the population of Australia lives east of a line drawn from Brisbane to Adelaide. Ten per cent of the population of Australia lives in the rest of the area west of that line. It seems that Mr Claughton, as a West Australian, would be prepared to give 90 per cent of the representation of Australia to Canberra. Mr J. T. Tonkin, Mr Jamieson, and other members of the Labor Party were dissatisfied with control from

Canberra, but it seems the honourable member opposite is prepared to give Canberra 90 per cent of control. I am reminded of the Australian Assistance Plan which came to nothing.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Oh no!

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Oh yes! The honourable member would possibly agree with me that the Australian Assistance Plan has cost \$34 000 to distribute less than \$22 000.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: The honourable member is speaking in terms of money again!

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: We are talking about money. The honourable member opposite addressed us in the old tourist building and told us of the money we were to get. She spoke about money and about benefits. However, the AAP is 25 years behind the times because when I was Road Board Chairman in West Arthur I introduced an amenities plan which cost nothing to administer. Money at the rate of \$2 per head was collected with the rates and when the scouts, the girl guides, or similar organisations wanted assistance we had the money available. We did not need to have an expenditure such as in the case of the Australian Assistance Plan where \$34 000 has been spent in order to distribute \$22 000.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley praised the Federal Labor Government for its recognition of Communist China, and quoted the wheat deal made with that country.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I thought the honourable member would bring this up.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He did not like bringing it up.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not Communist China; it is the People's Republic. We do not want to lose the wheat deal.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Let us have a look at the wheat deal with Communist China. I will quote from *The Bulletin* of the 6th July, 1974, as follows—

THE AUSTRALIAN Government is keeping quiet about news of a major trade rift with Communist China. According to a confidential government report, the Australian trade mission which visited Peking in April was told that there would be no more long-term contracts apart from a sugar contract still being negotiated. The report said the Chinese had made a series of angry charges against Australia and threatened retaliation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who wrote the article—Peter Samuel?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I would like to read a little further on. It says—

The promise of major growth of Australian trade with China remains quite unfulfilled. Despite government

propaganda, Australia's trade with China is actually diminishing in importance. Even though the Labor Government has switched its embassy to Peking,—

And we know that it cost about \$200 000 to fly over a little bit of furniture.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Will you criticise the Australian Government if it comes up with big beef and wheat orders?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: We will see what the attitude is when it does that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If it produces anything worth while we will be delighted.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Labor Government is the only one to have achieved anything.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Ignorance is bliss.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: The article continues—

—trade with Taiwan continues to be of more importance than trade with mainland China and has been growing faster.

In the first 10 months of this financial year Australian imports from Taiwan have risen from \$43 million to \$89 million—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Imports! What about exports?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: To continue—whereas imports from the People's Republic have risen only from \$40 million to \$57 million. Imports from China represent a mere 1.2 per cent of total Australian imports and there is no sign of any increase in this insignificant proportion.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: We don't want to increase those; we want to increase the exports.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have to get paid somewhere or other.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That little document four years ago said the only thing that could be imported from Communist China was pig bristles, so we must have imported a great deal of pig bristles—\$56 million worth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Everyone is going back to shaving brushes.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: To those who have asked about our exports to Communist China, I would like to say that they are less than they were in 1963 when we had all those "baddies" in Government in Canberra—the Liberal-Country Party Government. Although the present Commonwealth Government has recognised Communist China, we are doing less trade with it than we were in 1963.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You must have been sending the exports in the back door.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I bet that the author of that article is Eric Butler.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The author of that article would know his facts, unlike Mr Cooley.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: The Hon. Grace Vaughan in her maiden speech asked us to recognise that one of the most valuable actions taken by the Tonkin Government whilst in office was to rid the State of the blowfish at Rottnest. I have been accused at times of being a little biased, but I do not think I am so biased that I would not give the Tonkin Government credit for doing a little more than ridding us of the blowfish at Rottnest. Even in my province I can think of the meatworks at Katanning and the fruit cannery at Manjimup. It is incredible that a member of the Western Australian Labor Party should say that one of the most valuable actions taken by the Tonkin Government—and I hope I have the words right—was to rid the State of the blowfish at Rottnest.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Have they returned since the change of Government?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I believe so.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We failed in one thing—we did not rid the State of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We went jolly close to doing the reverse.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: With those few words I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [8.35 p.m.]: First of all, may I compliment you, Mr President, on the high office that you now hold. I am sure that you will acquit yourself with dignity in the true manner of a presiding officer. Of course, I have witnessed other areas where the presiding officer sits above a table which holds a thing called a mace. I understand in that particular place the front benches are placed three sword lengths apart so that the avengers are not readily able to tear into each other with the sword. The gentleman who presides in the other place can come down from his Chair and at least parry the thrusts before the members do themselves much harm. After listening to some of the speeches made in this place, I feel it may be very handy if you, Sir, had a mace with which to keep law and order, or at least to bring a little common sense into the arena.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We're always glad to have your help.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I remember an occasion when the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke was Premier. He was sitting in the corridor one day together with the Hon. J. T. Tonkin, the Hon. H. E.

Graham, and the Hon. W. F. Willesee. Shortly after an election I walked down the corridor with a new member. This gentleman had had a pretty torrid time out on the hustings, and he was still a little sore. I said, "Good morning", and these gentlemen all said good morning to me, but my friend did not say anything. Eventually Mr Hawke said, "Who is your mate?" My companion still made no reply, and Mr Hawke said, "You know, he will keep, we even tame lions in here." I believe that possibly this comment applies to some of the speakers to the debate. Their speeches reflect their pent-up emotions and philosophies, but in time they will realise that in a hallowed House such as this—and I still believe it is a House of Review—bitterness and bias should not play a great part in our deliberations. I sincerely trust that this Chamber I have entered will remain to do the work for which it was originally set up.

As I have listened to the speeches here, I have detected a certain amount of hatred, or if not hatred, at least a great many personal viewpoints being put forward at the expense of everything else—even rationalism. This surprises me to a degree because I thought that when people became members of a Chamber such as this, they would realise that a great amount of tolerance is needed and indeed, a great amount of research must be undertaken when one wishes to speak on a subject. For example, I noticed the various comments made about different aspects of agriculture, and I looked around the benches at the members of this House who support the Labor Party. Apart from one member who comes from Exmouth, I believe the others have only very rarely, if indeed at all, been out of the metropolitan area. So I feel that many members have spoken on subjects about which they have insufficient knowledge.

Members in this House will discover that they must journey to the library and they must be prepared to read a great deal before they can speak with any authority, especially in respect of agriculture. Personally I would be very loath to enter a debate on social services. I would not like to intrude into that area because I have no training in that regard. My only experience is with local government, but at least many years in this work has given me a practical knowledge of the subject. I am not an academic or a theorist, and I am not too sure that I would want to be. I do not think these learned gentlemen really know what makes the world tick.

In certain parts of the State, and even in the metropolitan area, we can see a growing hatred of the word "academic". This hatred is extending almost to the word "education". We see the philosophy expounded that everyone without an education or training to a certain standard is completely dumb. If one cannot talk of technological progress and these other

new words I have heard bandied around here, one gets the feeling that perhaps one ought not be in this Chamber. In fact, I doubt whether one should even exist in Australia.

It seems that academics are very interesting people when they are talking amongst themselves—neither one understands what the other is talking about anyway. We are becoming too involved with academic ideas; we have yet to see an academic make a million.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: There it is again—money!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I thought that the Hon. Grace Vaughan would object to my referring to money again. But nevertheless, let us be factual. I attended the university at Canberra in March of this year for the world outlook for agriculture conference. This was arranged by the Government of Australia, and many people from all over the world were invited to attend. We went into a huddle for four days, and we were lectured by academics in a proper manner. A world authority was brought over by Senator Wriedt to sum up the whole operation for us. We listened for many hours to many subjects such as rice and other basic commodities we produce in Australia, and many of the things that help to create the wealth of our nation.

Various matters were discussed at great length, and the agriculturalists hoped that they would know where they were going in the future. Out of all this came a magnificent statement, and I remember this as clearly as I stand here, "1974 looks like a reasonably good year; 1975 is doubtful; and 1976 could be crucial." And that was it—that was a statement made to sum up a conference which cost Australia about \$1 million.

If the businesses in the private sector had to build up companies and to create employment on that sort of judgment, then I am afraid none of us would be in existence, and certainly none of the farmers would be functioning. I am very mindful of these factors, as I am also mindful of the hate which the farmers are feeling against these advisers. I do not deny that the Forrest Place incident was quite an explosion because I, like the Hon. Grace Vaughan, was present in Forrest Place on that occasion. However, I did not stand on the back of a truck and incite a mob as she did. I stood there and I listened to the speakers with a great deal of control and interest.

At about 11.00 a.m. that morning I had attended a meeting at which Senator Wriedt was present. He was addressing the Co-operative Federation at a function in one of the hotels south of the river. After his speech he invited questions upon any subject at all. He was asked whether he was going out to Subiaco as Mr Whitlam had refused to go. He said he

could not go because he had to catch the public plane back to Canberra and this would leave him insufficient time as there was no room for him on the Prime Minister's plane which left later that day. Therefore, as much as he would like to have gone, he was unable to do so. Mr Whitlam came over in a very large VIP plane—I do not know its exact size, but this could be checked. He had his secretaries and many other staff members with him.

I think it was a pretty poor thing that one of the staff or one of the stamp lickers was not kicked off the plane so that at least they could give Senator Wriedt a flight home after he had done the courteous thing by the farmers and gone out to Subiaco Oval.

I also thought Mr Whitlam should have had the guts to come out to Subiaco Oval because so many of his predecessors in office had done so. It was not so very long ago that a crowd of some 2 000 or 3 000 were at the oval during the term of the Brand-Nalder Government in Western Australia and the Gorton Government in Canberra. I remember that they were very irate indeed because we were in the middle of a recession. But did Doug Anthony run away from the situation? Not at all! He went to Subiaco Oval with Mr Nalder. They certainly were heckled, but they were listened to. There is nothing cowardly about farmers. They are not going to attack people and run away; they are quite decent people. I think members of the Opposition should get to know them a little better. They will find that farmers are not the despicable people members opposite seem to think they are. As a matter of fact, if we are not very careful and if this country continues to be run in the way it is being run at the moment, there will be a peasants' revolt, because it is the aim and the desire of the Labor Party to remove them.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: We do not have any peasants.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Does the honourable member know how many farmers in Australia earn less than \$2 000 a year? She would not be interested in that. She should go and have a look at the statistics and while she is doing so, she should remember that there are three forms of liars—there are liars, bloody liars and statistics. That is a well known fact and the honourable member should be careful about how she handles statistics.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Statistics do not lie.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: This hatred will overflow in the Chamber. In the few short days I have witnessed what is going on here, something that has alarmed me has been the talk about farmers not having any possible reason to want to have a go

at Mr Whitlam. After all is said and done they have lost only a certain amount of their tax relief and their superphosphate subsidy! Why should they be irate?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: They have not lost the super subsidy yet.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is true, but it certainly looks to be on the cards. While they were paying \$14 a ton last year, they will be paying \$47 a tonne next year. If that is the right step in the preservation of the production of this country, I am afraid I cannot understand the reasoning behind it. The farmers are becoming particularly upset by the moves of this centralist Federal Government. If the proposals put forward during the joint sitting of Federal Parliament today relating to voting come into effect for the reasons advanced by Mr Whitlam, then what Mr Perry indicated could happen when he showed us his map will be a practical reality.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Australia stops at the South Australian border!

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you know how many members we have in the House of Representatives?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, I do, but does the honourable member know that when Mr Whitlam introduced the Bill this morning and referred to the varying degrees of representation, he mentioned various States such as Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia but—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not once was Western Australia mentioned. He stopped at the South Australian border. Not once did he mention Western Australia or anything that might have affected it. He went over it four or five times and never got past the South Australian border.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I agree with the Minister for Education. This is the type of thing to which we are being subjected. Mr President, there is nothing surer than the fact that you are not going to occupy your high office for long. I believe this House, together with the other House, will shortly go out of existence. I think it will happen quicker than a lot of us realise. We know that this is the aim of the Labor Party. We also know that local government is on the way out and that regional wards will be set up. This is to be the grand new order. It has happened before on other matters. How the devil honourable members opposite, as Western Australians—although some have imported themselves from other States—if they are genuine—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: And some from other countries.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Honourable members opposite should realise that this is a large State and needs a lot of looking after. It should be looked after in its

own right. We talk about the constitutional validity of the actions taken by senators in rejecting the Federal Government's legislation and in amending certain parts of other legislation. Let me remind the House that, when we are fighting for our very existence, we must be unconstitutional. This is the stage we are reaching.

A previous speaker referred to the great speeches made by Frank Wise and the late Sir Keith Watson. It is true that both made very good speeches on the matter of State rights. I do not think anybody would deny that both Sir Keith and Frank Wise were very astute men and were very much Western Australians.

I think it was in 1966 that the late Sir Keith Watson pointed out that, prior to 1942, two-thirds of the taxation generated in Western Australia stayed in this State while the remainder went to the Commonwealth. He went on to maintain—I agree entirely with him—that this proportion taken by the Commonwealth should be at least returned to the State Government. I do not care which way the honourable member who mentioned statistics a while ago looks at the situation per head. This is one of those graphic situations which indicates that the State is not receiving that same proportion. It does not take very much effort to realise that this amount will gradually reduce as time goes on and as various Bills are introduced.

Reference has been made to Commonwealth legislation dealing with main roads. It was lauded as being magnificent legislation. In 1973-74, this State will receive from the Commonwealth \$49.2 million; in 1974-75, it will receive \$49 million; in 1975-76, it will receive \$50 million; and in 1976-77, it will get \$51 million. With the increases in inflation, that is really a magnificent handout; there is no doubt about that! It is this type of thing that is breaking the country at present. It will not be long before this State will be brought down to its knees in a very sad way. Western Australia is one of the biggest States in the world. It is bigger than India. It encompasses one million square miles and has 4 500 miles of coastline and a population of only just over one million. Yet we are being subjected to centralism to the stage where it will be impossible to survive economically and I think that, ultimately, this is the aim of the Commonwealth.

A short while ago, we heard reference to the poor people who work for a living. I think that 40 hours a week for \$75 were the figures mentioned. I do not know how many people would fit into that category. I happen to know of quite a few construction jobs going on where people work what might be considered to be a man's week of work. They may work slightly more than 40 hours a week, but they get into double and treble time. If they do

do a lot of work, the hours might possibly equal those that a farmer would put in during a normal working day to keep alive.

I do not object to unionists getting together or to the fact that there is a Labor Party to represent them. I do not object to a Liberal Party which represents certain areas and I certainly believe there must be a Country Party to represent country areas. Nevertheless, I am rather incensed at the so-called injustices which are being raised by members opposite when today in Australia we are not even able to get rid of our wheat from the ports so that the farmers can earn enough money to carry on and when we are not able to conduct wool sales because, firstly, the Government will not continue with the price-propping arrangements which applied previously and, secondly, because the Government does not know how to find markets in which to sell the wool. Let us face it: No wool is being sold and there is no likelihood that it is going to be sold.

In regard to wheat, I have never heard so much drivel in my life about the new markets we have created in China. What a magnificent job! There is no country at present that has wheat it cannot sell. There is no carry-over of wheat anywhere in the world. These are the plain, cold facts. The Chinese is a very intelligent businessman and he will use political persuasion and any other method to bring an exporting nation to heel, if necessary; and it will do that, especially now when the situation looks advantageous to the seller. The Federal Government has signed a contract to sell one million bushels of wheat to China, but no price has been stipulated. Fancy thinking that we should want to stipulate a price! The Government just signed a million bushel contract and plans to arrange the price later.

Japan has been looking for a 750 000 bushel contract for over three years. It should be remembered that there is a possibility that we may enter into a long-term contract and then experience a season such as the one we are now experiencing in Western Australia—although members opposite would not know anything about that. A situation could be reached where we could not supply the grain to fulfil the contract, and for that reason long-term contracts are very suspect. Nevertheless, at present, we are faced with the prospect of not being able to move our grain from the ports because we are bound up by strike action—the same action which held up 13 ships in Fremantle recently.

Recently New Zealand was not allowed to put on another ship to import Australian wheat into that country because that particular line operates between Australia and New Zealand under a reciprocal arrangement with two ships. Consequently, New Zealand was forced to import wheat from America. They also introduced bread rationing in the North Island. What a

crazy situation! Put simply, we cannot get rid of our wheat because we cannot get it out of the ports.

The Australian farmers have suffered to a degree the magnitude of which is not realised by those who ridicule them and drive them into the ground. For example, on demurrage alone we lost \$500 000 over the last four or five weeks. It was also a fact that we did not earn despatch money. One never realises how much despatch money one will earn until one earns it. "Despatch" is the opposite of "demurrage". If a vessel is turned around quickly—this is what Kwinana was designed for—it attracts despatch money, but if the vessel remains in port waiting to be loaded, it incurs demurrage money. If we add the two facets together, we must include the \$500 000 lost on demurrage and add what we would have earned in despatch.

I hazard a guess that the recent strikes cost us \$1 million in this area alone. There is nothing surer than the fact that this loss is incurred by the farmer and by nobody else. Nobody subsidises him on that angle; it is entirely his responsibility. So, when people say how well the farmers are doing and how they have never been better off, they should examine the other side of the question, where virtually nothing can be done because of the incessant strike action which threatens from all angles and which affects all industries. The strike actions all have an effect, one way or another, in the farming areas, where the farmer cannot pass on the extra costs involved.

I am mindful of the fact that at Kwinana an installation is being established to enable the export of wheat. This was hailed by the previous Government as being the greatest installation ever because the farmers were saving the builders and labourers during a period of recession. This was said and can be checked from the papers. The Hon. J. T. Tonkin said it was magnificent that someone had the foresight to go into the venture. That installation was estimated to cost \$42 million, but the latest figure is that on completion the cost will be \$48 million. This increase is a direct result of strikes, hold-ups, and extra wage demands, but who will pay the piper? The farmer will pay and he is not able to export his wheat to obtain income. It was reported to me this morning that some farmers in the Gairdner River area are unable to have their sheep shorn because they cannot pay the shearers' new wage. They do not have anything with which to pay it. What I am saying is factual. Members may not believe it, but things are getting to a serious stage. As I said, by October the repercussions will have ricocheted into the cities so much that we will be faced with the biggest recession we have ever experienced.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is ricocheting now.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes. Many building contractors now will go on a holiday when they have completed their present contracts. Members can check with builders and labourers if they do not believe me. These people will find it harder and harder to get work. But do not blame us when it happens; blame the policy of the Federal Government which is doing all it can to virtually wreck this country because that is exactly what is happening.

I am also very mindful of the fact that the farmer is having extreme difficulty in obtaining any overdraft money or carry-on to make up the leeway of a promised 20c due to him as an advance on wheat in August. This payment cannot come in because if they do not deliver their wheat overseas they cannot be paid for it. It is as simple as that. Firstly, the \$1.20 advanced had to be paid back to the Reserve Bank before the farmer could take out a second advance. After all is said and done we pay interest on that \$1.20 and whose money was it anyway? Members want to look at the facts and statistics before they talk about the marvellous things which have been achieved.

The other day Miss Elliott listed some items. I do not know whether members heard her, but amongst the great things the Whitlam Government had done for farmers she listed the wheat stabilization plan. What an amazing plan! Every five years we have had one. I asked her what was good about it, but she did not reply. She just went on speaking because she did not know one thing about it. She has been taught to go around the metropolitan area and laud these things and then people think it sounds good; but actually she does not know what she is talking about in this respect. As long as she and others adopt that attitude, all they will do is widen the rift between the country and the city; that is exactly what is happening.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are not doing a bad job now.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is right; but do not forget that we have at least tried. This hate is not emanating from us.

The only good thing about the wheat stabilization plan is that it will give a guaranteed income to the farm operator. The amount will be \$3 200 a year, or \$64 a week, for the next five years. There will be no escalation at all. That is the component upon which it is based. This is the magnificent plan which will give all the confidence in the world to the farmers to enable them to produce the grain to feed the millions of starving people in the world and bring in as much overseas revenue as this country needs. Without overseas revenue a country cannot exist and the only way to get it is through the farmer who is still the greatest asset Australia has.

Make no error about that. This seems to have been lost sight of, especially in the last week in this House.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He is not very modest.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: He may not be; but I doubt whether the average farmer has been impregnated with a gramophone needle to protect himself in his own right, especially when so much is happening about which he can do nothing. As an individual he is not organised. He is an individualist.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He was pretty organised in Forrest Place.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not know about that. I thought Forrest Place was a very orderly meeting compared with what was said on the back of the truck parked there. If the people are called scum and other things, are they expected to laugh?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not call them scum; the word was not used.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes it was, do not worry about that; and many other indignities were thrown at them. Heavens above, there is nothing surer than that they could have torn things apart; but they did not. They restrained themselves, smiled benignly—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You will make me cry in a minute.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: —and then members of the Labor Party threw things for which the farmers were blamed.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Poor dears. My heart bleeds for them.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is just as good a story as the honourable member's.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Probably more factual.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is true. Where is the proof that farmers threw anything? Where is it?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I had some sheep dirt thrown at me plus Coca Cola and pies.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Lanoline will never hurt anyone.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I am not saying anything against it. It is very valuable.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: As far as I am concerned they had every reason to—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Throw it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: —be annoyed. I did not say they threw anything. The honourable member is talking about offal being thrown around the place.

I am extremely concerned to think that this State is developing into the uneasy position in which it is today. There is a great deal of sorrow in the land and this was not so a few short years ago. I live

in the country and I love the country people. They are fine and they work hard, make no error about that. Some members here should try it some time and then they will know how hard the farmers work.

At least they want to live their own lives. They do not want to be pushed around by people who preach about an Australian Assistance Plan. Someone in the Terrace stated that the farmers are sick of thinking for themselves and that they want someone to think for them. I have never heard so much poppycock in my life.

The situation of the shire councils is grim. I think they were mentioned earlier today when I was not present. One shire council is to increase its rates by 80 per cent and another is sacking 13 men. This is only a start. Mr Pratt stated the other night that some rates were going up by 30, 50, and even 100 per cent, and I know this to be true. I am not arguing this statement in the slightest. But why is this occurring? It is purely and simply because Commonwealth funds are no longer being channelled through the States. Some are coming direct from the Commonwealth but no-one knows what they will be. In addition controls are being attached to the funds by way of regions, main roads, and so on, and any form of help now comes through the region areas, bypassing the States altogether.

I was very interested to hear the talk by the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr Jones), when he introduced the Bill dealing with roads and road transport. He is a very good speaker, and when he introduced the Bill he said—

I am sure they will represent a radical departure from previous road arrangements.

That is the understatement of the century. I have never heard anything like it. The Bill has already passed through the House of Representatives and most likely it will receive a little slating from the Senate, but will go through eventually. The Bill indicates that the Minister may notify a State the day before which programme projects are to be involved and any projects of a specific nature must be submitted to him for approval. Machinery would be included in this. This will be really dandy. Supposing the shire council at, say, Quairading, wants to buy a grader. Because it is a specific project and is included under the Act, the shire will have to write to Canberra whereupon some public servant—I am sure the Minister will not deal with the queries of 900 shires—will tell the Quairading Shire whether or not it can buy the grader. This is how stupid the system will be.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: Centralism.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes. Someone 2 500 miles away will have to give the answer when Mr Whitlam does not even know we exist, as his speech this morning revealed. An extract from the Bill reads—

For the purposes of this Act the Minister after consultation with the appropriate Minister of a State may approve programmes of projects—

“May” approve programmes of projects. To continue—

—by way of—

- (1) The construction of rural arterial roads;
- (2) The construction of developmental roads;
- (3) The construction and maintenance—

Maintenance mind you! To continue—

—of rural local roads;

- (4) Minor traffic engineering and road safety improvements.

At present the State has a great deal of flood trouble. I can imagine what will happen when the Bill is passed and money is needed for repair to a road in a country area. The shire clerk will be sent to Perth to catch a plane to Canberra to make representations. These are the very things which are breaking the hearts of not only the farmers, but of all the residents in Western Australia who have gradually realised what centralism will do to this State.

I heard a while ago about grants coming back by way of regions, and what a good thing this will be. It was stated that this State was once under a grants system. I can recall that all right. I can recall that the reason road maintenance tax was imposed—incidentally this was imposed originally by a Labor Government—was because we had to be on a par with other States in connection with taxes imposed. I can remember very well what we had to do because we wanted money from the Grants Commission.

The other day Mr Thompson spoke at great length on the traffic Bill and I having queried you, Mr. President, as to whether he could speak on that Bill, you informed me he could, and so I propose to do likewise. Years ago the right to license vehicles was taken away from the country shires in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland and we know very well that if that had not occurred the rates and taxes being paid by the farmers in those areas would have been considerably lower than they are at present.

We know very well that in the first year of operation there was something like 68 per cent of the amount of money collected at the central office going back to the shires, while the remaining 32 per cent was lost in administrative costs in the city. Mr Heitman knows as well as I do that those figures are correct.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is right.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Accordingly, to catch up with the leeway, rates and taxes have had to be increased in those

areas. It appears to be the will of Mr Thompson that we give up the licensing of our vehicles and let this be done by the centralist authority here.

The first thing that would happen is that the shires would have to eventually lift their rates and taxes—and it will not be long before they do this—to counter-balance the small amount they used to collect. If the shires do not do this there certainly will be nothing coming back in the way of grants from the Federal authorities until such time as the people in those shires are taxed in exactly the same manner as they are in the other regions of Australia. I certainly do not think that this is good horse sense.

It is a shocking indictment to think that in relatively poor soil country we should have to suffer the indignity of having "to catch the horses' tail" in another part of the Commonwealth. These are very real issues with which we are faced.

I am also mindful of the fact that Mr Thompson went into considerable detail as to the advantages that would accrue, especially in the control of traffic if this were centralised. I would remind the honourable member that he is only using red herrings to justify his argument. I daresay the honourable member knows that in 1919 the first measure was introduced to license vehicles throughout the State and the money was to be held in a central place.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I quoted that.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The honourable member said 1917.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said the traffic authority was formed in 1919.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On the 6th December, 1918, the Bill lapsed because of the component dealing with the centralising of traffic funds. In 1919 the Act came into being with the provision that the country shires would collect the licenses and also employ the traffic inspectors; they would also maintain roads out of the amounts they were receiving.

This has gone on year after year and we have had almighty arguments by the Police Department, the Treasury, and others who have had only one idea in mind, and that is to get their fat little hands on the money being collected by the shires. This is still the aim, with the red herring of traffic safety being drawn across the concept. Mr Thompson said he was down south in Katanning and some people said, "You may as well convert to police control because we do not see traffic inspectors".

The Hon. R. Thompson: We wish we did.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I went from Melbourne the Christmas before last and travelled through Swanview and the top

end of South Australia and thence to Adelaide. I had with me the shire presidents of Wongan Hills and Narembeen. We saw two traffic policemen in that time in two States which have police control. So I do not know how Mr Thompson thinks they are doing a service. It is certainly the wish of the Queensland Government to hand back control. This can be checked.

We also know it will not have any positive bearing so far as this State is concerned particularly as it relates to expenditure.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You and I are only arguing about the authority. My argument is that it should be the police and not the authority. Your shires will be just as badly off.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The honourable member wants to centralise it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Government is going to centralise it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Why don't you bring back the sheriffs?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: In 1959 I was a member of the country traffic committee. In those days we were trying to get a statutory authority set up in the country to control country traffic. Mr Heitman knows of those years. The idea was that it would virtually control traffic inspectors, would train them, and would run the highway patrol. So there is nothing new coming into being. I was also a director of the National Safety Council for nine years.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In 1965?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I was a director from 1963 to 1971.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And your representative under the Brand committee recommended police control of traffic.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Every time the National Safety Council brought up centralised control I opposed it. It eventually became a one-sided argument and I got off the subject because I was not making much headway. I was only a lone country voice among the departmental interests and so on.

Nevertheless, whatever happens, if we can get a decent acceptable traffic control, other than the police—

The Hon. R. Thompson: Why other than the police?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Because I do not believe it is the job of the police.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You should start doing a bit of study on this.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I can do some study if the honourable member wishes. But again a lot of statistics will be trotted out and the same thing will apply to my statistics as does to those presented by the honourable member. I asked the honourable member the question and he

did not answer and quote the length of roads in Western Australia compared with the length of roads in Victoria; nor did he give me how many accidents occurred per mile of traffic. If the honourable member plays down one line of statistics he must play down the other. He is prepared to accept the figure because that is the answer he wants; because it tells the story he wishes to know. This matter has been blown up in previous years and no doubt it will be blown up here.

Mr President, I am quite convinced that Australia will be a very sick nation indeed inside three months. I am sorry the nation is heading in this direction and I am fearful of what will happen in the future. If we do not get our feet on the ground shortly and try to do something about the matter in an endeavour to straighten out the centralist Government it will be too late to do anything about it. I think already our powers are being usurped and eroded to such a degree that very soon the Government in this State will be superfluous. If things are happening which warrant the granting of additional supply, as the Minister pointed out, then there is nothing surer than the fact that another department should be set up by the Premier and he should bring in the best constitutional lawyer he can get from outside Australia to fight for our very life and existence within the Commonwealth of Australia because, at the moment, we certainly appear to be having all our rights taken from us. We will secure nothing unless we can secure the services of such a man who could attack the problem with a perfectly open mind; and who could view the position as only an outsider could. This being the case, it might be preferable to appoint somebody from outside Australia for this purpose.

I am sure nothing was laid down by our forefathers which indicated we should hand over government in Western Australia to the central authorities. I feel very sorry indeed for Australia, and I am very sorry that the academic brains of the country have advised us to the extent where we will very shortly find ourselves being formed into two groups of people—the elitist group which comprises the academics, and the other which comprises the workers, the farmers, and those whom I have the honour to represent.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [9.25 p.m.]: In supporting this Bill I would like to congratulate Mr Gayfer on his maiden speech.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He introduced a new cure for inflation—we should put our feet on the ground!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Some people might wish to place their heads on the block. I noticed that at the end of last week, and quite recently, a few people did place their heads on the block. I would like

to thank the Hon. D. W. Cooley for informing me of the position on the arts grant. He certainly took it the wrong way. Had he read my speech he would have found that I said I believed money should have been given to arts organisations which had plans to put up. The TLC admitted that it had no plans to put up.

The other interesting point I wish to mention is that Mr Bluck, who is the trustee, said that this money was going to be concentrated on art and not on entertainment. So unless the TLC has done a double switch the Hon. D. W. Cooley's explanation was not quite correct and the money is not to be utilised to take the theatre to the factories for the poor 80 000 people to whom he referred.

I hope the honourable member will realise in time that he should stick to one set of facts—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What are you—

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If my little friend opposite wants to keep on going I can raise my voice a lot louder and he will have no chance at all! I would now like to refer to some of Mrs Vaughan's comments, particularly to her remark that what I said on education was nonsense. Anybody hearing Mrs Vaughan speak could be excused for thinking she was an expert on many things.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: On social welfare.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have some doubt about that. I doubt whether Mrs Vaughan listened to what I said on education. I asked whether we were going the right way about education and whether we were spending too much money on education. The honourable member wiped those questions off as nonsense because they did not agree with her views.

I did say that overseas countries had found that possibly too much money was being spent on tertiary education. I presume the honourable member's reference to nonsense included that statement of mine. As one example I would like to quote a report of the Minister for Education to the Legislative Assembly in Ontario in 1973. It states—

In August, two of the teachers' colleges operated by the ministry, one in Stratford, the other in Peterborough, were closed. While the Stratford College staff members were transferred to the ministry to fill vacancies in certain areas, the staff of the Peterborough College was transferred to the Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Kingston, and its elementary teacher training program was combined with the Queen's program.

Two other teachers' colleges were integrated with university faculties of education.

This only goes to prove that some members in this place talk without doing sufficient research. They talk about nonsense when they do not really know what they are talking about, or are able to clarify what they have to say. Let me now turn to the Australian assistance plan and make the following quote from *Hansard*—

This plan is an opportunity for people at the grass roots level to involve themselves with the Government; it is an experimental programme and one which the Minister for Community Welfare welcomed as an opportunity for Western Australia to receive funds for the sorts of things about which Mr Masters was speaking last night; that is, those things which are necessary for an improved quality of life. Such things should be available.

Those words were spoken by the Hon. Grace Vaughan and are reported on page 107 of the current *Hansard*.

The interesting thing about it is that no money is available. The Federal Government has dropped everybody right in the soup. This money was to be handed out. We were told in the Tourist Development Authority's theatre that the money was to be handed to completely autonomous committees and that it would be a grant. Where is this grant? It is like everything else with the Labor Party—promises, promises, promises.

I am extremely worried about what has happened. Nobody has yet heard anything, and this week the chairman of the committee became so disgusted, because he could make no sense of the programme, that he resigned, and two or three members of his committee have also resigned. These people were to be autonomous. They are honourable men who were giving their time freely for the community, and they have reached the stage where they have had enough. They were not paid people, drawing their wages, who ran around talking about the quality of life and what-have-you. They were people who were doing a job for nothing, and it shocks me that any Government would make a promise of autonomy to a committee and then take it away. I do not believe this scheme, as it was introduced, will ever see the light of day.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You are talking nonsense.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, I am, but will the honourable member let me say that under this scheme an amount of \$284 000 was to be given to these committees before the 30th June and they have now received \$22 000? So I am the one who is talking nonsense! All the publicity put out by the PR officers of the ex-Minister for Community Welfare and the boys in

Canberra stated this money was to be allocated before the 30th June, but they have received only \$22 000—not 10 per cent. Even the building societies give better than that. It was an election gimmick and nothing else, and it did not do much good in that area.

Tonight we have heard a great deal about people attacking the workers. I sometimes wonder whether some of the people who talk about the workers have ever done any work themselves. Certainly they have never got down to the grass roots level and swung a pick; or they have been away from it for so long they have forgotten about it. As one of the so-called "conservatives", I have swung a pick and I have done some work. I am fascinated to hear again the trite phrases about how the workers are being attacked and how this shocking company BHP is taking \$91 million profit. What does \$91 million profit represent? It represents 5.2 per cent. If we could get our inflation rate down to that we would be getting somewhere in this country.

Everyone uses figures to his own advantage, but BHP employs 54 000 workers and I have worked with many of them.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That does not make them any better.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They are people for whom I have a great deal of time—far more than for those who are trying to "knock" the company which is employing them and giving them opportunities. One hears this trite stuff about "profit, profit, profit", but, when talking about 5 per cent, if one of the superannuation funds were producing only 5.2 per cent, members of the Opposition would want to know why.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No-one is "knocking" the profit. I said the workers were being attacked.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member was not attacking them? If he was not attacking them, I would be extremely surprised to learn the phrase: he used were not those written by some little research "peanut" in Canberra, as is 99 per cent of the Labor Party stuff, because they cannot write their own speeches.

The tendency seems to be that the unions do not want to trust their best employers in this country. They want to attack them at every turn—and these are the companies which are giving over a quarter of a million children, working men, and women their living. Yet members opposite want to attack them. It fascinates me to hear, day after day, the phrases that are rolled out, and I get sick and tired of hearing people say, "We never attack anybody."

The true worker, the man who is doing something for this community and who is prepared to work—and the majority of the workers in this country are people like that—are being sacrificed on the altar

for a few high union officials who want to make themselves secure for the rest of their lives by kicking up a fuss instead of getting down to the job of talking to employers and working for the men at the grass roots. The average Australian is the best workman in the world. Just let him work; do not ask him to stop working.

While I am in this mood I think I should refer to Forrest Place. I have heard some drivel in my time about tomato juice running down the back of one's neck and cans of Coca-Cola, either full or empty.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You did not have a full one hit you.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Before the honourable member ever came into the political arena I was warding off people who wanted to cut the extension cords of microphones and throw things—including punches—at people who were not even on the platform. In this case, one swallow makes a summer! The Labor Party grizzled so much that it is no wonder the Tonkin Government was tossed out on its ear. Such grizzling and groaning about one rowdy meeting! One Farmers' Union meeting would scare the pants off them. I have never heard so much rot in all my life. Let us have an end to this Forrest Place business.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You would want to, I am sure.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I could not care less. I will not go on with that. I do not like people to throw things, but I do like a good political meeting, and if members opposite want one without the other then they believe in fairy tales. They believe in fairy tales anyway because they believe in the ALP.

I would now like to deal with rural marketing. Mr Gayfer dealt fleetingly with this subject. In another place some 15 months ago I made a plea for the updating of rural marketing. The whole concept of rural marketing is still in the horse and buggy days. We must let experts sell our rural products. For too long we have allowed boards and other people to attempt to sell them, but I believe that despite the present conditions the farmers will have to contribute about 2 per cent of their turnover to a marketing organisation, just as any other business does. If General Motors-Holden's wants to build a motorcar, it gets an engineer to design it, a mechanic to build it, and a group of salesmen to sell it. We do not see an engineer going out to sell a motorcar, yet we find the primary producer trying to sell his products.

We must devise some up-to-date techniques for the selling of our rural products. In spite of what has been said in this Chamber about the farmers and the city, I think one of our greatest problems is in expressing the metropolitan view to the country, and the country view to the city.

The population in both areas must brighten up a great deal, and the complaining that is going on will not help in any way whatsoever. Within 12 months the farmers in this country will be in the most desperate straits they have ever been in unless there is a dramatic upturn in world demand for many goods. The last small so-called recession will be only a minor matter. The population of the country towns will be halved, and I suppose with the new 10 per cent rule we will need another redistribution. Our total livelihood depends basically on iron ore exports and the rural economy.

If the State is to go ahead we must get all the support we possibly can for our farmers, and the people in the city should be trying to understand the problems of the farmers. In the same way, the farmers must understand the problems of the unionists. There are faults on both sides. I think the project in connection with marketing must be commenced straightaway and that this Parliament should take the lead because we have seen what Canberra does in regard to rural affairs and, for that matter, anything affecting Western Australia. Canberra is not interested in us so we must take the lead and tell Canberra what needs to be done.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [9.43 p.m.]: Mr President, in addressing a few remarks to the Supply Bill I would like first of all to congratulate you on your elevation to the Chair of this House. I also congratulate my colleagues (Mr McNeill and Mr MacKinnon) on their appointment as Ministers, and Mr Heitman as Chairman of Committees and Deputy President; and I congratulate the members who were elected or re-elected to this House at the last election.

From the tone of the debate, it seems a few sparks will be flying in this House in the next few weeks, and I will probably cause some to fly during the course of my speech.

I rise to my feet to make some comments on Commonwealth-State financial relations. The Leader of the Opposition said I did not know anything about financial relations. I have been in the House only since 1950 and I would not know anything about Commonwealth-State relations! That is a surprising statement.

What stage have we reached? I will not quote dates, but some years ago it was decided, for a number of reasons, the Commonwealth would take over taxation. The reasons were that instead of having two taxation systems—one State and one Federal—we would have one system which is more economical and more convenient to run; and under the arrangements made between the States and the Commonwealth there was to be a division of the spoils of

revenue of the States and the States would be reimbursed from the taxation revenue. However, this has now developed into the case of big brother in Canberra saying, "We will grant you some money instead of reimbursing you from taxation." In other words, the Australian Government is saying that it is Commonwealth money and that it does not belong to the States. It has now become a grant. This attitude annoys me, and it has done for some time.

The same situation exists in regard to loan funds. We have reached the stage where we can obtain only so much loan funds, and the balance comes forward in some of the programmes such as that referred to by Mr Gayfer in respect of local government. Departments must now put up a programme; I do not know whether one should pronounce that word in the fashion of Russia or of our own country. It does not matter which department is concerned; if it wants extra money for a project it must put up a programme. If I want more money for hospitals I must get an officer to write to the Eastern States to the Sax Commission to ask for money and to outline what we want it for and exactly how it will be spent. This applies to other areas of spending.

This position was never intended at the time the right to raise loan moneys was given to the Commonwealth by the States; but this is the position which has developed and which we must now suffer as a result of giving centralised financial control to people in Canberra; those who are now bringing the States to their knees by their control measures.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan has made two speeches in this House within the last few evenings. The sum total of those speeches, apart from references to the franchise for this House—one vote—one value—and blowfish between Fremantle and Rottnest, has been directed towards social welfare. I believe she eats, drinks, and thinks social welfare from daylight till dawn; I am convinced of that. I think most members will realise who was the author of the social welfare programme to create the regions in this State which have been referred to by other members. The regions have been created to raise this so-called mythical amount of \$2 per head for each person in the region in respect of projects to be put up by the interim regional committee. The committee in the Great Southern which was referred to by other members was formed by Mrs Vaughan originally, and it has put up 127 propositions. However, what did it receive finance for? It received finance for eight of those propositions to the tune of \$23 000.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: So far.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That is so; only eight projects involving \$23 000 have been approved out of 127 propositions involving a possible \$248 000. That is the

figure I have been given. I can assure you, Sir, that the people of these regions are becoming pretty fed up with this sort of thing. I see this as a case of people believing they will get something for nothing.

I deplore this type of thing. Over the years country people in particular have gone to work and raised the money for things they wished to have. If they wished to have a swimming pool, a tennis court, or a football oval they voluntarily got to work and provided it for themselves. This business of putting up programmes takes away from them the individuality they have when they do things for themselves. It is another case of big brother granting some money for it to be done. I deplore this type of attitude being introduced in Australia; and I do not want to be directed by a centralised Government in Canberra in respect of social welfare funds.

When Mr Perry spoke earlier tonight and referred to these amounts of money under the welfare programme Mrs Vaughan retorted that he always referred to money. I refer back to her speech on the Address-in-Reply on the 31st July, as recorded at page 113 of *Hansard*, where she said—

If we can take advantage of what is being offered by the Australian Government I think the people of Western Australia will be grateful to this Government and realise it is big enough to recognise that where the money lies there lies the power.

Does not that contradict the interjection Mrs Vaughan made earlier tonight? Of course it does. She believes that the power in respect of social welfare lies behind the provision of money by the Commonwealth Government, which is merely using the taxpayers' money for its social welfare programmes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is not much heart and humanity in that statement, is there?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The honourable member also had a crack at me about something that happened at a Country Party conference. She read something about it in the paper, and so she had a bit of a go at me about it. I will relate to the Chamber what occurred at that conference. A delegate from the Ongerup area rose to his feet and informed the conference that an Aboriginal woman who was in regular employment at Ongerup had her wages taken from her by her husband and other Aborigines. Some local ladies in sympathy for her raised some money to buy food and blankets, etc. This was not third-hand or fourth-hand information; it came from a delegate and I take it that his word was his bond. He said the ladies were informed by the community welfare officer in that area that they were not to provide the woman with anything.

My remarks in reply to that were that at no time would I advocate a policy which did not allow people to raise money and to give it to anyone they liked to give it to. I think the heart of welfare is when people voluntarily help others in adverse circumstances.

I told the conference that if I heard of any officer of the Community Welfare Department saying that people are not allowed to donate money or anything at all to other people I would see that he got the rounds of the kitchen or else got the sack. I think I am justified in adopting that attitude because this is a free country and people must be allowed to help others without having somebody tell them they cannot do it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Have you seen the officer and found out his side of the story?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, I have not had sufficient time. I did not say that I had given him the rounds of the kitchen; I said that I would if I heard of it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In fairness to the officer I think you should make inquiries.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No name has been mentioned; I simply said that if an officer of the department did this I would take action. However, I have not had time to look into it; I have enough work to do in respect of the two portfolios I have inherited, and my task is not easy by a long shot as the Leader of the Opposition would well know.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You ought to be careful, Mr Minister; Mr Grassby will have you sacked.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Possibly.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is where the money is.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is right.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have many good employees in the Community Welfare Department, but not everyone is perfect; we always have some people who step over the line. I am not pointing the bone at anybody in particular, but I think we all know that at times mistakes are made or else some people get a little big for their boots and make statements which are resented and rightly so.

I have received complaints about officers by people who resent some of the things that have been said and done. Such complaints are inquired into and if the officers concerned have done anything wrong they are told so. Perhaps this could apply to the officer in this particular case but no name was mentioned; and no name no pack drill. The statement I made was purely that if this actually happened I would take action. I cannot see anything wrong with that. Am I as Minister for

Community Welfare an ogre who will not help people? I have been the Minister for some months now and I have not heard any complaint that I have refused to help anyone. Mrs Vaughan worked in the Community Welfare Department for some time, and I think she would know Keith Maine, Peter Gorton, John Bell, and Jeff Aves, all senior officers of the department. She can go to those officers at any time and ask them if I have ever refused help to anyone.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not say you had refused help in any way.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, but the honourable member intimated I would.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not. I was speaking about your remarks.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: At page 113 of the current *Hansard* Mrs Vaughan is recorded as saying—

In regard to co-operation being shown by other departments, I hope this Government and the Minister for Community Welfare in particular will ensure that no political bias is shown, because if it is it will mean that people are left high and dry; because, traditionally, this State has always filled the breach with emergency payments whenever there has been a hold up in any payment from the Australian Social Security Department. In taking such a step this is actually no skin off our noses because we are compensated for such payment from the Australian Government Social Security Department.

I therefore hope the Minister for Community Welfare will ensure that this custom is continued and will not introduce any spite in the handling of this matter because, if he does, we may find that disadvantaged people will be left high and dry without any money.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a terrible implication to make.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I take it as a bad implication that I would use political bias in the first place, or introduce spite in the second place.

I have never been a spiteful person; I have always been ready to help others and have gone out of my way to do so. I resent such a statement from a new member who by now should know me well enough to know that I am not spiteful. However, perhaps the honourable member does not know me well enough yet. Probably she will find that although I may appear to be tough on the outside I have a soft heart, even though I say it myself. When it comes to the crunch if anybody comes to me for help they know that help will be offered. Members of this Chamber with whom I have been associated for many years and

the people of my province who have re-elected me many times know what sort of heart I have, otherwise they would not have tolerated me for so long.

I trust that in future the honourable member will be a little more careful in regard to the statements she makes. I know that she is very interested in social welfare, but she should have a little more thought about whether the people of Australia want large doses of social welfare ladled onto their laps as the Federal Government is endeavouring to do at the moment while saying, "We are the big brothers and we will help you socially so that you will have to do very little to help yourselves." With those words I support the Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [10.00 p.m.]: First of all, I thank all members for their contributions to the debate and, more particularly, I thank them for their indications of support for this very important Bill. I think it will be borne out that the debate has been an extremely stimulating one; probably the most stimulating debate we have heard on any Supply Bill for a long time. As is usual on a financial measure such as this there has been a great variety of canvasses covered by members. I wish to assure the House that I do not intend to cover that ground again.

I certainly take the opportunity to comment on a few of the observations made by some members. However, before I do that—having on a previous occasion conveyed my congratulations to you, Sir, on your appointment as President of this House—as I have not had the opportunity to express my thanks before this, I now thank all the members who have spoken and extended congratulations to me and to my colleagues on assuming ministerial office in the Government. I acknowledge those congratulations now and express my appreciation for the sentiments expressed by members. I fully realise the position I hold, but I would like to point out that I will be able to carry out the duties as Leader of the Government in this House only with the co-operation of all members in order that the business of the Government shall be conducted—I hope smoothly—to the benefit of the House and certainly to the benefit of the people of Western Australia.

I would also like to convey my good wishes to the Leader of the Opposition and to his front bench members. I look forward to a period of co-operation, which co-operation will certainly be available from me, to ensure the passage of business in this House and I hope that the good spirit which has been maintained over a long period in the procedure of this Chamber will continue and that we will have a reasonably satisfactory year. I cannot ask for more than that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You will certainly get it from us.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: From the remarks of those who have already spoken to the Supply Bill I have gained the impression that they will not let legislation pass unnoticed, or unnoted. I would certainly expect them to make appropriate observations which, of course, is their entitlement.

I would like to compliment the new members who have spoken and who have made their maiden speeches in this House during this debate. I extend a hearty welcome to them and hope they obtain great satisfaction from their contributions to the debates in this House and that also they will obtain a great deal of satisfaction from the contributions made by other members. There is an old saying that there is nothing new under the sun, and I think that the new members in this House will find that, no matter what they say, all the observations they make will surely have been referred to or have been commented upon by many people during the long period this Parliament has been in existence. However, that need not deter them, of course, from making any observation they believe they should make.

I would like to say, too, that we have seen a good debate on this Supply Bill. Perhaps that is a sign of the times. It is a sign—to which I endeavoured to draw attention when moving the second reading—of the situation in which we find ourselves in Australia as a result of the economic circumstances. I make no apology for the fact that I did direct a great deal of attention to the actions and policies of the Federal Government. Irrespective of what the Opposition says, it must accept the fact that the economic climate in Australia at present is fundamentally the responsibility and the result of the actions of the Federal Government and its policies.

It is most interesting to note that in all the comments made by Opposition speakers, in their attempts to divert attention from the shortcomings and the failings of the Federal Government, there was no mention of one very salient feature which does, of course, occupy a tremendous amount of people's time and people's concern and occupies a great deal of space in the media. Not one word of it was mentioned by Opposition speakers. I refer to interest rates. Would any member of the Opposition suggest that the interest rates under which everyone in Australia is suffering, are not as a result of the policy followed by the Federal Government and are specifically and directly the result of the present level of the bond rate in Australia?

Of course, the Opposition cannot defend the indefensible. Let us be completely frank and honest about this. They can talk about inflation and say, "It is imported", but that is not the view shared

by everybody. If it is imported why is the rate of inflation not equal to the rate in all other countries throughout the world? Why is it that we in Australia should be suffering from a rate of inflation which is greater than that of other countries? It is just not an imported condition; it is one which is generated in Australia as a result of the fiscal and other policies followed in Australia.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not all of it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I said it is generated by those policies.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Some of it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: At least I have that acknowledgment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have never denied that to anyone.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Let me return to the Supply Bill itself. The Leader of the Opposition, in effect, said that State Governments and State Treasurers invariably referred to the insufficiency of funds made available by Commonwealth Governments irrespective of the party which happened to be in office. True, we have experienced this on many occasions.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Every year since I have been here.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. However, I think there is a slight difference, and perhaps it is a question of degree. If I may, I will refer to a speech made during a debate on a Supply Bill in 1971 which is reported on page 132, vol. 1, of the *Hansard* of that year. Before doing so, I refer particularly, in the first instance, to the question of wage and salary increases to which I certainly devoted some attention and in regard to which play has been placed on the word "unbridled". True, the word "unbridled" does not appear in previous second reading speeches made by the Minister who introduced the Supply Bill. However, I would like to quote an extract from a speech made by the Leader of the House at that time (the Hon. W. F. Willesee) in which he said—

The fact that the deficit has been held at \$4,368,000 in respect of the year just ended was due to the additional financial assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government towards the end of the year. But for the special Commonwealth assistance of \$5,000,000 together with the upward revision of \$4,000,000 to the financial assistance grant payable to Western Australia under the formula, the State deficit would have been of unmanageable proportions.

Even so, the deficit of \$4,368,000 is very substantial indeed and the worrying feature is that we move into the 1971-72 financial year with current expenditure running ahead of revenue

to that extent. Members will appreciate that any increase in revenue which becomes available to the Government this year will be required first to close that gap and only then to meet the additional full year cost of wage increases granted in the course of last year. The full cost of those increases will amount to \$40,000,000 during the current financial year.

Even the Labor Government at that time was extremely concerned about wage increases. So, I repeat: It is a question of degree. However, as to the reference by the Leader of the Opposition that the position has always been the same, once again, it is a question of degree. In the same speech, the Hon. W. F. Willesee went on to say—

In recognition of the plight of the States the Commonwealth Government has, at the recent Premier's conference, agreed to provide additional assistance in 1971-72 over and above the amount we could expect to obtain from the operation of the financial assistance grants formula.

We will receive in the aggregate an additional \$7,000,000 from this source; . . .

I do not need to read on, but I can perhaps make the observation that, at that time, there may well have been a more generous or a more understanding Federal Government which paid greater respect to the financial and budgetary difficulties of the State Government at that time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We were faced with a bigger deficit the year before; it was up by about \$9.8 million.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: If we want to talk in terms of deficits I will refer to them on another occasion in the operations of government, but at this stage I do not intend to embark on a whole canvass of that subject. The subject of the Leader of the Opposition's address to this Bill was mainly in relation to the setting up of a single traffic authority and I have no intention of entering into any lengthy detail or discussion on that subject. As I observed at the time, I thought that the Leader of the Opposition may well have been better engaged in reserving that subject until the Bill is introduced, because I think he would have been in a better position to make a more understanding observation of the Bill which I believe will be introduced later in the session.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It will get close scrutiny.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: However, the information he conveyed to the House is not necessarily the correct information and on this occasion I do no more than

to say that I will not contribute to the confusion, but because of a misunderstanding—

The Hon. R. Thompson: You do not specify where I am incorrect.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition where he was incorrect on the information I have received today. However, I will not contribute to the misunderstanding to which he made considerable reference.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is your opinion only.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I return to the point of making corrections. The Leader of the Opposition referred to misleading Press statements. That is true. I agree that many of the Press statements have been misleading and that is the reason the Minister for Transport has desisted making any further reference which may lend itself to any more misrepresentation. However, the Leader of the Opposition did say that we had 566 men actively engaged on traffic in Western Australia.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said 566 plus the men coming out of the school.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am advised that that information is not a fact. The number of police officers actively engaged on traffic control is 283. The number of 500 mentioned by the Police Department was probably the number required to control traffic efficiently throughout the State. The total of 566 mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition must include part-time traffic officers or people working for only one or two hours a day, and those officers are certainly not working full time as they will in our Government's proposal.

The Leader of the Opposition also said it would take \$8 million to set up the authority. I make no comment on that other than to say that that is purely an opinion expressed by the Leader of the Opposition, and I suggest that he should wait until the Bill is introduced when he will obtain an explanation and gain a greater understanding of the legislation, bearing in mind that the argument is to achieve the implementation of a proposal to guarantee an efficient traffic organisation in Western Australia; a view which I am sure we all share.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is right.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I pass on now to make some observations on some of the other contributions that were made to the debate. I refer firstly to the remarks made by the Hon. Lyla Elliott when she referred to the electoral position which I think has already been referred to by other members, and very graphically and very usefully by Mr Tom Perry, when he exhibited his map of Australia to the House. I will not canvass that subject other than to say that the Hon. Lyla Elliott said that a

greater number of votes were cast for the Labor Party than were cast for the Liberal Party and yet the Labor Party gained fewer seats. She went on to say that in a so-called democratic country, it seemed incredible that a party could poll more votes but win fewer seats than its opposition. I now say the Opposition members are always making statements such as this, but did they make such statements when they held seats in the north?

Opposition members are making suggestions such as this when they still hold the seats in the goldfields—which they have done historically—with what proportion of the population? Was there any great protest from members opposite then? Of course not. I also say there is another point which members opposite will continue to overlook, and which members of the Labor Party have been continually overlooking—deliberately, I believe—because it suits their purpose. The point is that in every electorate where a seat is contested every party has equal opportunity to win that seat.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: For the seat of Floreat, the honourable member is quite right!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: And in the Pilbara, the Gascoyne, and the Kimberley.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: And in Fremantle!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We did not complain about the Fremantle situation.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The honourable member did very nicely; I am sure he did not complain.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I have been through the situation, but Mr Cloughton claims that I did very nicely. I am one of those who won a seat, lost a seat, and just won a seat on another occasion. I know what a political campaign is all about. I know the situation; it is the same as in every other electorate. There is equal opportunity for any party to win a seat and if a party fails it should accept the situation, the same as the Labor Party claims we should stop squealing and accept the Commonwealth situation.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The honourable member would agree there is no such thing as a gerrymander?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: On the day of a joint sitting of the House of Representatives and the Senate we have Mr Cloughton referring to a gerrymander in terms of electoral matters! When we look at the electoral Bills which the Federal Government is passing by means of a joint sitting, what a thing for Mr Cloughton to come out and say. I am glad he smiles about it.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott also made quite a deal of reference to our economic position and, once again, as other members

have done, said that the State Government should just put up with the situation and that we cannot blame the Commonwealth Government for the difficulties we face.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is that not the advice which the previous Leader of the Opposition gave to us, and which I thought was very sound advice: Get on with the job and stop moaning?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is exactly what we wish to do: get on with the job.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is the Liberal Party policy; it is always somebody else who is to blame.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I think the Opposition does get a little sensitive because of the attacks on the Federal Government, and I think it has good reason to be sensitive. However, members opposite will not face up to the inflationary situation.

Another member opposite said when quoting from, I think, the Liberal Party policy or remarks of the present Premier, that inflation can be defeated State by State. Apparently that was a quote from a Liberal Party publication. The honourable member then went on to say that these matters could be sorted out and resolved. I am not sure of the exact words but I am quite certain there was reference to co-operation and negotiation.

Is that the way the Prime Minister (Mr Whitlam) wants to resolve the economic problems of Australia? By co-operation and negotiation? If he does he is going about it in a strange way. The result of the Premiers' Conference was that a direction was given to the Premiers to go back to their States and put up rates and taxes. That was an explicit direction from the Prime Minister. We had the position in this House tonight where the Hon. R. T. Leeson in what I thought was a useful contribution said he deplored the increase in freight rates. We do too; we deplore the necessity to increase rates.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: But we must not blame you!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We are responsible for putting up freight rates. What I am saying is the Prime Minister said that if the States want more money they will not get it from the Federal Government; it will have to be raised by putting up rates and taxes. Further to that, the Premiers have had to notify the Federal Government that that action had been taken, and our Premier has done that. It was in complete response to the direction of the Prime Minister so we regret the necessity for the increased charges too. However, the increase was inescapable in the circumstances. I repeat: we greatly regret the burden placed on the people.

Let us return to the point of co-operation and negotiation. An offer was made at the Premiers' Conference and on the 10th July, and the same offer was made to the Prime Minister as was made to the Leader of the Opposition prior to the election. The offer to the Leader of the Opposition was that if he were elected as Prime Minister the same offer would stand whereby the States would co-operate fully to the limit of their constitutional powers and administrative procedures in order to attack the national problem of inflation. What has been the response?

We have had to wait until this week for advice of a further meeting which, as I have indicated today, will be held next Tuesday. On a currently vital problem which is absolutely gnawing the entrails out of this country we have had to wait for a month in order to talk. The States have repeated their offers of complete co-operation which we fully recognise.

The aim and object of the Commonwealth Government is to secure powers from the States. We will pull with the Commonwealth in trying to meet these current difficulties and we believe that if action is taken with a total national strategy this problem can be overcome.

And as was stated by the Hon. Grace Vaughan in her quote, inflation can be defeated State by State. The purpose and meaning of that expression to which she referred is by co-operation and negotiation.

I do not wish to embark on a very lengthy speech in reply. Once again I thank members for the contributions they have made to the debate and I hope that as time goes by the new members in this House will take an enthusiastic part in future debates. I hope that as the weeks progress not only will we have a satisfactory session but those predictions of great difficulty which have been instanced by other members in this House tonight will not materialise. Surely the situation is serious enough as it is.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think we all agree with that remark.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I hope we will see better times and while there is a tendency for members to refer to newspaper headings and articles which happen to suit their purpose, I will mention one article in which a certain person—and no doubt, an eminent person because he got good coverage—predicts an inflation rate of 22 per cent. I hope that does not come about because its effect would be devastating.

I hope that our session during this year will be conducted in a far happier climate, economically, than has been the case in the past and I hope we can see some progress being made in Western Australia

without these difficulties which have come to light in the last few months and which, I think, we all regret.

I hope we can get back to the situation where there is not a great division between country and metropolitan, and not a great division between classes of people. This should not be the position in Western Australia. Surely we have left behind that situation in these enlightened times. Surely we are big enough now to be able to ride through that period. There is no place whatever in Western Australia for those divisions to be emphasised or, in fact to be permitted. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 6th August, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (38): ON NOTICE

1. GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Education Policies

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

Would he name the persons who advised the Government on the education policies announced by it in the policy speech and indicate their respective qualifications?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The persons concerned are substantially those referred to in the article in the *Daily News* dated 21st March, 1974. In addition, there were many others of experience and competence from a wide cross section who gave evidence.

2. DAYLIGHT SAVING

Government Members: Conscience Vote

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Since *The West Australian* of 1st August, 1974 under the heading "Daylight Saving in Western

Australia this year" says "Liberal and Country Party Members will have a conscience vote on the issue"—

- (a) is this an accurate report;
- (b) if "Yes"—

- (i) since when have Liberal and Country Party Members not voted according to their individual conscience;

- (ii) what are each and every of the special ingredients of the daylight saving question which cause members of Liberal and Country Parties to decide that it is necessary and prudent for them to vote according to their conscience?

- (2) Is it not so that when Liberal and Country Party Members are not free to vote according to their conscience they are not free at all, but they must obey party directions, and decisions, or suffer the adverse consequences of such disobedience?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) Reference to a "conscience" vote is the wording of the newspaper.

As announced, the Daylight Saving Bill is to be introduced on a non-Party basis, and Liberal and Country Party members will vote accordingly.

- (b) (i) The Liberal and Country Parties do not work on the caucus system practised by the ALP.

Naturally, it is assumed that all Members will normally vote according to party decisions in matters of basic policy, but the Liberal and Country Party have traditionally allowed greater flexibility than applies in a caucus system.

Mr Davies: Ho, ho, ho!

Mr Jamieson: Three bottles of rum!

Sir CHARLES COURT: To continue—

- (ii) and (iii) See answer to (a).

- (2) See answer to (1) (b) (i).

3. BUSINESS DEALINGS

Government Action

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Will he state each and every corrective step which the Government has taken thus far for the purpose of improving the—

- (a) general efficiency;