

statement to the address shown in that Appendix, the purchaser or bailee shall not thereafter be entitled under section four of this Act to terminate the agreement.

(3) If, after a statement has been posted to a purchaser or bailee pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, the vendor or dealer has contacted the purchaser or bailee to suggest that the purchaser or bailee confirm the credit purchase agreement, the provisions of subsection (2) of this section do not apply.

New clause put and passed.

New clause 11—

Mr GRAYDEN: I move—

Insert after clause 10 the following new clause to stand as clause 11—

Heading substituted. 11. The principal Act is amended by deleting the heading "SCHEDULE." after section 8, and substituting headings as follows—

SCHEDULES.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

New clause put and passed.

New clause 12—

Mr GRAYDEN: I move—

Add after clause 11 the following new clause to stand as clause 12—

Second Schedule added. 12. The principal Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a schedule as follows—

SECOND SCHEDULE.

STATEMENT.

To
(Insert name and address of purchaser or bailee)

You may, by completing a notice in the form of the Appendix to this statement and posting it to the address shown in that Appendix, confirm the agreement made by you on the day of 19..... with respect to
(Insert concise description of goods or services.)

Under the Door to Door (Sales) Act, 1964 (as amended) you also have the right to terminate the agreement within seven days of its making.

If you did not receive a statement of your rights to terminate the agreement at the time you made the agreement you should seek advice.

NOTE.—If you complete and post a notice in the form of the Appendix to this statement you will lose any rights you may have had under the Door to Door (Sales) Act, 1964 (as amended) to terminate the agreement.

APPENDIX.

NOTICE OF CONFIRMATION.

To
(Insert name and address of person who has sent statement.)

Take notice that I hereby confirm the agreement made by me on the day of 19..... with respect to
(Insert concise description of goods or services.)

I understand that in completing and posting this notice I lose any rights that I might have to terminate the agreement under section four of the Door to Door (Sales) Act, 1964 (as amended).

Dated this day of 19.....

* (Signed)

*To be signed by the purchaser or bailee.

New clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 20th August, 1975

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

Resignation: Statement

MEMBER FOR GREENOUGH

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough) [4.32 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Sir DAVID BRAND: It is my wish to have the opportunity to express my appreciation to members of the House for the wonderful experience I have had as a member of Parliament. Because of ill-health, I would like to read what I want to say to ensure I express myself to members as I would like to.

As members are aware, I have not enjoyed very good health in recent weeks, and during that time I have made up my mind that I should retire as the member for Greenough. I intend therefore to hand my resignation to the Speaker.

It is not necessary for me to say I was elected to Parliament on the 27th October, 1945. Since that time I have held a number of offices, including those of Whip, Minister for Works, and Premier of the State. I have already spoken to the House when I retired as Leader of the Opposition and handed over to the present Premier. I do not want to repeat what I have said already but I would like to mention the very happy experience I had during the 12 years in which I led the Government of the State of Western Australia. I am sure that when I retired as Leader of the Opposition I expressed my thanks to everyone for the co-operation and help which were forthcoming during that time and for the backing and loyalty upon which every leader must rely if he is to get anywhere.

I would especially like to mention the staff of this House, the members of which have always been co-operative and helpful in every way.

I would also like to take this opportunity to say a big "thank you" to the electors of Greenough. It is a very large district comprising rural areas and covering a region from the Murchison River right down to the boundaries of the Coorow Shire. It is with regret that I have come to the decision to retire from Greenough, because I believe there is a tremendous amount of work to be done in the area, and I am hopeful that my successor will experience the same co-operation, backing, and loyalty that I have had. If I make any comment at all to the member who takes my place, it must be along the lines that backing and loyalty are most essential, as of course they are to the Premier and his Government if they are to be successful during their term of office.

It is not everyone who has the opportunity to become the Premier of the State of Western Australia—a huge State with remarkable opportunities—and I hope I have played an important part during the time I was its leader. I realise that right now Australia and, indeed, Western Australia are passing through rather difficult times which are studied with financial difficulties and problems of all kinds. Let us hope that as time goes by the problems

will be resolved and that we will pass into steadier waters and see this great nation of ours develop as I am sure we all hope it will.

I must say that the Leader of the Opposition, who has been here for 42 years, has been most co-operative and helpful as far as I am concerned. I offer him my congratulations on the good health he enjoys and the way in which he has continued to work for his party. I can assure the members of the Labor Party that when John Tonkin retires a big hole will be left. I wish to pay him that compliment.

I want to say "thank you" to the Premier of this State. As members know, I worked with him for a number of years, and I am sure during that time we achieved a great deal. We achieved considerable development in the north, in which I am proud to have played some part. I hope that as the opportunity is afforded them, the Premier and his Government will meet with still further successes.

As I relinquish my seat in this House, I would like to think I shall have the opportunity to come back to visit members and see how Parliament is continuing to work. I have always enjoyed, as have other members, a very high standard of co-operation and "togetherness", which I believe is essential if Parliament is to work well and do the right thing by the people.

I would also like to pay a tribute to the members with whom I have worked—the Hon. John Heltman and the Hon. Margaret McAleer. They have both worked very hard indeed for the area of Greenough and I hope they meet with more and more success. I pay a tribute to the work they have done.

Following my decision to retire, I made a request to the Speaker that I be given the opportunity to thank members very much for everything they have done for me, the great help and backing they have given, and the understanding which I have seen evident everywhere. It has not been easy for me to overcome the problems which I experienced as a result of my sickness. I am sure the fact that I have some difficulty in putting my words together is understood by members of the House.

I hope that the co-operation I have experienced continues in the future and that it is enjoyed by all the people who find themselves saddled with the responsibility of being a member of this House. I sincerely thank everyone for the opportunities afforded to me, and I hope that when similar opportunities are afforded to members, they will take them and they will make Western Australia a greater and better place to live in.

Mr Speaker and members, I thank you for your help and backing. In 1945 I was a new member of Parliament, and perhaps a little nervous. I would like to say that at the time my best man told me I had been elected a member of Parliament, I hardly realised the great responsibility I had taken on. I hope, members, that I have been able to do a good job, and a job that was satisfactory to each and every one of you.

[Applause]

The SPEAKER: With the indulgence of the House, rather than individual members seeking leave to make a statement in response, I propose to allow the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and indeed, any other member, to make what valedictory remarks he may care to.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [4.41 p.m.]: This is an occasion that none of us welcomes, because it is a sad occasion for us all when we find that one of our number has come to the stage where he feels he should retire from this Parliament. It is a particularly sad day for me because Sir David Brand is a person I have admired for many years. I have worked under him and with him for a long period and I regard him as one of the great men I have met.

Sir David has had an illustrious career. He came into this Parliament as the first endorsed Liberal to be elected under the new party led by Sir Robert Menzies immediately after the war. He has that distinction throughout the whole of Australia.

He entered Parliament in his usual modest way, with his usual dignity, and quiet approach. It was not very long before his presence was felt in this Parliament. He rose to ministerial rank, and of course, it is now well known that he, working very closely with another great Australian and well known Western Australian, Sir Russell Dumas, was responsible for the great development in the Kwinana area which meant so much to Western Australia. He is a person who has great integrity, dignity, and kindness, but along with these qualities he has a great firmness. Those of us who have worked under him know that only too well. One appreciates and admires such firmness because with it he has a great human understanding. I never ceased to be amazed at his capacity to understand what was being attempted, to grasp the big issues, and having committed himself to whatever we sought to do, we could rely on the firm loyal support of a great friend and a great mind.

Some people have much greater academic and scholastic achievements than others; some people have great learning in terms of books, but it is given to very few people to have great natural wisdom. The longer I knew Sir David Brand the

more I realised and felt the great strength of this man's natural wisdom—one of the greatest assets that any man or any leader can have.

It was because of this man's tolerance, his patience, his dignified approach, and his kindness but firmness, that this State achieved so much. If we look at the record, we find Sir David Brand's influence goes back to the Kwinana development, the standard gauge railway, the record expansion in farming, the iron ore in the Pilbara, the Ord River, and so the list goes on. It does not end there because those of us who have worked with him know of his guiding hand in matters such as the establishment of the Western Australian Institute of Technology, the Murdoch University, the Perth Concert Hall, and many other such projects.

I am very grateful for the fact that I was able to serve under someone I regard as a very great man. Members know he had a record term as Premier; a record measured not only in terms of years, but also measured in terms of achievement and performance. I believe Sir David has established his name for all time in the history books of this State. As well as his integrity and dignity, he has always been very loyal. He knows what he stands for, and he has been steadfast in what he seeks to achieve.

We are all sorry that the burden of office has caused his illness and that this has forced him to retire. No man has given more of himself mentally, physically, and in terms of family life, than Sir David Brand. He stands as a monument to show that some people serve their country in a dedicated and selfless way not only in times of war but also in times of peace.

On this occasion, Mr Speaker, I would like to refer also to Lady Brand. Those of us who know her well know her as Doris. She is a wonderful person and she was a tremendous strength to Sir David Brand during the 12 years that he was Premier of this State. Those of us who have been in Government and in the Ministry know how important it is to have contented Cabinet Ministers' wives! Doris Brand was a leader amongst the womenfolk and she set a wonderful example in her home, her conduct, and her appearances in public life.

Up to the time Sir David retired from the Premiership, wherever one went in the free world his name was known—not known in a dramatic, spectacular way, but with great sincerity. I believe he did more than any man I know to establish the integrity and potential of this State in the minds of overseas businessmen.

So I say to you, Sir David, on behalf of all of us who have had the honour to serve in this Parliament, thank you for all

you have done; thank you for the example you have set. You will go down in the history of this Parliament as one of Western Australia's most illustrious sons and as a person who graced this Parliament with his dignity. We wish you well, and hope you have a recovery in your health.

[Applause]

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [4.48 p.m.]: I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to express some of my feelings on this occasion. Inevitably there is considerable sadness in a situation like this. It cannot be otherwise when we know that one with whom we have been associated closely for very many years is to leave the immediate scene. I say quite frankly that I experienced some emotion myself at the knowledge that ill-health has obliged Sir David to lay down the responsibility of his membership for Greenough and to retire from the political scene. However, Sir David retires in the knowledge that he has the goodwill of so many members of Parliament, if not all of them, and so many people of Western Australia, and an appreciation on the part of those people for whom he has worked.

Sir David Brand has led the Liberal Party in Western Australia for 15 years. That of itself is significant of the support he has been able to attract from those with whom he has been immediately associated.

I agree with the remarks of the Premier that Sir David has made his mark on this State. During his Premiership of 12 years, considerable progress was made in the State's development under his leadership.

He has certainly done more than carve a niche in Western Australia's history; he has established a well-known record as having been the Leader of the Liberal Party for 15 years and as having been the Premier of this State for 12 years. I very much doubt whether that record will be equalled or exceeded in any way because it is a wonderful achievement. Leaders do not last for long in politics. The fact that Sir David led his party for 15 years in a game which is a very serious one of hurly-burly is indicative of the kind of man he is.

I am reminded on an occasion like this of something I read about a great theologian, Henry Ward Beecher, who was born in 1813. He said—

A man will be what his most cherished feelings are. If he encourage a noble generosity his own feelings will be enriched by it; but if he nourish bitter and envenomed thoughts his own spirit will absorb the poison and he will crawl among men like a burnished adder whose life is mischief and whose errand is death.

I believe that Sir David Brand is a man who has cherished and encouraged feelings of goodwill and understanding and because of that he has been able to be so eminently successful.

I express very great regret on my own behalf, and on behalf of all members of the party which I have the honour to lead, at the fact that ill-health has obliged Sir David to retire from politics. He will be sadly missed.

[Applause]

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [4.52 p.m.]: I would like on a personal basis and on behalf of the Parliamentary Country Party to pay a tribute to Sir David Brand. Both he and his wife have been known to me personally for many years since he was simply David Brand in Dongara. A man who has done so much for the State and who has served the State so well is deserving of all the praise that can be heaped upon him. He has been a great friend to all in Western Australia and he has certainly been a great friend of and has co-operated well with the Country Party in several coalition Governments both with the late Mr Arthur Watts and latterly with Sir Crawford Nalder.

Sir David will be fondly remembered by many and especially by those who have had a personal association with him. I would like on behalf of my parliamentary colleagues to wish him well in his retirement and to express the hope that now that the burdens of office have been lifted from his shoulders his health will improve sufficiently to enable him to enjoy his retirement.

[Applause]

MR CARR (Geraldton) [4.54 p.m.]: Those who have spoken so far in tribute to Sir David Brand upon his retirement have all spoken on a State-wide basis and have referred to the contribution he has made to the State as a whole, and have discussed his performance and achievements in that regard over the years.

I would like briefly to comment from a more local and perhaps parochial point of view, because Sir David Brand's electorate surrounds my electorate for some 100 miles in all directions. In the short time I have been the member for Geraldton I have been conscious not only of the large electorate surrounding mine, but also of a large aura surrounding me of a person who is highly regarded by all of the people who live in the region.

Geraldton is very dependent on the various areas around it which make up the Greenough electorate, and it is also very important to all those areas.

I would suggest that while Sir David may have had political ideals different

from those of us on this side, all the people in that area of whatever political affiliation they may be, have always admired the integrity, the humility, and the sheer decency of Sir David Brand. I would certainly like to say how much the people of that area have appreciated what he has done for them, individually, and also for the individual towns.

[Applause]

QUESTIONS (51): ON NOTICE

1. CENTRAL MIDLANDS HIGH SCHOOL

Sports Ground

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

- (1) Will the Minister advise if work has commenced on the filling and levelling of the sports ground of the Central Midlands Senior High School?
- (2) If not, will he advise when it is expected that this work will commence, bearing in mind that it was to have been carried out prior to the 1975 winter?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Work has not commenced but the work has been listed for funding from a future loan programme. In the meantime, the oval area will be mowed and rolled as soon as weather permits, to provide a reasonable playing surface.

2. RAILWAYS

Rossmore Siding: Closure

Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the proposed closure of the Rossmore siding as advised by letter to me of 13th May from the district traffic superintendent, Northam, is he aware that I replied to his letter advising that the Goomalling Shire Council objected to this siding being closed?
- (2) Is he also aware I have received further objections to the closure of this siding from the Goomalling branch of the Farmers' Union who have arranged a petition of signatures of people objecting to the closure?
- (3) Is he further aware that disregarding the objections already indicated I have received a further letter from the traffic superintendent advising that approval has now been granted for the complete elimination of this siding and this will take effect as from 25th August, 1975?

- (4) Would he arrange for the postponement of this closure pending the proposed visit of Mr Pascoe, Commissioner of Railways, to Goomalling on 3rd September when a deputation of interested parties will meet him and discuss this matter?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) My approval to the elimination of Rossmore siding was given on 30th April, 1975 following a recommendation from the Commissioner of Railways. I was not aware of objections from the Goomalling Shire Council, which were received following my approval.

However, the Commissioner of Railways considered council's objection which consisted of a petition from seven farmers indicating the tonnages they anticipated would be freighted through Rossmore during 1975-76.

The Commissioner did not consider this information justified reversing the previous decision.

I am not aware and nor is the Railways Department, of any objection or petition from the Goomalling Branch of the Farmers' Union.

- (4) Yes.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Action by State Government

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that provisional Commonwealth Employment Service statistics for July 1975 show that in terms of actual unemployed as a proportion of the labour force in each State, South Australia has a lower figure than Western Australia?
- (2) If so, why did the Premier, when speaking in reply to a censure motion introduced by myself on Wednesday, 13th August, state, "Despite all the frustrations we in Western Australia have experienced, we have managed to produce an unemployment situation which, although it is not good, is much better than the national average over five consecutive months, and the best in Australia today"?
- (3) Is he also aware that even though Western Australia has had better than the national average over five consecutive months, for every other month of the term of his Government's office, with the exception of November 1974, Western Australia has been above

the national average in terms of actual unemployed as a proportion of the labour force in each State?

- (4) Is he also aware that in terms of actual unemployed as a proportion of the labour force, Western Australia has not obtained better figures than South Australia for the past 14 months?
- (5) Did not he state in Parliament on Wednesday, 13th August, speaking to a censure motion introduced by myself, that "In spite of the frustrations of Canberra, I remind members opposite that our management here has been such that we have been able to get on top of the employment situation, relatively speaking"?
- (6) Will he explain each and every step taken by the State Government to ease the unemployment situation in this State, through the diversion of State Government funds for unemployment relief and not by the distribution of funds provided directly by the Australian Government to the State Government, or indirectly through schemes such as the National Employment and Training Scheme or the Regional Employment Development Scheme?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes, the monthly review of the unemployment situation, for July 1975, published by the Department of Labor and Immigration, shows that the actual number of persons unemployed as a proportion of the labour force, was 3.43% in South Australia, and 3.44% in Western Australia.

However, I would direct the Member's attention to the seasonally adjusted figures shown in the same publication which indicate the proportion of the work force unemployed in each State to be—

N.S.W.—4.89.

Victoria—5.23.

Queensland—5.91.

South Australia—3.65.

Tasmania—4.15.

Western Australia—3.51.

The publication also shows that, in seasonally adjusted terms, the percentage of the labour force unemployed in this State has been better than the national average since February, 1975, and better than South Australia for the past three months.

- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) I am also aware that the Western Australian figures were higher than the national average when my Government took office, and

the Member will appreciate that it takes time to correct an established adverse trend.

- (4) See answer to (1).

- (5) Yes.

- (6) I do not accept the assumption implied in the Member's question that the only way to overcome unemployment is by mounting Government financed unemployment relief schemes. Indeed, nothing illustrates more clearly the wide gulf between the philosophy of the Government and that of the Members opposite.

Unemployment relief schemes are nothing more than a palliative that do nothing to correct the economic conditions causing unemployment.

The Government has done everything in its power—and in a great variety of ways—to stimulate the private sector to adopt a more optimistic outlook and to plan now for future growth, despite the stultifying effect of the Federal Government's policies.

In the present political and economic climate at the national level, this is not easy to do.

A small break in the clouds was apparent in the Federal Treasurer's Budget Speech last night when he belatedly acknowledged the vital role of the private sector in taking up the slack in employment.

I have no doubt that unemployment in this State could be eliminated rapidly if the Whitlam Government would co-operate with us in getting some major new development projects off the ground instead of frustrating private enterprise and State Governments at every turn.

4.

WORK FORCE

Government Statistic

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Why, in May this year, did the Government Statistician revise the February 1975 figure for Western Australia's work force, which originally showed 466 500 but now shows 496 000?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics labour force bulletin February, 1975, preliminary statement No. 6.32 showed the Western Australian total labour force to be 496 000. The labour force bulletin issued on the 10th July, 1975, which is a more detailed bulletin confirmed the figure of 496 000 as

the total labour force for February, 1975, for Western Australia. The labour force preliminary statement bulletin just issued shows the May figure to be 496 100. The quarterly figure for November, 1974, showed the total labour force as 488 700.

I am unable to trace the figure of 466 500 quoted in the question.

5. GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Nature

Dr DADOUR, to the Premier:

Would he list the nature of inquiries and investigations that have been reported on since he came to office either initiated by his Government or the previous Government under the following—

- (a) those that have been made public; and
- (b) those that have not been made public?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

It is assumed that the member seeks information only about major inquiries and investigations that have been publicly announced as such.

It would be impracticable to list all inquiries and investigations of varying size and importance which are part of the day-to-day administration of Government.

A list is being prepared and will be conveyed to the member, on the basis that my assumption above is the correct one.

6. SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Class Sizes

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) At the end of April, 1974, what was the average class size per teacher in—
 - (a) primary schools;
 - (b) secondary schools?
- (2) What were the comparable figures for April 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) The information sought relates to average class size per teacher. Such statistics are subject to interpretation of the basic information available.

If the average of all classes in schools is calculated, the figure will be quite independent of the

number of teachers employed. If, however, the number of children in the schools is divided by the number of teachers employed, the statistic obtained is not an average class size per teacher but a pupil-teacher ratio. The figures obtained in each case are quite different.

It is not possible to make the calculation at the end of April, as requested, without a major survey being undertaken. The reason is that the standard statistical dates, as accepted by the Australian Education Council, are March and August of each year.

As an illustration of the difference in these statistics, the average class size at August 1974 in primary schools was estimated to be 32.80. This figure excludes special schools, special aboriginal schools, one-teacher schools and special classes. At the same date, in 1974, the pupil-teacher ratio in primary schools, excluding special schools, was 28.37.

Statistics are not available for August, 1975, but if the comparison is made at March 1975, the figures for the primary schools would be 31.00 and 24.79 respectively.

With regard to secondary schools, it is not appropriate to endeavour to give a single statistic as has been the case for primary schools. The reason for this is that the organization of the upper and lower schools in secondary education is radically different. There is no constant class size because the teaching groups for core and optional subjects are very different.

An analysis of a sample of secondary schools made in August 1974 indicated that in the lower school the average class size in English, which is taken by all students, was 31.5.

An analysis of upper school classes indicated that the figure for groups taking English at this level was only 20.9.

The March 1975 figures indicate that in the primary division the average class size was 31.00 and that the pupil-teacher ratio was 24.79.

In the secondary division the current figures are not available for class sizes based on the teaching of English for upper and lower school groups. However, over the whole division the pupil-teacher ratio was 14.97 in March 1975.

7. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Grants Commission Programme

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Local Government:

With reference to the joint statement by Senator D. McClelland and Hon. Tom Uren, M.H.R., in which they claimed that local authorities within Western Australia would receive more than \$7.5 million under the Grants Commission programme for 1975-76—

- (a) is it correct that the grants are being forwarded through the State Government;
- (b) are there any conditions as to the way in which local authorities may spend their allocation;
- (c) would he list the local authorities to benefit from the grants and the amounts allocated to each?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (a) Yes. I understand the grant is to be received in November or December.
- (b) No. However, when the relevant legislation was introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament, I understand some conditions were attached.
- (c) List tabled herewith.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 331).

8. SHIRE OF HALLS CREEK

Grants

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) What grants from either the State or Federal Governments have been made to the Shire of Halls Creek—
 - (a) in 1974;
 - (b) in 1975 to date?
- (2) What is the population of Halls Creek?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) (a) 1974-75—	\$
M.R.D.	85 000
Grants Commission	14 000
R.E.D.S.	21 154
Department of Aboriginal Affairs	132 182
Lotteries	3 500
State Government local authorities assistance fund	7 000

M.R.D. statutory
grants 15 522

(b) 1975-76 to date—

Department of
Aboriginal Affairs 91 401
R.E.D.S. 3 647
M.R.D. statutory
grants 1 294

(2) At the present time about 1 300.

9. TRAINEE TEACHERS

North-West: Air Fare Entitlement

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

What is the air fare entitlement for trainee teachers from the north-west?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Under the school children subsidy scheme, administered by the Transport Commission, trainee teachers are entitled to three return trips per calendar year.

This subsidy is paid only if the applicant is not entitled to any free travel assistance under any other scheme.

10. BANANAS

Price at Perth Markets

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How often in the last 12 months has the price of bananas been below \$2 per carton at Perth markets?
- (2) Will he provide details of when this situation has occurred?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Metropolitan Market Trust reports which provide information on the price ranges in which most sales are made, but not on lowest price paid, indicate that during the past twelve months bananas were sold for less than \$2 per carton on nine market days.
- (2) Sales below \$2 per carton were all recorded between 21st February and 23rd April, 1975.

MEMBER FOR GREENOUGH

Resignation: Press Photographs

The SPEAKER: Before I call on question No. 11, I advise the House that I have been requested by the Press to allow photographs to be taken of Sir David Brand while he is sitting in the Assembly Chamber, and I have given my approval.

11. CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Group Percentages: Comparison

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the beef, mutton, lamb and processed meats components of the meat sub-group of the food group constitute only 9.92% of the total consumer price index aggregate?
- (2) Is he also aware that the Treasury Note on the CPI tabled by him on Tuesday, 12th August, indicates that in terms of a percentage increase from June 1975 over June 1974 Perth was 2% higher than the six capitals' average for the cereal products sub-group, 4.1% higher than the six capitals' average for the soft drinks, icecream and confectionery sub-group, 1.9% higher than the six capitals' average for the snacks and take-away food sub-group, and 0.2% higher than the six capitals' average for the (other food) sub-group, of the food group?
- (3) Is he aware that the cereal products sub-group, the soft drinks, icecream and confectionery sub-group, the snacks and take-away food sub-group and the (other food) sub-group in combination constitute 10.28% of the total consumer price index aggregate?
- (4) Is he aware that beside the food group, Perth was higher than the six capitals' average in the CPI in terms of increases from June 1975 over June 1974 for every other group in the CPI other than the housing group?
- (5) Is he also aware that those groups, other than the food group, in which Perth was higher than the six capitals' average; namely, the clothing and drapery group, household supplies and equipment group and miscellaneous group, constitute approximately 57.31% of the total consumer price index aggregate?
- (6) Does he maintain that he made a correct statement to the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 13th August, when he said with reference to CPI figures tabled by himself that, "By looking at them, members opposite will find the sole cause for Western Australia having a higher CPI figure is the price of meat"?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes, but the weighted average difference in the movement of the other items mentioned was only 2.4% against a differential movement of 11.2% in the meat sub-

group which carries a weighting of 10.75% of the total consumer price index aggregate. The predominant influence of meat prices in the overall movement of the food sub-group, and indeed of the whole index, is therefore apparent.

- (4) Yes, but in no case was the differential movement anywhere near as great as that for the meat sub-group.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The Member is referred to my reply to question 8 of Tuesday, 12th August in which I dealt fully with this matter. I do not intend to engage in a constant argument on the detailed interpretation of statistics, which is properly a task for statisticians.

12. COUNTRY CENTRES

Growth Rates

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister Co-ordinating Economic and Regional Development:

Which country centres in Western Australia are experiencing the fastest growth rates at the moment?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If the Member could advise me explicitly what information he is seeking, and over what periods, I will arrange for the information to be conveyed to him.

13. WATER SUPPLIES

Wungong Brook Catchment Area

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Is Wungong Brook or any part of its catchment designated as a water catchment area?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Yes. It was gazetted on the 13th November, 1925.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Bedforddale Rural Zone

Mr TAYLOR to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has his department made an impact study of the proposals with respect to the Bedforddale special rural zone (amendment No. 25 to town planning scheme No. 1 of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott)?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) on what date was such a study made;
 - (b) by whom was the study requested;

(c) would he table a copy of such statement?

- (3) If "No" to (1), would he undertake as a matter of urgency to have a study made of that part of the Bedforddale valley likely to be affected by the proposals?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
(2) Answered by (1).
(3) No—review by appropriate Government service departments has been undertaken to my department's satisfaction.

15. WATER SUPPLIES

Bedforddale Rural Zone: Catchment Area

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Was Bedforddale valley, Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott, at some time gazetted as a water catchment area?
(2) On what date was any change of status—
(a) decided;
(b) gazetted?
(3) For what reasons was any change of status made?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes, on 26th February, 1915.
(2) (a) and (b) A recommendation is in course.
(3) The change has been recommended as the land is no longer required as a water catchment area.

16. WATER SUPPLIES

Bedforddale Rural Zone: Survey

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Mines:

With respect to the Bedforddale special rural zone (amendment No. 25 to town planning scheme No. 1 of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott)—

- (1) Did the Town Planning Department or any of its officers request that his department carry out a survey of the ground water potential of the area?
(2) If "Yes" in what form and on what date?
(3) Did the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott or any of its officers request that his department carry out a survey of the ground water potential of the area?
(4) If "Yes" in what form and on what date?

- (5) If "Yes" to (1) and/or (3), would he table any report his department may have made in response to such requests?
(6) If "No" to (1) and (3) would he advise whether his department has ever carried out a comprehensive ground water survey of the area?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
(2) Not applicable.
(3) No. However, in December, 1974, the geological survey gave the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott a brief conceptual assessment of the ground water prospectivity of three Bedforddale lots.
(4) and (5) Not applicable.
(6) No.

17. WATER SUPPLIES

Rates: 38 Windsor Road, East Fremantle

Mr FLETCHER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware—
(a) that at 38 Windsor Road, Fremantle, this occupier was allowed for the year—
1973-74—366 kilolitres of water for \$55.68;
1974-75—347 kilolitres of water for \$73.92;
1975-76—287 kilolitres of water for \$97.66?
(b) that this demonstrates that my constituent is receiving 79 kilolitres less than he was receiving in 1973-74 and pays \$41.98 more for this lesser amount?

- (2) Even having in mind some inflation over the period above, what justification can be given to cause my constituent to pay so much more for so much less?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) The allowances granted were—
1973-74—366 kilolitres consisting of 320 kilolitres for \$19.65 water rates, plus 46 kilolitres flushing allowance for two water closets.
1974-75—347 kilolitres consisting of 301 kilolitres for \$24.04 water rates plus 46 kilolitres for two water closets.
1975-76—287 kilolitres for \$31.55 water rates. The flushing allowance was abolished.

The amount of rates quoted by the Member includes sewerage rating for which no water allowance is made.

- (b) The ratepayer is receiving 79 kilolitres less in 1975-76 than he did receive in 1973-74 and paying \$11.90 more in water rates consequent upon the increase in the price of water and the abolition of the flushing allowance.

- (2) Increases in rates and prices for water since 1973-74 have been necessary to enable the board to meet substantial increases in maintenance and operating costs.

18.

DOG ACT*Amending Legislation*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Does the Government intend to amend the Dog Act?
- (2) If so, what is the general outline of amendments sought?
- (3) If so, when will these amendments be introduced?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) No. A completely new Act is in the course of being drafted with the intention of introducing it into the House during the current session, and it is not desirable nor customary to release details in advance.

19.

STATE FINANCE*Suspense Account*

Mr HARMAN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the balance of the Departmental Receipts in Suspense Account as at 30th June, 1974?
- (2) What were the details of disbursement from that account during the year 1974-75?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$8 115 973.
- (2) A total of \$174 469 416 was debited against the account during the year, and the amount of research required to obtain the information requested is such that it is not practicable to answer this question.

If the Member could be more specific as to the transactions on which information is required, I will endeavour to obtain the details sought. In this respect, I refer him to pages 30 and 31 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30th June, 1974 on which a dissection is shown of the principal components making up the balance in the account at the end of that year.

20.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY*Prosecutions*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Since 1st July, 1974 have any employers been prosecuted for breaches of legislation having application to safety requirements in industry?
- (2) If so, what are the details?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes—employers have been prosecuted for breaches of legislation having application to safety requirements on 28 occasions. Prosecution proceedings have been instituted against employers for a further 11 alleged offences.

- (2) Twelve prosecutions were for the failure to maintain safe machinery or working conditions or to utilise certificated personnel.

Sixteen prosecutions were for the failure to provide protective guarding, public protection or failing to comply with written directions requiring safety precautions.

Twenty convictions have been recorded. Three prosecutions were unsuccessful. Five decisions are pending.

21.

WATER SUPPLIES*Metropolitan Consumption*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the average annual water consumption of metropolitan consumers?
- (2) What is the estimated average annual water consumption of an urban quarter acre lot occupied by a family with three offspring?
- (3) What might be an average daily consumption rate of water for such a family during the height of summer?
- (4) What was the record period this recent summer during which it could be said that insufficient rainfall fell to substantially replenish—
 - (a) tank water resources;
 - (b) ground water resources?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 500 kilolitres per residence in the normal year.
- (2) As per (1)—a small variance in offspring has little effect in consumption as most water is used on lawns and gardens.
- (3) 3.5 kilolitres.

- (4) (a) and (b) Rainfall throughout the recent summer was minimal. During the first half of December, 1974, 2.2 mm of rain fell and this was followed by 83 days without rain.

22. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Meetings and Site

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

With regard to the article on page 2 of *The Sunday Times* of 17th August, 1975 under the heading "\$4 000 m jumbo steel mill"—

- (1) Is the suggestion of meetings of consortium members in Perth and Melbourne during September substantially correct?
- (2) Will the Government be represented either—
 - (a) directly; or
 - (b) indirectly, at these discussions?
- (3) Is the statement, "The site at the mouth of the Moore River . . . would fit in with the State Government's plan for a new industrial area north of Perth" substantially correct?
- (4) If not, what is the Government's preference as a site for the mill?
- (5) Has the Government received any advice from consortium representatives which would indicate that they are "expected to make a final decision on the project early next year and start . . . within 12 months of the decision"?
- (6) If "Yes" when approximately would work need to commence to establish accommodation for the advance party of the construction force?
- (7) Is the suggestion of a construction work force totalling some 4 000 men a reasonably accurate one?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There will be meetings of consortium members and Government representatives.
- (3) This question is hypothetical and under Standing Orders I do not intend to reply.
- (4) The Government's preference is the Pilbara if practicable and economically viable from the point of view of the project.

- (5) Not to this extent. We understand consortium members will be discussing such matters next month.

(6) Answered by (5).

- (7) This depends on project construction schedule and the work force may be somewhat higher than this estimate.

23. WEST AUSTRALIAN GOLD DEVELOPMENT N.L.

Reports: Tabling

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

Would he please table copies of the last three reports issued by the West Australian Gold Development N.L. in accordance with the provisions of section 162 (A) of the Companies Act 1961-1975 and also a copy of each of any other reports during the past three years which the said company would have been obliged to file pursuant to the said Act?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Yes, papers hereby tabled.

Copies of reports were tabled (see paper No. 332).

24. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Treatment of Effluent

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

With respect to the proposed jumbo steel mill—

- (1) Is it envisaged that there will be biological treatment of coking plant effluent so as to destroy the phenols and mitigate the potency of the cyanide and thiocyanates?
- (2) Is it likely that electrostatic precipitators and venturi scrubbers will be used in conjunction to eliminate partially the effluent from the sintering plant?
- (3) What method will be used to purify the water from the gas cleaning system?
- (4) Does the department favour the introduction of clarifiers, vacuum filtrations or coagulating chemicals, or any combination of these or similar techniques, into settling tanks of the Dorr or similar variety when treating gas-cleaning water?
- (5) Is he in favour of the vacuum carbonate system, the Stretford Process or some other method of de-sulphurising coke oven gas?

- (6) Is it intended that there shall be a discharge of any nature into the ocean?
- (7) If so, what are the details?
- (8) To what other receptacles shall there be a discharge of liquid effluent?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (8) Such technical details await formal submission to the State by the consortium, when they will be appropriately analysed.

25. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Demographic and Environmental Resources Committee: Research

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

- (1) What research has the Demographic and Environmental Resources Committee done into the implications of the establishment of a jumbo steel mill since the production of the report contained in tabled paper 188 of 1975?
- (2) What finance has been allocated for such a purpose?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) None.
- (2) Approximately \$1 000 from the departmental budget.

26. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Town Planning Reports: Tabling

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

Will he table the reports submitted by the Town Planning Department to the Environmental Protection Authority relating to the social and urban factors involved in the establishment of a jumbo steel works?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

No. It must be appreciated that the whole matter is still a subject of inter-departmental discussion, which has not yet been finalised.

27. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Water Requirements

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

I refer to question on notice 46 of 20th August, 1974 and question on notice 5 of 26th November, 1974, concerning the water requirements of a jumbo steel works, because there is an apparent contradiction which may have a rational

basis—can the Minister reconcile his answer to the earlier question in which he referred to 120 000 m³ of water per day of which the major part may be non-potable, and the later answer which refers to 90 000 m³ of potable water per day?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Yes. As the study progressed the consortium's technical group have revised processes and equipment. This has affected resource needs, including water.

28. STATE FORESTS

Clear Felling: Effect on Water Salinity

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

- (1) Is he aware of the following quotation from the Department of Agriculture's Technical Bulletin No. 27, page 29—

Further studies of the salt and water balance of streams in the 1 000 to 1 200 mm/annual rainfall zones should be made and an attempt should be made to study the integrated effect of all possible clearing and woodchipping on the Warren River?

- (2) Does this indicate doubts as to the effects on water salinity of clear felling and heavy selection cutting, although it has been claimed that salinity will not be a serious problem vis-a-vis the woodchip/sawlog projects?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This confirms opinions expressed in the Forests Department's impact statement with relation to this restricted area and supports the rationale for the monitoring already in train.

29. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Report of Study: Tabling

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he table the report of the jumbo steel industry study?
- (2) If not, will he table the interim report of the same study?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) There is no report of the jumbo steel industry available to table. When it is received, a decision will be made on whether it is appropriate for tabling.
- (2) I take this opportunity of reiterating to the Member and to the House that the feasibility study is being conducted by a consortium of companies.

It is being developed in close collaboration with State representatives.

Consolidated information relevant to the projected industry will be available to the Government when it has been assembled and documented, after which a decision can be made about public release of appropriate information.

30. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Cockburn Sound

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

- (1) Will he provide the information promised by his immediate predecessor in question 19 (4) of 11th September, 1974 concerning protection of the environment of Cockburn Sound?
- (2) Will he provide a specific answer to the question "What remedial action is proposed and is being undertaken to deal with the marked deterioration in the health of the water and marine life forms in Cockburn Sound?"?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) As previously advised, such information for the major industries will be forthcoming when the current study is completed.
- (2) Yes, when the current study is completed and appraised by the Environmental Protection Authority.

31. HEALTH

Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons: Monitoring

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

What have been the results of the monitoring of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons since that referred to in the answer to question 9 of 28th August, 1974?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Benz-a-pyrene was measured on 37 occasions in the inner city streets in Perth during 1974.

The average level during the 10 hour sampling periods was 0.2 micrograms per 1000 cubic metres.

The highest and lowest 10 hour concentrations were 0.8 and less than 0.05 micrograms per 1000 cubic metres.

The 1975 results have not yet been processed.

32. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Steel Production: Raw Materials

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

Adverting to question 35 of 1st May, 1975, concerning the raw materials used in steel production, will he now provide the further data as suggested in his answer to that question?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No. I will further consider this matter when the study report is available.

33. FAUNA

Wood Chipping Industry License Area

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What fauna use well defined areas of the woodchip license area and no other area?
- (2) Have surveys been conducted to his satisfaction to assess the value of the area referred to in (1) as faunal habitats as recommended by the House of Representatives Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation?
- (3) If so, what are the details?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No species of wildlife which comes within the definition "fauna" in the Fauna Conservation Act, is restricted to the woodchip area so far as I am aware.
- (2) and (3) Surveys of wildlife within the definition "fauna" are being undertaken on a continuing basis by research personnel of the Forests Department. The surveys have not yet been completed.

34. PORT OF FREMANTLE

Grain Ships: Loading

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

What is the cost displacement for the loading of a 20 000 ton grain ship at Fremantle Port?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

I am unaware of the exact information required by the Member, but based on the assumption that the question relates to costs paid by a 20 000 gross registered ton ship loading bulk grain at Fremantle, and assuming that the vessel loads 24 000 tonnes of grain taking two days for the loading,

the following charges would be payable by the ship—

	\$
1. Tonnage rates	1 040
2. Pilotage	470
3. Mooring	145
4. Wharfage	4 000
5. State light dues	1 000
Total	\$6 655

The amount payable for services supplied by the Stevedoring Industry Authority is unknown.

35. *This question was postponed.*

36. GOVERNMENT HOUSE AND SUPREME COURT GARDENS

Area

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

- (1) What is the area of Government House grounds?
- (2) What is the area of the reserve commonly known as Supreme Court Gardens?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Class "A" reserve 1149 "Government Domain" comprises 2 468 6 hectares.
- (2) East of Barrack Street between St. George's Terrace and Riverside Drive and contiguous to reserve 18392 "Public Buildings, Supreme Court" there are the following—
Part "A" class reserve 1150 "Government Gardens"—9 864 square metres.
"A" class reserve 18391 "Public Gardens"—about 2 605 square metres.
"A" class reserve 10887 "Botanical Gardens"—2 966 9 hectares.

37. JUMBO STEEL WORKS

Processes and Products

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

- (1) To what stage will the proposed jumbo steel mill produce semi-finished steel goods, that is, prior to the hot-rolling process or prior to the cold-rolling process, etc.?
- (2) What is the approximate sulphur content of ores likely to be used in the jumbo steel mill?
- (3) Is it expected that the manufacture of refractories will be carried on in conjunction with the proposed mill?
- (4) What particular ferro alloys are likely to be manufactured?
- (5) Will the BOP incorporating the LD process be the method used?

- (6) If not, what process is likely to be adopted?
- (7) Is it envisaged that dry-quenching of coke will take place?
- (8) Will coke ovens be heated by coke oven gas containing hydrogen sulphide?
- (9) Will pelletising be carried on at the proposed works?
- (10) If pickling occurs subsequent to the hot-rolling process, will the oxidised scale be removed by the use of hydrochloric acid, by sulphuric acid or by some other process?
- (11) Is it envisaged that galvanising will occur?
- (12) For what particular cooling will sea water be used?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (12) The questions asked require a degree of detailed knowledge of the possible plans of the consortium which are not available. I must stress that the consortium study is not yet complete and no submission has yet been made to the State.

38. WOOD CHIPPING INDUSTRY

Effect on Forest Production

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

- (1) What degree of reduction in forests production would be required to achieve a sustained yield state in—
(a) the karri/marri;
(b) the jarrah/marri;
forests?
- (2) If a pulp mill was established, could jarrah be used for pulping and is it envisaged that material would be taken from outside the woodchip license area?
- (3) Have cost-benefit analyses of the economic benefits to the people been made of the forest production industries?
- (4) If so, what are the details and will he release the analyses?
- (5) How long does it take to get a clear-felled area back to its peak level of evapotranspiration?
- (6) What extra funds and employees have been provided to the Forests Department as a consequence of their statement in the environmental impact statement that such additions would be necessary in order to discharge effectively their responsibilities under the woodchip scheme?
- (7) Is this extra fully adequate?

- (8) Does the estimate given in question on notice 19 (4) of 18th September, 1973 still stand?
- (9) If so, how can that be reconciled with the estimate that the whole of the woodchip license area to be cut will be cut over within 35 years?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) It is not possible to provide a precise answer to this question as the type of produce has not been nominated.

The answer given to question 19 on the 17th October, 1974 indicates the reduction necessary for jarrah and karri sawlogs in State Forests based on current inventory and yield data.

The quantity of marri sawlogs which will result from the operations for woodchips can only be estimated after the trees have been felled.

The proposed operation will result in increased yield of each species through more effective utilisation.

- (2) If a pulp mill is eventually established it is possible that jarrah could be used for pulping and it is possible that some of this material may be taken from outside the woodchip license area.
- (3) The benefits of the forest production industries have been detailed on many occasions. An overall cost benefit analysis of all forest activities is being undertaken.
- (4) The details of the cost benefit analysis referred to in (3) will be released as soon as they are available.
- (5) Theoretical calculations and observations in the field indicate the time to equal the evapotranspiration level of the mature forest is less than 5 years. The peak level of evapotranspiration would be achieved in a vigorous regrowth stand.
- (6) The question of additional funds and employees to the Forests Department is currently under consideration.
- (7) The demands on the department in its wide range of activities, coupled with the current general financial stringency and the shortage of trained personnel available for recruitment make it impossible to provide fully adequate funds and employees. However, every endeavour will be made to provide additional resources to the department.

(8) Yes.

- (9) I am not aware of the estimate referred to and dispute any suggestion that the whole of the woodchip license area will be cut over in 35 years.

39.

BIRDS

Agriculture Protection Board Report

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

As on 11th August, 1975 the chief officer of the Agriculture Protection Board released a report on the reasons for the declared birds regulations relative to section 14 of that report would the Minister please advise—

- (a) the 287 species of birds which have been released or escaped in the world signifying which of those species are aviary escapees;
- (b) the 138 species that became established and where they became established;
- (c) the 35 species that became pests in their adopted homes;
- (d) the nine species that have been introduced and established in Western Australia and how they were introduced, i.e., were they authorised introductions and, if so, by whom?

Mr OLD replied:

- (a) to (d) The details of species and their releases were obtained in the course of a ten year study by an Agriculture Protection Board research officer. The information requested is contained in a manuscript at present being revised and edited for publication. The author will allow the Member to peruse the manuscript at the author's office, if the Member cares to make arrangements.

40.

BIRDS

Co-ordinating Committee

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

In 1959 when alarm was expressed about the presence in Western Australia of aviary birds which were potentially harmful to the State's agriculture, a committee was set up to co-ordinate the activities of the Agriculture Protection Board and the then Fisheries and Fauna department, would the Minister please advise—

- (a) the name of the committee;
- (b) the names of its members;

- (c) the qualifications of its members;
- (d) the number of times it met?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (a) The Vermin Control and Fauna Conservation Co-ordinating Committee was established from an *ad hoc* working group established by the Agriculture Protection Board and the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee which first met on 27th May, 1960. Afterwards, ministerial approval was given for the group to function on a continuing basis.
- (b) and (c) The members of the working group were—
 - A. J. Fraser, Chief Warden of Fauna, Chairman.
 - A. R. Tomlinson, A.A.S.A., Deputy Chairman, Agriculture Protection Board.
 - D. L. Serventy, Ph.D. (Cantab), Member, Fauna Protection Advisory Committee.
 - C. F. H. Jenkins, M.Sc. Member, Agriculture Protection Board.
 - H. B. Shugg, Fisheries Department, Secretary.
- (d) In 1960, four times—27th May, 22nd July, 11th November, and 20th December.

41. HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE

Retention

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government taken any action to ensure Her Majesty's Theatre will be retained as a theatre in the future?
- (2) If so, can he advise what action has been taken and what the outcome has been?
- (3) Is he able to advise when a firm decision on the future of the theatre is likely to be arrived at?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) A committee appointed by the Government is currently examining the problem in detail. As announced in the media, Tom Brown and Associates, theatre consultants of Sydney, have been appointed to examine the theatre. Mr Tom Brown has visited Perth and thoroughly examined the theatre.

While in Perth, Mr Brown had discussions with representatives of the major performing groups.

A report is expected later this month which will be considered by the committee.

- (3) The committee is expected to report back to the Government within a month with recommendations regarding the future retention of the theatre.

It is not possible to indicate, at this stage, when a firm decision will be made.

42. MENTAL HEALTH

Kareeba Nursing Home: Acquisition

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

- (1) Has a deposit yet been paid on the Kareeba nursing home?
- (2) If so, what takeover date has been agreed upon?
- (3) If not, when is it expected a deposit will be made?
- (4) Has the Minister offered or will he offer support of available Government agencies to assist with relocating of patients at present in Kareeba?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No. The vendors do not require a deposit but the occupier has asked for payment of a deposit.
- (2) The date of takeover is expected to be not later than 1st December, 1975.
- (3) 1st September, 1975, to the occupier only.
- (4) I have offered to consider this if the need arises.

43. MATERNITY HOSPITALS

Establishment Programme

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

What new hospitals providing maternity facilities, or additions to existing maternity hospitals, are planned in the next two years—

- (a) in the metropolitan area;
- (b) in country areas?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (a) King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women—Additions have commenced and will provide 120 new beds but these will not be available for more than two years.

Rockingham Hospital—New hospital—includes midwifery beds but the number is flexible as explained in (b).

- (b) The following hospital works include maternity facilities but there is flexibility on the

number of beds because the design enables use of beds for either general or maternity cases—

Busselton District Hospital—
Replacement of hospital.

Bridgetown District Hospital—
Replacement of hospital.

Esperance District Hospital—
Additions.

Laverton District Hospital—
Replacement of hospital.

Northampton District Hospital—
Replacement of hospital.

Leonora District Hospital—
Replacement of hospital.

Pingelly District Hospital—
Replacement of existing facilities.

North Midlands District Hospital, Three Springs—
Replacement of existing facilities.

Margaret River District Hospital—
Replacement of existing facilities.

44. IRRIGATION

South-west: Loss

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

What was the total loss incurred by the Public Works Department in providing water for irrigation in the south-west of Western Australia, in each of the past three years?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Total losses incurred by the Collier, Harvey, Preston Valley and Waroona irrigation schemes in each of the past three years are as follows—

	\$
1972-73	905 328
1973-74	1 030 265
1974-75	1 082 161

45. MILK

Cost of Production

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

What is the cost of production of market milk per gallons in each of the following districts—

- Pinjarra;
- Harvey;
- Busselton;
- Albany;
- Manjimup?

Mr OLD replied:

A survey conducted by the Department of Agriculture in 1974 determined the following average costs of production of market milk in 1973-74—

Average total costs (c per gallon).

- 59.20.
- 40.84 (dryland);
42.02 (irrigated).
- 37.12.
- 51.01.

(e) As there were only two suppliers of market milk in the Manjimup district in 1973-74 a district average was not calculated.

Similar costs will be determined for 1974-75 when farm financial accounts for this period become available.

46. BEEF

Kimberley Producers: Assistance

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

- What specific forms of assistance has the State Government made available to beef producers of the Kimberley region?
- How many applications for such aid have been received?
- How many applicants were successful?
- Does the Government intend to make available to beef producers of the Kimberley a subsidy on road transport costs of stock, and if not, will it consider doing so as a matter of urgency?

Mr OLD replied:

- The beef finance scheme which is funded equally by the State and the Commonwealth Governments is available for Kimberley beef producers on the same conditions as for southern beef producers.
- Five.
- One.
- This means of assistance was discussed and supported by the Department of Agriculture at the recent Industries Assistance Commission hearing in Canberra.

47. BARLEY

Prices

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- Could he provide f.o.b. prices per tonne for Western Australian barley, six row, two row (feed and manufacturing grades) for the years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74?

- (2) Can he provide information showing the f.o.b. prices ex Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney for comparable grades in the same years?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) The W.A. Barley Marketing Board has advised that the average FOB figures for export and home consumption for Western Australian barley are—

	Dollars per tonne			
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	*1973-74
2-row manufacturing	53.10	44.95	53.18	
2-row feed	44.23	39.22	48.16	
6-row	39.07	39.22	48.16	

*Pool not yet complete.

It must be noted that these figures are merely an average of export and home consumption sale prices. The comparable statistics for export sales only (as provided by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics from data supplied by the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board) are as follows—

	Dollars per tonne			
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
2-row barley—				
(a) manufacturing	52.29	43.17	50.54	
(b) feed (2-row+6-row)	42.73	39.07	47.65	
Manufacturing (Beecher)				
i.e. 6-row	39.60	N.A.	N.A.	

N.A. = Not Available.

The 1973-74 pool has not yet been finalised.

- (2) This information is not available to my department at this time. Statistics available through the annual reports of the Australian Barley Board (South Australia and Victoria) and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics do not indicate the FOB prices of barley from those States by grade.

The New South Wales Board has only recently commenced operation and the required figures are not available.

48. SWAN COASTAL PLAIN

Water Purity Tests

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) With respect to the answer by a predecessor to my question 12 of Wednesday, 22nd September, 1970, concerning water purity tests in the Swan coastal plain, is he able to provide a similar schedule which would bring these figures up-to-date?
- (2) Are regular checks made of such lakes and swamps and if so, at what intervals?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) With permission, I table details of the latest tests available.
- (2) Yes, twice yearly.

The details of tests were tabled (see paper No. 333).

49. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Sale Price

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

Can I take the Minister's answer to question 21 of 19th August, 1975, regarding valuation to Tresillian Hostel to mean that at no time was the valuation of \$150 000 promoted by the Public Works Department?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No.

50. COUNTRY ELECTORS

Inclusion in New Metropolitan Boundary

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

What is the estimated number of electors now enrolled in the part of agricultural, mining and pastoral areas that it is proposed to transfer under the new legislation to the metropolitan area?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No figures have been taken out, and the preparation of an estimate would involve heavy staff commitments. Any estimate based on present enrolments could also be misleading in regard to the actual number of electors in the proposed metropolitan area and the number of electors in the proposed agricultural, mining and pastoral area as at the 30th September, 1975, to be taken out for the Electoral Commissioners.

The preparation of an estimated number of electors now enrolled is therefore considered not justified.

51. DRUNKEN DRIVING

Random Tests

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Police:

Are the police carrying out random testing in efforts to apprehend drunk-driving offenders?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE**1. LOCAL GOVERNMENT***Grants Commission Programme*

Mr MOILER, to the Premier:

Arising from the answer to question 7 provided by the Minister for Local Government in connection with the Australian Government's allocation of more than \$7.5 million to Western Australian local authorities, has he contacted the Prime Minister for the purpose of objecting to the Australian Government's action in providing this very appreciable \$7.5 million to local authorities; and if not, why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If I heard the honourable member's question correctly, he was asking whether I have objected to the Prime Minister about the payment of \$7.5 million. I gather from the fact that he has asked the question that he wants me to object.

Mr Moiler: No. I am asking you whether you have objected, and if not, why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I gather the honourable member wants me to object. The answer to the question is that I have not objected.

Mr Moiler: I also asked you if you have not, why you have not.

2. BEEF*Kimberley Producers: Assistance*

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

In the fourth part of question 46 on today's notice paper I asked the Minister for Agriculture whether the Government intended to make available to beef producers of the Kimberley a subsidy on road transport costs on stock. His reply was—

This means of assistance was discussed and supported by the Department of Agriculture and at the recent Industries Assistance Commission hearing in Canberra.

It may have been supported, but is the intention of the Government to be announced?

Mr OLD replied:

A submission is currently being considered by the department.

**CHICKEN MEAT INDUSTRY
COMMITTEE BILL***Third Reading*

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.33 p.m.]: Just a final note on this Bill. During the course of the debate, especially during the Committee stage, questions relating to the definition of an "efficient grower" were raised and were not answered satisfactorily. There are still a number of aspects concerned with framing a definition to be decided, and the matter is left to the determination of the committee. To my way of thinking this is still too broad an approach and guidelines should be set down to enable the committee to operate in a manner seen fit by this Parliament.

As I said before, I do not intend to endeavour to submit an amendment on this matter or to suggest precisely what guidelines should be placed before the committee, but I do believe the matter should receive further consideration. I would like the Minister to have it examined and raised in another place during the discussions which will take place there at the appropriate time.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.34 p.m.]: I have consulted with a grower representative on the committee and discussed the matter. He assures me that the growers are happy with the Bill as it is. They have, in fact, endeavoured to find a suitable definition of an "efficient grower" but as the situation is liable to change so quickly and so often it is not feasible to have such a definition included in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), and transmitted to the Council.

RADIATION SAFETY BILL*Third Reading*

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [5.36 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

During the course of the second reading debate last night the member for Victoria Park raised some questions which I was not able to answer at the time and I undertook to try to provide the answers today.

He queried the cost of running the council and I am informed that this will be quite negligible inasmuch as some of the council and committee members will be paid only to the extent of \$30 a meeting. It appears that probably half the members will be public servants and so it is estimated that the total cost per annum will be in the order of \$2 000.

The honourable member also queried the cost of employing a secretary, and I am informed that this person is already employed as a physicist in charge of the State X-ray laboratories and he will be undertaking this work as part of his existing duties. Consequently there will be no extra cost associated with his employment.

The honourable member asked what revenue would be produced as a result of licensing various forms of equipment and apparatus. At the present moment licenses cost in the order of \$6 for an initial license and an additional \$2 for renewals. It appears almost certain that the cost of these licenses will be increased to \$10 and \$4 respectively, varying a little depending on the scale and number of pieces of apparatus a particular person or business might have. However, the object of increasing these charges will not be as a means of making revenue, but purely and simply to recoup costs; and for inspections carried out no charge will be made.

In connection with clause 12 (4) the member for Victoria Park suggested that there might be good cause for a time limit to be set within which a person can appeal to the Supreme Court. I understand that appeals to the Supreme Court are in accordance with its rules which specify that an appeal must be lodged within 21 days. Clause 12 (4) reads—

(4) Subject to subsection (3), an appeal under this Act shall be brought, heard and determined in accordance with the Rules of the Supreme Court relating to appeals from statutory boards and tribunals . . .

The rules of the court do specify the 21 days.

The honourable member also questioned whether an annual report would be submitted. I am informed that this will in fact be tabled in conjunction with the commissioner's report each year. It will be part and parcel of the report of the Commissioner of Public Health.

One other matter he referred to as I recall was clause 7 (1) which relates to the possession, storage, etc. of any radioactive substance by the Commissioner of Public Health or an officer authorised by him. The honourable member was concerned that this appeared to be a contradiction inasmuch as the clause confers certain powers on the Commissioner of Public Health, whereas the intent of the Bill is to give total power to the radiological council. It is not intended to depart from the legislation in connection

with this and the clause is simply for use in the event of an emergency. Perhaps I could explain by saying that if, for argument's sake, a machine or radioactive substance was found in the street, the commissioner would have the authority to act quickly and decisively without having to go to the council to have the material removed, conveyed, stored, and disposed of. I understand provision was in the present legislation but was never used and hopefully it will never be used under this Bill. It is purely and simply an emergency power.

As far as I am concerned those were the points raised by the honourable member and I now commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

DOOR TO DOOR (SALES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

HOME UNITS FOR THE AGED

*Censure of Minister for Town Planning:
Speaker's Ruling*

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson):

With regard to notice of motion No. 1, I advise the House I have sighted a copy of Originating Summons No. 5819 of 1975 issued out of the Supreme Court of Western Australia between the Commissioner of the Presbyterian Church of Western Australia, as the plaintiff, and the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board, as the defendant.

In my view the motion is *sub judice* and under Standing Orders debate on it could be prejudicial to the course of, and decision in, a pending court case, the hearing of which, as I understand it, could be fixed for October of this year.

I direct, therefore, that the motion be placed at the bottom of the notice paper and not be proceeded with until the case is finalised.

MILK QUOTAS

Negotiability: Motion

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.44 p.m.]:
I move—

That in the opinion of the House the Dairy Industry Authority should be instructed to change its present policy in regards to the negotiability of market milk quotas, to the extent that producers may only sell quotas to the Dairy Industry Authority which shall dispose of quotas purchased in accordance with the best long term interests of the dairy industry.

My motion deals with a matter which is of very grave concern and one which affects farming in the whole of the lower south-west. It is something with which a number of members in this House will have direct association, and they will share the same concern to which I have referred.

It is probably apposite to refer to the policy actions of the Dairy Industry Authority which was set up with wide powers. Those powers were necessarily and deliberately given to the authority to permit the flexibility desired to meet the changing circumstances in the industry.

Regrettably, some of the decisions and policy determinations of the DIA have not been in the interests of the industry as a whole. This has not always been the fault of the authority; some policy decisions have not been the work of the authority at all. Government intervention and imposition of policies and decisions have been in the short-term rather than the long-term interests of the dairy industry, and have brought about features in the operation of the authority which have been most unwelcome during 1975.

It can be shown that the Government directives which have been issued to the DIA have been at variance with the policy and outlook of the Farmers' Union, and at variance with the views of the farmers who are involved. In many cases the directives have been at variance with the Dairy Industry Authority itself, and at variance with the expressed attitude of the Country Party.

It was the attitude of the Liberal Party towards this matter which led to the split in the coalition; in particular, the question of negotiability of market milk quotas. The policy measures introduced by the DIA concerning the quota issue, generally, need to be mentioned. I refer to matters other than the straightout effect of negotiability which do impinge on the transferability of quotas to a very large extent.

For the purpose of giving some background I refer, firstly, to the quota price per gallon which has been set by the authority. It has been fixed at \$250 per gallon. That price assures only one thing—that the manufacturing dairymen will be precluded from purchasing quotas to enter into this aspect of the industry. There is no way the vast majority of the present manufacturing dairymen could afford to upgrade their facilities and install bulk tanks, and then pay \$15 500 for a minimum quota. That just is not practicable and, as I have said, that course cannot be followed by the vast majority of manufacturing dairymen.

I turn now to the justification for paying \$250 per gallon for quotas, and I find it is almost impossible to defend for a number of reasons. The origin of fixing a figure of that amount on the sale of quotas stems, I suppose, from two elements of rationale.

Firstly, there is the value which accrues to a property when it has attached to it a market milk quota and, secondly and associated with this, the reflection of the increased value which a quota brings to a property for probate charges. Probate has been fixed from time to time and the value of the quota has been included in a deceased's estate at varying figures. The last value which came to my notice was in the order of \$180.

A feeling seems to have developed that a quota should carry some element of negotiability and a particular value in its own right. However, that does not explain how, morally, ethically, or even technically, there can be any justification for attaching a value of \$250 per gallon to a quota.

Firstly, what is there to purchase? It is just an abstract right and whether it can be divorced from the operations of a business is something which comes back to a matter of legal nicety. Is it right, on the one hand, to attach negotiability to a quota which relates to market milk and not attach negotiability to a quota to fish for rock lobster or to grow potatoes? Where is the difference? As I see the situation, fundamentally there is no difference and yet the potato quota or the rock lobster quota does not carry a value. To be consistent, the Government should now turn around and fix a price for the negotiability of quotas for rock lobsters and potatoes. If the Government is to have any credibility at all, and if it is to have consistency, it can follow no other course. One industry cannot be treated in this manner, while another industry is treated in a different manner. If it is advisable not to make rock lobster quotas negotiable how is it possible to make market milk quotas negotiable?

On the other aspect, the goodwill of a hotel or any other business can be transferred only when the business changes hands, and it is part and parcel of the whole set of circumstances. So I cannot see it is at all possible to fix in this way a quota which is saleable as an entity in its own right and can become a negotiable asset.

The consequences emanating from the fact that a \$15 500 asset entitlement accrues immediately somebody is issued with a minimum quota of 62 gallons are considerable and somewhat disturbing. It has been claimed that the price paid for a 100-gallon quota would be \$25 000. Why should a farmer receive that? I have heard it said that a farmer who leaves the industry should be compensated. I read somewhere that a farmer deserves compensation, but that argument is utter rubbish. The industry owes the dairyman nothing—not a thing. Conversely, the dairyman is indebted to the industry.

The dairyman is in the business because it is lucrative, and for no other reason. It is a good source of living and the amor-

tisation of his capital is included in the price he is paid for his product. So there is no justification for giving him a golden handshake when he leaves the industry. To say he has made a contribution to the industry is a spurious argument. He is in it because he can get a good living out of it. He has no interest in whether the State has a supply of milk throughout the year; that is secondary. He is producing milk (a) because he is paid to do so, and (b) because he has to or be penalised. Altruistic motives do not come into it; that is simply not on.

The 30 new minimum quotas to be issued in 1976 will carry with them an entitlement of \$15 500, which is, to say the least, discriminatory. Allowing sales to take place—albeit subject to the permission of the Dairy Industry Authority—will increase the suggested price of \$250 to anything up to \$400. That is the view of leaders of the industry and those who have been associated with it, and it has been expressed to me by no lesser person than the President of the Farmers' Union. From my own experience I have no cause to doubt that will be so.

The argument that regulations in themselves are a preventive measure is laughable. The inflated price means that the manufacturing dairyman has a less than remote possibility of buying in. If market milk dairymen can pay up to \$400 a gallon for a quota, the stage has been reached where consumers must raise the question whether they are being overcharged for milk. If an industry can stand an inbuilt cost of this nature, surely the Consumer Affairs Bureau and consumers in general have a right to raise this query.

Mr Shalders: Compare the price of a pint of milk with the price of a pint of beer and tell us who is getting the best value.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I fail to see what relevance that has—

Mr Shalders: You are talking about the consumer and the price of milk.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am talking about whether consumers are getting a fair deal with this commodity. If the purchase price of a quota is amortised over five years and the producer is allowed to sell that quota for \$15 500 after five years, he has been getting a bonus of 13.7c. That is what the consumer is paying; it is built into the industry.

Mr Shalders: Are you saying the consumer is not getting fair value for the price of a pint of milk?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Knowing that \$400 a gallon will be paid for a quota, the consumer has a right to question the policy that is implemented. That is what I am saying. This is the situation that exists and I will deal with it at greater length later on. At the moment it is just a matter

of answering an interjection at the time it is made.

It has been stated quite openly by producers that the amount of \$250 will be recouped in a matter of two years. This is fairly easily followed. The price paid for manufacturing milk is roughly 20c, and the price paid for market milk is 60c, leaving a disparity of 40c. In the course of a year the amount will be \$146, and in two years it will be \$292; so in less than two years the purchaser of a quota has repaid to him, through additional income, the amount the quota has cost him. In addition, he receives income from manufacturing milk, without any further effort on his part. He can dispose of his quota as he sees fit.

The inbuilt cost is one of the factors giving rise to some questions from the consumer's point of view. Ultimately the dairying industry will be a market milk industry with the seasonal surplus going into manufacturing. As this stage is being reached, so the value of quotas will decline, and those who have purchased quotas will find they have purchased something which has a lower market value.

Although I am not altogether happy with my source of information, it was said by the president of a zone of the Farmers' Union at a special meeting, that in New South Wales, where it has been indicated that in 18 months' time quota negotiability will be abolished, the price fell from \$180 to \$5.10. Although it may be in 15 years' time, ultimately the stage must be reached in Western Australia where those who purchase quotas find they have actually purchased an asset which has a decreasing value.

It is probably relevant to mention at this stage that the report on the dairying industry in Victoria suggests a total new approach will be taken to equalisation in that State. I just make reference to that because it is worth noting the principles that have been enunciated and the research that has been carried out in Victoria.

I mentioned also the situation of the manufacturing milk farmer on a relatively small quota. It is difficult for a man on a quota of, say, 70 gallons, to increase his quota to 100 gallons. He faces a much more difficult problem than does the man who wishes to increase his quota from 200 gallons to the maximum of 250 gallons. In the first instance, the man with a 70-gallon quota probably has not been in the business very long, and he cannot afford the necessary outlay. The established producer necessarily must have been in the business for some time to be operating on such a large quota and he will be far more able to find the purchase price for the extra gallonage than can his counterpart with the smaller quota, especially in competition. This is the sort of situation which has resulted from the prices fixed on quota negotiability.

When speaking of the current policy on negotiability, reference must be made to the policy suggested by the Farmers' Union and initially by the Dairy Industry Authority. The existing policy on transferability has been followed, not only officially by the Farmers' Union but also by the farmers themselves in the lower south-west. To illustrate this point, I would like to quote from a letter signed by the Executive Officer of the Farmers' Union of Western Australia. In 1½ brief paragraphs, this letter states clearly the official attitude of the Farmers' Union. It reads—

A series of meetings was held between the two milk sections, and a joint recommendation was prepared and agreed. This was submitted to the D.I.A. in July 1974 and, we believe, formed the basis of the first recommendation on negotiability of quotas made by the D.I.A. to the Minister. The recommendation provided for quotas to be sold only to the D.I.A., at a recommended \$250 per gallon. The quota, so obtained, to be allocated to purchasers under a series of priorities.

That is the officially stated policy of the Farmers' Union, and it was confirmed on Monday in a telephone call from a representative of the manufacturing milk section of the Farmers' Union. He indicated that the view of the Farmers' Union was unchanged.

On Wednesday, the 13th August, the Leader of the Opposition asked a question of the Minister for Agriculture about the recommendations submitted by the Dairy Industry Authority. The first of these recommendations was that quotas could be bought and sold only through the authority except for the sale of dairies on a walk-in-walk-out basis. That recommendation was made by the Dairy Industry Authority and it supported the contention of the Farmers' Union that was referred back to the Minister for Agriculture at that time. We know what transpired after that. The recommendation was disregarded and the amended principles and bases that were forwarded to the Dairy Industry Authority allowed for open trafficking of quotas between producers.

Mr Shalders: What was the policy of the Farmer's Union at the time you were Minister for Agriculture and brought in the Bill in regard to negotiability?

Mr H. D. EVANS: As far as I know this was never stated.

I am sorry the Premier is not in the Chamber at the moment because he has made certain claims, and in a fairly typical manner he tried to skirt around the issues involved. He claimed that provision for direct transfer of quotas is contained in section 30(4)(a) of the Act. He went on to imply that because the provision is there it should be used without restraint.

He is probably aware that once this principle has been allowed there is no chance of refusing a similar application, and so it will mean an open slather. This has come about because of the Premier's narrow interpretation of the contents of the particular paragraph. However, his interpretation differs markedly from the contentions of the Opposition, and the interpretation made by my leader, not only in the Press but also in correspondence with the Premier. The Opposition remained fairly consistently in agreement on this point with the Farmers' Union, the Dairy Industry Authority, and the Country Party. We believe that section 30(4)(a) should be used only in connection with the walk-in-walk-out situation except in abnormal circumstances. It was for this reason that the provision was placed in the Bill. The Liberal Party policy which has been adopted by the Government is at variance with section 22 of the Dairy Industry Act, and I refer particularly to subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of that section.

This was referred to the Premier by the Leader of the Opposition in a letter, in which he stated that the directions issued are inconsistent with the Act because they prevent the authority from discharging its proper functions and powers in accordance with section 22. Again, that is open to some form of interpretation. He also pointed out that the Dairy Industry Authority is obliged to regulate the amount of supply and production of milk so as to ensure, as far as practicable, a reasonable opportunity for profit to all persons engaged in the production, supply, sale, and distribution of milk. He said that the authority is also obligated to determine and give effect to policies for ensuring the future maintenance and development of the dairy industry and for effecting economies in the industry. Those are the functions with which the authority is charged under section 22.

The incurring of expenditure of the sort that negotiability has brought about must surely in a number of ways preclude the authority from operating in the manner for which it was set up. The legislation provides the mechanism and the procedures; these were detailed in the Bill and were arrived at after some considerable debate in this place. The detail and policy were determined by the present Government subsequently. I state that the present Government has abused the vehicle which was provided to establish the Dairy Industry Authority in order to cater for a certain section of the industry. That is what has transpired. Certainly Parliament did not determine the amount of \$250 a gallon; and it certainly did not determine that trafficking in quotas should be unfettered.

Parliament did not determine that even general trafficking, subject to prior permission, should be allowed at all. The

permission of the Dairy Industry Authority is only a formality once the bases and principles are struck, and that is the way in which it should have been done.

Provision was made in the legislation for a farmer to appeal against rejection, but once the policy had begun to be implemented and the first transfer had been agreed to it meant he must win. To indicate the intention of Parliament at the time I refer to volume 3 of the 1973 *Hansard* at page 2975. A reading of this debate indicates the spirit and the intention of the legislation far more clearly than anything else can.

At the time you, Sir, will recall that the member for Wellington had presented certain amendments in respect of clause 30 of the Bill as it was introduced to this place. The amendments he put forward did have some merit, but were not acceptable. This is what I, as the then Minister, pointed out to the member for Wellington during that debate—

For example, proposed subclause (2) could possibly allow the authority to traffic in quotas without control. I do not think this would be desirable, because there would be no control over the price that was to be paid for the quota and this could lead to over-capitalisation as it has done in some parts of the United States of America.

It was then that the existing section 30 was introduced, but it will be appreciated that the spirit and the intention of the legislation is displayed not only in the paragraph I have just read, but also in the explanation of the new clause which established the bases and principles.

What we question is the directive that was given to the Dairy Industry Authority by the Acting Minister for Agriculture. There is no doubt in the minds of members of the Opposition that the very narrow interpretation he placed on the provision was a deliberately wrong one, especially in view of the debates that ensued when the Bill was before the House. No objection is raised to walk-in-walk-out sales. There can be no quarrelling with the intention in this regard. However, direct transference of quotas without an accompanying firm sale is producing deleterious effects which must have a far-reaching implication throughout the whole industry.

This is the year 1975—a year in which decisions must be taken to ensure that the dairy industry will survive in the more southern regions of this State. It will be too late next year because the opportunity will have passed. The Tonkin Government set up the machinery for this to be done, but the matter has been fumbled badly. I suggest this has been done almost deliberately, and in terms of the existing policy it is certainly catering for only a certain section of the industry.

"ORBITAL EVOLUTION" FILM

Screening

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I desire to remind members of the screening tonight of the film "Orbital Evolution" which has been organised through the Joint Library Committee. The film concerns the development of the Sarich orbital engine, and is to be presented in the members' common room at 6.50 this evening.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I should like to make three points, the first of which will clarify the initial point I made in answer to an interjection by the member for Murray. I refer to the case presented to a special committee by the president of a zone of the Farmers' Union. He referred to the disparity in the negotiability of milk quotas and what is meant in terms of annual gain to a farmer who can indulge in negotiability at the present price.

He put it this way: Those 62-gallon quotas issued five years ago, and saleable at \$250 a gallon today have a gross value of \$15 500, or \$3 100 a year. Sixty two gallons of milk supplied for 365 days a year totals 22 630 gallons which, when divided into \$3 100, represents a bonus payment to the producer of 13.7c a gallon of milk supplied, and can be recouped at the end of five years. Butterfat producers have been receiving a return of less than 20c a gallon, and it probably is quite appropriate to ask what the consumers would have to say about this situation.

I have received representations from various branches of the Farmers' Union in the south-west, including the branches of Margaret River, Denmark, Walpole, Nanup, Manjimup and Warren.

Mr Blaikie: Was it the Margaret River branch or zone council?

Mr H. D. EVANS: It was the zone council; I have the correspondence with me, and would be happy to let the honourable member take a copy of it. Without exception, each branch was opposed to the existing policy relating to the transferability of quotas. Indeed, the feeling was fairly strong in some of these areas.

I should now like to refer to the political significance behind these moves, to demonstrate and underline the importance this issue has commanded and is still commanding. The Country Party considered this issue and the inherent injustice of the Liberal Party policy—propounded in the manner in which the negotiability question was resolved—to be so great that it warranted breaking the coalition. This is the issue on which the coalition Government foundered. I point out that the issue still exists, unresolved and unchanged; the position is as serious as it ever was. With that in mind, perhaps it might be relevant to ask: Has the Country

Party's appraisal of the situation changed? It must have done, unless it can be demonstrated to the contrary.

The new Leader of the Country Party said, "The decision to break out of coalition was irreversible." I do not know just how irreversible "irreversible" is, but the wandering lambs are back in the fold, somewhat chastened, without having the position changed in any way. However, the principle involved in this matter remains unaltered.

But do not take my word for that being the summation of the political aspect of the issue. I refer members to a public document which embroiders the words I seem to recall using some months ago. I refer of course to a document titled, "Coalition or Surrender to Portfolios Before Principles" written by Mr Stephens. The first heading is, "Why the withdrawal from Coalition?" to which the following answer is supplied—

"The main point to remember is that Court flatly refused to allow McPharlin to exercise his prerogative as Minister."

That relates to the transferability of quotas. It continues—

"Court not only refused to accede to the Industry's requests." (Dairy Industry) "He would not even consider a compromise." (Would not agree to a producer referendum).

Further on, the document continues—

Was it the right decision?

YES. With 13 months experience of coalition it was evident that the National Country Party was regarded merely as a rubber stamp to implement Liberal Policy.

Mr Harman: Full stop, and that is that.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I will supply the details in a moment. Later, it continues—

Points to Note

1. The decision to stand firm on the quota issue was supported by the National Country Party and State Council.

It continues—

4. The Parliamentary National Country Party unilateral decision to re-enter coalition was not only in breach of a constitutional decision but ignored wishes of the majority of rank and file.

Still later, it continues—

6. Dick Old went to Ray McPharlin's office to ensure that the Premier was acquainted with the Party's determination on the quota issue. David Reid and Peter Jones continually exhorted Matt Stephens to see that McPharlin stood firm

on the quota issue as success on this issue was vital to Party prestige. Yet when pressure was applied to re-enter coalition all three except Matt Stephens deserted McPharlin.

I do not think the issue of principle has been resolved. The only members who have acquitted themselves in a reasonable and respectable manner have been the former leader and deputy leader of the Country Party; at least they showed they had the courage to stand out of the coalition which in fact the entire party should have done if it expected to gain any political recognition in the electorate. The document goes on to say—

9. The Statement of Accord accepted by Old and Jones and which was the basis of trying to justify a return to coalition commenced with the sentence:

"After a detailed review of the situation it is agreed that there is no conflict in basic policies."

Why, then, was the conflict sufficient to break the coalition in the first place? The situation is undiminished and unchanged.

I continue to quote—

If this is so why the need for a National Country Party or alternatively if Old and Jones believe this themselves perhaps they more rightly belong in the Liberal Party.

It would seem to me that unless the Country Party retrieves the situation to an extent that is possible by representing country producers as it professes or purports to do, its hope of building up credibility among any section of people in the country is impossible to imagine. The Country Party has the opportunity to retrieve the situation to some extent by taking up the issue where it was left off and supporting the initial recommendation of the DIA and the policy of the Farmers' Union.

When this matter is put to the vote I will surely divide the House as needs be. There are other matters within the dairying industry which must be examined, but not wishing to confuse those with this particular matter I have deferred seeking the permission of the House to move a further motion until a later date.

The motion before the House at present is one which is vital to the dairying industry. From it there stems so much, and if the dairying industry is to be returned to the degree of prosperity which is necessary in Western Australia, this is one of the measures that will be most important in bringing it about.

Mr HARMAN: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture).

LAMB MARKETING BOARD
Extension of Operations: Motion

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [7.42 p.m.]:
 I move—

That in the opinion of the House Section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act, 1971, should be gazetted forthwith and the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board be directed to extend its operations into the sale of all forms of sheep meats.

Perhaps I should preface the points I wish to make on this motion by referring back to the 19th March last when I moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply in terms similar to this motion. I did not think I would be indebted to the Premier for his action at that time, but as it turns out I am indeed grateful because this motion has now been moved at a more appropriate time and the arguments that were put forward in March last are even more applicable at this stage.

It will be recalled that when I moved my original motion to amend the Address-in-Reply, I sought leave for section VI of the Marketing of Lamb Act to be gazetted. I then sought leave to amend the motion to change the Roman numerals VI to IV, but this leave was not granted. I have no grounds for cavilling, nor have I any intention to cavil at the Government's attitude on that occasion. Whatever the cause and need to take action on any matter it is the responsibility of each and every member to justify his utterances and his actions in this place and I accept my responsibility just as every other member does. However, the Government's action in this instance was difficult to understand and it still is.

I can recall a number of instances when amendments have been made by leave of the House and permission has been granted for statements to be made by Ministers and others without any dissentient voice being raised. So when I sought leave to correct a typographical error in my motion and this was denied me by the Premier and two of his Ministers, it struck me that they were being somewhat precipitous and surely they could not reasonably expect that in the future they could expect to seek leave of the House without a dissentient voice being raised when they sought to make a statement.

Sir Charles Court: Your people did that quite often; they denied me the right to speak.

MR H. D. EVANS: I can recall an occasion when they did, but I also recall the reasons that were given for denying permission at the time. It was somewhat different from correcting a typographical error when I was refused permission. I am not complaining, but I am just pointing out that the Premier must feel that the pattern of behaviour and conduct that has been assumed—and certainly been con-

doned, anyhow—will not continue in the future and the Government must be prepared to abide by it. It is also assumed that, alternatively, the Government must intend to be absolutely punctilious in every action of its members right down to the finest detail including the duties performed by its typists and everyone else and not under untoward or fortuitous circumstances. On every occasion in the future when the Government seeks leave of the House to make a statement it will probably be advisable to check with the Leader of the Opposition to ensure that there is some circumstance that merits the leave being granted.

However, on the face of it, that situation having been created, I do not feel the Government, at any time, could take exception to similar treatment being accorded to its members.

Mr Harman: It was disgraceful.

MR H. D. EVANS: The principle was certainly undesirable in a place such as this.

Mr Harman: The Deputy Premier was a party to it, too.

MR H. D. EVANS: The matter was the gazetting of section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act which would have enabled the Lamb Marketing Board to trade in sheep meats. The situation is still unresolved even though a very tenuous sort of compromise was reached that overcame difficulties facing the Lamb Marketing Board, but this only highlights further the overall position that now exists and which has to be faced, because the refusal of the Government to gazette section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act has placed the board in an invidious position.

The Government will find difficulty in maintaining credibility among farmers in view of some of its actions in recent times, and at the same time retain that credibility among those who support the Government and whose interests in the meat trade are opposed to those of the producers.

These are the horns of the dilemma with which the Government is confronted—whether it will maintain its facade among the producers and at the same time continue to retain the support of those whose interests are not necessarily parallel with those of the lamb producers.

Under section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act the Minister is empowered to publish in the *Government Gazette* notices to allow the board to treat either mutton or hogget. This can be done without additional enabling legislation. The provision is in the Act because the previous Government had intended that when the Lamb Marketing Board had demonstrated its capacity and ability to function in a manner that was favourable—and not only favourable but also economically favourable to the lamb producer—this section would be gazetted.

If I may just set out the sequence of events that brought about the whole episode, there will be no doubts about the clarity of the situation in the mind of any member. I refer back to October, 1974, when the Farmers' Union asked for the gazettal of section IV to enable the Lamb Marketing Board to trade in hogget and mutton.

In December, 1974, following the visit of the General Manager of the Lamb Marketing Board (Mr Malcolm McSparran) to the Middle East the board submitted a report to the Minister and asked for an extension of its powers.

In the second week of December, 1974, the board stated by letter that it did not want acquisition powers, but it wanted to be allowed to act as a competitor in the market place. Surely this should appeal to any free enterprise Government, and an additional competitor should be welcomed with open arms.

What did the Government do? Did it bring about greater competition and greater benefits to producers? According to the philosophy of the Liberal Party that should be its aim; but the Government said "No" to a proposal to allow a competitor to be brought in even if that meant it was likely to give a better deal to the producers. The eroding of the interests of those already engaged in the trade had no appeal at all to the Government, for the very good reason it was likely to lose electoral and financial support.

A report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 3rd December, 1974, under the heading of "Hopes for Gulf lamb markets" states—

However, marketing of hogget to the Gulf would depend on a report he had to make to the Minister for Agriculture, Mr McPharlin. At present the board had power only to sell lambs.

This is a reference to the approach by the Lamb Marketing Board to which I have already alluded.

On the 29th January, 1975, the then Acting Premier (Mr McPharlin) promised a decision on whether the Government would or would not allow the extension of the powers of the board, and he promised a decision on the morrow. I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 30th January to the effect that some politicians claimed that certain companies involved in the meat trade had applied pressure through the Liberal Party to oppose the move. This is a matter to which further reference will be made at the appropriate stage.

On the 30th January last there was an announcement that Cabinet had deferred the decision for another week; so, the Government again put off the decision. The report in *The West Australian* of the 30th January also referred to conflict between the two coalition parties in the

Government. I understand that the Premier had left instructions that the matter was not to be resolved in the period that he was overseas.

On the 5th February the decision was again deferred, and the ground was that the Lamb Marketing Board had not put up a sufficiently strong case. The matter was referred to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee for further comment. The Premier (Sir Charles Court) said that the board had not made out an adequate case for the extension of its powers. He said the information before Cabinet had been inconclusive, and therefore we find Cabinet had referred the matter to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee.

It was on the 18th February, 1975, that the announcement was made that the Lamb Marketing Board would not be permitted to trade in hogget. The decision had been taken, and at the same time reference was made to the ability of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee to adjudicate in a matter of this kind.

The Farmers' Union, in particular, took up the issue. There is still some question about the validity of the decision of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, when it is recorded that the original report of the MIAC was a committee decision; that the second referral was handled by the chairman alone; and that the final recommendation was a chairman's decision. Technically and legally that might be correct, but I am sure in essence, spirit, and intent it is not correct.

It was on the grounds that the committee represented the interests of the meat industry to such a degree that the producer interests in the matter were open to question. The reaction to the decision was, to say the least, quite active. On the 19th February, 1975, the President of the Country Party (Mr David Reid) stated that he was bitterly disappointed with the State Government's rejection of the Lamb Marketing Board's request to trade competitively in hogget. He said he could see nothing harmful or sinister about open competitive marketing, and that would be the case if the powers of the board were extended. He said that the Country Party would push ahead with new moves. That was the reaction of the President of the Country Party.

On the 20th February, 1975, a report appeared in *The Countryman* under the heading of "Gardiner slams Government decision". It reads as follows—

The State Cabinet decision not to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to trade in hogget was political interference at its worst, Mr John Gardiner said yesterday.

Mr Gardiner, president of the Farmers' Union's meat section said he was disgusted at the decision.

The editorial of the *Farmers' Weekly* of the 16th February contained two interesting paragraphs which summed up in fair terms the attitude of the Farmers' Union. The first paragraph is as follows—

The Union badly wants its members to have the right to market their hogget through the Lamb Board if they so wish.

It is on that basis that the principle of the producer having at least some say in the disposal of his product comes to the forefront. It is the tenet by which the Farmers' Union had forged its philosophy for some considerable time. I fail to see how it could be otherwise.

The concluding paragraph of that editorial states—

Or it could be that vested interests are well organised in their opposition to giving farmers a say in the marketing of their own produce?

It stands to reason that vested interests comprising companies of all kinds—whether they trade in buildings or motor-cars—have boards of directors, telephones, and other means by which top-level decisions can be made at short order. Half a dozen telephone calls could be the means of arranging a directors' meeting.

Of course, to this extent they are organised. When farmers come into conflict and competition with such well-managed organisations guided by specialists who spend 24 hours of the day thinking on their particular aspect of trade, it is no wonder that the farmers are no match.

On the 21st February, 1975, the then Deputy Premier (Mr McPharlin) was at pains to stress that the coalition Government was working harmoniously. He said there was no party split, and that the coalition parties were working together well and harmoniously. As subsequent events have proved, this was not the case.

It is obvious that this is a more disruptive issue than was the transferability of milk quotas. I suggest that the inherent injustice in the decision taken on this is at least no less than it was on the milk quotas.

The State Government rejected the alternatives put to it, particularly by the Farmers' Union. While the farmers backed the union stand on hogget there was still a rejection of points they had proposed at the Farmers' Union conference. The conference backed the decisions and actions that had been taken right down the line.

I recall an answer to a question asked in this House. The implication was that the wishes and policy of the union had been met. That was not in accord with a letter I received very shortly afterwards. At the same time the Farmers' Union was not disposed to compromise on that principle, which involves such a very broad

ramification in marketing, that the producer must necessarily have some control over his product and he should not be completely excluded as had been the case in this regard. The uncompromising stand on that point taken by the executive and endorsed by the general conference makes the point and, to establish the facts, it is worth quoting the first few lines of the unabridged Press release which was forwarded to me from the executive of the Farmers' Union. It reads—

The Farmers' Union request for gazettal of Part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act still stands.

This would allow the board to trade on a voluntary basis in sheepmeats as well as lamb.

The union's request to this effect was first made last October.

The Lamb Board also requested gazettal of Part IV of the Act but the reasons for the two requests were on slightly different bases.

That demonstrates the point, without going any further, that the board has retained its consistency right through.

As a result of further negotiations between the union and the Government, which did not in any way clarify the whole position from the union point of view, the immediate question of clearing summer lambs was resolved, but not the issues of principle. The summer lambs might have gone, although no doubt they will be back, but the principle concerning the extension of the powers of the board has still not been determined, nor will it be until the gazettal of this part of the Act. So, because the board can handle summer lambs, and because there has been little hogget up till this time—and the situation has changed dramatically now—the two issues still remain.

The first of these issues is the request of the growers through their organisation to market their product as they see fit. This is still denied them. The second is that the board needs to trade in hogget and sheep meat. In fact this need has been intensified because the approach to new markets must be fully flexible to ensure that the board can operate at the capacity it is capable of.

Also the Australian Department of Agriculture regulations preclude summer lambs being marketed as hogget and this is the difficulty.

The extension of powers is sought to handle summer lambs—and the summer lambs certainly are a problem when it comes to the overall marketing situation. They cannot be shipped to the United Kingdom or the EEC. Many are rejected and certainly hogget commands a better price than summer lamb. Under the Crown Law decision which was taken I understand there is no way the board could handle hogget and this view is still the same. However, having acquired the meat

as summer lamb, the board can dispose of it as young sheep provided it conforms with the Commonwealth regulations.

The present position is that the board has gained an order for something like 10 000 tonnes, which includes approximately 2 500 tonnes of hogget, and to fulfil the total order it would have to arrange through the Midland Junction Abattoir or the WAME or some private abattoir to supply the balance of the order which is not lamb. To say the least this is clumsy and unsatisfactory from a negotiating point of view. No private firm would tolerate such clumsy, ill-conceived methods.

The ADA regulation precludes summer lamb being sold as hogget. The Premier is reported as being reasonably satisfied with the board, but are the board and the Farmers' Union satisfied with the Premier? That is a question which might well be asked, and if a reply were elicited I am sure it would be found they were not satisfied. Most certainly the Opposition is not satisfied with the Premier and will not be until part IV of the Act is gazetted.

Reference has been made to contracts with the Middle East. As I understand the situation from the Press releases, contracts have been secured for 5 000 tonnes of lamb, and a further 1 000 tonnes of sheep meat. Consequently approximately one-third of the total order has to be provided in sheep meat, not lamb, and the board is unable to touch this. This is where the difficulty arises. Also, there is an additional possible order of something like 3 000 tonnes of lamb, and 1 200 of mutton.

Let me make reference to the situation. In the first full year of its operation the board handled just over 1.250 million lambs. This year the expectation by the Department of Agriculture is in the order of 1.7 million lambs. Consequently it is obvious there is a need for the market to be well organised otherwise a glut situation could very easily arise. When we take into consideration the fact that something like 4 200 tonnes of sheep meat is to be supplied this puts the mutton and lamb producer in a favoured position this year, particularly when we realise what is happening to the beef farmers of Western Australia and, indeed, of the whole country.

This 4 200 tonnes of mutton in the amount additional to lamb, if the contract is obtained, will need to be supplied by private firms and one could well ask why should it not be supplied by the board. It just cannot be so under the existing situation.

I was rather interested to hear a radio talk at midday on the 8th August during the national country hour when the statement was made that Iran is prepared to pay \$1 600 per tonne for mutton, but is obliged to pay only \$1 200 to \$1 300 per tonne because competition in the industry has given cheaper rates to Iran.

I do not know specifically why this has come up but I can only conclude that competition among the traders has forced the price down, each seeking to gain contracts at the lowest possible price. The price finally decided on was \$1 200 to \$1 300 a tonne whereas officially Iran would be prepared to accept our mutton at \$1 600 per tonne. That is the sort of competition which the existing system brings about. It is occurring in the Middle East markets and also in the saleyards by the competition from the wholesale butchers and processors who force down the prices paid to the producers. The producers are being slaughtered, not the stock!

Mr Hartrey: The consumers are not receiving the benefit.

Mr H. D. EVANS: As the member for Boulder-Dundas has said, the consumers are not receiving the benefit which possibly they should receive. Iran is certainly enjoying a bonanza at the expense of the Western Australian sheep farmers.

There is an advantage associated with the Lamb Marketing Board dealing with the Governments of Middle East countries. Our largest segment of trade has been developed in Iran and that country has a set-up comparable to the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board. That organisation is respected and understood, and also it has the standing of a semi-Government authority and that, in the Arabian countries, means quite a deal. It inspires confidence and, at the same time, it is obliged to work through private contractors. So, it is obvious there is need for a single trading authority on the international scene.

The situation is difficult enough without the competition which exists within the trade. It would be preferable, certainly, to have a trade approach on a national basis, as is the case with countries such as New Zealand. If we cannot obtain that approach in the short term then, perhaps, the next best thing is to develop a State authority which is capable of fulfilling that function. The board, which handles the bulk of Australia's exports, is not in a very useful position. A natural adjunct to lamb is mutton, which strengthens the case for further negotiation.

It is also fitting—indeed, it is probably necessary—to refer to the traditional markets which we have developed in past years; markets which are no longer available to us, and markets which will not be available to us for much longer. The markets of the United Kingdom and the EEC are no longer open to us. Germany and Holland may take a small quantity of lamb, but certainly only a matter of 200 or 300 tonnes. The UK will accept our lamb, but at a price—something like 6c below that which is received for Western Australian lamb on the Middle East markets. That is the distinction.

There is a possibility that greater quantities of lamb will be imported into the UK when increased tariff rates become operative in 1976 but that will be only a trading device on the part of importers to obtain larger stocks before the effects of the tariff are felt. The Middle East prices are still well above those which are being paid in the United Kingdom and, at all events, any sales to the UK at the end of this year will be for a short duration only and certainly will not have influence on the industry in the long term.

The whole position is exacerbated to some extent by the step taken in New Zealand to devalue its currency. That move will give New Zealand trade advantages in many countries throughout the world, except where contracts are not written in US dollars. It could well be that Western Australian lamb growers and mutton producers will be facing stiffer competition from New Zealand in the future. For that reason our market structure should be kept at the most efficient level to meet the additional challenge to the problems which already exist.

The previous Government intended that the record of the board should be examined periodically and consistently until it could be ascertained that the time was propitious for the board to engage in the trading of sheep meat. I do not think it can be denied that that stage has not only been reached, but surpassed, because to June, 1975, the board had handled a total of three million lambs. The net average to the grower has been \$8.50 per lamb, and that includes culls. That figure compares more than favourably in the long term with Eastern States figures. Frequently we see items in the Press referring to the situation in the Eastern States, and pointing out how much better off the Eastern States growers are.

The full story needs to be told before any judgment of the position between the various States is made. When we examine the trading operations in Western Australia, over a two-year period, and try to compare them with reports which appear in the Press concerning Eastern States markets, a meaningful comparison just is not possible. In the first place, the Press reports are mere estimations; they are never a true picture of what is happening. In one particular Press report a market was quoted as paying \$17.50 for lambs. That may have been so, but it was for one pen only. The rest of the market was down \$3 per lamb on the previous week. That is the sort of situation which comes about and gives a distorted picture of the true position as it exists.

Let us face the facts. What justification can there be for rejecting this motion, and for denying the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board an opportunity to trade as it was proposed it should trade?

Mr Hartrey: None whatsoever.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The member for Boulder-Dundas has given the obvious answer, and anybody who attempts to give a contrary answer will be hard pressed to justify it. The only grounds I can see for denying the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board the proposed powers is to protect vested interests in the meat industry, and protect them at the expense of the growers. There is no other reason that this should not be done.

The WA Lamb Marketing Board has vindicated its establishment very thoroughly; indeed, even to the extent of satisfying the Premier. After the inquisition by the Premier the board would have had to operate faultlessly.

I will refer also to another item which appeared in the Press, and this was a criticism of the Lamb Marketing Board. It contained something like 20 signatures.

The principal who put that petition forward, I understand following investigation, is the supervisor of four properties which are owned by a concern which is involved in the export of lamb. I believe he is concerned with the interests of those who commission him to carry out supervisory duties. The petition which was put forward was in some cases signed more than a year previously, I believe, and circumstances have changed vastly in that time.

Earlier this evening I referred to the political aspects of another problem in the rural industries. We have exactly the same position here—a matter of principle and a matter of establishing credibility, which I think is desperately needed by the Country Party at the present time. The credibility—

Mr McIver: There is none.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It is well nigh obliterated, anyway. *The Albany Advertiser* of the 24th March quotes the previous Leader of the Country Party as saying—

... there was colossal pressure brought to bear by vested interests—
This related to the matter of gazetting section TV of the Marketing of Lamb Act.
The article continued—

—so much so that the Premier had requested him to take the matter to Cabinet and he was obliged to do so.

The article goes on to say—

In a Cabinet where the numbers were nine to three against the Country Party it was a difficult job to get a favourable decision—

Mr Carr: No wonder they pulled out.

Mr H. D. EVANS: But does it change anything? Does it mean the Country Party can never get a decision its supporters want if it offends the Liberal Party? If the Country Party has the ef-

frontery to go back to the electors and tell them it represents them sincerely and fully in this place—

Mr Barnett: Only two of them can hold up their heads and one of them is to be "redistributed out".

Mr H. D. EVANS: The former Minister said at a public meeting in my electorate that powerful interests had been responsible for this situation. My final quotation comes from the Country Party conference, when the same member of Parliament warned of a threat to the lamb board. The report reads—

Powerful groups were still trying to get rid of the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board, the former Minister for Agriculture, Mr McPharlin, said yesterday. . . . The dispute was a major factor in the NCP temporarily leaving the coalition Government.

"Temporarily" is the operative word. It did not last very long at all, and what is more it did not resolve the issues which were at stake. They are still with us and we are still trying to decide them tonight. The report goes on—

The education policies of the coalition partners in the State Government are still in conflict . . .

However, that is by the way.

All in all we are still confronted with a dire need to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to operate in the manner it desires, and that manner will be to the benefit of the lamb producers in this State. The motion before the House reads—

That in the opinion of the House Section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act, 1971, should be gazetted forthwith and the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board be directed to extend its operations into the sale of all forms of sheep meats.

To make that point clear, the motion is designed to ensure that the portion of section IV which requires a request on the part of the Board and acquiescence on the part of the Minister is put into operation. It is no good just gazetting the section and leaving it; it must go further than that. It is necessary to authorise the Lamb Marketing Board to proceed in the matter according to its commercial judgment and in accordance with the opportunities and circumstances within the industry, in much the same way as the Midland Junction Abattoir Board has done.

The abattoir board has been given the right to trade but it has been given only broad guidelines as to the manner of its operation. Basically, if a situation arises where it is necessary (a) to keep the works in operation to its fullest extent, or (b) to take out of the saleyard excessive sheep at a glut time when they are not being purchased, the Midland Junction Abattoir Board acts to fulfil those two functions.

Section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act should be gazetted to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to get on with the job in the circumstances which the commercial aspects of the industry demand. It would be foolish to give specific instructions as to how it should go about trading. It has done a good enough job up to the present time and there is no reason for concern that it will not fulfil its expanded function in a similar manner in the future.

I repeat there is no reason whatsoever that the Lamb Marketing Board should not be given extended powers, unless it is to protect the vested interests in the meat industry which are diametrically opposed to the interests of the farmers in Western Australia. It will be interesting to see the reaction of the Country Party if it is ever again to hold up its head in the electorate where it claims to represent the interests of producers.

Mr HARMAN: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture).

VIETNAMESE AND CAMBODIAN CONFLICTS

Condemnation of Statements by Deputy Prime Minister: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 17th April, on the following motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry)—

This House deplores the alarmingly anarchistic statements attributed to, and since confirmed by, the Deputy Prime Minister, Dr Cairns, and published in *The Launceston Examiner* on April 1, 1975, to the effect that "it was now inevitable that the Saigon and Phnom Penh governments will fall"; that "it is inevitable that the South Vietnamese Government will fall to a government dominated by the people's revolutionary government" and that "he expects Australia to be the first country to recognise the new communist government".

It considers these statements as being a savage attack on fundamental democratic principles in view of the fact that the present South Vietnamese president and National Assembly were constitutionally elected at an internationally observed election in the presence of representatives of many countries, including Australia and Australian Labor officials.

Furthermore, this House believes that such statements as those attributed to Dr Cairns, give devastatingly effective moral support and inspiration to the communist invaders of South Vietnam to the detriment of those who are now desperately fighting to preserve political freedom in South Vietnam.

In addition, the House believes that the statements are callously indifferent to the tragic plight of the Vietnamese refugees and are a grievous insult to all who have been wounded or who have laid down their lives in South Vietnam in order to prevent a small nation from being taken by force.

To which Mr J. T. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition) had moved the following amendment—

Delete all words after the word "deplores" in line 1.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [8.28 p.m.]: At eight minutes past six on the afternoon of the 17th April this House paid me the compliment of permitting me to resume my remarks at a future date.

The **SPEAKER**: I remind the honourable member he has 13 minutes.

Mr HARTREY: That will be about 12 minutes too many. I felt at the time that unless the opportunity arose very speedily it would be quite superfluous for me to resume my remarks at all, because this motion was all about the rather calamitous condition of two Asiatic countries which was entirely due to the military adventures of the United States and our stupid satellite performance in doing precisely what "LBJ" and other great heroes of the United States directed us to do through our then Prime Ministers Menzies and Holt. It is already ancient history, thank God, so I do not propose to address myself to the body of the motion.

I have already said—and I repeat—it was deplorable that the attack should have been made on Dr Cairns, and of course some very incorrect prophecies were made in connection with the motion. Terrible things were going to happen; the Premier even went so far as to say that Dr Cairns was such a powerful man he could easily overturn the Prime Minister at any time he chose.

Sir Charles Court: And he could.

Mr HARTREY: That is one prophecy which went completely astray.

Sir Charles Court: Cairns has not finished with him yet.

Mr HARTREY: Mr Whitlam has finished with Dr Cairns, I am afraid. However, I do not want to be drawn into prophecies.

Sir Charles Court: The shadow haunts him.

Mr HARTREY: The Premier was well off the mark. Cicero once said that the politician who can make the best conjecture is the one he regarded as the most prophetic. That is all one can do with politics—make conjectures—and the Premier's conjecture was hopelessly wrong, although at the time I was rather inclined to agree with it myself.

We will say no more about the subject. I have no more to say, and I hope no-one else has. Thank God—and I say that with all reverence and sincerity—the whole beastly episode is over. It finished much less tragically than I feared it might, and many other people felt the same apprehensions as I did, and justly so. It was a great mercy that the whole rotten situation has been cleaned up a good deal better than we ever expected it to be. I will say no more except to thank the House for giving me the opportunity to make a few more remarks. I hope we have now buried—without honour, glory, or bugles—the Vietnam war with all its concomitants, which may now be forgotten, although not necessarily forgiven, politically.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.32 p.m.]: The purpose of this amendment is to delete certain words from a motion I moved during the last session of this House and to insert others which are not very complimentary to me. I have no wish at this late stage to answer any of the allegations made. Although I took strong exception to them at the time, I do not feel there is any point in referring to them at this juncture.

However, I do want to say that an inadvertent error occurred in transcribing the shorthand notes of this particular motion, and this error was not picked up when the draft was checked. Members may recall that the original motion appeared on the notice paper for some days before the Leader of the Opposition drew the attention of the House to the fact that one or two words had been omitted from the statements which were attributed to the then Deputy Prime Minister (Dr Cairns). The words omitted were not really significant because when I moved the motion I read out the precise remarks of the then Deputy Prime Minister and I made absolutely clear which words I took exception to. So although this error occurred, no-one in the House could have been in any doubt about what was actually said.

As a result of the action taken by the Leader of the Opposition when he drew the attention of members to this error, I asked my own department to inquire into the matter. This inquiry has been completed, and my staff have asked me to table the relevant papers. The note that accompanies the photocopies of the papers is relatively brief, and therefore, I would like to read it to members as it explains what actually happened. It reads as follows—

Enquiries have been made into the omission of the word "among" from your motion in the House.

Attached are the following:

Marked "A"—A photo copy from "The Launceston Examiner"

of an article together with a typed extract.

Marked "B"—The shorthand notes as dictated by you of a rough draft of your notice of motion.

Marked "C"—The typed transcription of the shorthand notes marked "B".

Marked "D"—An alternative rough draft submitted by the Public Relations Officer.

Marked "E"—A re-typing in their exact form of the shorthand notes marked "B".

This note is signed by my private secretary—a gentleman well known to the member for Maylands because he was his private secretary before he became mine.

Mr Harman: He will be mine again too, shortly.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is wishful thinking.

Mr Coyne: Never.

Mr GRAYDEN: This document is dated the 18th April, 1975, and it goes on to say—

A careful examination of the shorthand notes indicates that the word "among" was dictated, however, in the typing of the rough draft marked "C" a mis-understanding apparently occurred through an overlarge erasure symbol—this is further borne out by the fact that although the shorthand symbol is for "countries" the typist changed this word to "country" to fit in with what was thought to be an erased outline.

In conclusion, from the paper submitted it is evident that an inadvertent error occurred in transcribing shorthand which was not picked up when the draft was checked.

I ask, Sir, that the papers be tabled. I regret that the error occurred, but I repeat that no member could be under any misconception about my motion because of it. At the time I moved the motion, I stated quite precisely the remarks to which I objected.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 334).

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—17

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sibson
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Sodeman
Mr Laurance	Mr Stephens
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Young
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Grewar
Mr Bryce	Mr Thompson
Mr May	Sir David Brand
Mr Jamieson	Mr Crane

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sibson
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Sodeman
Mr Laurance	Mr Stephens
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Noes—17

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Young	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Grewar	Mr T. D. Evans
Mr Thompson	Mr Bryce
Sir David Brand	Mr May
Mr Crane	Mr Jamieson

Question thus passed.

Motion agreed to.

KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION

Summoning of Witnesses to the Bar of the House: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd April, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

That the following be summoned to the Bar of this House on a date to be fixed to give evidence relating to the construction of a southern extension to the Kwinana Freeway and matters relating thereto:

Dr Edward Maslen of 31 Roebuck Drive, Manning

Prof. Martyn Webb of 102 Circe Circle, Dalkeith

Cr Paul Ritter of 76 Brookton Highway, Kelmscott

Prof. Desmond C. O'Connor of 118 Forrest Street, South Perth

Mr Gordon Barrett-Hill of 8 Binsdaring Parade, Claremont
 Mr Lauchlan Miller of 19 Larundel Road, City Beach
 Dr Alison Baird of 9A View Street, Peppermint Grove
 Dr Brian W. Logan of 18 Alness Street, Applecross
 Dr Byron Lamont of 12 Flamingo Run, Burrendah
 Mr L. A. Tilly of 195 The Esplanade, Mt Pleasant
 Mr George H. Playford of 184 Lockhart Street, Como.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Transport) [8.44 p.m.]: This motion was moved some months ago, and probably many members have forgotten the full detail of it. It was moved by the member for Morley for the purpose of bringing before the Bar of the House certain members of the public to give evidence in connection with the proposed extension of the Kwinana Freeway. I was absent on the night on which the member for Morley made his speech, but having read his speech it is my opinion that his stunt lacked body. In fact, while I appreciate the fact that he has made many capable speeches in this place I think this is one of his poorer efforts; indeed it is the most feeble of them all.

He did not include amongst the people he would like to summon to this place persons who have a lifetime of experience in traffic matters and who have an interest in roads. In fact, he gave no details of the experts he proposes to bring before the Bar of the House—all of whom he could have contacted had he wanted to do so. I ask the honourable member: Did he contact all these people? He does not answer, so obviously he did not. From the information I have received it is quite obvious that he did not.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Did not do what?

Mr O'CONNOR: Contact all of these people.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Yes, I did.

Mr O'CONNOR: Well, I was contacted by some of those concerned, and the Main Roads Department received letters from others which indicate otherwise. They indicated they did not want to be associated with the issue; as a matter of fact, one or two indicated that they did not support the point of view of the member for Morley, anyhow.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Do you think I am calling them here simply to support my view?

Mr O'CONNOR: No, but I had grave doubts as to whether the honourable member contacted each of them. He could have done that and obtained information from them without bringing them to the Bar of the House.

Mr Bertram: He has removed your doubts now.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, I accept what the member says and take it for granted that he did contact them.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: I contacted all of them, but there was a misunderstanding with one.

Mr O'CONNOR: I accept what the member for Morley says. However, I believe his motion is not only mischievous but also an affront and an insult to the elected members of this House. That is how I see his action, combined with the action of the Federal Minister (Mr Charles Jones) who has decided to overrule the wants and the requirements of this Parliament.

I am appalled to think that a Federal Minister who is without great knowledge of what has occurred in connection with this issue, should, at the request of members opposite, decide to interfere with what has been agreed upon in this Parliament. Quite frankly, this is one of the worst actions I have ever seen since I have been in this place. If the Federal Government is going to interfere in respect of every issue decided in this Parliament and with which members of the Opposition do not agree, what sort of Parliament will we have? What sort of system will we have if in each State, because the Opposition does not agree with something the Federal Government will step in and hold an inquiry irrespective of whether it is for the benefit of the electors of the State?

Mr Harman: Is the Federal Government supplying any money for this?

Mr O'CONNOR: I hope it will supply the lot. However, it is a waste of money conducting an inquiry because all the inquiries necessary have been made in the past. We are wasting our time sitting here debating all these matters if our decisions are to be suddenly overruled in the Federal sphere. This is an action we have never before seen in this place.

Mr Skidmore: There weren't many inquiries.

Mr O'CONNOR: Of course, the member for Swan is wrong, because his leader held an inquiry into this subject, and something like 18 inquiries have been held in the last 20 years. No matter which has been before this Parliament has been the subject of more work or more inquiries. What would be the result if we held another inquiry?

Mr Skidmore: History reveals that many inquiries have found the right answers.

Mr O'CONNOR: History does not reveal that in the past the Federal Government has issued an instruction that funds will not be forthcoming until such time as the wants of the Opposition are satisfied. Quite frankly, I feel that is an insult to the Parliament of this State, and

a further inquiry will be simply an unwarranted waste of time especially from the point of view of the people who live south of the river and who will have to wait a lot longer before they have a decent system of traffic movement in that area.

Mr Bertram: You were not worried about wasting time on the previous motion, which was introduced by your Government.

Mr O'CONNOR: Recently I had lunch at the Parmelia Hotel with Mr Jones, at the expense of the Commonwealth Government.

Sir Charles Court: At least you got something out of him.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am sorry; it may not have been at the expense of the Commonwealth Government because it was in connection with the oil drilling rig issue. Before I had lunch with Mr Jones I heard a whisper outside the hotel that he had received a protest from members of the Opposition in connection with the Kwinana Freeway issue, even though the matter had been resolved in this place. I think the member for Morley was involved, although he can deny it if he wants to.

Mr Charles Jones, the Federal Minister, did not have the courtesy to tell me he was going to override a decision of this Parliament, even though he sat next to me; he made an announcement later that afternoon. If this is the sort of co-operation they are prepared to give, where do we go from there?

Mr Barnett: He listened to the statements you made and gave his decision later.

Mr O'CONNOR: Of course, the member for Rockingham could not be too happy because many of his electors will be disadvantaged. The same applies to Mr Dawkins; members of his electorate will be stuck in traffic jams because of the decision of the Federal Minister.

Mr Taylor: Mr Dawkins, the Federal member for Tangney, has done nothing at all; he is not involved.

Mr O'CONNOR: Is he not? But was not his party involved?

Mr Taylor: That might be so, but that is a different thing.

Mr O'CONNOR: Is the member for Cockburn sure of that?

Mr Taylor: Well, you are on your feet, and you are making the statements.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Cockburn will get his chance to speak later. The member for Morley asked whether it is radical to seek the advice of experts. It is not; it is not even necessary to seek the advice of Parliament, if we are to be overridden in this manner by the Federal Minister. He went on further to ask, "Should there be any opposition to it at all?" It made not one iota of difference

what this Parliament said; despite the fact that we had instituted inquiries into this proposal, we were overridden by the Federal Minister. The member for Morley went on to say—

... Parliament will continue to be a farce ...

We now have a genuine one-party State, and because of that, Parliament has been emasculated, and it has lost any semblance of what it should be.

This Parliament has been emasculated through the actions of some members of the Opposition and of the Federal Government; I believe they have been tremendously discourteous to the people of this State in the way they have acted. What a farce for a member to speak in that way, when the Commonwealth Government, of which he is a supporter, has acted in the way it has; he shows total insincerity and a lack of concern for the electors of this State.

During his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate, the honourable member said the plans were available for only two weeks. The plans for the Kwinana Freeway extensions were available when his Government was in office. When I became Minister, I was advised that the plans were available, but had not been released. Immediately after I became Minister I released them, so what the honourable member said was not a fact. The plans not only had been available for a couple of weeks; they also had been available during the term of office of his Government.

Mr Skidmore: He did not make that statement.

Mr O'CONNOR: He did!

Mr Skidmore: That they were not released?

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Swan has not been listening, and I do not intend to go back over the same ground again.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Are you saying that I said the plans for the Kwinana Freeway extensions were not available?

Mr O'CONNOR: I said that the honourable member claimed the plans were available for only two weeks; but the plans were available during the term of his Government.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: They were not made available in this House.

Mr O'CONNOR: I released them when I became Minister, and that was not two weeks before the honourable member's speech.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: What was the date of my speech?

Mr O'CONNOR: The honourable member has the *Hansard* in front of him; let him find it.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: It was about two weeks.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am talking about April of last year.

Mr Barnett: To whom were they released?

Mr O'CONNOR: To the public! The honourable member does not even know these things, yet the proposal affects his area. This is something which vitally affects his electorate, yet he did not realise the plans had been released to the Press and television!

Mr Barnett: I wonder how many other people knew.

Mr O'CONNOR: The honourable member is a member of Parliament, and it is his duty to know these things.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Perhaps we are on a different wave length. Which plans are you talking about?

Mr O'CONNOR: I am referring to the plans for the Kwinana Freeway extensions.

Mr Barnett: What extensions?

Mr O'CONNOR: If the honourable member does not know by now, I do not intend to go over it again. The information was released to both Press and television.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Did you say the documents released by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning were available over a year ago?

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Speaker, if I may go on.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: I am asking a question.

Mr O'CONNOR: Further discussion took place when the Commissioner of Main Roads and his officers came up to Parliament House to give members details of the proposal. As I said, when I came into office I found the plans were available, and I instructed the commissioner to release them immediately so that the public would know what was going on; this was in, I think, April, 1974; although I am not sure of the exact date.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: The plans to which I was referring—the plans tabled by the Minister for Urban development—related to the MRPA inquiry.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am talking about the plans for the Kwinana Freeway extensions. The member for Morley went even further in his speech in the Address-in-Reply and said we should allow married policewomen on the Police Force. This already had been put into effect, but he did not know. It was one of the poorer speeches I have heard the member make in this House; he has done much better on other occasions. I believe his speech was poor because it was based on poor grounds.

The honourable member went on to say—

However, when information is given in a hole-in-the-corner fashion the Commissioner of Main Roads and

other bureaucrats can give advice to the Minister and then speak in confidence to a member of the Opposition saying different things.

I take exception to the honourable member referring to the Commissioner of Main Roads as a bureaucrat.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Why is that?

Mr O'CONNOR: The Commissioner of Main Roads is an extremely competent man who operated under the previous Government and under our Government.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: But he is still a bureaucrat.

Mr O'CONNOR: He is always prepared to listen and if necessary make any alterations which may be necessary. I believe it is an insult to him.

Mr Barnett: Do you not know what a bureaucrat is?

Mr Sodeman: It was the way the member for Morley put it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The preferred extension route will save 16 acres of river over the previous proposal. In over 20 years a great many investigations have been carried out on this proposal. The Stephenson plan was the first such investigation; the Leader of the Opposition was involved with the preliminary investigation of another study, the PERTS report; and a select committee which later became a Royal Commission also studied the proposal. Witnesses were given full consideration, and the Royal Commission made its recommendations in 1972. In April, 1973, the Labor Cabinet adopted the corridor plan, realising that the highest priority was the continuation southward of the Kwinana Freeway. I emphasise that this decision was taken by a Government of which the member for Morley was a supporter; yet he comes forward after all this, saying we have done nothing in connection with the matter.

I refer now to the people he would like to call before the Bar of the House. I accept that they are all very capable people, but when the honourable member spoke in support of his motion he gave us no details of any of these people.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You should know all about them.

Mr O'CONNOR: I intend to tell members about them. Obviously, if the honourable member had known his subject he would have done so at the time. The first is Miss Alison Baird, a retired lecturer in plant ecology from the Western Australian University. As a matter of interest, although this has no bearing on the matter, she did not appear before the Royal Commission.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: If it is irrelevant, why mention it?

Mr O'CONNOR: Much of what the honourable member said had no bearing on the subject, so I believe I am entitled to

take the same line for a few moments. The next person is Dr Brian Logan, senior lecturer in geology at the University of Western Australia, and an adviser to the Department of Environmental Protection. The next is Dr Byron Lamont, lecturer in biology at WAIT. Another person mentioned is Mr L. Tilly, private consultant engineer, who has property in the general area. Another is Mr G. H. Playford, a technician at the University of Western Australia; he also has property in the area. Dr Edward Maslen, a reader in physics at the University of Western Australia is the next person referred to; again, he has property—unless he has disposed of it in the last few months—in the general locality. I continue to quote the names of these people—

Professor Martyn Webb, Professor of Geography, W.A. University.

Councillor Paul Ritter, Private planning consultant.

Mr Harman: Any comment?

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Maylands can make his comments later.

Mr Harman: You were not very complimentary to the first woman you mentioned.

Mr O'CONNOR: I said they were all good people.

Mr Harman: You tipped the can on the first one you mentioned.

Mr O'CONNOR: What did I say?

Mr Harman: You read *Hansard*.

Mr O'CONNOR: Here we have the up and coming Leader of the Opposition pushing his way forward all the time and making interjections when he does not even know what was said. I certainly hope he gets the position he is seeking.

Mr Harman: You are embarrassing me; I am really touched!

Mr O'CONNOR: It will be a fortunate day for us if the honourable member gets the position. I continue to quote the names of these people as follows—

Professor D. D. O'Connor, Professor of Environmental Studies, Murdoch University

Mr Gordon Barrett-Hill, Practising Consultant Engineer

Mr Lauchlan Miller, Head of Department of Civil Engineering, WAIT

Whilst they are good people, those who have been omitted by the member for Morley have had a lifetime of experience on roads.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You can add them, if you like; don't leave it all to me.

Mr O'CONNOR: Obviously the member for Morley did not want to involve people who had had experience in that area.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You do not want them to come before the Bar of the House.

Mr O'CONNOR: Quite frankly, I do not want any of them to come before the Bar of the House, because it would be a waste of time on their part, and it would be wasting the time of this House. Had the member for Morley not brought the motion forward we would not be wasting time debating it now.

It was obvious that both the member for Morley and the Federal Minister for Transport were playing petty party politics in an issue that is vital to the people of this State. What they have done is to delay the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway which will result in traffic congestion in an area, and which will be a disadvantage to the people south of the river; and we will not forget to let them know this at the appropriate time.

I believe that what we should do is to get on with the job, because this issue has now become extremely urgent. There is no need whatsoever for the motion. It is a waste of time and if we proceed with it I hope we do not have too many speakers on it, because not only will we be wasting the time of the House but also we will be wasting the taxpayers' money. I say that because the party to which the honourable member belongs is endeavouring to deny the people of this State something to which they are entitled. If we are forced into holding an inquiry, in the interests of Western Australia and the public generally we should not do anything further. There have been enough inquiries into this matter; so if we are forced into holding another one let us get it out of the way as quickly as possible and, as far as I am concerned, I say let us get the motion out of the way now. I oppose the motion.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [9.04 p.m.]: I wish to speak briefly on the motion. I do not want to become as emotional as the Minister did in making his remarks; not that he said anything of any consequence, but I thought he may have followed a line of reasoning parallel with that taken by his counterparts in the Federal sphere when they brought a matter before the Senate recently and when they realised how that exercise was a waste of time. However, democracy should be preserved, especially so far as this House is concerned.

Nevertheless there is no doubt the situation has changed somewhat since the House last met and since the member for Morley moved his motion. I do not think it was moved in a fit of pique or with a determination to try to embarrass the Government. In fact, it was quite the opposite. The object of the motion was to help the Government and to provide a platform so that Parliament could hear the views of the people who have been mentioned. I must confess that until I heard the Minister give us the details of their backgrounds I was not familiar with all of them, but one would be somewhat of

a dunce if one did not have some knowledge of what they have done in the community generally, as a few of them are quite outspoken.

I would have voted for the motion despite the fact that I did not know what type of evidence these people would be giving or what their action would be in regard to the motion. If another inquiry is required by the Australian Government it points to the lack of co-operation between this State and that Government. Surely to goodness if all the inquiries that have been detailed by the Minister when replying to the motion have been held; if they are as comprehensive as he would have us believe, then what evidence is there left? Further, if the Government requires money from the Australian Government surely a proper case should have been submitted to the Australian Government; one that would have been acceptable to it thus obviating the need for any further inquiry. I want to know why this has not been done in the intervening period between April and the present.

Mr O'Connor: I visited the Eastern States to see Mr Jones and to show him all the documents available, but he had committed himself.

Mr DAVIES: When?

Mr O'Connor: Last June.

Mr DAVIES: In that case I have the answer and I do not want to pursue that line of questioning any further. However the fact remains that before the Australian Government is prepared to make money available for developments of this nature—and I point out there is considerable concern throughout the world at present as to whether freeways are desirable—it requires an impact statement, and as far as I know no impact statement has been prepared either by the Australian Government or by the Department of Environmental Protection in Western Australia—

Mr O'Connor: It has been.

Mr DAVIES:—and this seems to be one of the essentials in seeking money from the Australian Government.

Mr O'Connor: The Department of Environmental Protection has submitted a document; it has been given to the Commonwealth people.

Mr DAVIES: Is this the one we have been seeking?

Mr O'Connor: I could not tell you at the moment, but we gave them full documentation.

Mr DAVIES: There seems to be a reluctance on the part of the Government to supply information to Parliament and as no moves are being made at present we might justifiably ask these people who are listed in the motion to appear before the Bar of the House and let us have the benefit of their knowledge on a matter which is creating a great deal of concern.

I believe it is an insult to the people of Western Australia who are seriously concerned about the development of our city that this suggestion is not acceded to. The Minister takes it the other way. He considers it is an insult that we should want the motion or the inquiry to proceed.

Mr O'Connor: We would have proceeded with it already if the Australian Government had not intervened.

Mr DAVIES: In this day and age people are adopting attitudes different from those they adopted 20 years ago, particularly when it comes to building freeways and extending cities beyond what we consider to be liveable and reasonable limits. The Minister seemed to take exception to the fact that he had lunch with the Commonwealth Minister, and although he had heard that an inquiry was to be instigated, the Commonwealth Minister made no announcement of it until late in the afternoon. But why was the Minister so coy about not asking Mr Jones what his intentions were? If he believed that this was something that could happen, why did he not try to defend his case when he had the Commonwealth Minister sitting next to him at lunch and when he was no doubt in an amiable mood?

Why did the Minister wait until the announcement was made—when he could have prevented it—and then criticise people whom he believes were instrumental—although he has no proof—in getting Mr Jones to appoint a committee of inquiry?

Mr O'Connor: He was not in a very amiable mood.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister might have been able to take his mind off that subject and steer it in other directions.

Mr O'Connor: I doubt it very much.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister for Transport had the Federal Minister alongside him, but he said he was too coy to ask the Federal Minister questions. I cannot believe that of the Minister for Transport, who is an aspirant to the leadership of his party. I cannot believe he would let an occasion like that go by. His claim that he took exception to the way the Federal Minister acted does not hold water with me.

I had no intention to speak in the debate on this motion; I am doing so because of the manner in which the Minister for Transport attacked the very genuine efforts of the member for Morley whose attitudes to questions of this nature are well known. That honourable member is always very highly motivated in matters of this kind.

It was because the Minister for Transport seemed to deny completely everything the member for Morley was trying to achieve, every opportunity he took to prove how democracy should work, every advantage that could come from bringing the people proposed in the motion before the House, and all the good that could come

from an inquiry such as the one proposed by the Australian Government, that I felt I had to speak in the debate.

Recently I saw a reference by the Premier, who seems to be in the habit of making statements like this irrespective of the departments concerned, that he was happy with the inquiry proposed by the Australian Government, provided it paid the expenses and did not cause a furore.

We have before us an opportunity to proceed and obtain expert knowledge, and to ascertain what the people mentioned have to say about this question. When those people are before the Bar of the House members need not remain in the Chamber if they do not want to. Perhaps members opposite would be ashamed to take this course of action because of the result of the move by the Liberal-Country Parties in the Senate of the Australian Parliament when they questioned witnesses on proposed overseas loans.

Members are not compelled to remain in the Chamber if they do not want to hear the witnesses being questioned before the Bar of the House, but I say that an opportunity should be given to the people mentioned to present their views. To question them privately, or to say that they told us something or other, is nowhere near as good as obtaining evidence from them when they are before the Bar of the House.

I believe this is a reasonable motion, and it was well motivated. It could provide the House with the opportunity to hear expert opinion, and thus to decide whether the decisions initiated by the previous Government, and taken by the present Government, have any merit. I support the motion.

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [9.14 p.m.]: Very briefly I would like to indicate the manner in which this motion has been delayed in the House. Parliament went into recess for three months, but I do not say that all members were on holidays during that time, although some of them might have been. This gives us an indication of the way in which this Parliament operates, when we see the motion coming up tonight for debate, months and months after it was moved. That also indicates how inefficient Parliament is.

I do not believe that the best way to examine these witnesses is to bring them before the Bar of the House. But if they were brought here through the action of members I can assure them that they would not have a rough time from me, and we on this side of the House would certainly not be laughing at their accent as did Liberals in the Senate recently.

The reason I suggested that the persons mentioned in the motion should be brought before the Bar of the House is that we do not have a committee system which enables us to examine such people. In using the term "bureaucrats", I am not being abusive. I think it is a descriptive word. Some

bureaucrats will say one thing to the Minister, and another thing to me in confidence. I am not suggesting that they willingly say different things on different occasions; it is a question of giving answers to different queries. Perhaps the Minister asked the bureaucrats a question which was marginally different from mine, and so it required a different answer.

However, if the Minister and I were together at an inquiry, and there was an apparent contradiction then both of us would hear the contradiction. Immediately one of us could follow up with a further question to clarify the matter. It is very easy to get stories which are significantly different when we question people or talk to them at different times.

In my opinion if this Parliament is to be anything but a mockery and a rubber stamp of the Executive, then we should adopt a proper committee system. This motion was moved in lieu of a proper committee system.

I do not believe there has been interference on the part of the Australian Government. That Government is providing the money, and this money belongs to the people of Australia. It is not the money of this Parliament. As the Australian Government is raising the money and is charged with spending it, it has a responsibility to see that it is spent wisely.

We operate under a Federal system of Government. It is not right to say that the Australian Government overrules this Parliament, any more than we can say that we get the money without reference to the Australian Government and thus this Parliament overrules the Australian Government. I agree that the Federal system of government is a very irksome one, and naturally conflicts between the two tiers of government arise. In the first place the State Government should have held an open inquiry and not the secret Metropolitan Region Planning Authority inquiry.

Mr Rushton: That is totally untrue, because it was not a secret inquiry. The inquiry was conducted in accordance with the Statutes, and there was public and open discussion.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Does the Minister say that inquiry was not a secret inquiry?

Mr Rushton: All the evidence obtained at that inquiry has been brought here.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Even according to the definition of *The West Australian* it was a secret inquiry. The members of the Press were not permitted to be present.

Mr Rushton: That is rubbish.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I would say the Minister is flirting with the truth. If that was not a secret inquiry then I would like to know his definition of a secret inquiry. I know the evidence has been brought here, but that is not the same

as having the people concerned before the Bar of the House giving evidence at an open inquiry.

Mr Clarko: There are disadvantages as well as advantages in holding secret inquiries.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: If the honourable member wants to be a success he will have to concentrate harder on his job as Government Whip, without interfering in matters he cannot understand.

Mr Clarko: That answer is not an intelligent one. You are trying to say something clever, and perhaps you are still feeling the after-effects of influenza.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I believe there should have been a proper open inquiry. Even if the inquiry was conducted under the requirements of the Statutes it was still a secret inquiry. I believe the time is long past when this Parliament should have the means to satisfy itself on matters in a proper way. One way of achieving that is to be able to examine openly, and not secretly, civil servants and bureaucrats.

The fact remains that all over the world the construction of freeways is being questioned. Increasingly all over the world people are beginning to wonder whether freeways are necessary.

For anyone to say that because the Leader of the Opposition was on a committee 20 years ago those on this side of the House are bound, when all the parameters have changed in those 20 years—it is a completely different ball game now—and also because the Corridor Plan was approved we are to be bound by those decisions for evermore means he must be blind to the fact that the world is a rapidly changing place and we have far more doubts about such things as freeways and private transport than we ever had many years ago.

All this motion attempted to do was to bring to the Bar of the House people I thought could make a contribution. I did not include in the motion all those people I would like to question, such as Mr Aitken, the Commissioner of Main Roads, because I thought such a move would be seized upon by the Government at once as being something which could not be tolerated. I believed that the Government would say these people would have a hard time. Because I did not call him does not mean I did not want to hear from him, and there was nothing to stop the Minister adding any name he desired. He has the numbers; we do not. The Government's argument that only one viewpoint would be given does not stand up because in actual fact the Government could have added anyone's name it liked if it felt a more composite view could be developed.

To get back to the whole basis of the argument, we must have a proper method of inquiry. I do not think this is the best

method, but it was the only method available at the time in the absence of a proper committee system.

Finally we must remember that whenever this Parliament makes a decision that decision must be regarded with a jaundiced eye by men of goodwill because this Parliament is not elected on a proper basis. It is elected on electoral laws which I regard as dishonest and which contrive to give a predetermined result. We cannot expect people to have the same kind of respect for the decisions of this House and another place, which has always been controlled by conservative forces, that they would have if the Government were prepared to be honest and allow electoral decisions to be made by the people instead of in a predetermined fashion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—16

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr Moller

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridges
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sibson
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Sodeman
Mr Laurance	Mr Stephens
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
Mr Nenovich	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Young
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Grewar
Mr Bryce	Mr Thompson
Mr May	Sir David Brand
Mr Jamieson	Mr Crane

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

HEALTH

Mercury Content in Fish: Speaker's Ruling

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): In regard to Order of the Day No. 8 I advise that I have sighted a copy of a writ issued out of the Supreme Court of Western Australia between Norman Eric Baxter as plaintiff and Arthur Raymond Tonkin as defendant. It appears to deal with matters relating to the motion and in my opinion this motion is therefore *sub judice* under Standing Orders and debate on it could be prejudicial to the course of, and decision in, a pending court case.

I direct therefore that the Order of the Day be placed at the bottom of the notice paper and not be proceeded with until the case is finalised.

COST AND QUALITY OF LIVING IN COUNTRY AREAS

Inquiry by Royal Commission: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 30th April, on the following motion by Mr Carr—

In the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be established to investigate matters adversely affecting the cost and quality of living conditions in country areas of W.A.

The House proposes the Royal Commission so that difficulties and disadvantages of living in non-metropolitan areas can be carefully and impartially analysed and recommendations made as to appropriate action towards creating more equitable living conditions for people in all parts of the State.

The House further agrees that the terms of reference for the Royal Commission should be as wide as practicable to enable a comprehensive study of many diverse factors.

In particular, the terms of reference should include provision for:—

1. An examination of price structures operating in country areas in comparison to metropolitan prices to determine whether any form of improper or unfair trading practices or excessive marking up of prices is occurring.
2. A consideration of medical and other welfare facilities available in country areas with particular attention to be focused on determining the most appropriate means of providing free travel to Perth for persons from all parts of the State requiring emergency or specialist medical treatment or remedial education facilities.
3. An examination into the widespread country feeling of isolation and neglect to attempt to isolate and reduce the causes of such.
4. Consideration of what are minimum requirements of transport facilities to and within country centres and how they should be provided.
5. Consideration of how best to promote decentralisation through regional community development and regional economic development.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.28 p.m.]: The motion before us calls for the House to agree to the establishment of a Royal Commission to investigate matters affecting the cost and quality of

living in country areas. The motion refers to country areas in all parts of the State from one end to the other.

The terms of reference in the motion are very wide ranging indeed, covering all areas referred to in all parts of the State. I believe that such a commission would involve a great deal of time and would incur considerable expense.

I agree with the sentiments expressed by the mover of the motion. I consider there is need for an inquiry of some sort to investigate the cost of living in country areas, but I believe it is imperative that there be quicker action taken than would be possible under a Royal Commission. People in the areas affected must have an opportunity to make submissions; recommendations must be made quickly; and this would not be possible if a Royal Commission were appointed.

When the mover of the motion was speaking on, I think, the 30th April, I interjected and said I thought these matters could be handled by the Consumer Affairs Bureau. In view of the concern I have for the delay which would be incurred in the process of an investigation by a Royal Commission—and members on this side of the House have expressed some concern—I intend to move an amendment to the motion for consideration by this House. I believe my amendment will expedite the intentions of the motion and provide a quicker result for the people in the affected areas.

Amendment to Motion

I therefore move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "House" in line 1 with a view to substituting the following—

All matters relating to the provision of goods and services to rural communities of W.A. should be referred to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, in order that he may examine and report on any improper, discriminatory or unfair trading and on any lack of services or facilities.

In moving the amendment I wish to refer to a document covering a survey conducted by the Consumer Affairs Bureau into the Pilbara region. The report consists of 95 pages and contains in the vicinity of 20 recommendations. When I spoke to an officer of the Consumer Affairs Bureau and asked him just how long it would take to carry out an investigation into a particular area he said it could be done in a matter of weeks. It would not be a matter of six months, nine months, or 12 months, which is the time that could be taken by a Royal Commission. The inquiry could be carried out and a recommendation made within a matter of weeks.

The inquiry covered by the report which I have in my hand took a little longer because of the distances which had to be

covered in the Pilbara. A total of 19 recommendations were made after an investigation took place covering all aspects of living conditions including the cost of food, clothing, and transport.

Mr Harman: Do you know how long it took to carry out that particular investigation.

Mr McPHARLIN: I believe it took a couple of months.

Mr Harman: It took nearly 12 months.

Mr McPHARLIN: The process could probably be streamlined in areas which did not involve such vast distances as were encountered in the Pilbara.

Mr Harman: That inquiry was the result of one of the first decisions I made as Minister for Consumer Affairs. It was completed about two weeks before we went out of office, and took about 10 months to produce.

Mr McPHARLIN: A similar inquiry into living conditions in rural communities could probably be speeded up to a great degree.

The mover of the motion mentioned the cost of certain foodstuffs, and referred to the cost of bread in the town of Wyalkatchem. I got in touch with the baker at Wyalkatchem in order to check out the figures quoted by the honourable member, and I have a copy of a letter which was written by the baker and addressed to the Manager of ABC Channel 2. Apparently Channel 2 had conducted a survey of food prices in certain towns, and Wyalkatchem was one of the towns mentioned. The price of uncut bread was 37c a loaf and for sliced and wrapped bread the price was 41c a loaf, yet it was claimed that bread was being sold at 50c a loaf.

On checking the prices it transpires that the baker is selling bread at the correct price of 41c for a sliced and wrapped loaf and if a price of 50c was paid the bread certainly did not come from the bakery. The baker had written to the ABC requesting that the correct price be made known.

When referring to the cost of potatoes the mover of the motion mentioned Busselton. When I made inquiries through the Potato Marketing Board I discovered that an officer from the department had been in the Busselton area only recently. The claim was made that the cost of potatoes in Busselton was about 58c. It was not stated whether the potatoes were washed, unwashed, or whether they were in 5-lb bags or in 10-lb bags. The information supplied to me was that the price of 5-lbs of washed potatoes at Busselton was 56c on the day that the officer was in the town. However, that was a special line and another shop had 5-lb bags of washed potatoes out for 67c. Unwashed potatoes varied between \$1.11 and \$1.19 per 10-lb bag.

I made further inquiries regarding costs at Collie. A 5-lb bag of washed potatoes at Collie cost 62c. Again, that was a special and another shop was selling the same quantity for 67c. The price for 10-lb bags varied between \$1.17 and \$1.22. The point I am making, of course, is that the prices move up and down and do not remain static. Some shops put out specials to bring people into the premises hoping they will buy other goods. I think I have indicated that costs do vary from place to place. The Consumer Affairs Bureau is well equipped to go into these matters and examine them in greater or lesser detail as is required. As I have said, I was told that a report could be made in a matter of weeks.

Transport costs in country areas are always subject to criticism. That criticism applies to both road transport and rail transport. I understand that the Director-General of Transport is conducting an inquiry at the present time and that a report is to be made available in the very near future regarding the efficiency and cost of transport in a number of areas of the State. I am not sure as to whether the investigation covers all areas of the State, but I believe the report will be comprehensive. It will cover transport patterns, various items of isolation, and the transport of perishables.

The mover of the motion also mentioned the isolation and neglect which is part of the environment and part of life in certain parts of the State. We are all aware of these problems and we agree it is desirable to try to do something to alleviate the isolation and feeling of neglect experienced in these areas. I do not know that a Royal Commission would have any effect on that aspect or change the situation of those people, wherever they may be.

We need to give people better services in all aspects of living to help to take away the feeling of neglect and isolation. This matter can be covered by the Consumer Affairs Bureau. We should give people incentives by ensuring they receive fair prices for their products to provide the income they need for a good standard of living. The allowances under the taxation system help the people in the north and should be continued.

Education is another aspect which I think the bureau would be able to cover. It has done so in the report I have before me. It has also made some investigation of and comments on medical facilities. I understand from the Minister a report will shortly be received on investigations the bureau is conducting in several country areas.

I go along with what the honourable member is seeking by way of an inquiry into matters which adversely affect the cost and quality of living, but I think it needs to be done as quickly as possible in

view of the way costs are going up in all directions. We can see from the Federal Budget which was presented last night that increased costs will have an impact in all parts of the State, and I believe a move of this kind should be expedited so that we can obtain a report and recommendations. An inquiry by a Royal Commission will be no different from an inquiry by the Consumer Affairs Bureau. The Government may or may not act upon the recommendations. I hope other speakers will support the amendment I have moved.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [9.44 p.m.]: I appreciate the remarks made by the member for Mt. Marshall but I do not appreciate the length of time he devoted to what I believe is one of the most important matters to come before this House for some considerable time. For a previous Leader of the Country Party and a present member of the Country Party to spend something like five or six minutes on a motion of this importance leaves me almost speechless.

Mr Grayden: You have the obvious solution: why talk about it?

Mr HARMAN: What the ex-Leader of the Country Party said completely missed the whole point of the motion because what the motion refers to is the quality of life of people living in the country.

Mr Grayden: The member for Mt. Marshall would have more knowledge of country areas than you have.

Mr HARMAN: The fact that country people pay 35c or 45c for a loaf of bread, or that they have to do this, or that they have not got that, is only part of the proposition. The real "nitty-gritty" of the motion is the quality of life of people living in the country. I am afraid the member for Mt. Marshall has completely missed that point. I hope that when I have finished my remarks he will reconsider his position.

The Minister for Consumer Affairs has suggested I have no experience to talk about people living in the country.

Mr Grayden: I said the member for Mt. Marshall would have more knowledge of country areas than you have.

Mr HARMAN: I spent some years living in the country. As a matter of fact, I have spent half of my life in the country. I went to school in York and after coming to Perth I returned to the country for a further 11 years, living in such places as Wyndham, Derby, Broome, Port Hedland, Geraldton, Kellerberrin, and Kalgoorlie, just to name some of the major centres.

Mr Coyne: That was a decade ago. Things have changed since then.

Mr HARMAN: Since that time I have made several journeys back to those places and I am quite aware of what has happened.

Mr Coyne: Fleeting visits, I would call them.

Mr HARMAN: The ex-Leader of the Country Party suggests the best method of dealing with this proposition is through the consumer protection bureau. That bureau was set up to protect the interests of consumers, mainly in matters affecting business or trade dealings. I am at a loss to understand how the consumer protection bureau—

Mr Grayden: It is not called the consumer protection bureau any longer. It is called the Consumer Affairs Bureau. The scope of the department has been widened.

Mr HARMAN: Whatever its present name, I cannot understand how that particular organisation would be able to report on—

A consideration of medical and other welfare facilities available in country areas with particular attention to be focused on determining the most appropriate means of providing free travel to Perth for persons from all parts of the State requiring emergency or specialist medical treatment or remedial educational facilities.

Nor can I see how that bureau will consider—

... how best to promote decentralisation through regional community development and regional economic development.

Nor can I see how the bureau would be able to report upon—

Consideration of what are minimum requirements of transport facilities to and within country centres and how they should be provided.

On reading the motion moved by the member for Geraldton it is rather obvious that the kinds of matters he wants to have investigated are beyond the scope of the Consumer Affairs Bureau.

I said in my opening remarks I could appreciate the reasons that the ex-Leader of the Country Party advanced his amendment. He knows very well he has been told by the Liberal Party that in no way will it support the motion moved by the member for Geraldton. One has only to look at the record of the Liberal Party.

Mr Laurance: A wonderful record!

Mr HARMAN: When it comes to motions moved by the Opposition calling for inquiries by Royal Commissions or members of this Parliament, on every occasion the Liberal Party has refused the inquiry for which the Opposition has asked. In this case the Liberal Party is consistent, so the Country Party had to find some way of getting out of this situation.

The Country Party knew the attitude of the Liberal Party. Its members did not want to vote with the Labor members of this Chamber to ensure that the people who live in the country would have some inquiry into the quality of life in country areas. That is how the situation stands.

I would like to develop this theme of the quality of life a little further. It is an important matter in today's world, and assumes greater importance to the people living in the country. However, one of the facts of life is that nowadays people are becoming alienated and estranged from the "system". People retreat into themselves because they cannot identify either with Government, local authorities, their work, or even, in some cases, with their own communities.

When Liberal Party and Country Party members hold a conference to determine matters relating to their policy, various motions are passed at these annual or biennial conferences. However, these motions have no influence at all upon the parliamentarians of the Liberal Party or the Country Party, because they are not bound to support those motions.

Mr Laurance: Thank God!

Mr McIver: Depending on which way the wind is blowing at the time.

Mr HARMAN: That is the very attitude I was attempting to explain. The member for Gascoyne said that he thanked God he did not have to take any notice of the motions passed at annual conferences of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. These motions are passed by members of the party in the hope that some improvement can be effected in various areas.

Mr Laurance: You know that when Trades Hall pulls the string you jump.

Mr HARMAN: As I pointed out the other night—

Mr Laurance: All you say is, "How high will I jump?"

Mr HARMAN: The whole policy of the Liberal Party is to keep everyone at arm's length. Its parliamentary members believe they know what is right for the people.

Mr Clarko: You tell your people what to do.

Mr HARMAN: The attitude of the Liberal Party and the Country Party is, "We have a divine right to rule. We know what is right. We do not want the people of Western Australia to become involved."

Mr Laurance: You signed the pledge. You do not represent your electors at all.

Mr HARMAN: "We will not even allow the members of the Liberal Party who pay their fees each year to make decisions which will affect us." The member for Gascoyne says, "Thank God", to that!

Mr Clarko: You might as well be a robot.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: (Mr Blaikie): Order!

Mr HARMAN: If Government members keep going, they will put their feet in it further, and I will be quite happy to help them do so.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I think the best course for the member to follow is to continue his speech.

Mr McIver: And a fine job he was doing!

Sir Charles Court: That is loyalty for you.

Mr HARMAN: The point I was endeavouring to make is that when it comes to a question of politics in Western Australia, the members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party are not really involved in the decision-making processes of government.

Mr Sodeman: That is your opinion.

Mr HARMAN: This happens even though the Government is composed of members of these parties. If its members feel alienated from the Liberal Party and the Country Party, how must the people living in the country feel when they have no opportunity to present their views to the Government through a Royal Commission? They would like to tell a tribunal the way they would like to live their lives in country areas.

Mr Laurance: They can go to their member of Parliament.

Mr HARMAN: It was this very matter that I wanted to bring to the attention of the member for Mt. Marshall. He is saying that he would like to see an inquiry initiated, but he does not want the people living in country areas to take part in it. He would like to see a public servant—the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—travel around the different country towns and then return to report to the Government. Incidentally, the commissioner would be asked to report on matters that are really beyond his province. I believe that the member for Mt. Marshall is asking the commissioner to undertake something beyond his expertise.

Mr Laurance: The Pilbara report comments on health.

Mr HARMAN: It is a little unfair of the member for Mt. Marshall to ask the commissioner to take this action.

Mr Grayden: The situation in the Pilbara and the Kimberley has also been investigated.

Mr Laurance: Have you read the report on the Pilbara? It goes into health and transport matters.

Mr HARMAN: What has happened to that report?

Mr Grayden: Have you read the one on the Kimberley?

Mr HARMAN: No, I have not. Has it been tabled?

Mr Grayden: No, it has not been tabled.

Mr HARMAN: I have not had much chance to read a report that has not been tabled!

Mr Sibson: That is what the Minister was wondering about.

Mr HARMAN: In the whole process of alienation, when a person is alienated or estranged from government, he becomes apathetic, disinterested, and in some cases despair results. The member for Geraldton moved this motion to ensure that people living in country areas become involved in an inquiry which will affect their future livelihood. I do not care whether such an inquiry would take 12 months or two years, as long as it is an inquiry involving the people, and one to which they can present their case. We need to bring to such an inquiry all the expertise which is available in this State, in any other State of the Commonwealth or in any part of the world.

I am sure that similar inquiries have been conducted in other parts of the world in similar societies, and the result of such inquiries should be made available to the Royal Commission. I am quite hopeful that as a result of such an inquiry we will see a greater sense of involvement and an improvement in the present situation.

Unfortunately it is quite obvious from the attitude taken by the Minister for Consumer Affairs that this very noble and practicable motion moved by the member for Geraldton will suffer the same fate as every other motion for an inquiry moved by the Opposition.

Mr Grayden: You can have full confidence in the Consumer Affairs Bureau.

Mr HARMAN: I have every confidence in it.

Mr Grayden: It does not appear so.

Mr HARMAN: The Minister for Consumer Affairs is missing the point. I am saying that a Royal Commission will give people living in country areas an opportunity to present to a tribunal their views about many facets of life in country areas.

I do not question the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs; he can make his inquiries. However, I want to see proper sittings scheduled at every possible country town so that people can go along and tell the Royal Commissioner how they feel about things in their own towns.

Mr Sibson: Do you believe they should have proper representation?

Mr HARMAN: I do not respond to that interjection.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): I think it would be better if you addressed the Chair.

Mr HARMAN: The interjection is inane.

Mr Sibson: Are you saying that you believe they should have proper representation?

Mr HARMAN: Of course they should have.

Mr Sibson: Why do you grizzle so much about the representation they receive in Parliament? You are quite happy to take that away from them.

Mr Bertram: You represent a country electorate, don't you?

Mr HARMAN: I will not waste my time on that.

The next point I want to make is that the alienation to which I have referred also occurs in the work force. This has been referred to on many occasions for quite some time. Even shortly after the industrial revolution it was pointed out by thinkers of the time that because of the way goods were churned out by mass production work became impersonal and workers became alienated from their jobs. In recent times we have heard a great deal said—and in some places we have seen action taken in this respect—about the involvement of workers in the decision-making process in their place of work. Where that has occurred there seems to be a renewal of interest amongst the workers; job enrichment takes place, job satisfaction is obtained, and there has been a reduction in absenteeism and also to some extent a reduction in unemployment. Of course, production is also improved.

The great thing about the concept of worker participation is that it makes the worker aware of what he is doing. No longer is his job impersonal because he is involved each week in the decision-making processes of the firm by which he is employed, whether that decision-making be in regard to production, forward planning, safety requirements, the hours of work, or even the rate of pay. The important aspect is that every individual is involved.

What I want to see is people who live in the country being involved in the proposed inquiry. This is one of the problems at present. These people have become alienated, isolated, and estranged; and when that occurs they become apathetic. I do not know whether the member for Mt. Marshall spoke on behalf of the Country Party or on his own behalf, but I would have hoped that he would realise that the motion moved by the member for Geraldton deals with the quality of life of people in country areas,

and that their quality of life is under severe challenge in this State at the very moment—

Mr Sodeman: You can say that again.

Mr HARMAN: —mainly as a result of the matters to which I have referred previously: People have lost all interest in government as a result of the actions of this Government. They are apathetic because the techniques to become involved in the process of government are not available to them and, because the system has become so impregnable to them, they have opted out and have become disinterested and full of despair. Apathy has set in.

Mr Sodeman: Do you think the member for Geraldton is genuine in respect of this motion?

Mr Bertram: Of course he is.

Mr Sodeman: Is that so? Did he mention super subsidies, petrol subsidies, education subsidies, or telephone subsidies?

Mr HARMAN: That is the sort of interjection one expects from members of the Liberal Party. This is what they do in order to defend their cause; they cast slurs upon members who move motions of this kind. I have seen the member for Warren and the member for Collie time and time again get up in this House and move motions concerning the industries in their electorates, whether they be in respect of coalmining, dairying, apple growing, or timber.

Mr Sodeman: You haven't answered the question.

Mr HARMAN: They have risen in this place and moved motions with a sense of dedication and sincerity because the matters involve the people who live in their electorates. The member for Geraldton moved this motion in the same fashion, and he moved it because he is concerned about the quality of life in country areas. But we have a member of Parliament who has been in this place for only some short 16 months—

Mr Sodeman: How long has the member for Geraldton been here?

Mr HARMAN: —who represents a country area—Pilbara—and he will vote against this motion. He will vote against the holding of an inquiry into the quality of life in country areas, and yet he represents a country electorate. That is a nice attitude, I am sure. When the electors of Pilbara realise what sort of member they have, and when the people who live in Tom Price and other such towns in which there is very little involvement in decision-making processes realise what sort of member they have I am sure they will be very interested in him. I am sure they will be very interested in the attitude of our newly arrived member for Pilbara.

Mr Watt: At least he doesn't call them idiots like your deputy leader does.

Mr HARMAN: I presume that remark was made by the member for Albany.

Mr Watt: That is right.

Mr HARMAN: I take it that the member for Albany will also vote against this motion which calls for an investigation into the quality of life of people in country areas. I do not know whether he intends to make a speech, but it is quite rare for him to do so in this place.

Mr Clarko: Why don't you rubbish a few people?

Mr HARMAN: However, I am sure the people of Albany will be interested in the attitude adopted by their member on such an important matter as this which would prevent the people of Western Australia being alienated, isolated, and estranged, and would prevent them from becoming apathetic with regard to their involvement in the decision-making processes in this State.

Mr Sodeman: You are right, of course.

Mr HARMAN: Of course, this suits the members for Albany and Pilbara, and the members of the Liberal Party, generally. I did not think it suited members of the Country Party, but apparently it does. Do you know why it does, Sir? They do not want to see the people having anything to say in the process of government. They like to keep people at arm's length; they like decisions to be made in their own narrow circle of parliamentarians, and by the inner circle of Cabinet. In some cases they do not even want members of Parliament to be involved. Certainly they do not want financial members of the Liberal Party to make decisions which are binding upon them. They say, "Don't involve the financial members of the Liberal Party or the financial members of the Country Party in the decision-making processes of this Government."

Mr H. D. Evans: The Country Party parliamentarians don't have much say, either.

Mr HARMAN: My colleague, the member for Warren, has pointed out that even Country Party members of the Cabinet were alienated from the decision-making processes. The former Leader of the Country Party pointed out—I think it was in *The Albany Advertiser*—that they were outnumbered nine to three in Cabinet. This is the basic philosophy of the Liberal Party and it is achieving its aims by not allowing any sort of inquiry in Western Australia which could enable people in country areas to become involved—

Mr Sodeman: You have a short memory.

Mr HARMAN: —in the decision-making processes of Government. The people want to have a say. Is there something unusual or extraordinary about that? Why cannot the people who live in Mullewa, Wiluna, Southern Cross, or Carnarvon have a say in some of the matters which affect them?

Why should not these people be able to go along to a Royal Commission when it sits in their towns and put forward issues which should be taken into consideration? If this were done in the major country towns of Western Australia, then and only then would the people become more interested in their way of life. Such slight involvement—not major, but slight—would be to their benefit and may even influence the Liberal and Country Parties to adopt a process by which their own financial members became more involved in their political parties.

Mr Grayden: How do you explain the Labor Party's aim to cut down representation in this Parliament?

Mr HARMAN: I will not take up the time of the House by going into something like that.

Mr Laurance: I bet you will not!

Mr HARMAN: I am sure that after we have finished debating the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill, the Minister for Labour and Industry will know the reason for our attitude on this issue.

Mr Grayden: You still aim to cut down country representation in this Parliament? How would you reconcile that with what you are now saying?

Mr Davies: We want equality for all citizens.

Mr HARMAN: The alienation to which I have referred and which is occurring today not only in country areas but also in the metropolitan area stems from a lack of involvement on the part of the community, whether it be lack of involvement in government, in their work, in their community, in their authorities or, in some cases, even in their families.

For geographical reasons, many people must commute long distances to their place of employment, and often wives and husbands are separated for long periods because the husband is working in another part of the country. In many cases, when children first enter the work force, they must leave home and live near their place of employment; principally, they leave the country districts and move to the city.

All these factors tend to alienate the families within themselves, and to me that is not a good thing. As I say, Australia seems to be a nation of commuters, travelling to and from work; this fact tends to alienate members of families. I would have thought the Government would adopt a very different attitude from the one it has taken; I suggest that it reconsiders its attitude. I do not believe the Consumer Affairs Bureau or its commissioner has the ability to cover all aspects raised in this motion and I do not think it is proper for us to ask them to make a report on these particular matters or on any other matters raised by other members; for

that reason, I am not in accord with the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Marshall.

I believe if members opposite really examined the motion moved by the member for Geraldton, they would see that what he is saying is that he wants an inquiry into the quality of life of people living in country towns. He does not want an inquiry solely into the price of bread, tinned meat, beans, or whatever it may be; he is not proposing an inquiry solely into medical facilities, isolation, education, or decentralisation. He is proposing an inquiry into the quality of life, and calls upon people who live in country areas to become involved. For those reasons, I ask members opposite to reconsider their attitude towards this motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Laurance.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 21st August, 1975

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

MEMBER FOR GREENOUGH

Resignation: Letter

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I have to announce the receipt of a letter of resignation from the former member for Greenough (Sir David Brand). The letter reads as follows—

Parliament House,
Perth, W.A., 6000.
21 August, 1975.

The Speaker,
The Hon. Ross Hutchinson, M.L.A.,
Legislative Assembly,
Parliament House,
PERTH, 6000.
Western Australia.

Dear Mr Speaker,
I hereby submit my resignation as a Member of the Legislative Assembly in the State of Western Australia, to take effect as from the above-mentioned date.

Yours sincerely,
DAVID BRAND.

Seat Declared Vacant

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [2.17 p.m.]: Consequent upon the letter read by Mr Speaker, I move—

That owing to the resignation of the Hon. Sir David Brand, KCMG, the seat of the Member for Greenough be declared vacant.