

The university has experienced considerable difficulty in recent years in complying with the statutory restriction of three months from the close of the university year in which to submit its report. This has been further aggravated by the need for the report to be submitted together with a copy of the Auditor-General's report on the accounts which, of necessity, is usually not available until later in the following year.

The amendment to section 41 is simple and provides for the senate to forward its report as soon as practicable after the close of the university year, and for the Auditor-General's report to be forwarded as soon as practicable after being received by the university authorities.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 20th March, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (56): ON NOTICE

1. RAILWAYS

Kalgoorlie Bar and Refreshment Room

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When were the bar, kiosk and the refreshment room at the Kalgoorlie railway station closed?
- (2) Why were these facilities closed?
- (3) Is he aware that the closure has resulted in inconvenience to railway patrons passing through Kalgoorlie, those originating journeys from this centre and those terminating journeys there?
- (4) Will he please consider making these facilities once more available?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) From the 28th December, 1974.
- (2) Because of decline in patronage and financial loss.
- (3) No. Bar, cafe, confectionery, and limited periodicals and magazines are available for sale on interstate passenger trains and also on the *Prospector* prior to arrival at and immediately after departure from Kalgoorlie.
- (4) No. There is no evidence to indicate that the situation which existed at the time of closure would improve.

2.

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Kalgoorlie

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a recent survey conducted by Mrs M. Tonkin of Menzies of parents who would be prepared to have their children attend a school hostel in Kalgoorlie if one existed?
- (2) Why was a submission made to the Minister in 1974 for the purchase of the Christian Brothers College building subsequent to the transfer of the college to a new site for use as a hostel rejected?
- (3) Has the Minister considered an approach to the Australian Schools Commission for necessary finance to purchase the said building for the purpose of a hostel?
- (4) Whilst it is true that on each occasion of a survey as to numbers of children who would attend a Kalgoorlie hostel judged by existing criteria, it has been reported that there have been insufficient children available to make a hostel a viable proposition, is it a fact that the situation is really one of the "chicken and the egg" because due to the lack of a hostel many parents make long range decisions early in a child's life for the education of the child away from Kalgoorlie?
- (5) When was the matter of a Kalgoorlie hostel last considered by the Country High Schools Hostels Authority?
- (6) Why cannot the situation in the eastern and north-eastern gold-fields, because of many factors not the least being due to environment and remoteness, be given special consideration?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The request to purchase the CBC building was carefully considered. It was rejected on the grounds that all the available evidence indicated that there were not sufficient students in the Kalgoorlie area to justify the provision of hostel accommodation. Other factors taken into account were some reservations about the suitability of the building, the availability of finance and the number of vacancies in other country hostels.
- (3) The special needs in regard to hostel accommodation have been included in the submission to the Schools Commission for the coming triennium.

- (4) This question calls for an expression of opinion. Departmental decisions are not related to such evidence. The fact is that there is insufficient demand for such a hostel in Kalgoorlie at the present time.
- (5) The matter of a hostel at Kalgoorlie was discussed at the meeting of the Authority held on the 27th February, 1974. It was decided to defer the building of a hostel for the present but action is proceeding to obtain a suitable site for future development should the demand for hostel accommodation increase.
- (6) The special factors associated with the goldfields are given every sympathetic consideration. The needs for a hostel at Kalgoorlie will continue to be kept under review.

3. MINERALISED OUTCROPS

Paterson Range: Nomenclature

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:

Why were the names submitted by the prospector Jean-Paul Turcaud, referring to the geographical location of three main mineralised outcrops in the Paterson Range of the Great Sandy Desert of Western Australia and discovered by him in October 1970, accepted by the Mines Department (which has samples of same) but refused by the Lands Department? Reference: Department of Lands and Surveys, Nomenclature Advisory Committee, File No. 2274/63.

Mr RIDGE replied:

There has been no correspondence from the Mines Department concerning the acceptance or otherwise of names submitted by the prospector Jean-Paul Turcaud.

4. MINERALISED OUTCROPS

Paterson Range: Discoverer

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it not a fact that in October 1970, Mines Department records confirm that an independent prospector, Mr Jean-Paul Turcaud, discovered in the Paterson Range in the Great Sandy Desert of Western Australia large mineralised outcrops (gossans) previously unknown?
- (2) Is it not a fact that the small prospector has been responsible for most major mining discoveries in Australia?

- (3) Has it not been a common practice for small prospectors to discuss their finds with mining companies and take mining companies onto their discoveries before any ground is pegged on the basis of trust on the part of the prospector?
- (4) What recognition in the knowledge of the Minister did the said prospector who discovered in 1970 the Paterson Range mineral deposit receive after bringing it in good faith to the attention of quite a number of very experienced mining companies?
- (5) What is the known connection between Newmont and Day Dawn Minerals in this Paterson Range development?
- (6) Is the Government going to stand by, knowing that the independent prospector Turcaud who brought the Paterson Range prospect to the attention of the mining company Newmont in 1970 and again in 1971 (and the company has never denied it), is refused proper recognition by the same company?
- (7) Has the Government which has been approached by Mr Turcaud's lawyer previously and is therefore quite aware of this situation, by not acting on the reports of a blatant injustice, to support the multinational corporation against the local prospector?
- (8) What tangible form of assistance has been extended by the Government to Newmont to develop this large mineral deposit, because of the importance of the discovery to the State?
- (9) Would the Government consider establishing a committee of inquiry into the history of the discovery of the Paterson Range deposit to establish to whom proper credit should be given for this discovery; and if the inquiry establishes that a company has benefited by the discovery made by the prospector who claims credit for same, without the company having properly rewarded the prospector, to ensure that the said company developing the deposit shall be required to equitably compensate the discoverer?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Assay results dated the 17th November, 1970, were shown to the Geological Survey Branch of the Mines Department by Mr J. P. Turcaud in May, 1972. The results, although analogous, were not encouraging and samples were not assayed for gold.

(2) Prior to 1960 this may have been true but since then most large deposits have been found by company exploration teams.

(3) No.

(4) I understand that Newmont Pty. Ltd. has made an offer without prejudice to Mr Turcaud in regard to the Paterson Range prospect.

(5) I am informed that Day Dawn Minerals who are reported to have prospected in the Paterson Range area independent of J. P. Turcaud passed their information on to Newmont.

(6) The matter of proper recognition by the company is a domestic issue between it and Turcaud.

(7) The Government has not supported either party in this issue.

(8) No tangible form of assistance has been extended to the company other than the granting of normal mining tenements and temporary reserves.

(9) No.

I might add that if the honourable member has any further inquiries he may as well consult the member for Clontarf who spent as much time on this matter as I have done.

5. POULTRY FARMING

Egg Producers: Reduction

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many egg producers were in the industry in each of the following years—January 1972, January 1973, January 1974, January 1975?

(2) If there is a reduction in the number of producers in recent times does he agree that people have been forced out of the industry?

(3) To what causes does he attribute the loss of these people from the industry?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) The total number of people liable to pay the hen levy under the Commonwealth Poultry Industry Levy Collection Act 1965-66 for the years in question is as follows—

January 6, 1972—545.

January 4, 1973—468.

January 3, 1974—399.

January 2, 1975—350.

(2) I would not agree that producers have been forced to leave the industry.

(3) Many causes could be listed including a desire to retire, health reasons, urbanisation, old farms requiring modernisation, and the incentive to take advantage of the monetary value of the license.

The trend towards fewer and larger farms in Australia is world wide.

6. POULTRY FARMING

Hen Licenses

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What is the number of birds necessary to produce the State's egg needs at this time?

(2) What is the number of birds presently licensed?

(3) Is there an excess number of birds necessary for the State's needs; if so, what is this number?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) Approximately 957 000.

(2) 1 083 000.

(3) Yes, 126 000.

7. POULTRY FARMING

Unit Viability

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What number of birds does he consider would be necessary in order to make an egg farm a viable proposition?

(2) Will he give consideration to an immediate cut in the numbers of licensed birds and will he also ensure that this cut is made on a graduated scale as distinct from an across the board cut in order to ensure that the small producers are not adversely affected?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) The viability of a poultry unit can only be determined on the basis of an individual's own financial and personal circumstance.

Currently the cost of egg production is based on a 5 000 bird unit.

(2) An immediate cut in the numbers of licensed birds is not possible under the Marketing of Eggs Act. Consideration is being given to a 12 per cent cut across the board as from the 1st July, 1975.

As an improvement in returns to producers is unlikely without a reduction in bird numbers, and as all egg producers, both large and small stand to gain through the reduction of bird numbers, the cut-back will be applied uniformly.

8. **BLACKWOOD RIVER***Salinity*

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

- (1) Is he aware that the research undertaken by Dr N. M. Morrissy indicates that the salinity in the Blackwood River has increased to a remarkable and dangerous degree?
- (2) What action does he intend to take with respect to this development?
- (3) What implications does the research finding have on the continued clearing of land for agricultural purposes and on any Government position to release more land for agriculture?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) to (3) No results of research undertaken by Dr Morrissy draw this conclusion. The only article by Dr Morrissy sighted, lists figures from two sample dates during a summer and these indicate as expected an increase in salinity during the summer. However the increase in salinity of the Blackwood River since the beginning of the century is well known and has been documented by Mr G. H. Burvill.

I am unaware of any moves to alienate more land in the catchment of the Blackwood River.

9. **HEALTH***Chemicals in Foodstuffs: Effect on Children*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that research in the United States into the incidence of chemicals in food and soft drink products indicates that such substances may distort a child's natural development?
- (2) What action is the Government taking, pending the conclusion of the research?
- (3) What action does the Government intend to take to protect Western Australian children from such dangers?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The additives to food are strictly controlled.
- (3) The nature of these additives is under constant review by Government.

10. **HEALTH***Venereal Disease: School Instruction*

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

- (1) Is it a fact that instruction is being afforded to young people in schools and in youth clubs as to the dangers of venereal disease?
- (2) If "Yes" how many such young people received this instruction during the years 1972, 1973, 1974?
- (3) How many students is it expected will receive this instruction during 1975?
- (4) What are the numbers of cases of venereal disease reported in Western Australia for each of the years 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and so far in 1975?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not accurately known but between 10 000 and 15 000 per annum.
- (3) Unknown. This depends on requests and officers available. The council is developing specialised audio-visual materials for use by schools.
- (4) 1970—1 328.
1971—1 493.
1972—1 728.
1973—1 952.
1974—2 475.
1975—Not available.

11. **TRADE***International Markets: Government Interference*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Was he correctly reported in January as having said in Washington that Government interference in international markets is a danger to world development?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) does this mean that he is a free trader and does not believe in tariffs;
 - (b) does he believe in import quotas, and if not, how would he protect the jobs of Australian employees threatened by a flood of cheap imports, and how would he control the balance of our overseas reserves;
 - (c) what other forms of Government interference in international markets would he advocate should be dispensed with;
 - (d) does his philosophy apply to Government interference in market forces within an economy, and if so, what interference would he prescribe?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) I am not prepared to comment on a matter of this importance out of context.

The whole question of Government interference, as such, in international trade—as distinct from the proper and desirable role of Governments to encourage and facilitate trade on sound lines—is hardly one to be dealt with in the answer to a routine question.

In any case, Standing Orders would not permit the length of answer necessary.

The Speaker ruled that the second part of this question was on a matter of policy too large to be dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question and therefore was not admissible.

12. TEACHERS

Increase in Number

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was the Minister correctly reported in *The West Australian* of 16th January when indicating that the number of teachers in State primary and secondary schools will increase by more than 1 000 this year?
- (2) How much of this increase is due to Australian Government money being made available for education?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Commonwealth Government has returned Australian taxpayers' money to the State for this purpose. However, the component of the Schools Commission grant allocated for salaries is the equivalent of approximately 600 teacher salaries; i.e., some 60 per cent of the additional teachers employed.

13. WATER SUPPLIES

Kent River Catchment Area

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) As he has described the Kent River catchment as of long term importance, what is being done to ensure that the catchment is not cleared for farming or any other uses?
- (2) What percentage of the catchment is cleared?
- (3) What percentage of the catchment area is Crown land, alienated or otherwise utilised or reserved for particular purposes?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

- (1) Alienation of Crown land on the Kent River catchment area above what is considered the lowest practicable damsite is no longer permitted.
- (2) In the order of 50 per cent.
- (3) The calculation of these percentages requires considerable work and the actual values are not available at this time.

14. WATER SUPPLIES

Available Known Sources

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

In his answer to question 19 of 15th August, 1974, he referred to "increased regulation of existing resources" as an answer to the question asking for details of the known sources of water which will be available to the metropolitan area in the next two decades. What will be the nature of the increased regulation that is likely to occur?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

Increased regulation of existing resources could be achieved in the following ways—

- (1) By providing additional storage on selected streams;
- (2) By more refined operating techniques applied to existing and future water storages.

15. WATER SUPPLIES

Damming of Brooks and Murray River

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What evidence is there to show that the Rockman River, Woorooloo Brook, Jane Brook, Gooralong Brook, Cooralong Brook and the Murray River are sources of potable water which seems to be the assumption underlining the answer to question 31 of 28th August, 1974?
- (2) How much water would be available from each of the above sources?
- (3) What would be the effect on downstream areas if dams or reservoirs were to be constructed across the above streams?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

- (1) Flow measurements and water quality tests have been made on the streams referred to for a number of years and are continuing. While it is recognised

that there may be varying degrees of salinity, turbidity and colour, water treatment of an appropriate type would enable use of these sources for public water supplies.

- (2) This has not been determined; it will depend upon the type of development adopted for each particular source, e.g., pipehead or storage dam.
- (3) Current studies have not reached a point where this effect can be predicted meaningfully; generally, the downstream annual stream flow would be diminished whereas the tendency for downstream flooding would also be reduced.

16. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Petrol: Lead Additives

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) What action has been decided upon as a consequence of the discussions on lead in petrol by the Australian Environment Council on 30th November, 1973?
- (2) What meetings of the council have been held since the meeting referred to in (1) and what subjects were discussed at any such meeting or meetings?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Since the meeting of the Australian Environment Council on the 30th November, 1973, the matter of lead in petrol has been extensively discussed by the Australian Environment Council Standing Committee.

Steps have already been taken in that a seminar on lead in petrol attended by representatives of the Standing Committee was held in Sydney on the 8th and 7th November, 1974. New South Wales has already designed regulations relating to lead in petrol and these have been circulated to Standing Committee members.

At the most recent meeting of the Australian Environment Council in Adelaide on the 7th February, 1975, it was resolved that the Standing Committee should prepare a synthesis of existing information for consideration by council.

- (2) One meeting of the Australian Environment Council has been held since the meeting referred to in (1). The many subjects discussed at this meeting are contained in the agenda, a copy of which I table for the information of Members. A point which may be of interest to Members is

that the next meeting of the Australian Environment Council is scheduled to be held in Perth on the 8th August, 1975.

The agenda was tabled (see paper No. 82).

17. LEEDERVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Plastering Classes

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many students are taught at the one time in the plastering section of Leederville Technical College in—
 - (a) solid plastering practical;
 - (b) fibrous plastering practical;
 - (c) theoretical?
- (2) Are plastering apprentices taught at the same time as architectural drafting students?
- (3) What space is available per student in the practical plastering sections at the time of maximum utilisation?
- (4) Can afternoon practical students work in the same area as that used by morning practical students or is the background still wet?
- (5) What other students use the facilities in addition to those referred to above?
- (6) Is there sufficient space available for the various purposes in the plastering section?
- (7) Who built the plastering section?
- (8) When was it built?
- (9) What does the Government intend to do to remedy the situation?
- (10) What other plastering schools are in existence in Western Australia?
- (11) Is practical experience afforded to plastering apprentices by sending them out on actual jobs?
- (12) Have the bricklaying classes encroached on the original plastering area, and if so, to what extent?
- (13) How much has been provided by—
 - (a) the Australian;
 - (b) the Western Australian Governments for—
 - (i) capital expenditure;
 - (ii) recurrent expenditure, in each of the past five financial years?
- (14) How much has been spent from those sources on the—
 - (a) bricklaying section;
 - (b) the plastering section;
 - (c) the plumbing section?

- (15) Have consultations regarding the conditions at the school been held with the Master Plasterers Association of Western Australia or with the Operative Plasterers and Plasterworkers Federation (W.A. Branch) (284022)?
- (16) If so, on what occasion did these meetings take place?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) There are in fact three teaching areas, solid plastering, fibrous plastering and theory. Student groups can be in all three sections simultaneously but the maximum in any one section is 15.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) It is impossible to assess a figure for space per student. It depends on the nature of the work being undertaken, the equipment being used and the materials required.
- (4) The work is rostered in an endeavour to gain the best utilisation of the area.
- (5) Draughting, night classes for floor and wall tiling, country apprentices, Quantities I, Trade Calculations.
- (6) It would be an advantage to have additional space.
- (7) Public Works Department.
- (8) In 1949 with additions in 1967.
- (9) The accommodation situation will be considered in the development of technical education teaching facilities.
- (10) None.
- (11) Technical training is designed to complement the extensive practical training gained in industry.
- (12) Brickwork which intrudes into this area is used by the plastering apprentices.
- (13) It is not possible to supply this information as it is not clear as to the division of education or the area involved.
- (14) Expenditure in these sections has occurred at the same time as other works in the college. Itemised expenditure to different sections of a major work is not assessed.
- (15) Yes.
- (16) The advisory committee has been active in its discussions.

18. INTERSTATE CORPORATE AFFAIRS COMMISSION

Establishment

Mr HARTREY, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission?

- (2) (a) How;
(b) when;
(c) where, and
(d) for what purpose, was the said commission created?
- (3) What is the agreement with the States of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland which, according to the Governor's Speech, our State Government proposes to join and adopt by legislation?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission was constituted by the Interstate Corporate Affairs Agreement. The Ministerial Council (which is provided for in clause 3 of that agreement) appointed six persons as members of the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission on the 15th March, 1974. Three of these persons are each responsible under the Attorneys-General for the States of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland for the administration of the law relating to companies in each of these States—the non-Government members of the commission represent the commercial and professional fields.
- (2) (a) Refer to (1).
(b) The agreement was entered into on the 18th February, 1974, and the appointment of members of the Commission was made on the 15th March, 1974.
(c) The Secretariat of the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission is located in Sydney.
(d) Subject to the direction and control of the Ministerial Council—to secure uniformity in administration and reciprocal arrangements within the participating States with respect to certain Companies Act and Securities Industry Act matters.
- (3) A copy of the agreement is submitted for tabling.

The agreement was tabled (see paper No. 83).

19.

HOUSING

Northam, York and Beverley

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it the intention of the commission to construct any homes in Northam, York or Beverley this financial year?
- (2) If "Yes" would he advise how many will be two or three bedroomed and where will they be situated in the respective towns?

- (3) Would the commission have regard for further pensioner accommodation and include pensioner units in its programme?
- (4) When is it contemplated the houses being constructed in Tooday Road and Hutt Street, Northam (Government Employees' Housing Authority) will be completed, and to whom will the houses be allocated?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

- (1) For the financial year 1974-75 and subject to the availability of serviced land and discussion with the local authority it is the commission's intention to build 4 units of pensioner accommodation; 8 three-bedroom dwellings under the Aboriginal Housing Scheme at Northam; 2 three-bedroom dwellings at York; and 2 three-bedroom dwellings under the Aboriginal Housing Scheme at Beverley.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) (a) There are presently 4 pensioner applicants for Northam. These applicants could be accommodated on completion of the above programme.
(b) 2 pensioner applicants are seeking assistance in York and these will be considered during the preparation of the 1975-76 building programme.
(c) There are no applications for pensioner accommodation at Beverley.
- (4) The contractor is experiencing difficulties and action is being taken to expedite the completion of the dwellings which is beyond contract time.

The question of allocation of the dwellings should be referred to the Government Employees' Housing Authority.

20.

RAILWAYS

Goomalling Stock Yards

Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Transport:

In view of the request by the Goomalling Shire Council and the Member for Moore to the Western Australian Government Railways not to demolish the stockyards at Goomalling, would he please advise—

- (1) Have the stockyards been demolished?
- (2) If "Yes" when was this work done?
- (3) When was the decision made to sell the stockyards?
- (4) Why was this decision made to sell them when the shire had objected to their demolition after being asked by the

WAGR if there were any objections to the demolition?

- (5) Is it WAGR policy to ask local government if it objects, and then to carry on regardless of objection to the removal of stockyards and ramps as is happening in the Moore electorate at other railway sidings?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The outside crush has been demolished but the main yards are still intact.
- (2) Work commenced on the 12th March, 1974.
- (3) The decision to demolish the Goomalling stockyards was made on the 31st October, 1974.
- (4) It is the Railways Department's practice to advise local shires and other interested parties of its intention to remove facilities considered to be redundant. If objections are raised and considered valid, the proposed action may be deferred and reviewed at a later date.

In the case of Goomalling, the department advised the shire that because of limited use being made of the existing yards they would be demolished and a portable stock race made available. The shire requested the department to leave the yards *in situ* because they considered them to be in a serviceable condition. The department did not accept this as a reason for retaining the yards because maintenance would still be required to keep them in good condition and the limited traffic could be adequately handled with a portable race.

- (5) No. Objections received are considered on their merits.

21. KALGOORLIE CEMETERY BOARD

Application for Grant

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

- (1) Did he receive a letter from me dated 16th January, 1975 seeking a financial grant on behalf of the Kalgoorlie Cemetery Board?
- (2) If "Yes" when may I expect a reply or at least an acknowledgment of same?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) A decision has been taken on the board's submission which will be communicated to the Honourable Member shortly.

22. EDUCATION

Karmel Funds, and School Building Programmes

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

- (1) Will the Minister confirm that Western Australia received grants totalling \$12.7 million and \$2.8 million respectively for general building programmes and library-resource centres from the Australian Government through Karmel programmes for the years 1974 and 1975?
- (2) Is the money allocated for general building programmes for use in constructing new buildings or upgrading existing buildings, or both?
- (3) Will the Minister list the metropolitan primary schools which have been approved for upgrading or rebuilding works during 1974 and 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The Karmel Report referred to general building programmes and specific building programmes. The general building programmes total \$8 510 000 and, as such, do not include special education or disadvantaged schools. The figure of \$12.7 million quoted in the question can only be reconciled if buildings other than general are included. The figure for the library-resource centres is \$2 720 000.
- (2) The provisions of the Karmel Report and the resulting legislation are specific in regard to replacement and upgrading. In many cases it may be necessary to erect a new building to replace an old structure but the Education Department cannot use its allocations to build new schools.
- (3) The building programme requested is contained in the report of the Schools Commission "Progress Report on General Building Programme" a copy of which is tabled.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 84).

23. SCHOOLS

Library-resource Centres

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

- (1) Which metropolitan primary schools have received or have been approved to receive library-resource centres in 1974 and 1975?

- (2) Does the Education Department apply a "needs criteria" in establishing priorities for such library-resource centres; if so, will the Minister indicate the basic factors considered in establishing "need"?

- (3) If (2) is "No" on what basis are schools selected to receive library-resource centres?

- (4) What criteria are employed to determine a school's priority for rebuilding or upgrading works programmes?

- (5) What section of the Education Department is responsible for establishing the priority list for such programmes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Ashfield
Attadale
Bassendean
Beckenham
Calista
Carlisle
Churchlands
Coolbellup
Deanmore
East Fremantle
East Hamilton Hill
Forrestfield
Gosnells
Glendale
Graylands
Greenwood
Guildford
Hampton
Hilton
Kalamunda
Kapinara
Karrinyup
Kensington
Lesmurdie
Maddington
Medina
Midland
Millen
Mt. Helena
Nollamara
North Balga
North Beach
North Inglewood
North Innaloo
North Lake
North Perth J.P.
Riverton
Rossmoyne
Safety Bay
Sorrento
South Coogee
South Terrace
Thornlie
Westfield
Westminster J.P.
West Morley
Whiteside
Willson
Winterford

(2) In the majority of instances, the criteria determining fund allocation for library-resource centres are the size of the enrolments and also the availability of existing facilities. In the case of cluster schools, the resource centre is added with the third cluster block.

(3) See answer to (2).

(4) The type and extent of the facilities available, in relation to the enrolments, both current and projected and also the finance available.

(5) Divisional priorities are collated and the final responsibility is that of the director-general.

24. TRANBY SCHOOL

Classrooms

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

(1) Is the Minister aware that at Tranby primary school in River-
vale—

(a) "temporary" prefabs have been used to accommodate classes for 23 years and that nine such prefabs are still in use;

(b) 50% of the school's enrolment is currently accommodated in the temporary prefabs;

(c) prior to 1972 for a period of 20 years the entire school enrolment was accommodated in temporary prefabricated classrooms?

(2) Has Tranby school been considered for a rebuilding programme?

(3) If (2) is "Yes" will the Minister indicate when this deplorable prefab accommodation will be replaced?

(4) If (3) is "No" will the Minister assure the House that immediate consideration will be given to this matter?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) to (c) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Replacement will depend on the availability of loan funds and the programmes to be introduced by the Schools Commission in the new triennium.

(4) Not applicable.

25. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

List

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

(1) Will the Minister provide the names of Western Australian schools in—

(a) the metropolitan area;
(b) country districts,
which have been classified as disadvantaged schools?

(2) For what period of time is this classification expected to last?

(3) When will consideration be given to extending the list of disadvantaged schools?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) Metropolitan—
Beaconsfield
South Terrace
White Gum Valley
South Fremantle S.H.S.
Winterfold
Hamilton Hill
North Fremantle
East Fremantle
Willagee
Koorilla
Hilton
Hamilton S.H.S.
Bellevue
Midland
Midvale
Middle Swan
North Perth J.P.
North Perth
Highgate
Newcastle St. J.P.
Osborne Park
Queens Park

(b) Country—
Onslow
Boulder
Boulder J.P.
Useless Loop
Camballin
Wilson Park, Colliie
Derby D.H.S.
Roebourne
Wyndham D.H.S.
Broome D.H.S.
Norseman D.H.S.
East Carnarvon
Carnarvon
Carnarvon H.S.
Rangeway, Geraldton
Beachlands, Geraldton
Carey Park, Bunbury
Yalgoo
Shark Bay
Leonora
Marble Bar
Cue
Meekatharra D.H.S.
Mullewa D.H.S.

Coolgardie
Zanthus
Rawlinna
Coonana
Menzies
Read

- (2) For the currency of the States Grants (Schools) Act 1973—that is, until December, 1975.
- (3) This will depend on the disadvantaged programme being continued by the Commonwealth Government beyond December, 1975.

26. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES

Liberal Party Policy

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Having regard to the prior election announced Liberal Party education policy "In primary schools—We will lower the admission age to the year in which the child turns five," does his reference in the printed version of his statement made in the Legislative Council on 18th March, 1975 concerning pre-primary and pre-school centres, to the "Department's pre-primary centre pilot scheme" mean to indicate that—
 - (a) the initiative for establishing pre-primary centres was taken by the Education Department and not by the Government; and
 - (b) does the Government intend to carry out its said promise without the qualification of that policy in the pre-primary centre scheme?
- (2) If either (a) or (b) is "No" why did he refer to the pre-primary centre scheme being that of the department rather than that of the Government?
- (3) Have any funds made available by the Australian Government Schools Commission been spent or committed on or to the pre-primary centre scheme?
- (4) Would he please explain why on page 5 of the printed version of his statement he said that "If the current pre-primary centre programme were dropped none of the funds allocated to it could be spent on other education projects"?
- (5) Referring to *The West Australian* newspaper report of his statement (19th March, 1975) it is reported that he said that the interim committee of the Children's Commission had endorsed the State

Government's pre-primary programme to the extent of about \$900 000. Does he confirm this amount?

- (6) Was the Pre-School Board consulted re the Government seeking a large sum of money from the above committee to have committed to the pre-primary centre programme (as distinct from pre-school centres)?
- (7) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) The reference to the "department's pre-primary centre pilot scheme" arises from the normal and desirable relationship between a Minister and the officers of the department within his portfolio. The Minister for Education actively associates himself with implementation of Government policies by his department and in no way considers that the initiative for establishing pre-primary centres was taken by the officers of the Education Department.
- (3) Schools Commission funds have not been spent on pre-primary centres.
- (4) A special Treasury allocation was made for this specific purpose and, as such, it could not be used on other educational projects.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) and (7) Invitations were issued by the Interim Committee of the Children's Commission. It was not necessary for any one applicant to discuss their plans with other groups.

27.

TRAINEE TEACHERS

Allowances

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Has Cabinet discussed the matter of a realistic increase in student allowances for trainee teachers?
- (2) If so, on what date or dates?
- (3) Having regard to the fact that submissions from student bodies seeking such an increase were received by the Government in August 1974, why has he, as Treasurer, apparently taken an inordinate period of time to make a decision?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) This matter has received full consideration, but as teacher trainees now have the choice of unbonded tertiary allowances or Education Department scholarships under the bonding system,

it is important that some comparability in allowance should be established.

The Commonwealth Government has established a committee to consider and advise on the nature and level of tertiary allowances. It is therefore advisable that the State Government should be aware of the outcome of these investigations before proceeding with a review of its own payments.

28. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION BOARD

Suggestions by Minister

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

(1) In the light of the disquiet existing in pre-school circles and highlighted by recent newspaper publicity and the Minister's own statement given in the Legislative Council on 18th March, 1975, will the Minister clearly state specifically the "suggestions" he put before members of the Pre-School Board for consideration and in respect of which the *Daily News* reported on 19th March, 1975 that members of the "Pre-School Board sit tight"?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) When the Minister is in receipt of a number of recommendations reported to have been made by the Pre-School Board at its meeting on 18th March, 1975, will he table these please (bearing in mind that it is reported the board is desirous of having the Minister make these recommendations public)?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) A meeting was arranged to discuss matters which the board had raised in general correspondence. Arising out of these discussions further thought was given to such matters as—

(a) The possible future of the board.

(b) The development of pre-primary education.

(c) The extension of the board's responsibilities in regard to the policies which have been formulated by the Children's Commission.

The word "suggestion" was used purely as an indication of general discussion as opposed to any firm proposals.

The Minister considers this to be a proper course of action. The

alternative of open publicity without reference to the board would have been most discourteous to the board members.

(3) The Minister has no doubt that the recommendation will be made public.

29. WATER SUPPLIES

Carnarvon and Gascoyne Groundwater Scheme

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Following my question of 2nd October last year when the Minister replied that he had had no indication from the Federal Government regarding the provision of funds for the Carnarvon and Gascoyne groundwater scheme as promised in the Queen's Speech when opening the Federal Parliament on 28th February, 1974, can he now advise if this position has changed?

(2) If (1) is still "No" can he advise if there is any reason from the point of view of the State Government as to why these funds are not forthcoming from the Federal Government?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

(1) The position has not changed.

(2) No.

30. ABATTOIRS

Meat Inspection Charges: Differentiations

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Were alterations in the realm of meat inspection fees in abattoirs published in the *Government Gazette* of 13th December, 1974?

(2) If so, does there exist a differential in charges between one zone and another?

(3) If (2) is "Yes" what is the reason for such differentiations and what is the level of difference in each case?

(4) Is he aware that some butchers who have to pay higher charges at a particular abattoir are being disadvantaged in competition with butchers who are able to deal with abattoirs where fees are less, and does he propose to take any action to rectify this situation?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) to (3) See the report tabled in reply to question 46 asked by the Member for Mundaring on the 19th March, 1975.

(4) Reports have been received that there are a few anomalies and these are being investigated with a view to adjustment.

31. MILK LICENSES

Albany-Denmark

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many licensed market milk dairymen in the Albany/Denmark district hold market milk licenses?
- (2) Of these, how many have been penalised this year for producing sub-standard milk?
- (3) What levels of penalty have been placed on each producer?
- (4) Was warning given to these producers in each case prior to the imposition of penalty, and if so, what length of time was allowed to rectify the position?
- (5) What advisory service to assist in upgrading milk produced has been made available to these producers?

Mr MCPHARLIN replied:

- (1) 20.
- (2) This information is not available to me as the application of the Dairy Industry Authority's differential payment scheme is not directly carried out by the authority.
- (3) Note comments in (2) above.
The details of the penalties under the scheme are that any market milk supplied testing 8.40 per cent to 8.49 per cent SNF receives basic market milk price less 5 c/gallon, that testing 8.30 per cent to 8.39 per cent SNF receives basic market milk price less 10 cents/gallon and that testing below 8.30 per cent SNF is paid for at manufacturing milk prices.
- (4) All dairymen licensed to produce market milk were circularised with the above details of the scheme in June 1974. Since then each dairyman has been given the results of his milk quality test after each eight days testing period by the factory receiving the milk. He would be able to determine the trend in his milk composition and foresee danger of producing milk in the penalty range.
- (5) There are departmental officers at Albany and at Denmark who are available on request to assist any producer to upgrade his milk.

32. WOOD CHIPPING INDUSTRY

Pemberton Water Supply: Effect

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) Is there any danger of waste and wood sap from the proposed wood chip plant currently being constructed at Diamond Tree finding

its way into the Lefroy Brook from which the town of Pemberton draws its water supply?

- (2) Has the Department of Environmental Protection carried out an investigation of the probability of contamination from the source referred to above, and if so, what were the results of the inquiries?
- (3) What measures has the company concerned taken to prevent pollution of this water course through any activities of the company from occurring?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Studies by Forests Department indicate no danger from this source.
- (2) No.
- (3) A settling dam is being installed for the purification of process water which will only be used for washing logs. Water will flow from this dam into a holding dam from which it will be recycled for log washing. The process will be controlled under the provisions of the Wood Chipping Agreement Act of 1969 and 1973 and under the terms of the chip milling site lease which expressly prohibits the discharge or overflow of water containing contaminants in suspension or solution into the natural watercourse adjacent to the site.

33. DAIRY INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Producer Representative

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) On what date was the name of the new producer representative to the dairy authority announced?
- (2) Was a poll held by the Farmers' Union to determine who this organisation would recommend to fulfil this position?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2)—
 - (a) who were the candidates in the poll;
 - (b) what number of votes did each candidate gain;
 - (c) did any of the candidates hold a market milk license, and if so, which ones?
- (4) Will he list the existing members of the dairy authority and the section of the dairy industry which each represents?

Mr MCPHARLIN replied:

- (1) The announcement that Mr B. J. Oates was appointed to the Dairy Industry Authority was made in the daily Press of the 20th February, 1975.

- (2) Yes.
- (3) (a) B. J. Oates, I. Clune, E. G. Noakes.
- (b) This information is confidential to the Farmers' Union of W.A.
- (c) B. J. Oates, I. Clune.
- (4) A. A. Mills, Chairman—representing consumers of milk and dairy produce.
- R. W. Skidmore, B. J. Oates, M. Bell, T. W. Noakes—nominees of the Farmers' Union of W.A.
- E. F. Ptolomey, W. L. Simm—nominees of The Butter and Cheese Manufacturers' Association, The Milk Treatment Plants Association and the W.A. Chamber of Manufactures (Inc.).
- T. A. Morris—representing the Department of Agriculture.

34. WATER SUPPLIES

Port Hedland: Rates

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the current rate charged for domestic water supply to consumers at Port Hedland per kilolitre?
- (2) What is the rate per kilolitre to industrial concerns including the mining companies at Port Hedland?
- (3) What rate per kilolitre is charged to shipping taking on water at Port Hedland?
- (4) Is there any proposal to increase these rates at the present time?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

- (1) Domestic
 - First 683 kilolitres @ 7 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 227 kilolitres @ 11 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 455 kilolitres @ 22 c per kilolitre.
 - Over 1365 kilolitres @ 44 c per kilolitre.
- (2) Industrial
 - First 909 kilolitres @ 11 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 8183 kilolitres @ 22 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 81830 kilolitres @ 11 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 90922 kilolitres @ 13.2 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 90922 kilolitres @ 15.4 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 90922 kilolitres @ 17.6 c per kilolitre.
 - Next 90922 kilolitres @ 19.8 c per kilolitre.

Over 454 610 kilolitres @ 22 c per kilolitre.

Mining

All water consumed @ 22 c per kilolitre.

Goldsworthy and Mount Newman Companies pay actual costs arising from producing and delivering water to the point of draw.

(3) Shipping

All water consumed at 15.4 c per kilolitre.

(4) No.

35.

SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Replacements

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

As a result of the funds being made available by the Federal Government through the Australian Schools Commission for the replacement of old school buildings, would the Minister please inform me—

- (a) how many such buildings have been replaced since his Government came to office;
- (b) where are these schools located;
- (c) what was the cost of replacement;
- (d) what buildings does the Government propose to replace under this scheme during the balance of 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The details requested are included in the report of the Schools Commission issued in December, 1974, and entitled "Progress Report on General Building Grants Programme". A copy of this report has been tabled in relation to question 22 for Thursday, the 20th March.

36.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Dodd-Harborne Streets Intersection

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it intended to install traffic lights at the intersection of Dodd and Harborne Streets, Wembley, a dangerous intersection at which a fatal accident occurred recently?
- (2) If "Yes" when?
- (3) If "No" why?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) This intersection has not been included in the 1975-76 programme. Available funds limit the number of signal installations which can be provided each year.

At present there are numerous other intersections which have higher priority for signal control than Harborne Street-Dodd Street.

- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

37.

CIGARETTES

Ban on Advertising

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

- (1) To be consistent with the Australian Government's policy designed particularly to give young people and their parents a fair go in combating the pushers of cigarettes, will the Government legislate so as to place a ban on the advertising of cigarettes in newspapers and other publications?

- (2) If "Yes" when?

- (3) If "No" why?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) The principal advertising media are television and radio. Until the Commonwealth Government stops advertising cigarette smoking on television and radio, there is little effective action the State Government can take.

38.

STATE FINANCE

Loans from Private Sources

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he yet sought permission to borrow funds outside of the Loan Council?
- (2) If "No" will he outline the circumstances under which he will consider it opportune to do so?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Not at this stage.

- (2) When the Commonwealth Government permits the State to exercise its constitutional prerogative to foster development and expansion projects.

39.

PINE TIMBER

Price Increase

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is it a fact that the price of pine timber has increased by 60% since September 1974?
- (2) If "Yes" why?
- (3) If "No" what is the precise increase in the price of pine timber since September 1974?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) For large sawn baulks, "Yes." For sawn boards and case baulks, "No."

- (2) The increases were the first since February, 1972, despite three interim requests in the period February, 1972, to September, 1974. These increases were based on the previous unrealistically low price and were necessary to—

- (a) cover the unprecedented escalation in production costs, particularly wages, over the period;

- (b) restore former parities in stumpage rates;

- (c) obtain a general level of re-alignment of prices with comparable products elsewhere in Australia. Even so, the prices for baulks are still uneconomic and substantially below those for comparable products in South Australia where production is highly mechanised and on a much larger scale.

- (3) 56 per cent for sawn boards and case baulks.

88 per cent for large sawn baulks—this class constitutes approximately 25 per cent of total production.

40.

LIQUOR ACT

Payments under Section 168 (1)

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

What sums of money have thus far been paid and when and to whom pursuant to subsections 168 (1) (a) and (b) respectively of the Liquor Act, 1970?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No funds have so far been provided under these provisions.

41.

POLICE

Rape: Incidence and Charges

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Since 1st January 1974 how many cases of rape or attempted rape have been reported to the police?

- (2) During this period how many individual cases of rape or attempted rape have been committed by more than one person (e.g., pack rape)?

- (3) Since January 1974 how many persons have been apprehended and charged in connection with—
(a) single cases;
(b) pack rape?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) 50.

- (2) 13.

- (3) (a) 28.

- (b) 34.

42.

**HYDROELECTRIC
POWER STATION***Darling Range*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Has the Government's inquiries into the possibility of establishing a pump-storage hydro-electricity station in the Darling Range been completed?
- (2) If not, when is it envisaged that the Government will be in a position to make an announcement?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The feasibility study and detailed engineering investigation has been completed.
- (2) It is not envisaged that an announcement would be made before a decision to proceed with the scheme was decided.
Generating plant on order will meet present system load growth up to 1982.
Pumped storage would be evaluated with other alternatives when deciding on generating plant installations, to meet system requirements after 1982.

43.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES*Country Towns Assistance Scheme*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) How many towns have been assisted under the country towns assistance scheme since 4th April, 1974?
- (2) Will he detail the towns concerned and the date assistance commenced?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) Ravensthorpe—the 1st May, 1974.
Leonora—the 4th September, 1974.

44.

OIL CONTRACTS*Finalisation*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has agreement been reached on all aspects concerning the new oil contract?
- (2) If so, will he indicate the date of settlement and particulars of the new price?
- (3) If not, when will finality be reached?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The 12th December, 1974.
Base price at Kwinana power station—\$47.30 per long ton.
- (3) See above.

45.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES*Overseas Undertakings: Ministerial
Inspection*

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

Will he detail the companies and countries where electricity undertakings were visited by himself and the Minister for Electricity during their recent overseas visit?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Members of the Investment and Technical Mission who recently visited overseas, either individually or collectively, met with officers and/or visited facilities of—

Pacific Gas and Electric Company of San Francisco.

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District—California.

The Duquesne Light and Power Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Consolidated Edison Company, New York.

The Central Electricity Generating Board in the U.K.

In addition, consulting organisations which carry out work and offer consulting services appropriate to electricity undertakings, and which were also visited are—

Bechtel Pacific Corporation, California.

Kaiser Engineers, California.

Stanford Research Institute, California.

Ebasco Services, New York.

Hudson Institute.

In the USA, the following Federal agencies, whose activities impinge on the electricity supply industry, were also contacted—

Energy Resources Development Administration.

Federal Energy Agency.

The National Science Foundation.

Discussions and inspections of plant were also made with the manufacturers of heavy power equipment in the United States and the United Kingdom.

46.

STATE FORESTS*Overcutting*

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

- (1) With reference to question 5 of 18th March, 1975, how can an admitted degree of overcutting not lead to the destruction of our hardwood forests?
- (2) If overcutting is occurring because the livelihood of many people must not be jeopardised, why is

the Government seeking the migration of more timber workers whose livelihood will as a result of such migration be in jeopardy unless overcutting should occur?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The question reveals a glaring lack of understanding of forestry practice. Cutting of a forest does not lead to destruction. Under proper management, forests continue to provide a renewable resource and can be cut again and again. Overcutting refers to a level of cutting in excess of the sustained yield of a forest. Sustained yield management can be restored by a reduction in the level of cut. The level of the reduction necessary to restore sustained yield management depends on the level of overcutting and the length of time it is permitted.

As pointed out in answer to a previous question on this subject, Government policy provides for a degree of overcutting which is to be phased out by the closure of some sawmills when they reach the end of their economic life. The resultant loss of production will be compensated by the availability of additional supplies from the exotic softwood forests.

The policy is in conformity with the provisions of Working Plan No. 85 approved by the Governor in Council in February, 1972.

- (2) The additional timber workers are required to fill vacancies existing at a number of sawmills. Without the additional workers, the livelihood of the existing labour force in some mills could be placed in jeopardy because of an enforced closure.

47. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Pilot Uranium Plant

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) With reference to question 14 of 18th March, 1975, sub-question (8) should have read—
(8) Why was the Environmental Protection Authority's approval not sought—

will he give the reason for the EPA's approval not being sought?

- (2) What is the Government's policy as to how a decision is to be reached whether the EPA's permission is to be sought or need not be sought and what criteria are used in determining whether such approval shall or shall not be obtained?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The EPA's approval was not sought because adequate protection was assured by the Radiological Advisory Council's control by virtue of the Radioactive Substances Act.

It should be noted that the pilot uranium plant in question is small and was established within Western Mining Corporations' nickel refinery site at Kwinana. The plant produced an approximate total of only 20 kg of yellow coke during its entire operation.

- (2) Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act requires referral to the EPA of matters which "may have a detrimental effect on the environment".

In a case such as this one where the matter is adequately controlled under other Acts and regulations it is not normally referred to the EPA. A similar situation would exist in relation to the Clean Air Act and small emissions from an industrial operation.

However, may I assure the Honourable Member that this Government's policy is to refer any case where doubt could exist.

48.

HEALTH

PVC Food Wrappers

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

- (1) With reference to question 7 of 18th March, 1975, was the examination of a single wine cask the only investigation made by the State Government in respect of PVC wrappings?
(2) What other action is to be pursued?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) No immediate further action is anticipated. This would duplicate the very extensive Australian and overseas work in this field.

The National Health and Medical Research Council is collating information from all sources and departmental officers are closely involved.

49. *This question was postponed.*

50.

WATER SUPPLIES

State Forests: Effect of Overcutting

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Will he table the Water Research Foundation's research paper "Effects of Exotic Softwood Afforestation on Water Yield"?

which was published as a result of research carried out at the University of New South Wales?

- (2) Is it a fact that the overcutting in our hardwood forests will lead to the increased salinity and siltation of our water supplies?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr O'NEIL) replied:

- (1) One copy is held in the Public Works Department library. This copy is presently in use and not available for tabling. The member may sight the copy in the Public Works Department if he wishes; otherwise a copy can be obtained from the Water Research Foundation of Australia.
- (2) There is no evidence of this having occurred in carefully managed forests but the need to monitor these operations is recognised.

51.

HEALTH

Arteriosclerosis: Treatment

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

Further to question 15 of Thursday, 17th October, 1974 and earlier regarding the Dr Moeller treatment for arteriosclerosis, can he advise—

- (a) what progress has been made in this direction;
- (b) how many patients have so far been treated;
- (c) if none, when is it anticipated treatment will commence?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (a) Further progress has been made in arranging the necessary protection of the rights of patients who may be included in the controlled clinical trial of the machine acquired by the Government from Dr Moeller. It was agreed that the machine be placed under the management of the peripheral vascular unit operated by the visiting vascular surgeons to the Royal Perth and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospitals, that use of the machine on patients would be in accordance with appropriate requirements governing human experimentation, including the protection of the patients and the satisfactory obtaining of their consent. The Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital has now come to an arrangement with the University of W.A. whereby the Human Rights Committee of the university will, on behalf of the hospital,

review and ensure the protection of the rights and welfare of patients within the hospital involved in clinical trials of this kind. It is anticipated that the Human Rights Committee will be able to give early attention to this important aspect of the work to be carried out on the machine.

(b) None as yet.

- (c) The controlled clinical trial will be undertaken subsequent to and in the light of the advice of the university's Human Rights Committee.

52.

RAILWAYS

Narrogin-Kondinin and Narrogin-Kulin Services

Mr P. V. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it proposed that there should be any reduction or amendment to the number of rail services on the Narrogin-Kondinin railway?
- (2) Is it proposed to reduce or amend the frequency of WAGR road freight between Narrogin and Kulin?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No, but the number of services depend to a large extent on superphosphate and grain haulage.
- (2) No.

53.

SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Policy Change

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) Does he acknowledge that he has dispensed with the policy introduced under the Tonkin Government by which major school construction projects were proceeded with prior to the allocation of loan funds, hence facilitating new buildings being ready at the start of the school year?
- (2) Does he acknowledge that this reversal of policy has been largely responsible for the abnormally high number of school buildings being uncompleted at the start of this school year?
- (3) Will he revert to the previous policy so that the same situation will not occur in 1976?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No. The policy has not been reversed.

In fact, the policy which extends back beyond the Tonkin Government, has now been developed to allow of actual expenditure instead of merely committal prior to the commencement of the new financial year.

- (3) In view of the comments in (2), no such action is necessary.

54. TRAFFIC

Great Eastern Highway, Greenmount: Speed Limit

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Police:

With reference to my question 1 of 19th March, 1975 and in particular part (8) (c), would he list the speeds at which the six persons charged were travelling?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- 1 at 70 km/h
- 1 at 72 km/h
- 2 at 73 km/h
- 1 at 74 km/h
- 1 at 80 km/h

55. VENEREAL DISEASE

Health Education Officers

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

- (1) Referring to question 26 of Tuesday, 26th November, 1974, has any increase been made in the number of health education officers to deal with the problem of venereal disease?
- (2) If so, what are particulars?
- (3) If not, what is the reason?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Funds are not available.

56. POLICE

Patrol Cars: First Aid Kits

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Have all police cars been equipped with first aid kits?
- (2) If not, how many are equipped and how many are not equipped?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) 64.
(b) 513.

QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. INFLATION

Cost of Living: Increase

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the latest figures show that the cost of living in Perth is still rising at almost double the level for other cities in Australia?
- (2) Is he aware that the increased cost of living figure for Perth as compared with other capital cities is being fueled by decisions of his Government? I instance as an example increased electricity charges.
- (3) Does he intend to take any action to arrest the spiralling cost of living in Perth?
- (4) As I understand the Premier is going to the Eastern States next week, will he undertake to confer with the Premiers of the other States so that they might give him a clue as to how they are reducing the cost of living increases in their own States?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (4) I did not have any advance notice of this rather lengthy question from the honourable member and I do not think he could reasonably expect me to answer each part in detail. However, I make the following comments: Firstly, it is not sufficient to take just the movement in food prices as indicating a movement in the cost of living; and, secondly, it is no good taking one isolated month on its own to determine the general trend. For instance, if we consider last December on its own and compare it with the previous December we would get a distorted figure for the entire cost of living increase in Western Australia. In point of fact, the statistical table shows that, for the whole of 1974, Western Australia's increase was lower than any other capital in Australia.

Mr Harman: Where did you get those figures?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am giving the member for Maylands the official figures supplied by the Treasury and which I have quoted previously in answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the week. If the honourable member questions those figures, he is quite at liberty to do so and I am sure the Treasury officers will be only too delighted to give him the working

sheets from which they arrive at their figures. They have no desire to concoct figures.

The fact is that when we are talking about the cost of living, we must look at the total picture for a year because the reaction in cost structure is different in all States at different times of the year. For instance, the month in which we move our price of power—if it is different from the month in which it is increased in another State—will give a distorted picture for that month and for the quarter. The same applies with increases in food, water charges, rents, and so on. I ask the honourable member not to jump to conclusions. Of course we are concerned about the increase in the cost of living.

I remind the honourable member of the battle this State put up at the June meeting with the Prime Minister and other Premiers and the support we received from South Australia and other States; however, we got precisely nowhere in trying to convince the Commonwealth to help us abate the increases in costs that are under Government control. Furthermore, we renewed the effort on a number of other occasions particularly during the February Premiers' Conference and got exactly the same rebuff from the Prime Minister. So the honourable member should look at the total picture and also search his conscience in relation to the performance of his colleagues in Canberra.

2. ABORIGINES

Gnowangerup Hospital: Discrimination

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

What action is proposed in regard to the alleged racial discrimination at Gnowangerup Hospital as given in evidence before the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and reported in today's issue of *The West Australian*?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Minister for Health thanks the honourable member for notice of the question and asks me to inform him that the allegations referred to will be investigated.

3. NUCLEAR POWER STATION

Ledge Point

Mr Moiler (for Mr MAY), to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) In connection with the article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* dated the 26th January,

1975, headed "Ledge Point survey for nuclear plant" will he advise if the information contained in the article is correct?

- (2) If any of the information is incorrect will he indicate the relevant errors?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I thank the member for Clontarf for giving me notice of this question, the reply to which is as follows—

- (1) and (2) The basic facts concerning the State Electricity Commission are—

The commission has acquired a site for a future power station in the Ledge Point area. The site was selected so that a nuclear station could be possible.

Appropriate planning staff in the commission keeps itself alert to the future possibility of nuclear power generation.

4. ROAD TRANSPORT

Overload Permits: Compensation to Shires

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Where a permit is granted for overload carting of road construction material, is the shire council whose roads are being used entitled to require a percentage of the material carted to be used for its road works as compensation for road damage?
- (2) If "Yes", will the Minister provide details?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).

5. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Franchise: Royal Commission Report

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

The Premier will be aware that last year, in answer to a question, he informed the House that the report by the Royal Commission into the franchise of the State Government Insurance Office had been received in May. The Premier advised the House that the report was being considered by the Government. Will the Premier now make that report available?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

It so happens that the report is still the subject of some very detailed examination by at least

two, and possibly three, Government departments, because it is not just a question of the State Government Insurance Office franchise that is involved. However, I will give the honourable member a more specific answer on Tuesday.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 19th March, on the following motion by Mr Old—

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

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

6. SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Policy Change

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

My question arises out of his answer to question 53 on today's notice paper. In view of the answer given by the Premier, to what causes does he attribute the abnormally high number of school buildings which were uncompleted at the start of the current school year? I quote the example of Geraldton where three major school projects which were due to be completed by the start of the current school year are all running well behind schedule.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I must remind the honourable member that the control of this is in the hands of two other Ministers. Whilst I do try to keep in touch, I cannot be expected to keep in touch to that extent. However, I did understand the two Ministers concerned had, in fact, made the reasons clear not only in respect of that particular school but of the whole range of schools involved. I will seek the information for the honourable member; I hope he is not questioning the previous answer that has been given by me.

BILLS (6): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and read a first time.
2. Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Bill.
3. Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.
4. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.
5. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and read a first time.
6. Fruit-growing Reconstruction Scheme Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr McPharlin (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [3.16 p.m.]: I was disappointed by the answer given by the Minister for Transport to a question on today's notice paper relative to the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Dodd Street and Harborne Street, Wembley. It so happens that at the intersection is located the Wandarra State School. Whilst I acknowledge that certain criteria have to be followed to establish priorities for the installation of traffic lights, it is disappointing that the installation of lights at this intersection will have to be deferred longer. I emphasise that located in the vicinity of that intersection is the Wandarra State School.

A great number of children have to cross Harborne Street and Dodd Street, and without traffic lights they are doing so with considerable danger to themselves. It is true that a crosswalk attendant is engaged at that intersection and he does a good, workmanlike job to safeguard pedestrians crossing the road, but the flow of pedestrians, particularly little children, is so heavy that it is really expecting too much of the attendant to cope.

It so happens that for some time the Wandarra State School has not received a fair go in other directions. The school is served by a very good teaching staff; the grounds appear to be very satisfactory; but the accommodation is very poor, indeed. In the hot weather it is virtually impossible for the teachers to teach, or for the children to be taught, in the temporary structures—a type of Bristol hut which comprises the bulk of the buildings at that school.

I understand that the Minister for Education is taking this matter in hand and has given some indication that certain action will be taken rapidly in respect of the substandard school buildings. I hope the problem will be dealt with in that way, because the Wandarra State School has been left out in the cold for a long time. With the flood of funds flowing to the State from the Australian Government for the purpose of education, no longer is the State not in a position to undertake improvements in respect of school projects.

The money is coming in from the Australian Government, so surely the priority of Wandarra State School cannot be denied.

I hope that what I have heard is correct; that is, the Government will take action quickly to remove the substandard buildings and erect satisfactory ones in their place.

Another disappointing reply—although thoroughly predictable—was given in respect of question 37 on today's notice paper. My question was as follows—

- (1) To be consistent with the Australian Government's policy designed particularly to give young people and their parents a fair go in combatting the pushers of cigarettes, will the Government legislate so as to place a ban on the advertising of cigarettes in newspapers and other publications?
- (2) If "Yes" when?
- (3) If "No" why?

As I have already said, I am quite sure that you, Mr Speaker, will not argue with my proposition that the reply was completely predictable. In reply to my question asking whether the Government intended to do anything about placing a ban on the advertising of cigarettes the answer was "No". Part (2) of the question was answered by the reply to part (1). For the benefit of any member in this House who cannot understand the answer to part (3) of my question I will read it, as follows—

- (3) The principal advertising media are television and radio. Until the Australian Government stops advertising cigarette smoking on television and radio, there is little effective action the State Government can take.

That is a predictable no-hoper buck-passing answer. However, it has been supplied and we in Opposition, unfortunately, have simply to put up with that sort of answer.

Let me say there is plenty which the State Government can do. We do not need to be given the proposition—which was also thoroughly predictable—that everything depends on the Australian Government. The Australian Government will put an end, in the near future, to the pushing of cigarette advertising down the throats of young Australians but advertising will continue to appear in the newspapers and other publications over which the Australian Government has no jurisdiction, and the pushing of cigarettes through advertising will go on for another five or six years. We do not want to be faced with the proposition that because the Australian Government gave ample notice to the pushers of cigarettes—say, about five years—the Western Australian Government will then have to do the same.

Instead of waiting for some other State to hold its hand, or instead of waiting for a cue from Mr Bjelke-Petersen—and certainly instead of passing the buck and adopting a hopeless defeatist attitude which is manifested here nearly every day and nearly all day—the State Government ought to come out promptly and, to be fair to the pushers of cigarettes if fairness is appropriate in such circumstances, notwithstanding the fact that I believe such practices are not fair, say, "Take notice that from a certain day there shall be no advertising and no pushing of cigarettes in Western Australia."

I would like to make a comment at this stage. I, personally—and it should hardly be necessary for me to say this, but I shall—have no objection if people wish to smoke provided, of course, they do not puff their smoke down my throat.

Mr Jamieson: They often do, I suppose.

Mr BERTRAM: I have no objection to people smoking, if that is their choice. However, as I pointed out previously—and I underline my statement—I take the greatest exception to the situation where a responsible parent is seeking to educate, persuade, and by example indicate to his children that cigarette smoking is not a desirable habit. As a matter of fact, it can be fatal and it certainly is deleterious to health. Whilst parents battle desperately along those lines we have other people bombarding us through television and radio with nonsensical advertising, both amoral and immoral. If that type of advertising of such wares is said to be fair then that, of course, is news to me.

It certainly is not good enough for a no-hoper Conservative Government in this State to say it will not do anything until Gough Whitlam takes its hand. We should stand on our own feet. We have an obligation to put things right! When I say, "we" I mean the Premier. Here is an opportunity for him to put things right. Such action would attract votes to him, even if it does not attract election funds. It may cost him plenty in campaign funds, but he has to make up his mind where his priorities lie. Has the Premier a moral obligation to the people—the parents and the children—or has he no moral obligation? Is the Premier obsessed with getting more and more power in his hands? A question of this kind affects the health of the people and one gets the impression, from recent debates, that he is concerned with the health of the people.

The Premier could indicate his concern for the people by doing something on this very question, and doing it quickly.

Mr Nanovich: I know that smoking is not a clean habit but what does one do about the instance of a doctor recommending that a person should take up smoking?

Mr BERTRAM: If the honourable member believes in healthy young Australians he should get up and declare himself, so that everyone will know.

Mr Nanovich: I simply said that I agreed smoking was not a clean habit, and asked what one should do when a doctor recommends to a patient that he should take up smoking.

Mr Jamieson: That person should change his doctor.

Mr BERTRAM: In that case I would be inclined to support the suggestion put forward by my deputy leader. However, we are not discussing that aspect. We are discussing the habit of pushing cigarette smoking down the throats of young Australians. I am aware that occasionally doctors do advise people to take up smoking, but in my experience those instances are very rare, and perhaps on half the occasions that such recommendations are made the doctors are right.

I am not worrying about that aspect. I have already said that I am not worried about the person who wants to smoke. If smoking gives him satisfaction, or whatever else it is, good for him. I am concerned with the pushing of cigarettes and nicotine down the throats of Western Australians.

The no-hoper attitude demonstrated by the Premier is of concern to Western Australians, and I have just given an example of that attitude. Why the Premier should go gallivanting around the world spreading defeatism and trying to tell the captains of industry in the greatest private enterprise country in the world all about socialism and how those people should counter it, puzzles me. Surely the people in the United States are not stupid. They know more about private enterprise than the Premier has ever dreamt about. However, the Premier goes wandering off from Western Australia—not even as a national representative—and tries to tell the people of the United States all about socialism.

I certainly do not have any objection to anyone attacking socialism or any other "ism", whether it be liberalism or nationalism, to name a few. That is perfectly okay so far as I am concerned. But to run around telling people who know more about the subject than he does, and to go around knocking and not giving any constructive criticism, is worse, and it depicts a very poor image in this day and age. We, as a State, have some pride even if the Premier does not have it. It does not lie within the province of the Premier,

or the province of any other person, to condemn socialism if, in fact, other people practise it. That would seem to me to be a perfectly obvious fact.

What do you think, Mr Speaker, of the credibility of a person who condemns socialism on the one hand, thereby implying he will not have a bar of it and will not practise it, but when in fact given an opportunity to practise it he will practise it if it will win him votes or party funds? What about the credibility of that situation?

Last year our Budget totalled \$1.5 billion with a deficit of something like \$8.5 million. If we divide the figure of \$1.5 billion by \$8.5 million to obtain a percentage, we can see the lack of size of the deficit. Members may make their own assessment about that. The deficit could have been wiped out with complete ease if the Premier had believed what he said and undertaken to do something about removing the socialist content from his Budget. That is all he had to do. He had all sorts of reasons to justify himself for taking this action.

Mr Sibson: What would be the socialist content?

Mr BERTRAM: We have had responsible Government in this State for 80 years, and for 40 of those years the State was controlled by socialist Governments. Therefore, it would not be staggering to find a sizeable socialist content in our legislation. The Premier did nothing to strike one cent of socialist content from the Budget when he had the opportunity to do it.

Sir Charles Court: Tell us what you say we should strike out?

Mr BERTRAM: That is what I am doing.

Sir Charles Court: If you criticise you have the responsibility to give the alternative.

Mr BERTRAM: I will do this in due course when I have sufficient time. I do not have long enough to go into it at the moment, but any member who had read the Budget would know about this. Of course, I do not know whether or not members opposite have read the Budget. However, there is a very considerable socialist content in the Budget and one would not need to be Speed Gordon to know that when a socialist Government has ruled this State for 40 of our 80 years of responsible administration, we would have a fair proportion of socialism on our Statute book.

Sir Charles Court: Just give me a few examples of what we should have cut out.

Mr BERTRAM: What is the credibility of a person who runs around the world wasting our money and time, talking nonsense which is not supported by facts?

Mr O'Connor: Are you talking about Mr Whitlam?

Mr Sibson: What is your feeling about Mr Whitlam's spending?

Mr Bryce: We do not change our leader every three weeks.

Mr BERTRAM: I will come to that matter later because it is a very important issue and we would be very remiss if we did not talk about the endless leadership wrangle going on in Canberra at the present time. This lack of loyalty in the Liberal Party is caused by selfish interests and self-aggrandisement.

I will come back to my original point. If one wants to control socialism, one does not do it by blowing a lot of hot air and nonsense against it whilst practising it. If one wants to do away with socialism one ought not to practise it. Presently we are said to operate under a private enterprise system, although *The West Australian* frequently refers to "our welfare State". Apparently that newspaper thinks a lot of socialism is practised here. We must learn from the lessons of the past and especially from the great loss of life suffered in other parts of the world operating under corrupt Governments. It is no good bolstering up corrupt Governments. Surely the thing to do is to decide whether a country seeking assistance has a worth-while Government. This applies in the case of South-East Asia and the other countries to which I have referred. Our support must go to worth-while Governments which will not be overrun. The result of supporting corrupt situations is a foregone conclusion.

The thing to do with private enterprise is to ensure that it is efficient. The people involved in private enterprise must be encouraged to lift their standards of efficiency so that no-one will wish to replace that system with any other. Does anyone seriously argue about that point? We find that through the years there has been an endless stream of legislation and regulations to try to improve, to perfect, and to control private enterprise.

In this House we spend most of our time trying to render private enterprise acceptable. In making that comment I do not refer only to Labor Governments but also to Conservative Governments; that is, Liberal Party, National Alliance, and Country Party Governments. Conservative Governments have introduced a steady stream of legislation designed to control the activities of private enterprise of one sort or another. If members look at the Statute book they will see page after page of legislation designed for that very purpose. When people are given a free hand to operate within the community, it often happens that the privilege is abused.

From time to time the people scream that they want relief, protection, and a fair go. This happens no matter which Government is in power. So the remedy is to make private enterprise more efficient; I do not mean that private enterprise should say it is efficient, it should show that it is efficient. In such a situation there would be no onset of "isms" of any kind because if the people are satisfied with a situation certainly they will not tolerate any dramatic change.

Sir Charles Court: You are more naive than I thought. What about a committed regime?

Mr BERTRAM: One runs into trouble every day. Every member knows that when he arrives at his electoral office he will find many problems awaiting him; a legacy of the inefficiency—call it what one likes—of people operating in the private sector. Every member knows this to be true, and I can produce a bundle of evidence to support my statement. Private enterprise must become less offensive to the public generally. It must become less greedy and less avaricious; it must become more efficient and more humanitarian; and it must become less dishonest and less wasteful. The test to apply must be a test of fairness rather than one of avarice and greed.

Sir Charles Court: But under our system you can do something about it. Under a socialist system you cannot. You have it whether you like it or not.

Mr BERTRAM: If the Premier is satisfied with inefficiency in the private sector as he obviously is—

Sir Charles Court: No-one is satisfied with inefficiency, but we can do something about it.

Mr BERTRAM: Private enterprise must do something about it. The people in the United States of America know this to be true. The Premier should have told them about something different—he should not have wasted their time with humbug—

Sir Charles Court: We were not wasting their time.

Mr BERTRAM: —at the same time bringing our system into disrepute, and carrying on in a manner unacceptable to the people of this State.

Sir Charles Court: I must tell you that this State Government's stocks are much higher overseas than those of the Federal Government.

Mr BERTRAM: In the humble opinion of the Premier!

Sir Charles Court: You should be mighty worried. I wish you could get your colleagues in Canberra to go to the United States with dark glasses and whiskers to hear what is being said about them.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BERTRAM: If the Premier can tell me that this State gathered any kudos by his going to America and puffing nonsense, will he go ahead and do it?

Sir Charles Court: This does not get you anywhere at all.

Mr BERTRAM: I am telling the Premier that the people of Western Australia are unimpressed with the Premier. They want a higher standard of efficiency in private enterprise. I could list dozens of instances of people who have been exploited and disadvantaged by the activities of people in the private sector. Unless something is done to improve the situation and make things more satisfactory people will continue to exert pressure for a change.

Mr Sodeman: The same explicit comments would apply to the Federal Government.

Mr BERTRAM: The people of Western Australia do not blame the Federal Government for the inefficiency of private enterprise.

Sir Charles Court: He did not say that.

Mr Sodeman: I did not say that.

Mr BERTRAM: Judging from the interjection, however, it does seem that the Government is perfectly satisfied with the lack of efficiency and fairness, and the rest, of private enterprise about which I have spoken.

I simply want to place this on record, because I have been meaning to do so for years. Private enterprise must lift its sights; it must become efficient. It is not good enough for private enterprise to sit still and become grossly inefficient and for it to react only when the Government takes some action against it; it is only then that it becomes concerned about the public good. It does not evince any concern for the public good until the Government—whether it be a Liberal Government, a National Alliance Government, or a National Australia Party Government, whichever Government it is—takes some action against it. Often, it is only then that private enterprise shows concern.

For example, a national insurance scheme is to be introduced—that is, if the Liberal-Country Party coalition in Canberra does not defeat it—and a tremendous scheme it will be. Similar schemes have been operated in other countries with tremendous success.

Sir Charles Court: Are not some of the unions opposing it?

Mr BERTRAM: As a result of this we now find that some of the insurance companies have suddenly decided that they must snap into gear and improve their

image and the service they give to the public; but did they do that before the scheme was mooted? Of course they did not. They have had control of the situation, so why have they not been delivering the goods? Had they been doing so no Government would have dared touch them.

We also have the same reaction from the medical practitioners. Wherever we look we find them springing into action, particularly when they slip back and come into conflict with Government policy.

One of the greatest curses of our time is that people are encouraged to become wasteful. Is there anything meritorious in waste? We find that goods are produced in a slipshod fashion. For example, one might buy a shirt and find that a button suddenly drops off. One may buy a pair of shoes only to find that the heel drops off. The same happens when one buys a bicycle—either the saddle drops off or something else goes wrong with it.

Mr Sodeman: Are you criticising the worker?

Mr Jamieson: No, the manufacturer.

Mr BERTRAM: It is these little things which the people find most irritating.

Sir Charles Court: You must have been buying things from mainland China.

Mr Jamieson: Goods from there generally last.

Sir Charles Court: Like fun they do.

Mr BERTRAM: I thought it was Red China—in fact I have come to the conclusion that the name changes depending on whether one wants to curse them or make a quid out of them.

I do stress, however, that the wastefulness of our present system is thoroughly amoral if it is not thoroughly immoral. It is a poor old system when goods are manufactured in such a fashion that they fall to bits shortly after they have been bought, which means, of course, that one has to go out and buy the same article again which, in turn, ensures that the turnover is maintained. This is what it is all about.

There is little doubt that a lot of rubbish is being produced and it is high time that we in this Parliament acknowledged what is going on. We should urge there be some relief from the present situation. Our present system is wasteful, and any system that is based on waste cannot be any good.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.02 p.m.

Mr BERTRAM: Just prior to the afternoon tea suspension I was saying that a system that is based on waste is completely unacceptable, and a philosophy that is based on that type of system is an unconscionable one. This is not simply an opinion that I have held over the years on a matter which is of great concern to me.

Many people, from time to time, have drawn my attention to the fact that there is need for improved performance by private enterprise along the lines I have outlined.

For example, how can one really support the activity of private enterprise in the area of advertising? I have already spoken about the advertising of cigarettes. That type of situation is completely unacceptable and the whole area of advertising in this field needs to be tidied up. Until our existing system is made efficient and acceptable to the people we will never go forward, despite all the harangue and nonsense entered into by the Premier and by politicians on both sides of the Chamber.

I am more concerned about the people of Western Australia, but people throughout the whole of Australia are concerned about the proceedings going on in the Federal sphere at present over the leadership of the Federal Liberal Party. As this is a matter that affects the people, I know that you, Mr Speaker, would expect me to be on the side of the people and therefore I endeavoured to ask a question of the Premier in order that he may be able to give the required information to the members of this House concerning that matter, as I am sure he would be quite able to give it. We in this Parliament and the people of this State would then know how the Government stands and what it happens to be doing about the leadership of the Liberal Party in the Federal Parliament.

However, on Tuesday last I got only as far as uttering a few words of the question when I was stopped and I was not permitted to proceed with the remainder of the question and, as a result, I did not receive any answer. Further, what is more to the point, the members of this House and the people of this State have been deprived of an opportunity to learn all the facts and information from the Government or from anywhere else in regard to this question of the leadership of the Federal Liberal Party.

Yesterday I had hoped to pose another two questions because I believed they were in the public interest, but the questions I had drafted were not admissible and therefore, once again, I was denied the opportunity to ventilate the concern held by those on this side of the House in respect of a national and important issue which also concerns the people of this State. So long as we have a dud Opposition in the Federal Parliament this State suffers; so long as the Premier has no confidence in the Federal Leader of the Opposition this State suffers; and so long as the Premier has no confidence in the Western Australian members of the Liberal Party and the National Alliance who are supposed to represent this State in the Australian Parliament, this State suffers.

This is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs and one about which we are duty bound to do something. The Opposition

will not let the side down in this regard. The first question I sought to ask of the Premier yesterday was—

Does he share the view that the replacement of Billy Snedden as Leader of the Liberal Party could seriously restrict the electoral base of the Liberal Party and thereby seriously and adversely affect the policies of his Government?

If "No", why?

If "Yes", why, and what steps has he taken to see that this will not occur?

The other question which I had hoped to put to the Premier was—

Since it is imperative in the interest of this State that there should be established in Canberra as soon as possible a worthwhile Opposition will he state—

(a) What steps he and or his Government have taken to persuade the Liberal Party to desist from its endless leadership wrangling and to settle down for the first time to consistent and constructive opposition?

(b) Whether he is of the belief that unless the present attempt to remove Billie Snedden from Leader was defeated, no future leader of the Liberal Party will be free from such a campaign?

These are important questions to which we have to obtain answers. Incidentally, it is not as though we on this side of the House are desirous of bringing into this Parliament or into the State arena events which are happening outside. We happen to be part of the Australian nation, a fact which the Premier, very often, seems to forget.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has seven minutes left.

Mr BERTRAM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is not as though we are introducing external matters into this Parliament. We are reluctantly brought into this particular question, but reluctant or not, we are not frightened to enter into it now that it is appropriate to do so, because the people of Western Australia are thoroughly dissatisfied with the policy and the attitude of the Opposition in the Eastern States.

Members will recall the type of situation we had here recently when on T.V. the Premier was asked: Was he aware of the coup in December or January to remove Snedden's head? The Premier replied: I know that. His inference was: Is there anything I do not know? The answer to that, of course, is "Yes". However, he did not indicate to the people that he had not done the right thing; that he did not tell Snedden there was to be an attempt to remove his head. Although Snedden is a man who was born in Western Australia and who lived here for the best part of his life, and is one who can

look after the interests of Western Australia, the Premier saw fit to let him down and allow him to be subjected to such attempts on his head because, by inference, he did not tell Snedden what was about to happen to him. However, more of that in a moment.

Amendment to Motion

The fact of the matter is, since I have only a limited time left to me, I now move the following amendment to the Address-in-Reply—

: but we regret to have to inform your Excellency that whilst the Government of Western Australia and more particularly the Premier has long since been obsessed with the affairs of the Australian Government and the Australian Parliament instead of putting things right in this State as he undertook to do, neither the Premier nor his Government has informed the House of the actions if any, which have been taken to end the interminable wrangling as to the Leadership of the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party which appears to be based more on self interest and self aggrandizement and television image, than the national and public interest. In consequence of the said interminable wrangling and changes of leadership amongst other things—

- (a) the policies and attitudes of the Liberal Party-National Alliance cum Country Party cum National Country Party of Australia coalition are unpredictable;
- (b) the electoral base of the Liberal Party could be seriously and adversely restricted; and
- (c) this State's interests in the Australian Parliament are being sorely neglected for want of a proper consistent and constructive Coalition Opposition.

Mr Nanovich: Brilliant! I don't think! Very childish!

Mr BERTRAM: I could not say that, but as the honourable member has said it I can hardly deny it.

The contents of that amendment are all statements of fact known to the public. In the time remaining to me, I would like to remind the House of certain facts; that is, since 1967 the Australian people have been denied anything like continuity of leadership and anything like a satisfactory Opposition in the Australian Parliament. The whole matter centres on the fact that the Menzies Ministry ended in 1966; the Holt Ministry ended in December, 1967; and the Gorton Ministry—a very sad and inept one it was, although the Premier seemed to be enthusiastic about it—ended on the 10th March, 1971. The McMahon Ministry—and what a giant that was—ended on the 5th December, 1972, and Mr Snedden's Federal Opposition leadership appears as though it will meet its demise tomorrow

with no attempt at all on the part of the Government of this State to intervene or to indicate where it stands in the matter.

Is the Government a Snedden supporter? Does it support Fraser? I know what will happen if Fraser becomes Leader of the Federal Liberal Party. It will go back to follow a policy some miles to the right of that laid down by Menzies. Then there are Killen and Peacock. In the Eastern States the knives are being sharpened all the time. Further, there is abundant evidence to indicate how false is the suggestion that Labor, in the Australian scene, is spreading rumours around that there is an attempt being made to stab Snedden in the back.

It is no good saying those things if they are false. That is the Premier's technique; that is, to repeat things which are false in the hope that ultimately they will be accepted as fact.

The fact is that people over there are hell-bent on getting the leadership for their own personal gain and self-aggrandisement without caring two hoots what happens to the Opposition in Australia.

For this and the other reasons I have given I am pleased—although I find it an unhappy thing to have to do—to be dragged into this arena on the Australian scene as a result of the efforts of the Premier in this direction. I commend the amendment to members.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [4.16 p.m.]: I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the amendment—

Mr Sodeman: That figures.

Mr B. T. BURKE:—and in putting to vocal members opposite one question. Through you, Mr Speaker, perhaps one of those members might be able to enlighten me as to whether he believes a constructive Opposition in the Federal sphere is of value to the people of this State. Those members are strangely silent. Of course they are.

Mr Sodeman: Because it is obvious; that is why.

Mr B. T. BURKE: What is the obvious answer?—

Mr Sodeman: The answer is, "Yes"; and I ask you to ask the member for Mt. Hawthorn to demonstrate his sincerity. Is he going to stand for Liberal endorsement next time so that he can improve matters?

Mr B. T. BURKE:—the answer is, "Yes".

Mr Sodeman: He is? That's good.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is an answer given in a period in time during which we have had the worst Opposition we have ever had in the Federal sphere.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr Sodeman: Brought about by the worst Government.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is a leaderless collection of knifers and stabbers; men who do not know from one day to the next just who is to be their leader, creating the impression abroad that the Liberal Party, if elected in the national sphere, would have no leader, but a succession of them. It is one subject to the whims and fancies of the men who are supposed to stand behind their leader and support him.

Yet, on this issue, the Premier has been strangely quiet. He is not willing to say to the people of Western Australia: "There is a situation in Canberra. As the person elected to lead this State this is my opinion and impression." The Premier remains silent.

Sir Charles Court: I have to deal with the Government—the most repressive and most unsatisfactory Government Australia has ever had. That is what I have to do.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Notwithstanding the fact that the Premier also had to deal with the Australian Government when it was elected, he was not found lacking in advice to the Labor Party when certain differences of opinion occurred within its ranks; and so the measuring stick the Premier applies is an elastic one.

Sir Charles Court: You can rant on.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us look at statements the Premier made when a difference of opinion occurred within the Labor Party. He said—

This move to muzzle men of the Labor Party machine is an indication that A.L.P. direction of its parliamentary members is seen by Labor people as one of their biggest electoral handicaps.

Should Labor ever gain control of the Federal Parliament, the degree of direction of parliamentary members will be intensified both in Federal and State spheres. It would not be the elected Government "calling the shots."

Notwithstanding the fact that the Premier had to deal with the Australian Government when it was elected, he was prepared to make those comments and prejudice the treatment the Western Australian people would receive once that Government was elected.

What is he now going to say to the people of Western Australia? Is he going to say, "Do not vote for the Liberal Party in Canberra because we are not sure who its leader is. Wait until we see whether they develop some longevity before you support the Liberal Party."? He is freely giving advice to the Labor Party, but in a situation where he bears some responsibility he is strangely quiet.

What about other members? They say nothing. They are not willing to say, "The Liberal Party is going through a difficult time, but things will be put right". Instead they attack the Australian Government in the absence of any viable alternative.

Mr T. D. Evans: No alternative at all.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier has always been very generous with his advice to the Australian Labor Party. Among other things he said in September, 1972—

Today's Labor Party has forgotten the words of John Curtin when he said it would be treading on dangerous ground to set the Labor Party up as a non law-observing party...

Perhaps it might be put to the Premier that the Liberal Party has forgotten their great and revered Sir Robert Menzies. Would members place these leaders in his category or just say nothing? Would he allow the continuation of these fights and wrangles to prejudice the people of Western Australia? Does the Premier not see himself as having any responsibility? The Premier is a man of whom it has been said in years gone by that he may well be a national leader, and yet when the challenge comes he abdicates a national position.

Sir Charles Court: I am in State Parliament and not the Federal Parliament in case you didn't know.

Mr T. D. Evans: I hope you remember that in future.

Sir Charles Court: Unfortunately I have to deal with the Government in Canberra which is committed to the annihilation of the States.

Mr B. T. BURKE: He should do something about an alternative. He should lead us with his flaming sword and march through the ranks and call the Liberal members to order.

Sir Charles Court: That brave fellow from Balga!

Mr May: This is the usual Thursday afternoon debate we had last year.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Does the Premier want us to believe that the national Opposition is prepared and able to put alternative policies to the people of this country? Let me ask this question of the Premier: If he were an elected representative of the national Opposition at this time, to what would his mind now be turning? The papers are full of it. The minds of all the Opposition members in the national Opposition are turning to the leadership struggle. Who is looking after the sort of things the Opposition should be looking after?

Mr Coyne: Junie Morosi.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is well for members to talk of Junie Morosi, particularly the member for Murchison-Eyre. He would not get a look in. The fact of the matter is that the Australian people are seriously suffering because the national Opposition cannot do its job. The Premier of this State, who is elected to lead the people of this State, refuses to show any responsibility in trying to right a situation which

has disadvantaged the people. He is supposed to lead. At other times he is only too well prepared to comment on the disadvantages of Labor Party differences of opinion, but in this area he remains quiet.

At this moment in Canberra, the alternative Prime Minister is facing, by his own admission, 21 who support him and the same number who are opposed to him, and, according to his supporters, approximately the same number who have two heads. In other words, there is a significant proportion of Liberal supporters now in Canberra preparing to vote on the leadership who are telling each camp that they will support it. This is an untenable situation and yet by his silence the Premier of this State is prepared to approve of the prevarication of these men and agree to Australia being held in a state of suspended animation until his colleagues can make up their minds.

Mr Sodeman: Your counterparts sacrificed their Treasurer. That was shameful.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The member for Pilbara, whose electorate has been severely hit by inflation in terms of value for money in its representation here, is now giving us advice again. Let him tell me what he thinks of the Liberal Party struggle.

Mr Sodeman: It is an admirable one to resolve its problem. If your Federal counterparts would put as much effort into solving our problems in the Pilbara we would be a lot better off.

Mr B. T. BURKE: At the next election we will be putting abnormal efforts into solving Pilbara's problems, and we will be successful.

Mr Sodeman: Time will tell.

Mr B. T. BURKE: This is like drawing teeth. Instead of members opposite on their own initiative making comments, we have to pause and really break Standing Orders to allow one of the most junior members of the House to state the Government's policy. The Deputy Premier knows to say nothing, and the Premier is silent. He says it is an abnormal occurrence. Certainly it is. Any action as the result of which one finds one's head beneath the bed in the morning is abnormal, and it happens with surprising frequency and regularity in the Liberal ranks in Canberra. Yet this Premier refuses to say anything when he has been so prepared on other occasions to assume centre stage in the international theatre. Now he is silent.

Mr Skidmore: He has deserted them.

Mr B. T. BURKE: He does not know whom to desert. It is very dangerous to line up on a side which might not win, and it is difficult to know who will win until after the knives have been flung. This Premier is doing his State a disservice. Where is the positive lead he was so intent on taking prior to the last election?

Sir Charles Court: Do you want me to go to Canberra and cast a vote?

Mr May: It is a wonder you haven't.

Sir Charles Court: I would like to.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier is among those Liberal Premiers who come together to express opinions on different things. Publicity is accorded his remarks not only in local papers, but also in Eastern States' papers. The opportunity for him is there. Why does he not use it or does he not have an opinion on what is happening? What does the Premier really think about the leadership crisis in the Liberal Party?

Sir Charles Court: The men over there who have the responsibility tomorrow have all the capacity to make their decision, and they will make it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: How rarely it is that the Premier is able to say that men somewhere else have the capacity. I had been convinced there was only one man who had capacity to do anything and he was right here.

The truth of the matter is that the Premier and his Government are very selective. They know not to venture into areas of swampy land and quicksand for fear of their being caught up and sucked down. Therefore the Premier and his Government steer clear from any dangerous decision or courageous path of principle unless they can see political advantage in it. There is none to be gained in taking hold of one's own fellows and saying to them: How can we defeat a Government of opposing ideology when we are so splintered ourselves? That takes courage. It is very easy for me to stand up today and criticise this Government. It is not so easy for me to criticise my own party; and that is the basic problem with this Government.

Mr Coyne: You would not be allowed to.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Government's principles are dictated by political advantage. Consistently the Premier refuses to grasp the nettle and do the courageous thing of principle. He dismisses the situation by saying that there are men of capacity over there to make the decision.

Sir Charles Court: And responsibility.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Yet the men over there do not know who are the men of capacity because half the Caucus is lining up for the leadership.

Mr Sodeman: Half what?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Many men over there have the capacity, but there is only one problem: there can be only one leader. While the Premier of this State will join with the others in fixing up the house of the Labor Party, he steers very clear of the repairs which are needed in his own abode.

Mr T. D. Evans: He leads his army from behind.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The fulcrum which allows me to lever myself into this debate is my very real interest in the welfare of the people of Western Australia.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr B. T. BURKE: That is what I have been elected to safeguard in this House if I can and that is the aspect to which I turn most of my attention.

Can any member on the other side honestly say that the leadership crisis on a national level within the party to which he belongs is not disadvantaging the people of this State? Does anyone believe that is not the case? Again members on the other side are silent, because it is a self-evident truth.

Sir Charles Court: It is just a lot of claptrap. They are not the Government of Australia at the present time.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Does the Premier of this State not believe it is important to have a viable Opposition and alternative Government?

Sir Charles Court: Of course you want a good Opposition.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Is the present Opposition, by reason of its leadership struggles which have continued for a long time, a good Opposition?

Sir Charles Court: I wish you could sit over here and see yourself; then you would stop talking.

Mr B. T. BURKE: If the Premier could sit on this side and see himself, he might well go over there.

Summing up, the fact of the matter is, this amendment to the Address-in-Reply is well warranted because—

- (a) the policies and attitudes of the Liberal Party-National Alliance cum Country Party cum National Country Party of Australia coalition are unpredictable—

We do not know who the leader is. The amendment continues—

- (b) the electoral base of the Liberal Party could be seriously and adversely restricted . . .

What kind of minority far right splinter group would the member for Wannon in the Federal Parliament (Mr Fraser) lead?

Mr McPharlin: The actions of the Federal Government are unpredictable.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The leader of the Country Party in this House has already put his hand firmly in the air; he will be behind Mr Fraser. The amendment continues—

- (c) this State's interests in the Australian Parliament are being sorely neglected for want of a proper consistent and constructive Coalition Opposition.

Is that not true? Has not the Premier abdicated his responsibility of safeguarding in this crisis the interests of the people he leads?

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 p.m.]: I think the situation is more than passing strange, now that the Premier has given a very clear indication that he is not prepared to make any statement or move on this matter.

Sir Charles Court: We are treating it with contempt.

Mr JAMIESON: The Opposition, too, is entitled to treat other people with contempt if that is the attitude to be adopted.

Sir Charles Court: You are not very proud of this.

Mr JAMIESON: There is nothing wrong with it. I do not want to run a "Snedden for leader" campaign. He should be able to rely on his own supporters.

The only matter I want to point out is, as was said a little earlier by the member who moved the amendment, that Mr Snedden does come from this State, and the Premier is always saying Canberra does not know enough about this State and does things which are unsatisfactory to us. If Mr Fraser replaces him, we will get a lot of sympathy! We might get that blue-blooded, right-wing sympathy the Premier is so fond of, which does not help the people in this State very much. It might help those in high places and those carrying out business deals but it certainly does not overcome the problems in this State.

When we have a look at the situation which exists in the country, I think the member for Mt. Hawthorn was wise to propose his amendment. In this morning's Press we saw a rather unusual advertisement which was inserted by somebody who said he had an interest in public affairs—J. Robinson, Mews Road, Fremantle, "on behalf of a group of concerned Australian middle-of-the-road citizens", whoever they might be. Chifley always said they were hit by the cars going both ways, and I think that is so. The advertisement is quite a good one. It says—

It happened to Gorton . .
It can happen to Snedden
Unless you say "Not again"

The parallel is exact:
The Same Circumstances
The Same People
The Same Motives

And you'd see the Same Result
Tell your member that you do not want to see it happen again—
Phone him today

If you are a Liberal supporter use your voice now—let your member know that you're an active concerned Australian citizen.

Australia needs strong government and strong opposition—Liberal OR Labor.

Perhaps it is a plant; I do not know. It could have been planted by either side. But I would say the circumstances of the appearance of the advertisement are very strange. I cannot recall ever having seen such an advertisement previously. On the other hand, not knowing the background to it, we must take the view that a group of citizens are saying, "It is time this kind of caper stopped"; and I, too, think it is.

I come back to the point I was making earlier. Mr Snedden is a person whom you know, Mr Speaker, and whom I know. I have known him for a long time. I knew him long before the Premier knew him, and perhaps I knew him long before most members of this House knew him, because years ago he and I were delegates on a local organisation, long before he went into Federal politics and in the early days of his interest in State politics when he stood for the seat of Boulder in this State.

Mr Sodeman: Would you like to see him as Prime Minister?

Mr JAMIESON: If there has to be a Liberal Prime Minister in power, I would prefer he were someone from this State who knows our requirements and may be able to assist us. He was born and bred here. I do not want to recount the story about how he sold newspapers to help him on his way and was later a grocer's delivery boy. We all know that.

Malcolm Fraser, the blue blood from Victoria—bred on one of Bart Cummings' stud farms—is now using the sword, the knife, and whatever else he can get hold of to oust Mr Snedden. I would not want to be Mr Snedden's particular protector, but I say the Premier of this State should at least be persuading some of his Federal colleagues that here is a fellow who knows our problems, is associated with us, and is often having holidays and trips to this State—one only a few weeks ago. Therefore he would have an opportunity to converse with the people of this State and know their problems. If we must have a Liberal leader—and we must have a Leader of the Opposition—he is the man who would be most satisfactory so far as we in this State are concerned.

As was mentioned earlier, various people have spoken about the matter. Even the Federal President of the Liberal Party said, "They should stop publicly sniping at one another", and three Liberal members of the Federal Parliament issued statements immediately afterwards. Mr Killen, a Queensland member, said if the

leadership question were not settled tomorrow the Liberals would be in opposition for 10 years.

I think the Premier should show concern. We on this side do not want a Liberal Government in Canberra. I remember the "belly-aching" of the present Premier about the Menzies Government. He and Menzies found no great favour with one another because of the various problems which Menzies could not understand. Menzies, again, was an "Eastern Stater" through and through. He came from that part of Australia which controls the voting power and from which most of our Prime Ministers have emanated.

The more successful Prime Ministers were from the lesser States, and they were possibly more popular Prime Ministers—Lyons, Curtin, and so on. They were not more brilliant than the other Prime Ministers but they had a greater understanding of the problems of Australia because of their association with the people of the lesser States. They did not have so much concentrated knowledge of the people of Victoria and New South Wales. We do not want to argue with the people in those States—they are our cousins—but surely it is to our advantage to have in a high position a person who understands our problems and is able to represent them without having to be fed the necessary basic information. We would doubt that a person not so closely associated with Western Australia would appreciate our problems, because this State is generally considered to be too far away for them to come to see for themselves.

Malcolm Fraser was rather active over here recently, attending all the Liberal Party area functions, no doubt on a Malcolm Fraser campaign. If he is contending for the leadership he probably realises that is one of the canvassing jobs he must do.

I noticed in the Press a few days ago a letter from the Federal Liberal members of this State, indicating their support for Mr Snedden. Following upon later questioning, there appeared in *The West Australian* of the 19th March the headline, "Two reaffirm Liberal statement". A couple of others were not so sure, and others were not available for comment. That seems to be the drift. Evidently Mr Snedden cannot rely on people from this State, who should see some advantage in having such a person as leader.

I do not want to be Mr Snedden's champion but I think it is of advantage to have a leader who understands our problems rather than one who does not. Under the circumstances, I think the Premier would be justified in at least having a word, by telephone or otherwise, with the Liberal members in this State and telling them, "I hope you understand what you will be doing if you replace Mr Snedden. We will

have to start from scratch again when we make representations to the leader of the Liberal Party for assistance in matters associated with our activities in Western Australia."

We hope Mr Snedden will continue for a long time as leader. I do not wish him great success and overwhelming support for his leadership; that would not be to the advantage of the Labor Party because he might ultimately bring us down. But if ever a State should have a point of view, I think this State should; and the Liberal forces in this State have been very remiss in not voicing an opinion and suggesting we have an advantage in retaining at the helm of the Opposition in Canberra a person who has a knowledge of this State.

I support the amendment.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [4.44 p.m.]: I desire to support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Hawthorn. In normal circumstances, we might not expect this amendment to the Address-in-Reply to be moved in this House but, the Premier of Western Australia being the man he is, we can well expect this kind of amendment.

The Premier is the individual member of this House who has been responsible more than any other member for turning this Parliament into a reflection of what happens politically on the national scene. For less than half of the time I have been here this Parliament has operated as a State Parliament. I have seen the Premier, month after month, preoccupied himself on the other side of the House as well as on this side of the House with what goes on in the national Parliament.

He has turned this forum into a spectacle which it was never intended to be. Those of us in this Chamber who can remember the McMahon Government and Billy Snedden's horror Budget of August, 1971, when hundreds of thousands of people were thrown out of work—

Mr Clarko: Hundreds of thousands?

Mr BRYCE: That is right.

Mr Clarko: What about now? It is over 300 000—a record figure.

Mr BRYCE: If the member for Karinyup checked the figures applicable at that time he would know that more than 200 000 people were out of work at the end of 1971. I recall it well because I was elected at a by-election at that time, and I have clear memories of the sort of bravado we saw from the Premier—who was then the Leader of the Opposition—who claimed time and time again that unemployment was the responsibility of State Governments. When we were on the other side of the House and Mr McMahon was experiencing all sorts of troubles with the economy, we suggested that he should send for Sir Charles Court and that the Liberal Party at the national level should select that man to solve its problems.

We even drew to his attention the fact that Governments overseas were experiencing the same sort of economic problems, and we suggested that we would give him our endorsement—not politically, but by way of support—to go overseas to solve the problems of other countries.

Of course, since he has become the Premier of Western Australia we have seen him cut for himself a very fine reputation on the national stage. He has even been overseas. So we on this side of the House feel collectively that it would be in the best interests of the nation if the Premier of Western Australia declared himself as a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal Party at the national level. Admittedly this would complicate the matter, because we would then have Snedden, Fraser, Killen, Peacock, and Court.

There is absolutely no inconsistency in members on this side suggesting this would be a realistic proposition, because the Premier of this State has shown himself to be more preoccupied with what goes on in the national Parliament than with what goes on in Western Australia. A little over 12 months ago he promised the people of this State he would put things right. Instead of putting things right he has concentrated on everything that is going on outside of this State. To use his own phrase, if he were prepared to put his shoulder to the wheel in Western Australia we might expect a return to sane and meaningful progress. But instead of that—and the amendment refers to this matter quite specifically—we have a leader of this State who has spent his time denigrating and condemning the national Government.

No man can possibly spend as much time denigrating and condemning the national Government as he has and still deliver the goods in this State. Of course, after 12 months in office the Government has proved that it simply cannot deliver the goods.

In this respect I want simply to refer to three specific areas—three policy promises in respect of which nothing has been done. The first is, of course, in respect of unemployment. I think it is very important for us to place any discussion on the question of unemployment in the context of the statements made by the present Premier over the last decade or so. Time and time again in this place and publicly through election promises and Press releases, etc., the Premier has sustained the view that the State Government is responsible for employment opportunities, and that if there happens to be unemployment it is the responsibility of the State Government to solve it.

In 1972 when a series of economic we saw thousands of Pilbara construction decisions was made 12 000 miles away, workers come to the metropolitan area

because work stopped on projects in the Pilbara. The Premier—at that time he was the Leader of the Opposition—was adamant that it was the responsibility of the State Government to solve unemployment. To quote him, "If they are worthy of their salt they will solve this problem."

In fact, I remind the Premier that on the 16th August, 1972, he made a statement that he would dearly like to forget. He said he would solve the problem of unemployment within six months of getting back into office.

Sir Charles Court: I don't want to forget that at all. You state the date on which that statement was made.

Mr BRYCE: It was made on the 16th August, 1972.

Sir Charles Court: That is right. It was in 1972 when we had in Canberra a Government that would allow us to develop the State. Now we have a Government which prevents us.

Mr BRYCE: Now we have the Premier arguing that, by March, 1974, he did not know what the policies of the Whitlam Labor Government were. The Australian Government had been in office for 18 months and had laid down guidelines, and any Opposition party in this State which was worthy of its salt should have had a very clear understanding of where the national Government was going. However, the Premier was still holding forth with brave statements such as, "We will solve unemployment within six months if returned to office." In fact, he went on to say he was prepared to stake his reputation on success.

Let us consider the figures, because they are consistent with the argument used by the Premier when he was in Opposition. When the Tonkin Labor Government left office 1.17 per cent of the work force in Western Australia was unemployed. The figure is now 5.4 per cent. Is it any wonder that he loses credibility when he makes promises in Parliament and statements in his policy speech that he will solve our problems? On the 14th March, 1974, he promised a programme of strong and well-planned economic growth, security against unemployment, a rising standard of living, and a broader range of career opportunities. We would scarcely expect such promises from a leader of a political party who does not accept responsibility for employment opportunities or unemployment problems once he is elected to office. We would scarcely expect a man who now does not accept responsibility for unemployment to promise security against unemployment when on the hustings.

The facts of life are that the present State Government has failed to deliver the goods. I refer to a question asked in this House this week and mention a couple of important regional centres as examples.

When the Tonkin Labor Government left office, 234 people were registered as unemployed in the town of Albany. The latest figures show that has trebled, and that now there are over 700 unemployed.

Mr Watt: Not in the town of Albany.

Mr BRYCE: I am talking about the district of Albany.

Mr Watt: You referred to the town.

Mr BRYCE: The district figures are the only available figures, and the member for Albany knows that well. The point is that the Premier made a promise that he would solve unemployment within six months.

Mr Watt: You are comparing a regional figure with a town figure.

Mr BRYCE: Take the Bunbury district; the picture is similar. When the Tonkin Government left office 684 people in that district were registered as unemployed. Today 1 031 are registered as unemployed in that district. Members opposite simply have not got an argument in respect of this question because their leader led them into a dead end as a result of his bravado, and he knows it. The Premier also referred to the miracle of the '60s and said, "We did it then, we will do it again."

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this related to the amendment?

Mr BRYCE: I would respectfully suggest, Sir, it is related to that part of the amendment which suggests that the State Government promised to put things right but has instead concentrated its energies on simply attacking the national Government. I indicated earlier that I hoped to illustrate three specific areas in which it has failed to put things right.

It has failed not only in the area of unemployment. Another very important area in which the Premier has failed to put things right is that of inflation. We had sincere promises about this on the 14th March, 1974. The Premier said in his policy speech that inflation can be beaten State by State. What happened? After 12 months of administration of the present Government the rate of inflation has been pushed to 18 per cent—a level higher than that in all other capital cities in Australia.

Sir Charles Court: It is not 18 per cent. Why don't you quote the right figure?

Mr Jamieson: You are quoting the wrong figure. You are getting your figure from the Treasury instead of from the statistician.

Sir Charles Court: I obtained my figure from the statistician. You have elected to use the wrong figure.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker, I would appreciate getting a word in edgeways as it is my time that is being used.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: Thank you, Sir. The fact is that was an absurd promise to make. It was totally unrealistic. The Premier now knows that, and the people of the State are going to be informed of it. I am sure the people will appreciate the alleged sincerity of a man who promises to solve problems which, in fact, are international problems. So, Sir, you can appreciate that members on this side of the House are quite well motivated in moving this amendment. We had an outstanding statement from the Premier of this State—

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr BRYCE: —who claimed he has solutions to the economic problems of the nation and the Western world. Yet he cannot even solve the problems within his own State. Lest some may suggest that the Opposition is acting a little hastily in this respect, I point out that the Premier has already had 12 months in which to take action. Previously we might have been accused of being a little impatient, but after 12 months nothing has been done.

Mr Sodeman: How long has the Federal Government had to bring down housing interest rates?

Mr BRYCE: If the member for Pilbara is permitted by his leader to stand up and participate in debates we would like to hear him do so. I think it is wholly unfair for the people of the Pilbara to believe that they have a worthy representative who will make representations on their behalf in this Parliament only while he is sitting down.

Mr Laurance: Mr Bickerton stood up to Canberra, and look what happened to him.

Mr Sodeman: I will be quite happy to stand up, and I will address my remarks to you when I do.

Mr Coyne: Tell us about the promise made by Labour Minister Cameron in respect of unemployment. What happened to him? Did he resign?

Mr BRYCE: The incident of the evening before last illustrated to this House very clearly the degree of political somersault the Premier is capable of turning in respect of his statements in this House and to the people of Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! This amendment is one which perhaps can be spoken to in fairly broad terms, but only brief reference can be made to those broad terms. I would like all members to note that ostensibly the prime reason for the amendment is the lack of action by the Premier in regard to the wrangling of the Federal Liberal Party and aspirations to leadership within the

party. This is the prime point to which members should direct their speeches. I do not mind members referring to other matters in order to give instances, but they must be only brief references.

Mr BRYCE: The aspect of this question which merits some explanation is the way in which the Premier has on so many occasions involved himself in the national scene on the question of Commonwealth-State relationships. In other debates in this Chamber, we have all been happy to have to sit back and listen to a very wide-ranging debate and argument whenever this question arose. That is the substance of the first part of this amendment; members on this side of the House are concerned that we have a Premier who is obsessed with hating a national Government.

In the second part of the amendment we draw attention to the fact that we are surprised he has not taken some action to intervene on behalf of the people of this State in this vitally important leadership struggle that is going on at the moment in Canberra. You will appreciate, Mr Speaker, from the third specific paragraph that the policies and attitudes of the Liberal Party-National Alliance, Country Party-cum-National Country Party of Australia coalition are unpredictable. These are the sorts of things which concern us greatly.

I would like to draw members' attention to a few specific matters in this direction. These are the sorts of things that have been eating away at political unity in this country—not just political unity inside the national coalition Opposition, but political unity generally. We argue that the policies of the Opposition at national level are unpredictable and fail to be consistent. Take for example the conflict we have witnessed over the advocacy by the Leader of the Country Party-cum-National Party-cum-Australian National Country Party—or something—in the national Parliament that the price of oil should be increased by some absurd percentage.

Mr McPharlin: Why do you not get your facts straight on that question? You have got it from the Press—that is the only place you got it from.

Mr BRYCE: The Leader of the Country Party is criticising me because I am beginning to believe something of what I have read in the newspaper. One of the most astounding experiences I have ever had in this place was after I had been here for only a month. I witnessed the then Deputy Leader of the Country Party stand in his place and quote as evidence an opinion letter to the editor.

Mr McPharlin: You do not even have the Press statement from which to quote.

Mr BRYCE: I would have thought that any reasonably well read political animal in this country would have been well aware

of the point I was making. There seems to be substantial conflict between the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Country Party at a national level over this question of oil prices. There seems to be some concern that promises have been made to oil companies about an increase in oil prices; but there is no concern for the farmers, for the motorists, or for anybody else in respect of their fuel bills. This is when the chickens come home to roost. The Leader of the Country Party made this statement, knowing that the cost of fuel was of vital importance to any man on the land.

Mr Laurance: What about the removal of the petrol subsidy?

Mr BRYCE: However, when we think a little harder about this question we begin to understand that perhaps it is necessary for the Leader of the Country Party to make these statements because quite a considerable amount of campaign funds seem to go from oil companies to Conservative Governments at national level.

Sir Charles Court: How do you know? Are you going to tell us how much they put into the Labor Party?

Mr BRYCE: This is an area of conflict and of unpredictable reaction.

We have been very surprised over the whole question of the Supply Bill; we never know where they stand on this matter because they are unpredictable, inconsistent and in conflict with one another over the question of the refusal of supply in the national Parliament. One day we pick up a newspaper and we see a report that the Leader of the Country Party—cum-National Party or something has advocated the refusal of supply over the Medibank issue.

He says that supply will be refused and the people of this country will be forced to go to another Federal election, probably a double dissolution. The very next day, the Leader of the Liberal Party says, "I am not so sure" and the next day the Leader of the Country Party starts to climb down a little on his original statement. There should be a little liaison over the telephone between the two parties. The Leader of the Country Party then starts to make a few qualifications to his previous statement.

Subsequently, because of this highly confusing leadership struggle we have at national level, in order to demonstrate that he is a strong man, Mr Snedden comes out leading from the chin and says, "There will be no decision to refuse supply." Of course, we cannot be certain about that; we are not even certain whether Mr Snedden will be in the box seat when a decision will be made. It is this sort of inconsistency and contradiction that bring politicians generally into contempt in the

minds of the people and it is based, fundamentally, on the ego, short-comings and sense of pride amongst a handful of leading Conservative politicians in the national Parliament.

I come back to my original thesis that under no circumstances would such an amendment be warranted normally in a State Parliament. However, the Premier of this State has taken this forum as being a reflection of what happens in the national Parliament and therefore we feel genuinely concerned that he has taken no step to indicate to the Liberals who represent people in this State how they should vote in Canberra. It would even suggest that the Premier does not exercise the same tight-fisted control over the Liberal Party nationally as he does over the parliamentary Liberal Party in Western Australia.

Mr McIver: And the Country Party.

Mr BRYCE: And the Country Party, as my worthy colleague, the member for Avon, interjects. As the member for Balga indicated, we believe he does exercise such influence, but is simply sitting back, waiting to see what happens. We believe he has a responsibility because he has played himself deliberately into the image of a great national spokesman for the Conservatives of this country, and even an international representative. A man like that surely has a responsibility to do something and intervene.

If we on this side of the House could assist him in any way to ensure that the name Sir Charles Court was added to the list of candidates on the ballot paper tomorrow, we would do so.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.08 p.m.]: The amendment before the House just does not deserve any consideration at all. If it were not for the formality of having to record that the Government had done the courtesy to the Opposition of making a comment on it, I would not even bother to reply. I remind members opposite that there were occasions when the Tonkin Government merely put some of these matters to a vote without even making a comment, on one occasion even using the closure motion to do it. This one deserves such treatment, if ever a motion did.

All of a sudden we are seeing crocodile tears all over this Chamber, like we had last night when members of the Labor Party were shedding tears for the farmers and joining forces with the Farmers' Union. It was so hypocritical.

Then the cat was let out of the bag: the member for Swan started to talk about the consumers being his prime concern. I want to remind members opposite that the decision to be made in Canberra tomorrow essentially is one to be made by

the men who are the elected representatives in the Federal Parliament, standing in the Liberal cause. Our party does not direct those members as to how they should vote; we would not under any circumstances attempt to try to control them or influence them in the election of their leader. It is so like the crass ignorance of members opposite to try to influence through this House the decision to be made in Canberra tomorrow.

We have heard a great deal of talk today about people being stabbed in the back. I just remind those gentlemen opposite of some of the acts their Prime Minister has been privy to, and in some cases was the initiator. I just refer to the Gair affair which was a blot on the parliamentary history of Australia. I also refer to the Murphy appointment. If ever there was an appointment that stunk to high heaven, that was it. I then refer—

Mr Jamieson: If a Liberal lawyer is appointed to such a position it is all right, but if a Labor lawyer is appointed it is not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that I have always opposed the appointment to the High Court of a former Minister regardless of the party to which he belongs.

We then move on to another little episode in the Federal Parliament which was the greatest example of stabbing in the back the Federal Parliament has ever seen. It was only the extreme loyalty of one man to the Labor Party that saved Mr Whitlam's Prime Ministership. I refer to the stabbing in the back by the Prime Minister of Mr Frank Crean. The situation at that time went on for weeks and weeks with that poor man still nominally being the Treasurer of this country. Yet the Prime Minister and all his colleagues were just bypassing him and getting him ready for the day when they were to put him on the "barbecue". That man's loyalty to the ALP was the only thing that saved the Prime Minister from losing his office at that time, because had Mr Crean not agreed to accept the portfolio granted to him all the portfolios in the ALP would have been thrown open. So great was the feeling about a man who had been one of the Prime Minister's most loyal supporters through thick and thin Mr Whitlam would have lost his position.

Then we proceed to the classic of all times. We could see it coming a week before. We could see that Mr Speaker Cope was being set up for the kill. We could see, from the reaction of the Prime Minister and his colleagues that it was only a matter of time before the Speaker would be dealt with, and look how he was dealt with—in a most disgusting way!

Yet the Opposition here has the hide to move an amendment such as this and shed crocodile tears for Billy Mackie Snedden; a man for whom they have all expressed nothing but contempt.

Mr Bertram: So have you.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have not.

Mr Bertram: You have by inference.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The honourable member is not entitled to say that, because I have been a very loyal supporter of Billy Mackie Snedden right through the whole business. The honourable member cannot cite one instance of where I have been disloyal to Mr Snedden. He is a man in whom I have complete confidence. He is a man who has been sincere in his work and, when a Minister, he administered his portfolios to the maximum of his capacity. Also, I think he succeeded in those portfolios in a wonderful way.

I also remind members opposite that the Prime Minister—

Several members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members opposite just cannot take it. They are so used to throwing muck around the place that they do not recognise good sense when they hear it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I just remind members opposite that it was their Prime Minister who ridiculed the policies put forward by Billy Mackie Snedden. Some of the people opposite ridiculed the policy put forward by Billy Mackie Snedden in trying to solve the economic policies of this country. Subsequently, after the Whitlam Government was re-elected, Billy Mackie Snedden put forward further proposals in respect of the economy of Australia.

Mr Jamieson: He is no longer Billy Mackie Snedden. He changed his name by deed poll. He is now Bill Mackie Snedden.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Is that all the Opposition has to talk about?

Mr Jamieson: If you are going to be perfect you may as well be properly perfect.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Subsequent to the re-election of the Whitlam Government this man put forward a very strong economic policy but again it was ridiculed by Mr Whitlam and his colleagues, including Dr Cairns. What happened? Practically everything Mr Snedden put forward before the re-election and since has been quietly and sneakily slipped in by Mr Whitlam and his colleagues and they are still trying to implement his ideas in the hope that, even belatedly, they might be able to get something out of the wreckage.

So I, personally, have always been loyal to Mr Snedden, but it is not my prerogative to make a decision on who will be leader and I hope we will keep that decision right where it belongs, because members opposite are guilty of a great crime. They are guilty in exactly the same way as their Prime Minister is, because members opposite set out to assassinate a man's character and reputation and what their Prime Minister did in the Federal Parliament is the greatest disgrace of all time.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Point of Order.

Mr T. D. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Premier looked at the members on this side of the House collectively and said, "You are guilty of a crime". I for one refute the statement that I am guilty of such a crime and I ask the Premier to withdraw the remark that I, as a member of this Opposition, have been guilty of a crime.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to withdraw the remark.

Sir CHARLES COURT: On your wish, Mr Speaker, I certainly will withdraw the remark, but I just want to say—not by way of amplification of the withdrawal, but as a statement of fact—that the members sitting opposite are just as guilty as the Prime Minister and his colleagues.

Mr MAY: Mr Speaker—

Sir Charles Court: I have not said anything yet.

Mr MAY: The Premier withdrew the remark he made. Is he entitled to go on and give a speech on the withdrawal?

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes, the Premier is allowed to go on and make his speech. However, he cannot amplify in any way the statement he has withdrawn and he should not make similar remarks.

*Debate (on amendment to motion)
Resumed*

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, I had no intention of amplifying or qualifying my withdrawal.

Mr May: Much!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to say quite categorically that members opposite have been just as much parties to the act of the Whitlam Government in trying to denigrate Mr Snedden as Whitlam himself—

Mr May: I bet you have been on the telephone to the Eastern States!

Sir CHARLES COURT: —because the Labor Party, long before the State election, made the decision, at the tactical level so far as the State election was concerned, that if they could destroy Court they could destroy the Liberal Party.

Mr May: He destroys himself.

Sir CHARLES COURT: So the members of the Labor Party set out on this character assassination with a viciousness never before seen in this State.

Mr May: What was that remark you made about not being able to take it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: So in the Federal Parliament we have seen the Prime Minister, day after day, with the help of some of his lieutenants, doing his best to try to destroy the personality, the reputation, and the performance of Mr Snedden. In the political game it is quite fair to test out a person. Goodness only knows, members opposite have been doing that to me ever since 1953; all they do is to make me stronger all the time. I want to remind Opposition members that the insincerity they are showing by shedding so many crocodile tears for Mr Snedden today can be treated by the Government only with the contempt it deserves.

I did not want to go into any detail in regard to some of the statements made by the member for Ascot when he was speaking of the unemployment scene. In time I will go back and remind him what I said in 1972. We still stand by that statement. If Whitlam and his Government in Canberra would let us get on with the development of this State we would live up to that promise and be delighted to do it.

I told this House within the last few days of the project we had put before the Prime Minister, and what we had negotiated; if only those people in Canberra would let us do the job that normally a State Government is allowed to do. The Government rejects this nonsense from the Opposition as plain political skulduggery. It is absolutely indecent for the Opposition to do what it has done, and no credit reflects on its members. Here we are with tremendous matters of importance to the State to be discussed, and we have the vehicle of the Address-in-Reply debate to discuss them, but what do we find? We find that day after day these stupid amendments are moved by the Opposition. This particular one must be an all-time low.

Mr T. D. Evans: You started it when you were in Opposition.

Sir CHARLES COURT: But there was substance in our amendments. The Government rejects the amendment before us.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR STEPHENS (Stirling—Minister for Conservation and Environment) [5.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971, to enable the alteration of titles of some bodies included by name in the original Act and to increase the membership of one such body. The changes are consistent with the Government's expressed policy with regard to conservation and the environment.

The Bill provides for the words "environmental protection" to be deleted and substituted by the words "conservation and environment". The Department of Environmental Protection is to be called the department of conservation and environment and the Director of Environmental Protection to be the director of conservation and environment.

Further, it is proposed that the name Environmental Protection Council be changed to the conservation and environment council and that it has an increased membership from 14 to 16.

Members will be aware that in Western Australia the principal environmental executive management responsibility lies with the three-man Environmental Protection Authority. I wish to pay tribute to the work and success of the authority since its inception and make special mention of the competence and diligence of the chairman, Dr O'Brien. I do not propose that there should be a change in the title of this authority as I believe it has already established itself within the community through its series of decisions and recommendations which have been accepted by both the previous Government and this Government.

However, the Environmental Protection Council, composed of senior personnel, is perhaps less well known and requires revitalisation. I believe that this can be largely achieved by two steps—

- (1) A change of title from Environmental Protection Council to conservation and environment council, and
- (2) an increase in the membership by adding a nominee of the Minister for Agriculture and a nominee of a tertiary institution.

I believe that the new council will be very effective in its role of providing advice to the Minister responsible and to the Environmental Protection Authority.

I would like to conclude by adding that in following through the Government's policy there is forthcoming a rationalised

arrangement for conservation and environment in Western Australia. The bringing of national parks within my jurisdiction is one such example. The amendments contained in this Bill are another.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the present wording of the Anzac Day Act to enable the profits from a greyhound meeting held on Anzac Day to be paid to the Anzac Day Trust.

The present Act provides for all profits made by racing and trotting clubs and 60 per cent of profits made by other sporting organisations from meetings or fixtures held on Anzac Day to be paid to the Anzac Day Trust. Greyhound racing commenced in Western Australia last December and this amendment to the Act is necessary to ensure that all profits in relation to greyhound racing meetings held on Anzac Day will be paid to the Anzac Day Trust.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Carr.

WESPLY (DARDANUP) AGREEMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill before the House is to obtain Parliament's authority for the Government and Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. to enter into the agreement appearing as a schedule to the Bill. By passing the Bill, Parliament would be authorizing the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State and when it is then executed by Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. the document would immediately have the force of law.

Members of the Opposition might express surprise that the Government has adopted this procedure. Let me hasten to assure them that there has been no change in the sound policy adopted by the Government that agreements of this nature are executed and brought before Parliament for ratification, rather than following the route whereby authorization of an unexecuted agreement is sought.

In this particular case, however, there is a very good reason why authorization rather than ratification is the appropriate course. It will be noted that clause 2 of the Bill is worded in such a way that not only the Premier is authorized to execute the agreement, but also the company. The reason for this is that it might be argued that certain provisions in the agreement are in conflict with the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, 1974, being in restraint of trade.

So as to avoid any suggestion of the agreement being held to be invalid on this ground the parties are taking the precaution of having the agreement authorized by Parliament before executing it. In this way the agreement is exempt from the Trade Practices Act according to the provisions of that very Act.

The terminology used in clause 2 of the Bill is otherwise identical with that used in previous authorization Bills in that the right is sought to execute an agreement "in or substantially in accordance with the form set out in the schedule". The use of the word "substantially" is intended to allow sufficient flexibility to enable any last minute corrections or legal drafting alterations of a minor nature to be carried out without the need to refer the matter again to Parliament. I would not at this stage anticipate that any such changes are necessary since the agreement has been the subject of the most lengthy and detailed negotiations and of a very careful scrutiny as to its terms.

The particle board industry that will result from the agreement will be the largest of its kind in Australia and one of the largest industries of its nature in the world. It will be established at a capital cost of \$11.5 million at a point about midway between Dardanup and Picton Junction and not far from the existing industrial area at Picton Junction.

The size of the industry will naturally have a significant effect on the economy of the Bunbury region. Additional employment will be generated and there will be demands for back-up services such as transport, engineering, and so on.

At the commencement of operations the industry will employ about 100 people within the factory and the forest areas and in due course it is planned that the industry will expand to employ some 300 people in factory and forestry operations.

The factory will require considerable inputs of chiplogs and sawmill residues, adhesives, fuel oil, etc., and have a very substantial output of particle board.

It is also anticipated that the company will in due course expand its operations into fields which have a natural link with particle board production, such as the manufacture of adhesives.

The achievement of these agreed conditions under which the industry may establish and become a viable operation is an excellent example of Government and private enterprise working in close co-operation to achieve mutual ends.

From the Government's point of view there is the very real advantage that the project will lead to the significant decentralisation of a metropolitan-based industry and as I have said provide a considerable economic boost to the Bunbury region. It will also improve the economics of softwood forestry operations. Furthermore the company will be utilising chiplogs and sawmill residues which would for the most part be otherwise wasted.

On the company's side, in addition to receiving the Government's guarantee of certain borrowings, it has gained the advantages of having assured rights to chiplogs and sawmill residues and of having certain transport rights not normally available to industry.

The recitals to the agreement summarise the State's and the company's consolidated precepts under which the terms of the agreement have been negotiated.

The company is committing itself to building a factory with a design capacity considerably in excess of the present market for particle board. It naturally could not do so without secure access to softwood resources. The Government recognises the advantages of establishing the industry with capacity to increase throughput and to achieve a level of economy which assures viability.

I turn now to the provisions of the agreement and deal firstly with clause 2. Under this clause the company undertakes to proceed within six months of the date of commencement with the construction of a factory at Dardanup having a capacity to produce not less than 17 cubic metres per hour of particle board, the latter on a basis of 19 millimetre thickness. This plant must be in production within 24 months of the date of commencement. The date of commencement is defined as the date of execution of the agreement.

In fact, some work has already commenced at the plant site and the company anticipates commencing installation of plant by the 30th September, this year, with the plant coming into operation during the third quarter of 1976.

To facilitate this rapid progress in the development of the project the State has agreed to guarantee the repayment of a series of loans as detailed in clause 3 (1), such guarantees being given under the normal provisions of the Industry (Advances) Act, 1947.

An initial loan for \$1.5 million has already been made available to the company by the Superannuation Board, the normal formalities in respect of securities,

etc., required under the Industry (Advances) Act having been completed. I should mention here that the agreement has been written with Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. rather than its parent company, Westralian Plywoods Hearn Industries Limited, primarily because of the security situation in respect of these guarantees.

Although it might be argued that from the outset it would be more desirable for the guarantee for the initial loan to have had the full backing of an authorized and executed agreement, there is no question that the State's security position is satisfactory, and having regard for the commitments already entered into by the company, a delay in making the loan would not have been justified. I recognise however, that the project cannot succeed without the company having available to it the full rights conferred by the agreement.

Were it not for the Trade Practices Act aspect, we would have executed the agreement long before this date.

So far as the question of raw materials for the industry is concerned, it should be stressed that the capacity of the industry has been based on estimates by the Conservator of Forests as to the availability of these materials during the term of the agreement. This is reflected in clause 4, subclause (1).

Subclauses (2), (3), and (4), set out the mechanics by which the conservator and the company will reach agreement as to materials to be supplied to the company in each year of its operations.

At the same time under subclause (5) a limit of 330 000 cubic metres in any year is set.

It will be noted that under subclause (3) the conservator, in selling or disposing of chiplogs and sawmill residues to other parties, cannot prejudice the supply of annual quantities to the company as agreed under clause 4. Furthermore, under subclause (5) the State is not permitted to sell to another particle board manufacturer any quantity of chiplogs or sawmill residues which might be in excess of such agreed annual quantity, but less than the maximum quantity to which the company is entitled; namely, 330 000 cubic metres. In other words the company is being given sole access to all available raw materials up to that figure, but only in respect of particle board manufacture. This means that any short-term change in the market demand for particle board does not prejudice the company's reasonable prospects of fully utilising the allocation of raw materials in a subsequent period.

The position regarding the Trade Practices Act to which I have referred relates to this provision.

Whether or not the company has sole right to certain quantities of raw materials, I should point out that in any case the quantity of raw materials available over and above the company's anticipated requirements at any stage of the project and up to its maximum allocation are expected to be well below those which would enable a second viable particle board industry to be established in Western Australia. During the first years of the project it is anticipated that there may be some excess materials available, but in later years during the life of this agreement, the maximum allocation to which the company is entitled will fully commit the presently estimated available resource.

Clause 5 of the agreement simply deals with the specification of chiplogs made available to the company.

Clause 6 highlights an area of significant advantage to the State in entering into this agreement.

It is a fact that the Forests Department must thin its pine plantations in order to develop their saw-log potential, whether or not the thinnings so produced can be put to good use. Although the company's Kewdale plant has been taking some of these thinnings there has been a considerable volume of wastage. On top of this wastage there is, of course, the cost of carrying out thinning operations.

Under clauses 6 and 7 of the agreement however, the company will not only be responsible for the cost of felling, extraction and cartage of chiplogs to loading points plus the cost of supervising and overheads associated with this work, but it will also have to pay a stumpage rate or royalty for timber so taken.

The stumpage rates are set out in the schedule to the agreement, under which it will be seen that in the first years of production the company has been given a concessional rate in respect of chiplogs supplied to the Dardanup factory. These rates are subject to escalation in line with inflation, and are subject to review from time to time after a fixed period.

Furthermore, if the anticipated pattern of sales varies from the position where the company sells the bulk of its particle board in the Eastern States to the effect that it will sell more profitably on the local market then the conservator has the right to review the stumpage rate.

It will also be noted that under paragraph 2 of the schedule the company will have the advantage of lower stumpage rates on chiplogs supplied to its Kewdale plant from southern plantations prior to commencement of its Dardanup plant.

With your permission, Mr Speaker, I shall table a copy of a plan which is referred to in the definition of pine plantations in clause 1 of the agreement, and

which shows the dividing line at State Forest 16 referred to in the paragraph and also in the transport clause.

Returning now to clause 8 of the agreement, this clause provides that the company shall pay stumping for not less than 90 per cent of the quantity of chiplogs agreed under clause 4 in the event that it takes delivery of less than that quantity.

Clauses 9 and 10 deal with the mechanics of payment of stumping and the determination of quantities. Under clause 11 the State is protected by *force majeure* conditions in the event of the destruction or damage of pine plantations due to fire, disease, or other cause, barring the State from supplying the company's requirements.

The next four clauses contain provisions quite comparable with other development agreements of this nature. They set out the terms under which the company will be supplied with its electricity requirements, obtain rights to draw underground water at its own cost or be supplied by the State, obtain supplies of natural gas if available, and conditions for disposal of wastes.

Under clause 17 the State undertakes to buy all of its particle board requirements from the company so long as it is the sole manufacturer in Western Australia and the quality and price of its product is acceptable.

Clause 18 is one of the most significant in the agreement in that it provides privileged conditions under which the company may transport raw materials and finished particle board by road, notwithstanding the provisions of the Transport Commission Act, 1966.

Dealing with the subclauses to clause 18 in order, firstly subclause (1) establishes the conditions under which the company may transport its construction materials by road. Although these conditions have been stated in the agreement for clarity the provisions do not differ from the normal conditions under which the Commissioner of Transport issues licenses for road transport.

However, under subclause (2) the commissioner shall grant to the company or its nominee, licenses to operate commercial goods vehicles for the goods and on the routes specified in that subclause.

Cartage of chiplogs and sawmill residues from forest and sawmill to the factories, as limited by the subclause, does not amount to any real concession since road haulage of saw logs is normally approved in connection with the day-to-day operations of any sawmill.

The decision concerning road transport of the Dardanup factory's particle board output and of adhesives for the manufacture of the board has been the result of very careful consideration of the feasibility of alternative forms of transport for this industry by the Government and its advisers.

The location of the factory, the form of packaging of the product, the need for rapid door to door service and the limitations of handling the product during transit, combined with the desirability of an integrated transport operation for adhesives, has led the Government to grant an industry concessions which are not in accord with long established policy.

The clause grants the company the right to road transport of 70 per cent of the products destined for Perth. However, the qualifications covering the balance of the output make it unlikely that the transport task will be attractive to the WAGR. However it must also be recognised that the transport task involves a multi-specification, multi-destination product not at all well suited to rail transport and that without this concession the company would not have entered into its commitment to establish at Dardanup.

There are two observations I would like to make in connection with this position. One is that I am confident the boost which will be given to the economy of the Bunbury region by the establishment of this industry will be reflected in considerable increases in the demand for rail transport in other ways. The other is that the Government makes it quite clear that the provisions of this agreement do not constitute a change in the Government's transport policy generally.

It will be noted that similar provisions apply in respect of the transport of particle board to the Eastern States, with the exception that the percentage is 50. Transport to the Eastern States is not, of course, subject to licensing under the Transport Commission Act due to the provisions of section 92 of the Constitution providing for free trade between the States.

I move now to clause 19 which is the usual clause in respect of the company's use of local professional services, labour, contractors, and materials, with the additional provision that the Minister may call upon the company from time to time to provide a report as to its implementation of the provisions of the clause.

Clause 20, covering zoning, nondiscriminatory rates, rating, and provisions regarding resumptions, contains the standard approach to these matters, as does the environmental protection clause, clause 21.

Most of the remaining clauses are standard to this type of development agreement. The exceptions are clause 31 which specifies that the term of the agreement shall be 25 years, clause 32 which provides for the company having the right to seek a further agreement after the expiration of this agreement, and clause 34 providing for the use of the "Made in Western Australia" insignia on all of the company's products.

Let me conclude by saying that the agreement before the House will achieve a

number of very desirable objectives sought by the State and is very real evidence of the Government's desire to foster the decentralisation of industry and provide for employment opportunities and economic growth. The Western Australian company it will assist deserves every encouragement for proceeding with the project.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The plans were tabled (see paper No. 85).

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr May.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to make minor amendments to sections 3, 9D, 28, 37AE, 37AF, and 37A of the Education Act, 1974.

In the 1974-75 Budget speech the Premier announced that the subsidy paid to parents of fourth-year secondary school pupils was to be increased to \$25 from the beginning of the 1975 school year. It is therefore necessary to amend section 9D which relates to the subsidisation of the cost of textbooks at efficient schools. It should be noted that in clause 2 of the Bill allowance is made for the provisions of clauses 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of the Bill to come into operation on the 1st January, 1975. The department has been paying the increased rate of subsidy since the beginning of the current school year.

The other amendments contained in this Bill are of an administrative nature and mainly relate to the need to widen the current references to teachers' colleges in the Act to include the other tertiary institutions now engaged in teacher education. With the involvement of the Western Australian Institute of Technology and the two universities in teacher training, the reference to teachers' colleges no longer adequately covers all student teachers. This is considered particularly important in relation to the department's authority to pay allowances or scholarships to students.

Other references throughout the Act to students attending teachers' colleges are to be amended to include any student pursuing a teacher education course and receiving financial assistance pursuant to section 37A of the Act, as amended.

Care has been taken to include in the draft Bill a clause which adds to section 3 of the Act interpretations of "teachers education course" and "tertiary education institution". This should ensure that no ambiguity exists in the amended Act.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. D. Evans.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR STEPHENS (Stirling—Chief Secretary) [5.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

A committee of inquiry set up to investigate the situation of people who have no proof of identity has reported that real hardship is experienced by people who, although having proof of identity, have not had their birth registered in the normal manner, and also for people who have no positive proof of identity and find it absolutely impossible to obtain any recognition of identity whatsoever.

I might add that this position is not peculiar to Western Australia, but exists throughout the world. Nevertheless, it is reported that a large number of people in Western Australia are so inconvenienced.

In its report the committee recommended procedures to facilitate the registration procedures for people whose birth has not been registered in the normal manner and to provide some form of identification for those who cannot register their birth. The Parliamentary Draftsman recommended that it would be preferable to deal with these matters separately, and accordingly two Bills have been prepared, one to amend the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act, 1961-1965; the second, the Registration of Identity of Persons Bill, 1975, to provide a means of identification for persons whose birth has not been registered.

In regard to the first-mentioned Bill I would point out that at the present time if a person wishes to register his or her birth after a period of seven years from the date of birth, it is necessary for him or her to produce the necessary evidence to a judge of the Supreme Court and obtain an order directing the Registrar-General to register the said birth. Registration of birth up to a year after the birth needs no authority, whilst registration between one and seven years after the birth needs the Registrar-General's authority.

The amendment to section 24 of the Act and the repeal and re-enactment of sections 25 and 26 seek to extend the jurisdiction of the Registrar-General by making him the responsible authority after the seven years in lieu of the Supreme Court judge. The amendment, however, includes a safeguard in that where the Registrar-General authorises or refuses to authorise the registration of a birth, any person so aggrieved may apply to a judge of the Supreme Court for an order against that decision.

It may be surprising to some members that there would be appeals against the authorisation of a registration of a birth, but it may be that persons nominated as parents or relations will want to deny this relationship.

As to the necessity for the amendment, members may query whether there is any hardship in the present procedure, but it appears that many people are overawed by having to make an approach to a judge, and in some cases the legal cost of such an approach makes it a hardship.

In making these amendments, the opportunity has been taken to effect a number of other minor amendments which I will briefly outline.

The first amendment deals with section 18 and its object is to remove the obligation from the Registrar-General or district registrar to permit any person to inspect an entry in a register.

In actual fact this practice was discontinued years ago, and today any person who is entitled to information from a registrar is supplied with a photocopy of the relevant section rather than being allowed to examine the register.

Any such inspection had to be done under supervision as the person examining is allowed to see only information that concerns him or her. In other words the present amendment merely seeks to legalise present practice which is now universal procedure.

Of course the amendment does not prevent the Registrar-General or district registrar from showing a person the register if he feels it is advisable to do so.

The second amendment deals with section 32 of the Act. As it now stands, it is necessary for the death of a person to be reported to a district registrar and the amendment seeks to include assistant district registrars, as district registrars are located only in districts or large towns, whereas assistant district registrars are scattered throughout districts. The amendment is in the public interest as it provides a more convenient procedure.

The third amendment concerns section 41 of the Act. This section makes it obligatory for a medical officer to complete a medical certificate forthwith after a death, but it allows him to hold it up for up to 10 days before passing it to the person responsible for the registration.

This person has only 14 days from the date of death in which to complete a registration and the purpose of the amendment is to oblige the medical practitioner to give the certificate forthwith to the person required to complete the registration.

In the past the delay has frequently caused inconvenience and is a constant source of concern to funeral directors, who have made representations on the matter.

Section 45 of the Act is the next section to claim our attention and the amendment is in two parts. Section 45 (1) is amended to include an assistant district registrar as a person who may receive a certificate of disposal of a dead body.

The second part of the amendment revokes subsection (3) in order to re-enact it in its logical sequence, but as a separate section; namely, 45B. Section 45B is exactly the same as the old subsection (3).

A new section 45A has been inserted to prevent the removal of a dead body from this State before the death is registered.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Carr.

REGISTRATION OF IDENTITY OF PERSONS BILL

Second Reading

MR STEPHENS (Stirling—Chief Secretary) [6.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is the second of two Bills arising out of recommendations made by a committee of inquiry into registration of identity procedure and the intention is to assist the large number of persons resident in this State who have no legal means of identification by providing a certificate of registration of identity.

The committee of inquiry was emphatic that such an omission caused considerable hardship to these people and should not be allowed to remain.

At the outset may I say that the proposed legislation has been the subject of considerable research and that ample provisions have been included to protect all parties who could be affected and the actual certificate which is set out in the schedule to the Bill includes the name of the person registered only and does not mention any other person as a parent or relation.

This was considered to be a very necessary safeguard as no doubt legal complications and distress could have been caused by including such particulars.

Another safeguard is of course the provision that the certificate of the registration of identity is not prima facie evidence, whilst a third provision provides that if the Registrar-General refuses to issue a certificate of registration of identity the person concerned may appeal to the Minister who may direct the Registrar-General to comply.

I feel that the machinery enabling the provision of a certificate is laid out concisely and can be adequately dealt with in the Committee stage.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

House adjourned at 6.06 p.m.