

in two businesses in Melbourne and in banks in South Australia. He applied for rural reconstruction aid. To me it is disgusting that a man with that sort of financial backing can apply for reconstruction aid. The scheme was set up to aid men who are genuine farmers with their backs to the wall—men who make their living from farming. Fortunately this man's application was refused, but this sort of thing goes on.

I would like to refer now to Collie and the situation which applies there. When we were in Government we were criticised about the length of our coal contracts. Mr. MacKinnon would know something about this because at one time he represented that area. We were criticised for building an oil-fired power station in Western Australia, and at the time the Labor Party promised that if it became the Government it would extend the term of the coal contracts, and that it would extend the Muja power station by the addition of an extra 240 megawatt generator. This was the promise made, and the people went to the polls and voted accordingly.

In the last issue of the *Collie Mail* there appeared an article written by the present Minister for Mines. I do not blame him for what he has written. He defined the present Government's policy, and he wound up the article in this way—

The present arrangement is businesslike in view of the special conditions outlined and as a result, with the present level of output, the employees have security of employment.

However, that is not what the Labor Party promised when it was in Opposition. That party promised to extend the life of the coal contracts. It also promised to expand the Muja power station, but it has not done so. In my book that is political dishonesty.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This must be a bitter disappointment to the Miners' Union, which has been so loyal to the A.L.P.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I am glad Mr. MacKinnon mentioned that, because the union has written to the Premier asking him to honour the promises he made. In reply Mr. May—and I have no grudge against him—outlined the Government policy, which is not to expand the Muja power station or to extend the life of the coal contracts.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please quote the date of the issue of the *Collie Mail* to which he is referring?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: This is the *Collie Mail* of Thursday, the 16th March, 1972. In view of the fact that the promises of the Labor Party have not been honoured, I challenge the Premier either to carry out his promises or to resign and tell the people the truth about what he intends to do, and fight an election on that issue.

I do not think it is good enough to make a promise to the Miners' Union in 1967 and not honour it. Since then at the last election Labor Party candidates produced propaganda about what a Labor Government if elected would do for Collie and the miners. I could show members that propaganda. However, the promise has not been fulfilled. I think the honest and decent thing for the Government to do is either to honour its promises to Collie or else to resign and tell the people the truth about its intentions. Then the people could make a decision. With those few remarks I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon.

House adjourned at 8.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 22nd March, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (50): ON NOTICE

1. KELMSCOTT HIGH SCHOOL

Cost and Plans

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How much is the Kelmscott High School estimated to cost?
- (2) Will he let me have a ground plan of the site showing the placement of the buildings and recreational facilities for both the high and primary schools?
- (3) Will the Public Works Department day labour force be enlarged for this and other projects this year?
- (4) If "Yes" by how many?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) \$691,500.
 - (2) Plan is, with permission, hereby tabled.
 - (3) No.
 - (4) Answered by (3).
- The plan was tabled.*

2. EDUCATION

Bonded Teachers

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he let me have the number of teachers under bond who have not left the department other than for sickness and like reasons and who have not been placed in teaching positions this year?
- (2) Will he break up the total as to how many who have applied for a position are unplaced from each of the five years involved?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Seven. The delay in placing these teachers has been due to their restricted availability and not to a lack of vacancies.
- (2) Four completed training in 1972, one in 1970 and two in 1969.

3. *This question was withdrawn.*

4. ALBANY HARBOUR

Berths: Extensions

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Are Albany's land backed berths to be extended?
- (2) Is the fourth berth to be commenced?
- (3) If "Yes" when is work likely to commence?
- (4) If not, in which direction and for what distance is the present berth to be extended?
- (5) When is work likely to commence?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of the project?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Future requirements are reviewed from time to time. Current proposals relate to Nos. 1 and 3 berth extensions only as detailed in reply to question (4).
- (4) No. 3 berth is to be extended in a south-easterly direction on its present alignment by 106 ft. 8 in. and No. 1 berth is to be extended in a north-westerly direction on its present alignment by 42 ft. 8 in.
- (5) Work has commenced to the extent that the erection of temporary plant is in course.
- (6) \$445,000.

5. VETERINARIANS

Government and Private

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many veterinary officers are employed by the Department of Agriculture—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) in the country areas; and
 - (c) at what centres?
- (2) How many veterinary officers are in private practice—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) in the country areas; and
 - (c) at what centres?
- (3) How many veterinary officers have been assisted by the Government—
 - (a) either directly; or
 - (b) through local or other responsible authorities?

(4) What was—

- (a) the number of veterinary officers assisted for each of the years from 1959-60 up to and including the year 1970-71; and
- (b) the amount for each of the years?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) 20
- (b) 28
- (c) Merredin, Katanning, Kununurra, Narrogin, Esperance, Albany, Derby, Moora, Northam, Manjimup, Bunbury, Geraldton.
- (2) (a) 44
- (b) 33
- (c) Metropolitan area, Albany, Bunbury, Esperance, Northam, Rockingham, Boyup Brook, Waroona, Muresk, Katanning, Kununurra Margaret River, Busselton, Dalwallinu, Bridgetown, Pinjarra, Kalgoorlie, Narrogin, Harvey, Yarloop and Geraldton.

(3) (a) 34 (through tuberculin testing contracts).

(b) 8 (through the veterinary practice subsidy scheme).

(4) (a) Tuberculin testing contracts—

1959-60	8
1960-61	9
1961-62	9
1962-63	9
1963-64	9
1964-65	11
1965-66	11
1966-67	15
1967-68	16
1968-69	15
1969-70	14
1970-71	29

Subsidised Practices—

1962-63	2
1963-64	3
1964-65	2
1965-66	5
1966-67	3
1967-68	4
1968-69	2
1969-70	1

(b) Tuberculin testing contracts—

\$

1959-60—No figures available.	
1960-61—No figures available.	
1961-62	18,582
1962-63	12,482
1963-64	9,080
1964-65	36,304
1965-66	40,297
1966-67	53,435
1967-68	52,378
1968-69	70,752
1969-70	82,342
1970-71	60,959

Subsidised Practices—

	\$
1st Year 1962-63	1,181.16
1963-64	2,521.34
1964-65	1,989.14
1965-66	3,320.74
1966-67	2,782.68
1967-68	2,666.67
1968-69	166.67
1969-70—No claim	

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

Yes, a request has now been made to the Prime Minister for copies of the plans.

8. CONNELL AVENUE SCHOOL

Extension

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Why was the new Connell Avenue cluster school at Clifton Hills, Kelmscott, built to minimum capacity to hold only the known students in a growing suburb?
- (2) Will the department immediately proceed with the completion of the first cluster of classrooms and balance of administrative block including staff room and first aid room?
- (3) If "No" to (2) what are the department's plans for this school?
- (4) As the Connell Avenue school is built on a through road, will a fence between the road and school be now installed, also the usual school road warning signs?
- (5) Will the department develop the swampy low lying oval area necessary for the children's playing and recreation?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5) when can this work be expected to commence?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Connell Avenue primary school was built to accommodate the anticipated enrolments from the Clifton Hills area for 1972. It is not possible, in view of the heavy demands on the annual allocation of loan funds, to build ahead of requirements.
- (2) and (3) The completion of the first cluster and the addition of the balance of the administrative block have been listed in the 1972-73 school building programme. At this stage it is anticipated that the accommodation will be ready for occupation by February 1973.
- (4) It is not intended to provide a fence at the front of the Connell Avenue primary school. The erection of school road warning signs is normally the concern of the local shire. An approach will be made by this Department to the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire for the erection of such signs at Connell Avenue primary school.
- (5) and (6) In primary schools the development of school ovals is on a subsidised basis between the parents and citizens' association and the Education Department. The provision of a subsidy to help

6. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

Opening, and School of Veterinary Science

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it expected that the first stage of the new Murdoch University will be open?
- (2) What will be the first facilities available to students?
- (3) Will he deny the rumour that the promised veterinary school is to be delayed?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 1975.
- (2) Proposals submitted by the Murdoch University Planning Board provide for a range of courses to be available in education, the humanities and the sciences and for veterinary studies.
- (3) Consideration is currently being given to the submissions of the Universities and the Institute of Technology in relation to the 1973-75 triennium. The total expenditure proposed would require financial support from the State well in excess of the funds likely to be available even allowing for a substantial increase in the size of the grants for both capital and recurrent purposes compared with the current triennium.

Consequently consideration must be given to deferring some proposed developments and deferment of the commencement date of veterinary studies is being weighed against other possible adjustments.

7. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND

Garden Island: Plans for Development

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Premier:

In order that those who wish to give evidence, when the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Public Works meets here in the near future, may be more fully informed and prepared, will he request the Prime Minister to supply copies of the most recent plans for the development of Garden Island as a base for naval facilities, with a view to having such plans laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament?

finance this project will be considered when a request has been received from the parents and citizens' association.

9. WATER SUPPLIES

Thompson Brook Dam

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the Government made a decision to construct a dam at Thompson Brook?
- (2) If so, will he outline the programme?
- (3) If (1) is "No" will he advise what level the investigations have reached?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) Three alternative damsites on Thompson Brook are under consideration. These have been the subject of aerial photography from which preliminary contour plans have been prepared.

10. COLLIE RIVER

Eroded Banks

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Works:
When will work commence on the eroded areas of the banks of Collie River in the Ewington area?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Work will commence by early April.

11. KWINANA POWER STATION

Units and Capacity

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) How many units are installed at the Kwinana power station?
- (2) What are the sizes of the units?
- (3) What additional capacity is planned for the station and when is it anticipated the units will be brought into service?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) One.
- (2) 120,000 kW.
- (3) No. 2 Unit—120,000 kW, 1972.
No. 3 Unit—120,000 kW, 1972.
No. 4 Unit—120,000 kW, 1973.
No. 5 Unit—200,000 kW, 1975.
No. 6 Unit—200,000 kW, 1976.
Gas Turbine—20,000 kW, 1972.

12. POINT PERON RESERVE

Shipbuilding Facilities and Berths

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) When did the Government approach the Commonwealth Government for the resiting of the shipbuilding and maintenance facilities away from Mangles Bay?

(2) What progress has been made with these negotiations?

(3) Why is it now necessary to replace the shipbuilding facilities with these proclaimed berths in stage 1 adjoining Point Peron reserve and beach, when it was not required in previous planning?

(4) What is the acreage of the reclaimed area for stage one?

(5) Will he present a plan showing—
(a) projected usage of reclaimed area;

(b) integration and associated development on Point Peron reserve;

(c) service connections between stage 1 and Kwinana industrial complex?

(6) What is the anticipated demand for the present and future use of container and unit load vessels as related to our State's trade—

(a) domestic;

(b) interstate;

(c) international?

(7) Will the three berths planned (stage 1) now cancel the need for general purpose berths planned adjacent to the Kwinana industrial complex?

(8) What reasons can the Government advance for its confidence in the retention of the beaches for public use between stage 1 and the Kwinana industrial complex after stage 1 is operating?

(9) Has the Government obtained a report from the Environmental Protection Authority on the issues raised in (8)?

(10) If "Yes" will he let me have a copy?

(11) If "No" will he obtain one before proceeding further?

(12) Where is the Cruising Yacht Club and small boat harbour to be sited?

(13) Will he let me have a plan of these projects?

(14) If no decision has been made with (12) when will finality be reached?

(15) What improved recreational amenities are to be available as predicted by the general manager of the Fremantle Port Authority?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) and (2) This was a Commonwealth decision.

(3) (a) The use of Garden Island by the Commonwealth which reduced the potential for the development of general cargo berths provided in the 1966 plan.

- (b) The knowledge that an area was set aside on Garden Island by the Commonwealth for future ship repairing facilities.
- (4) 100 acres.
- (5) I refer the Member to report of the Premier's Committee for the Development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana, January, 1972, tabled in the House on March 21, 1972, pages 16 to 27 inclusive.
- (6) It is anticipated that 70-80% of all general cargo will be carried in container and unit load vessels.
- (7) Future berths along the Kwinana foreshore will service only bulk handling projects.
- (8) The preservation of beaches for public usage was provided for in the 1966 plan. There has been no change in this concept.
- (9) This matter is now being considered by the Environmental Protection Authority.
- (10 and (11) Answered by (9).
- (12) Facilities for small craft will be provided on the eastern side of stage 1 development.
- (13) Plan is in course of preparation.
- (14) Answered by (12).
- (15) Protected water for small craft and beach users in the lee of the causeway along the Rockingham foreshore.

13. ROADS

Grants to Local Authorities

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Relating to his new formula for road grants distribution to local authorities in the metropolitan area as reported in *The West Australian* of 20th March, will he advise—
 - (a) the population, length of roads and area of each of the local authorities in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) the entitlement of each metropolitan authority under the present formula and what it could expect under his new suggested formula?
- (2) Does this mean additional road grants for these metropolitan local authorities collectively; if "Yes" how much extra?
- (3) Under the new formula will the Main Roads Department contribute more or less to these local authorities?
- (4) What is the total of Main Roads Department grants to the metropolitan local authorities under the present formula and the suggested new formula?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The information is contained in a statement which, with permission, I hereby table.
- (2) Yes, for the next financial year, i.e., 1972-73: \$147,483.
- (3) The Main Roads Department will contribute more.
- (4) Using the financial year of 1972-73, as a basis, the distribution under the present formula would be \$6,029,516. Under the proposed new formula it would be \$6,176,999.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the first part of the answer which the Minister has just given indicates that this information is to be tabled. Is it possible that this could be read, or is it too bulky? It is information that members representing metropolitan electorates might like to have readily and, if possible, I would like to hear it read.

The SPEAKER: It has been tabled and it could be photographed.

The paper was tabled.

14. DERBY POLICE STATION

Lockup

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) In what year was the Derby police lockup built?
- (2) In the last 12 months has the sanitation and/or structural condition of the buildings been reported on by—
 - (a) the Kimberley regional health inspector;
 - (b) a P.W.D. building inspector or supervisor?
- (3) If "Yes" will he table the most recent reports?
- (4) If "No" will he call for an immediate and detailed report on the buildings from competent health and building surveyors?
- (5) When is it proposed to replace the existing lockup with new buildings?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Approximately 1886. I might mention here that this was prior to the present Government coming into office.
- (2) There is no record of reports being received.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) No. The request for an immediate and detailed report is considered unnecessary in view of the answer to (5).

- (5) The replacement of the Derby Lockup has been given early priority in 1972-73 subject to funds being available.

15. VERMIN CONTROL OFFICERS

Kimberley

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it intended to withdraw the services of the regional vermin control officer from—
 - (a) West Kimberley;
 - (b) Wyndham-East Kimberley?
- (2) If "Yes" how is the decision equated to his reply to question 25 on 8th December, 1971 in which he stated that "Kimberley Vermin Board funds are buoyant", and that "There is no restriction on vermin control work in this area at present"?
- (3) Has there been any indication that in the event of one or both of these officers being withdrawn, that pastoralists will cease to support existing group dogging schemes?
- (4) What is the area (in square miles) of the territory supervised by—
 - (a) the West Kimberley vermin control officer;
 - (b) the East Kimberley vermin control officer?
- (5) In road miles, how far distant are the two officers from each other's headquarters?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The placement of regional supervisory staff employed and financed by the Agriculture Protection Board in the Kimberley region is being re-organised. Details have been communicated to Member.
- (2) This is a long term re-organisation of Agriculture Protection Board regional staff and is not dependent upon a local contribution of finance. The group doggers employed jointly by the Agriculture Protection Board and the Kimberley Vermin Board were the people referred to in my previous reply.
- (3) Not officially, but this has been suggested.
- (4) (a) 600,000 square miles.
(b) 101,000 square miles.
- (5) Approximately 615 miles. However, it is intended to use regular civil aviation services for most of the travelling from one centre to the other.

16. ORD RIVER PROJECT

Catamaran: Cost of Purchase and Overhaul

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the purchase price of the catamaran *Lilian Hamilton* which was acquired for use in the Ord Noah project?
- (2) What was the total cost of overhauling the vessel to make it suitable for use in the project?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The catamaran *Lilian Hamilton* was purchased for \$4,000 for use as a maintenance work boat on the Ord River Dam and on the Ord Diversion Dam.
- (2) \$5,690.

17. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Kununurra Native Reserve

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

What steps have been taken towards the provision of electricity at Kununurra native reserve?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Normal reserve lighting facilities were installed on the Kununurra native reserve before the end of last year.

18. PARLIAMENT IN SESSION

Flying of British Flag

Mr. BRYCE, to the Speaker:

- (1) Is he aware that the Western Australian Parliament is the only Parliament in Australia to observe the practice of flying the British flag specifically on occasions when the House is in session?
- (2) Will he review the need and justification for continuing this practice?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) This does not come under my control as Speaker and I am not aware of who directs what flags are to be flown and when.

Mr. Court: Good answer! They would want to have the hammer and sickle instead.

19. ROADS

State Expenditure 1969 to 1972

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Works:

What was the amount and source of finance expended on roads by the State of Western Australia for the financial years 1969-70, 1970-71 and estimated amounts for 1971-72?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

The information requested is contained in the following statement:—

Statement showing Amount and Source of Funds expended on Roads by the State of Western Australia

Source of Funds	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72 (Estimates)
	\$	\$	\$
Commonwealth funds	30,699,989	36,634,531	40,750,000
State funds—			
(a) Vehicle Licences etc.	19,415,511	19,019,280	20,937,000
(b) Loan	860,296	1,300,000	1,500,000
(c) Other	866,905	921,717	1,200,000
	51,862,701	58,775,578	64,387,000

20. BUNBURY HARBOUR

Use of Korean Dredge

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the Korean dredge which contracted to dredge Bunbury harbour capable of performing the work for which it contracted?
- (2) Is it a fact that the dredge has failed in its attempts to dredge the rock found in the harbour?
- (3) If the dredge is incapable of dredging the rock and since 56% of the time of the contract has expired and only 47% of the work has been completed, what arrangements have been, or are being made for the completion of the work?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Some "rock" has been dredged successfully. In work of this type some use of rock breaking equipment and/or explosives is normal.

The progress of the work is the responsibility of the contractor. Improved performance can be anticipated by the use of a new cutter which is to be delivered shortly. The situation is within the conditions of the contract.

21. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Revenue, and Administration Cost

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the number of motor vehicles registered in the State of Western Australia as at 31st December, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971?
- (2) What was the amount of revenue received under the terms of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act for the financial years 1969-70, 1970-71 and from 1st July, 1971 to 31st December, 1971?

- (3) What was the amount of licence fees collected from motor vehicles subject to the payment of road maintenance tax for the financial years 1969-70 and 1970-71?
- (4) What was the amount of revenue collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act from vehicles registered outside the State of Western Australia for the financial years 1969-70 and 1970-71?
- (5) What is the total outstanding amount of road maintenance tax still owed by owners of vehicles registered outside the State?
- (6) What was the total cost to the Transport Commission of the administration of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 31-12-1966—327,327.
31-12-1968—381,116.
31-12-1969—415,471.
31-12-1970—443,300 (preliminary).
31-12-1971—Not available.
- (2) Receipts for the financial years—
1969-1970—\$3,623,518.
1970-1971—\$3,990,144.
Period 1-7-1971 to 31-12-1971—
\$1,925,826.
- (3) This information is not available.
- (4) Receipts for vehicles registered outside the State for financial years—
1969-1970—\$145,331.
1970-1971—\$160,914.
- (5) Road charges outstanding by owners of vehicles registered outside the State—\$123,888.
- (6) Payments for financial years—
1969-1970—\$206,560.
1970-1971—\$232,774.
Period 1-7-1971 to 31-12-1971—
\$125,100.

22.

SHIPPING

Oil Pollution

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has consideration been given to a suggestion in *The West Australian* of 29th September, 1971 that oil pollution of the sea might be drastically reduced by sealing the pumps of tankers and merchant ships?
- (2) What reasons, if any, could be advanced to prevent some Commonwealth or international agreement being arrived at where—
(a) appropriate pumps and bilge pumps on tankers; and
(b) bilge pumps on merchant ships,

could be sealed in one port and reinspected in another Australian or overseas port?

- (3) In case it might be argued that such pumps could be required in an emergency at sea, is it not reasonable to assume the ships' log books would show such an emergency and any need for the emergency use of the pumps mentioned?
- (4) As the suggested increased or current fine of \$5,000 would be little deterrent to an unpoliced ship, under cover of darkness, and many miles at sea from dumping oil waste, will he raise the above suggestions with his Commonwealth counterpart?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Although this is a matter of Federal policy and ultimate international agreement, the suggestion is being considered at State level.
- (2) Reasons which come to mind are—
- (a) Agreement by all countries that such action was both necessary and prudent.
 - (b) Any general service pump can be used to pump bilges and these cannot be sealed because they are required for necessary daily service.
- (3) Emergencies are generally noted in ships' logs but could be manufactured and would be difficult to disprove. Bilge pumps being a necessary part of safety equipment, limitations on their use could meet with resistance.
- (4) Present maximum penalty in Western Australia is \$2,000. Substantial increases are proposed in legislation to be introduced to this Parliament and the subject will be discussed at the next interstate conference.

23. T.L.C. HOUSING LOANS

Comparison of Terms

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Does the answer given to Question 22 on notice on Thursday, 16th March, imply that a "mutually acceptable" S.H.C. applicant will receive priority over existing applicants in allocation of a new S.H.C. house provided that such applicant is willing to pay an interest rate 1½% in excess of the normal S.H.C. rate and is also prepared to repay the loan over a period at least 15 years shorter than that for an S.H.C. loan?

- (2) On a loan of \$10,000 what would be the difference between the monthly repayments on a home purchased with a S.H.C. loan and that provided from funds allocated from the home builders account if such loans were at current rates and maximum repayment period?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) \$15.34 per month. That is \$49.20 as against \$64.54.

24.

HOUSING

Terminating Building Societies: Non-allocation of Funds

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Why was no allocation made from the home builders account in 1971-72 to the following terminating building societies—
- Police Union
 - Postal Employees
 - Western Australian Carpenters
 - Teachers
 - Railway Employees?
- (2) Which of the above societies are conducted by unions not affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council of W.A.?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) It has been long standing policy in the case of terminating societies to require, after one or two years to establish, some effort to raise funds from other sources before further allocations are made from Home Builders Account. The Western Australian Carpenters, Teachers, and Railway Employees Societies did not raise any funds during 1970-71 and, therefore, did not qualify for allocation in 1971-72.
- An allocation was made to the Postal Employees Society and advances are being made. The Police Society originally received an allocation but by agreement this has been transferred to another society because of lack of demand from persons eligible for advances from the Police Society.
- (2) Not known since it was not relevant to the criteria adopted in deciding allocations.

25. KLINGER ASBESTOS OF W.A.

Statement by Hancock and Wright

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

Since it has generally been accepted that the establishment of Klinger Asbestos of W.A. came

about as a result of an overseas mission by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., when a Minister in the Hawke Government, would he confirm or deny the following statement which appears on page 12 of the booklet "Hancock and Wright" by John F. Moyes—

"And they (Hancock and Wright) had persuaded an Austrian firm to establish Klinger Asbestos of W.A., with a factory in Perth for processing Asbestos."

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The statement in the John F. Moyes booklet "Hancock and Wright" is incorrect.

26. ALSATIAN DOGS

Sterilisation

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it correct as stated by a correspondent in *The West Australian* 21st March, 1972 that cross-bred alsatian dogs have to be sterilised in the Eastern States?
- (2) If so, will he give reasons why Western Australian veterinary surgeons cannot perform this relatively simple operation?
- (3) If (1) is "No" will he make a full statement in order to advise alsatian dog owners of the full facts?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Unsterilised alsatians and part bred alsatians are not permitted in Western Australia. The Act specifically states that if an unsterilised alsatian is brought into Western Australia, it must be destroyed.
- (2) There is no provision in the Act to permit sterilisation in this State as this would be opposed to, and defeat the purpose of the Act.
- (3) Full publicity is given at every opportunity to publicise the requirements of the Act by means of press statements, leaflets and signs along Eyre Highway. As all alsatian dogs in Western Australia must be sterilised and registered with the Agriculture Protection Board, all owners are already aware of legal requirements.

27. WATER SUPPLIES

Industries at Albany

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware of a leading article in the *Albany Advertiser* of 15th March titled "Paucity of water for industry"?

- (2) Is it correct that the Public Works Department had told an applicant wanting to establish an industry in Albany that they could not supply his requirements of one million gallons a day?

- (3) If "Yes" did the former Minister for Works—

- (a) tell Albany that there was adequate water in the service tanks for an industry; and/or
- (b) tell Albany that the Albany water supply would be enough for ten years normal growth, and if an industry wanted water it could be handled, no matter what the industry?

- (4) Will he state the source and P.W.D. ability to provide water at Albany for industrial purposes?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Public Works Department has no knowledge of any such refusal.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) Surface water is presently supplied from the Two People Bay source and groundwater from the south coast catchment area. In the long term the potential of the Denmark River is available.

28. P.W.D. PROJECTS

Albany, Plantagenet, and Denmark Areas

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What projects have been commenced by the Public Works Department, or have been the responsibility of its architectural division since July 1971 in the Albany Town Council, Albany, Plantagenet and Denmark Shire areas?
- (2) What has been the total cost of each project?
- (3) What projects are in advanced planning stages?
- (4) What is the estimated value of each of these projects?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) and (2)—	Contract Price
Albany Town Council—	\$
Albany Technical School	943,206
Agriculture Department—	
Offices	94,000
Garage and store	5,068
Albany Shire—	
Nil.	
Plantagenet Shire—	
Agricultural Department quarters	20,343
Denmark Shire—	
Nil.	

(3) and (4)—	Estimate	30.
Albany Town Council—	\$	
Spencer Park school—		
Connection to sewer	12,560	
Department of Corrections—		
Hostel alterations	45,000	
Senior High School—		
Library	87,000	
Senior High School—		
Grounds water reticulation and pumping equipment—tenders received	9,042	
Regional Hospital—		
Alterations to X-Ray and laboratories	70,000	
Albany Shire—		
Nil.		
Plantagenet Shire—		
Nil.		
Denmark Shire—		
Agricultural Junior High School—		
S.H.C. to call tenders for farm supervisor's quarters	20,000	
Junior High School—		
Tenders about to be called for additions and administration alterations	118,000	

29. WATER SUPPLIES, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE

Expenditure in Albany Area

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What has been the sum spent on—
 - (a) sewerage works;
 - (b) drainage works;
 - (c) provision of or upgrading water supplies,
 in the Albany area since 1st July, 1971?
- (2) What is the estimated expenditure on these works to the end of this financial year?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Spent from 1/7/71 to 29/2/72—

	\$
(a) Sewerage works	108,718
(b) Drainage works	7,497
(c) Provision of or upgrading water supplies	161,704
- (2) Estimated expenditure 1/7/71 to 30/6/72—

	\$
(a) Sewerage works	170,000
(b) Drainage works	25,000
(c) Provision of or upgrading water supplies	331,000

ALBANY HARBOUR

Berths: Extensions

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) When is work expected to commence on the extensions to Albany's land-backed berths?
- (2) What is the estimated total cost of the project?
- (3) In which direction and for what distance is the extension planned?
- (4) Have any firm decisions been made on future dredging works for the harbour and/or sound?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Work has commenced to the extent that the erection of temporary plant is in course.
- (2) \$445,000.
- (3) No. 3 berth is to be extended in a south-easterly direction on its present alignment by 106 ft. 8 in. and No. 1 berth is to be extended in a north-westerly direction on its present alignment by 42 ft. 8 in.
- (4) No.

31.

MIGRANTS

Family Classifications

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Immigration:

What was the number of migrants detailed according to

- (a) bread winners;
- (b) their families;
- (c) total,

who arrived from overseas to Western Australia with the aim of permanent settlement during each year from 1957 to 1971?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

Statistics on a State by State basis of settler arrivals in the categories requested are not available.

Settler arrivals by State of intended residence are available from the financial year 1963-64 only and are as follows. (Source: Australian immigration consolidated statistics).

Year	Western Australia		Total
	Assisted	Unassisted	
1963-64	6,568	3,243	9,811
1964-65	6,952	3,066	10,048
1965-66	10,530	3,490	14,020
1966-67	14,668	4,100	18,768
1967-68	14,324	5,825	20,149
1968-69	10,756	6,782	23,538
1969-70	17,022	5,644	22,666
1970-71	15,730	5,769	21,499

Assisted settler arrivals only by State of intended residence are on a calendar year basis and are as follows. (Source: Australian immigration consolidated statistics).

Western Australia

1957	2,669
1958	3,193
1959	2,369
1960	2,482
1961	2,994
1962	5,234
1963	7,184
1964	6,917
1965	8,531
1966	12,851
1967	13,718
1968	16,912
1969	16,551
1970	17,685
1971	13,363

(Preliminary)

32. ELECTORAL*Adjustments of Boundaries: Objections*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

Would he inform the House as to—

- (a) how many objections have been lodged and by whom against the electoral commission's proposed alterations to State electoral boundaries;
- (b) when the commission is likely to complete its hearings and considerations of the objections and present its final recommendation?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (a) I do not have the information sought. The matter is in the hands of the Electoral Commissioners.

I might add that, pursuant to the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act, neither the Attorney-General nor any other Minister has power to seek the information requested.

- (b) Within the time provided in the Electoral Districts Act.

33. UNEMPLOYMENT*Commonwealth Grants*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

Would he please list from 1957 up to date each special Commonwealth grant received by Western Australia and given by the Commonwealth Government expressly for the purpose of alleviating unemployment in this State?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

Commonwealth grants for stimulation of employment were provided in each year from 1961-62 to 1963-64.

The amounts were—

1961-62	\$660,000
1962-63	\$1,364,000
1963-64	\$1,882,000

Grant for relief of unemployment in non metropolitan areas—

1971-72	\$2,020,000
---------	-------------

34. IMMIGRATION*Reduction of Quota*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Have the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Immigration at their conference reportedly held on 26th February, 1972 agreed to further cut the migrant intake into Western Australia?
- (2) What is the anticipated quota for 1972, or for an agreed period of time, to Western Australia?
- (3) Could he give any further information as a result of this conference's decision regarding migrant intake to Western Australia?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Discussion at the Conference of Ministers for Immigration held on the 25th February, 1972 concerned migrant intake on an Australia wide basis and not State by State. The original estimated intake for 1971-72 of 140,000 assisted and un-assisted settler arrivals was anticipated to be reduced to approximately 135,000 which includes approximately 86,000 assisted migrants.
- (2) It is anticipated that the assisted passage intake into Western Australia for the year 1971-72 will be approximately 12,000 persons.
- (3) Answered by (1).

35. WHEAT QUOTAS*Report of Committee of Review*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the fact that at least one Labor candidate for the coming Federal election has had the benefit of a copy of the report of the "Committee of Review for the system of assessing wheat quotas in W.A.", will he table a copy of the report in order that publication of it will enable farmers at large to assess the report and not confine discussion to the favoured few?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

A copy of the report referred to was forwarded to the convener of the appropriate Committee of the

Australian Labor Party. Similarly, a copy was forwarded to the Research Officer of the Liberal Party.

As stated in my reply of 16th March, a copy of the report will be tabled in due course.

36. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Shopping Complexes and Bulk Consumers

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Is it true that a number of owners and/or operators of large shopping complexes, including city shopping and commercial developments, are buying electricity from the S.E.C. at "E"-rate, and selling it to tenants of the complexes at "A"- and "B"-rate, and making a considerable profit by the practice?
- (2) Is he aware if such a practice is allowable under the State Electricity Commission Act?
- (3) Will the Government consider charging electricity to bulk buyers at the same price that these people charge the actual consumers?
- (4) Would this make a general reduction in the price of electricity possible?
- (5) How many consumers receive electricity at "E"- and have tenants metered at "A"- and "B"-rate?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) and (2) This practice is permissible under the Electricity Act and regulations. The difference between the purchase cost and the amount for which the electricity is sold depends on the circumstances of each case.
- (3) No. The owner buys in bulk at a better rate than the individual tenants could normally obtain. The surplus is intended to cover the owners administration costs and risk.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not known.

37. WELSHPOOL ROAD

Widening and Traffic Lights

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that Welshpool Road, between the junction of Shepperton Road and the standard gauge railway line at Wattle Grove, is becoming very congested during peak hour traffic?
- (2) When does the Government plan to widen this section of the road?

- (3) Will he say when traffic lights are to be installed in Welshpool Road at the junctions of roads which lead to the adjacent railway installations and industrial complexes?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) In common with other through routes serving areas of rapid development, Welshpool Road traffic is increasing at a steady rate.
- (2) Welshpool Road is the responsibility of the Canning Town Council. The Main Roads Department has no plans for widening.
- (3) There are no proposals at present for the installation of traffic control signals in Welshpool Road.

38.

LAND

Railway Reserves: Use

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Does the Government propose to develop in any way the disused railway reserves between Bellevue and Mt. Helena (the old Mundaring line and the Swan View line)?
- (2) If so, to what purpose is the land to be put?
- (3) If no use is to be made of the land, will the Government hand control of it over to the National Parks Board or some other appropriate body so that it can be developed for recreation purposes?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Proposals concerning the future of the land in the disused railway reserves are at present under consideration.
- (3) The sections passing through the John Forrest National Park, and the tunnel area, have been placed under the control of the National Parks Board. The possible use of other sections for recreational purposes is included in the examination referred to.

39.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Industrial Sites: Reports

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) In view of the importance placed on air pollution potential by the Environmental Protection Authority on the siting of the Pacminex refinery, is it intended to have the Environmental Protection Authority carry out studies and give reports on all existing and proposed industrial sites and areas?
- (2) If so, when will these studies commence and in which areas of priority?

- (3) How soon after the studies are completed will the reports be made available to the public?
- (4) If no such studies are to be undertaken what are the reasons for this decision?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Answered by (1).
- (4) Air pollution measurements are the responsibility of the Department of Public Health.

a "foreign company" within the meaning of the Companies Act—can issue a prospectus without being incorporated or registered in this State under the Act, but a copy of the prospectus must be lodged with the registrar under the Act before the prospectus is issued or circulated.

This answer is given on the basis that the prospectus is one within the meaning of the Companies Act and the organisation or company comes within the provisions of that Act.

40.

EDUCATION

Children of Pensioners

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the present policy and criteria for pensioners with school age children to qualify for assistance in the purchase of school books, equipment, fees, etc.?
- (2) What changes have been made to this policy since the Government came into office, and what are the reasons for the changes?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The present policy provides for school book assistance for children of indigent families. There is no separate policy for pensioners. The criterion for assistance is a net family income at or below a figure determined by the Education Department and is based on the parent's income less deductions for dependent members of the family.
- (2) Because of a pension increase in October 1971 the Department has approved that each individual increase be allowed as a deduction in order to maintain the qualifying figure at the same level as that pertaining prior to the pension increase.

41.

UNITED FARMERS & GRAZIERS ASSOCIATION

Registration

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Is the United Farmers and Graziers Association incorporated or registered under the Companies Act?
- (2) Is it necessary for an organisation or company to be registered under the Companies Act before issuing a prospectus?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No. A proposed company or a corporation—and a corporation is used with the meaning of

42.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Brokers

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is it correct that the State Government Insurance Office will only appoint insurance brokers in the metropolitan area?
- (2) If so, will consideration be given to appointing insurance brokers in rural centres, and, if not, why not?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) No. The State Government Insurance Office appoints insurance brokers, irrespective of location, if they meet its requirements as to expertise and solvency.
- (2) Answered by (1).

43. This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 28th March, 1972.

44.

AGED PERSONS' HOMES

Daily Bed Costs

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

What was the average daily bed cost on 29th February, 1972 at the following institutions—

- (a) Home of Peace;
- (b) Sunset;
- (c) Mt. Henry?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

It is not possible to calculate the average daily bed cost on a specific date. Costs have not yet been processed for the eight months to February 1972.

The average daily bed cost of each of the institutions mentioned for 1970-71 is as follows:

	\$
(a) Home of Peace	7.75
(b) Sunset	9.16
(c) Mount Henry	12.12

45. **POULTRY FARMING***Hen Licenses: Increased Quotas*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With reference to the licensing of hens, how many poultry farmers did not receive a quota increase on their base year number of hens?
- (2) How many of these farmers had a base year number of hens over 8,000?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 410
- (2) 10

46. **FREE SCHOOL BOOKS***Student Transfers*

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it true under the free text book scheme that students when transferring to another school must hand in their books allocated under the scheme?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) how long does he think the books will last while no responsibility of ownership exists;
 - (b) will not this result in students on transfer to other schools finding themselves presented with torn and uncared-for books;
 - (c) will not this policy result in a serious escalation of costs to the scheme?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) It is anticipated that the text material will have a life of about three years.
- (b) The experience of the many schools which operated book hire schemes indicates that books on loan can be well cared for and care of the books forms part of a child's training.
- (c) No, the scheme envisages the school maintaining control of the books and re-issuing them to children each year.

47. **JARRAHWOOD SCHOOL***Television Set*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Education:

When is it expected that a television set will be installed at the Jarrahwood Primary School?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

A television set is to be installed at the Jarrahwood primary school as soon as the contractors have erected the antenna.

This is expected to be completed within three weeks.

48. **MARGINAL DAIRY FARMS RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME***Purchase and Sale of Properties*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he in possession of information showing—
 - (a) how many dairy farms have been purchased through the marginal dairy farms agreement scheme since inception in each State where the scheme operates;
 - (b) the total cost of purchase of property in each State under the above scheme;
 - (c) if any State varies the method of purchase and sale as compared with the administrative practice followed in this State?
- (2) If "Yes" to 1(c) in which State and what is the variance?
- (3) Since inception, what has been the administrative cost to the scheme in this State?
- (4) When did the agreement become operative in this State?
- (5) What was the first date when the initial property sales were finalised in this State?
- (6) How many applications from dairy farmers to—
 - (a) buy;
 - (b) sell,
 properties have been received by the administering authority in each month since inception?
- (7) How many applications from farmers wishing to—
 - (a) buy;
 - (b) sell,
 properties through the above scheme have—
 - (i) been declined;
 - (ii) withdrawn offer,
 since inception?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (2) In Queensland, New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia the scheme requires that the owner who wishes to dispose of a marginal dairy farm must nominate a willing buyer, or alternatively a

person wishing to acquire a marginal dairy farm must nominate a willing seller. Both the prospective vendor and purchaser must then submit a joint application indicating the price at which the sale is to be negotiated.

In Victoria, as in W.A., the administering authority takes an option over eligible farms offered to it for sale. The Victorian authority then endeavours to seek buyers by advertising in district newspapers. If no offer is received which is at least equal to the option price, less the value of redundant structural improvements, then the option is not exercised.

In Western Australia the administrative authority has tried all possible means, including personal approach, to find buyers.

- (3) \$41,864.
 (4) The agreement between W.A. and the Commonwealth became operative in September 1970.
 (5) March 1971.
 (6) Applications received from farmers.

1970	Buyers	Sellers
September	7	9
October	27	20
November	32	13
December	20	4
1971		
January	10	9
February	9	1
March	15	7
April	11	9
May	7	5
June	4	3
July	12	7
August	10	2
September	2	—
October	7	3
November	6	—
December	2	3

Applications received from farmers—

1972	Buyers	Sellers
January	1	2
February	1	1
March	1	—
	184	98

- (7) (a) (i) Nil
 (ii) Not applicable
 (b) (i) 34 on grounds of ineligibility.
 (ii) 26

49. **DARRYL BEAMISH**
Parole

Mr. O'CONNOR to the Attorney-General:

- (1) On what date was Darryl Beamish released on parole?

- (2) What was the period and conditions of parole?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 25th March, 1971.
 (2) The usual conditions attaching to any parolee were applied.

50. **STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION**

T.L.C. Representative

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

Referring to the announcement in the *Daily News* of 20th March that changes to the State Electricity Commission constitution had been made to enable the Trades and Labor Council to choose the employees' representative, will the Government now take action to allow the many other organisations, e.g., Local Government Association, Farmers' Union, etc., to do likewise, or is this a right or privilege to be reserved for industrial unions and their organisations?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

Before I reply to the question, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest—as I have heard a similar suggestion in the Commonwealth Parliament—that very many questions directed to the Premier could more appropriately be directed to the Minister concerned. However, the reply is as follows:—

The question has no relevance since there is no provision for representation of the organisations mentioned, whereas the Act specifically provides for a representative of employees of the S.E.C.

QUESTIONS (9): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. **MURDOCH UNIVERSITY**
School of Veterinary Science

Mr. T. D. EVANS (Minister for Education):

In answer to a question without notice asked of me yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, I undertook to table a copy of a letter written by me to the Federal Minister for Education and Science on the 23rd February, this year. I might add that this letter has not as yet been acknowledged nor has it been replied to.

The letter was tabled.

2. **FREMANTLE PORT**
Outer-harbour Development

Mr. COURT, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) In view of the fact that the Government's comments in *The West Australian* of the 16th

March, 1972, clearly indicate Government decisions on the report of the Premier's committee for the development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana, and the report dated February, 1972—tabled on the 21st March—has therefore been in the hands of the Government for a reasonable period before such decisions, will he please explain why he would not give me the information sought by question on Thursday, the 16th March, when the information was in the committee's report and readily available to the Government?

- (2) Why, in view of the wide public interest, did he decide to table the report on the 21st March instead of the 16th March when the Government had already made and announced decisions related to the report?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Because the views of the Director of Environmental Protection were sought.
 (2) Because the Government had not finalised the terms of the release until the 20th March.

Mr. Court: You made an announcement about it.

3. T.L.C. HOUSING LOANS

Comparison of Terms

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Housing:

My question refers to part (1) of question 23 on today's notice paper which, in itself, refers to question 22 on the notice paper of last Thursday, in respect of which I attempted to obtain from the Minister an answer to a question without notice on Thursday last. However, in view of the time factor I could not have this question placed on the notice paper until today.

The Minister has stated that 30 per cent. of home builders' account funds must be used by terminating societies to purchase existing State Housing Commission homes on terms and conditions which are less favourable than State Housing Commission finance, which is available for purchase of precisely the same homes by precisely the same applicants.

My question suggested that if someone were prepared to pay the higher interest rate and the shorter term repayment he would receive priority. The Minister replied that this was not so.

I would like him to expand on the situation whereby funds made available to building societies can be used to purchase State Housing Commission homes on terms and conditions which are less favourable than State Housing Commission finance.

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

I have no intention of commenting on the situation. After reading the question asked by the honourable member and the answer that was supplied to him I consider his question was adequately answered. If the member for East Melville wants any further details on this matter he could either approach me personally or place another question on the notice paper.

Mr. O'Neill: I have done that already.

4.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Report of Committee of Review

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to question 35 on today's notice paper—

- (1) Will he confirm that the report referred to was made available to the research officer of the Liberal Party on a confidential basis?
 (2) In view of the fact that a particular Labor candidate for the coming Federal election is freely using this report in the electorate he aspires to represent, does not the Minister feel the report should be made public so that everyone can discuss it and debate the merits and demerits of it?

Mr. Court: That puts a different complexion on it.

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I have pointed out that under the terms of the Wheat Quotas Act it is obligatory for me to refer to and discuss the matter of wheat quotas with the Farmers' Union. Each member of that executive has received a copy of the report and I feel it is incumbent upon me to show the courtesy of completing those discussions which are continuing at the moment, before tabling it in this House, which I have already indicated I will do.

Mr. Court: What about your candidate who is using it?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: To conclude the answer, I have no knowledge of the situation referred to by the member for Darling Range.

Mr. Williams: There are none so blind as those who will not see.

5. **COCKBURN SOUND**

Harbour Development

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

Regarding the plan for the development of Cockburn Sound, which was announced in *The West Australian* this morning, have any of the houses mentioned in the report yet been acquired; and if so, how many?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I preface my remarks by saying the area the subject of the proposed acquisition of houses was zoned for industrial purposes in 1955 in the Stephenson plan, and again in 1963 in the metropolitan region plan. Therefore, this is not a new decision. Some 54 houses have already been acquired. Incidentally, I approved of two of them this morning. It is intended that as opportunity offers and as circumstances dictate, in particular cases, especially where there is likely to be any hardship, every effort will be made to take over these properties on generally acceptable terms. Members may recall that when we were sitting on opposite sides of the House comments were made in this Chamber regarding the statement of an officer of the Town Planning Department that in his opinion living would ultimately become intolerable in this area because of the impact of industrial establishments already located there and further industries that would be established there.

I therefore want to put this whole matter in perspective because, from the way it appeared today, it seemed there had been a complete reversal of form, that it was an entirely new step, that people were being taken by surprise, and, furthermore, that here and now, on the 22nd day of March, 1972, a new threat was arising to people who live in the area. The decision was made and accepted as long ago as 1955.

6. **DARRYL BEAMISH**

Parole

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Attorney-General:

In connection with question 49 on today's notice paper, would he explain to the House the usual conditions attached to any parole?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

If the honourable member cares to look at the regulations pursuant to the Probation and Parole Act, he will find the conditions enunciated there.

Mr. Court: They can vary from person to person.

7.

MINISTERIAL VISITS

Frequency

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Acting Premier:

(1) Would he inform the House on how many occasions the Ministers of the previous Government, during the period of office from 1959 to 1971, visited—

- (a) Overseas;
- (b) Eastern States; and
- (c) North-West?

(2) How do each of these totals for each year of office compare with the totals given on the same basis in the answer to a question asked elsewhere on the 15th March, 1972?

The SPEAKER: I hope you have given the Acting Premier prior notice of this question.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

(1) and (2) I want to make some comment upon the question, if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker. I have discussed the question with officers of the Premier's Department today. It would be impossible to give the complete information because it covers such a lengthy period, going back so many years, and many of the particulars would appear in Ministers' diaries and documents of that nature. By tracing accounts in some detail, it may be possible to gather this information but it would be an exceedingly lengthy and difficult exercise covering a considerable number of departments. Unless it is pressed for, the information will not be provided, for the reasons I have mentioned. I also think there may be questions of some delicacy with regard to the activities of Ministers of any Government when engaged upon public business.

Mr. Court: I hope not.

8.

DARRYL BEAMISH

Parole

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Attorney-General:

The Minister appears to be avoiding the issue in connection with this question. Will he table the precise conditions applying to the parole of Darryl Beamish?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I regret that the member for Mt. Lawley seems to be persisting with questions relating to this particular individual. It may be that the question could be ruled to be *sub judice*, but I understand that because the fact that this person was paroled is public knowledge, you, Mr. Speaker, permitted the question. In the interests of justice, and as this man is still to appear—on the 5th May, I believe—I would prefer that the member for Mt. Lawley conferred with me privately. If he persists with the questions, I will answer them, but I appeal to his good judgment and sense of justice in this case.

Mr. O'Neil: All he asked you to do was table them.

9. UNEMPLOYMENT

Government Financial Assistance

Mr. GRAHAM (Acting Premier):

Yesterday, the member for Mt. Lawley asked the following question:—

(1) What amount of additional money has been provided by the State Government this financial year to assist unemployment in Western Australia?

(2) How was the money used?

The reply given to him indicated that the State had used the \$2,990,000 made available by the Commonwealth. I discussed this matter with the appropriate officers and have been advised in the following terms:

The whole of the loan funds available to the State in this financial year were allocated in the Capital Funds Budget and no additional funds were available from State resources for expenditure on unemployment relief works.

The extra works and housing allocation obtained at the February Premiers' Conference was no different from our normal capital funds allocation and it is not valid to distinguish this as Commonwealth money while regarding the allocation determined at the June Loan Council meeting as State funds.

Although the additional allocation was for the purpose of enabling the State Government to expand its capital works programme and thus provide additional employment, no restrictions were imposed on how these funds were to be spent.

BILLS (10): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Jamieson (Minister for Water Supplies), and read a first time.

2. Western Australian Products Symbol Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and read a first time.

3. Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Town Planning), and read a first time.

4. Education Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Minister for Education), and read a first time.

5. Public Trustee Act Amendment Bill.

6. Inheritance (Family and Dependents Provision) Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General), and read a first time.

7. Parks and Reserves Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

8. Bee Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

9. Beekeepers Act Amendment Bill.

10. Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 21st March, on the following motion by Mr. Brown:—

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

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

MR. REID (Blackwood) [5.32 p.m.]: I would like to add some comments to those already made during this Address-in-Reply debate, and initially to direct them

to something which has caught our imagination within the last six months probably more so than ever before; that is, this very much overworked term "decentralisation."

On the 10th February last the Acting Premier announced in *The West Australian*, under fairly large headlines—

The State Government has approved big changes in its decentralisation policy to give greater encouragement to establishing industries in country areas.

The changes were recommended in an interim report by the departmental decentralisation review committee and have been adopted by the Cabinet.

The Government regards them as a vital part of its decentralisation plans.

As yet the finer details of this scheme are not common knowledge; but I think it has been welcomed generally right across the board by all and sundry. On the same day the *South Western Times* of Bunbury—once again, in large headlines—announced, "Shot-in-arm for region's industries." This article goes on in a vein similar to the statements made by the Acting Premier. Still later, once again in the *South Western Times*, dated the 21st March—which was yesterday—this headline appeared: "\$1m plan to boost light industry." So much for the plans for decentralisation. I will perhaps refer to some of those comments later when I make other points.

However, before passing off the subject I would like to say that a reporter from the *South Western Times* contacted me after the announcement in that newspaper about a shot in the arm for the region's industry. Apparently the Press went around contacting a number of people to obtain their reaction to the Acting Premier's announcement. In a later edition of that newspaper I think I am on record as saying that I welcome this move towards decentralisation, because I feel that in the past, although many politicians had given lip service to it, in the main their efforts lacked any real concrete bite and effect.

I would like now to turn briefly to the situation of decentralisation in regard to the fruit industry. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that last session prior to Christmas I outlined at some length the problems of the fruit industry. Indeed, as a result of that move for an inquiry we have seen tremendous advances made towards solving some of the problems faced by the industry. We now have a transportation and handling committee set up under the Minister for Agriculture to investigate and make recommendations upon the reorganisation of the fruit industry.

However, quite apart from that, let us look at the fruit industry as it stands today. Fortunately it is in a much healthier

situation than it was when I last spoke of it at length in this House. Nevertheless, the problems facing the industry now are of a slightly different nature because they are in direct contrast to the principle of decentralisation. We now find that through no fault of the growers or of the Government we are being forced into a system of centralisation for the export of our commodity, largely or totally arising out of the action of overseas shipowners. Those owners have decided that a large percentage of our fruit will be containerised and very little will be exported by conventional shipment. This means, of course, that our traditional export port, Bunbury, will be used very little in this coming fruit season. Naturally, the water-side workers at Bunbury, the people of Bunbury, and the Bunbury Town Council—

Mr. Williams: And the member for Bunbury.

Mr. REID: —yes, and the member for Bunbury—are very concerned. I think the member for Bunbury has paddled his own canoe fairly well in making known his comments in this regard. It is strange to note that whereas last year 600,000 bushels of apples were exported from the Port of Bunbury, this year perhaps only 100,000 bushels will be exported from that port. Why? Because somebody who owns ships decided that we will maximise the use of containers and that the containers will be shipped from the Port of Fremantle. The economics of the situation so far as the growers are concerned are not very different because the additional cost incurred in transporting the fruit to Fremantle is offset to some degree by the lower overseas freights. However, I think it is a bad thing to see this move towards exporting the fruit from one point in Western Australia.

I would now like to leave the fruit industry and press on to the wool industry. I think it is agreed that the freight subsidy scheme is a good one for growers, and is an effort to build up wool sales in the Albany area. I find from questions I asked in this House on the 15th March that wool received in Albany since the commencement of the subsidy scheme totalled 183,965 bales, of which only 58,540 bales were exported from the Port of Albany; and 61,166 bales were railed to Fremantle, obviously for shipment from that port. The balance of the wool is still being held in store in Albany.

The cost of railing that wool from Albany to Fremantle is \$2.75 a bale. This, by the way, means that 55 per cent. of the wool received into store in Albany so far has been railed to Fremantle.

Mr. Cook: I think the member is electioneering.

Mr. REID: I do not think so. I think the member for Albany will perhaps realise later on the points I am trying to make in this regard. They are certainly not the points he thinks I am trying to make.

Mr. Cook: You have missed the point. The wool freight scheme was aimed at trying to provide an inducement to ship through the Port of Albany. The amount of wool shipped so far this year is almost double that of last year. You are suggesting that more and more is going to Fremantle and, therefore, more and more is being lost to Albany.

Mr. REID: I am suggesting Mr. Speaker, that 55 per cent. of the wool going into Albany is being rallied to Fremantle. The point I am trying to make for the benefit of the member for Albany is that 72,978 bales were received into stores in Albany by rail. The freight on that wool is subsidised by 50 per cent., or approximately 88c a bale; so 72,978 bales of wool at 88c represents a cost of \$64,240. I am trying to get the message over to the member for Albany that the W.A.G.R. received additional revenue of \$178,205 for rallying that wool back to Fremantle.

The point I am making—and I am not launching an attack against the member for Albany as he might think I am—is, what a shame it is that the wool was not shipped out of the Port of Albany. The fact is that an amount approaching \$200,000 could have been much better spent providing facilities in the port, the town, or the district rather than going in freight. The main point which I have not yet mentioned is, of course, that this additional \$178,205 comes out of the woolgrowers' returns. There is no doubt about that; this cost is borne by the producer. A scheme has been put forward to support the sale of wool at Albany, but it has been largely negated because the wool is not being shipped through the Port of Albany.

Mr. Cook: If you compare the amount shipped out of Albany in the last season you will see it is almost double. You are not suddenly going to get all the wool through the Port of Albany.

Mr. REID: I think I have made my point: that the idea of building up wool sales in Albany is not being maximised because the shipping interests will not co-operate. I make a further point: This idea of urging and encouraging all wool to be sent to Albany involves additional costs by its having to be rallied back to Fremantle for shipment at the expense of the industry. The member for Albany is trying to interject, but he will have an opportunity to tell us what he knows about the industry at a later stage.

Mr. Cook: I will probably know more about the situation than you do.

Mr. REID: I will be most interested to hear the honourable member's comments.

Mr. Cook: I spoke on it last session.

Mr. W. G. Young: We did not have the figures then.

Mr. Cook: But I asked questions.

Mr. W. G. Young: About wool shipped in March of this year?

Mr. Hutchinson: Would you fellows speak up?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Blackwood.

Mr. REID: I pass from the subject of wool and fruit to the cost of a bottle of tomato sauce and a bottle of beer. Perhaps the member for Albany will find this less objectionable. It is interesting to note that the freight on a bottle of tomato sauce represents approximately 2c. In comparing this freight with the freight on beer we find that the freight on beer is much higher than that on tomato sauce; yet the method of transport by rail is almost identical in hauling a wagon load of beer and a wagon load of tomato sauce.

The point I make is that people living in the country are encouraged to buy the commodities they use from the country stores. In the case of tomato sauce the freight is not very high; it is only 2c on a bottle, but when a person in the country buys a bottle of beer he finds there is a difference of 10c to 11c in the price compared with the price that is paid in the city.

We are advocating decentralisation and the provision of incentives to decentralise. In this respect we have one channel to provide an incentive. The beer is placed in railway trucks f.o.r. in the metropolitan area; and the beer sold in the metropolitan area is delivered by the brewery free of charge. However, the people living in the country have to pay a much higher price for a bottle of beer than do consumers in the city. Consequently, country people coming to Perth are inclined to fill the boots of their cars with beer when they return, because of the tremendous difference in the price.

The freight which beer attracts, over and above the all-in bulk freight rate scheme for groceries, is about 60 per cent. higher than the freight on tomato sauce or groceries. I believe this system was evolved from the British railway system where it was the ability to pay that determined freight rate. Although this system has certain merits, we are finding that today it is working against the interests of the country people. In the case of beer perhaps it is not the ability to pay but the willingness to pay that is the main factor. The people will still buy beer, regardless of the price. When we take into account the fact that the intake of beer averages about 30 gallons per head per annum in Western Australia we find that the communities in the country are paying a bigger share than should be expected of them for this commodity.

I now turn to the effects of the recent increases in charges by the State Electricity Commission, particularly on the industries in the country. I say at the outset that it is most unfortunate the Government has increased electricity charges; and it should be highly criticised for so doing. The previous Brand-Nalder Government had undertaken to reduce the differential between the city users and the country users of power. It made a start on this as an interim measure, and brought about one reduction.

I think the present Premier, in giving his policy speech before the last election, undertook to introduce an equal rate for electricity throughout the State, but I am sure no-one in the community expected he would do so by increasing the charge for electricity for domestic use in the city. The users of electricity in the country areas found that their rates were left at the same high level.

Foremost among those to be disadvantaged are a number of major power users in the south-west—in the Bunbury, Capel, Bridgetown, and Albany areas. The majority of these industries are established in my electorate; one of these companies is just outside my electorate, and others are further out. To get the correct picture of the increased charges for electricity in country areas one must look at the effects across the board. I believe that the viability of these companies is being threatened by the increase in electricity charges.

In some cases retrenchments of staff have taken place, and in other cases the companies are relying on the normal wastage of labour and are not making any new appointments. This is a dangerous situation. These companies are large employers of labour, and they depend almost entirely on exporting their products overseas on a fluctuating market. They are striving to compete in a highly competitive world market, and they are very sensitive to any increase in the cost of labour on the home market.

I would like to give details of the companies in respect of which I have made some research, and they number six. Company "A" employs 220 persons, and pays approximately \$1,000,000 per annum in wages. The gross value of its products is approximately \$3,000,000. Its electricity charges at the old rate totalled \$250,000 per annum, and it is expected that the increase resulting from the new rate will mean an additional \$40,000 per annum.

Company "B" employs 280 persons. It pays approximately \$1,260,000 in wages annually, and the gross value of its products is approximately \$7,000,000. Its electricity charges under the old rate were \$250,000 a year, and the expected increase will mean an additional \$41,000 a year.

Company "C," which employs 135 persons, pays approximately \$707,000 in wages a year. The electricity charges at the old rate were \$160,000 per annum, and the expected increase is \$21,600 annually.

Company "D" employs 110 persons. The old electricity charges amounted to \$124,000 a year, and the increase resulting from the new rate will be \$15,500 per year.

Mr. Williams: That is a good form of assistance towards decentralisation!

Mr. REID: Company "E" employs 430 persons, and its total annual wage bill is \$1,720,000. I might add that this company is established very close to the electorate of Albany. The electricity charges paid by this company under the old rate were \$51,590, and the increase per annum is expected to be \$10,000.

Company "F" employs 90 persons and its wage bill approximates \$360,000 a year. The electricity charges under the old rate were \$13,200, and the increase will represent another \$4,000 a year.

Those six companies employ 1,265 persons in the rural areas. They pay approximately \$5,542,000 a year in wages, and the gross value of their products totals approximately \$19,750,000. The electricity charges they paid under the old rate amounted to \$848,000, and the expected increase resulting from the new rate is \$132,100 a year.

I ask: Does this assist decentralisation? The full measure of the effect of this sort of increase in electricity charges can be gauged from the fact that those six companies employ 1,265 people, and they will have to pay an extra \$132,100 in electricity charges; or a staggering \$104 for every person employed by them. No wonder some companies in the south-west are retrenching staff, and no wonder some of them are not engaging any labour but are relying on the normal wastage to offset the situation.

The assessment of the six south-west country industries referred to is broadly based, and is evenly representative of the major power users in the area. They comprise companies involved in the beach sands industry, the mining industry, the meat industry, and the wool industry. I think they represent a fair average of the industries in the area and of the major power users in the south-west.

Mr. Graham: Which one of those is making retrenchments on account of the power costs?

Mr. REID: The details concerning these companies have been prepared by an accountant. I would not be prepared to divulge the details without their approval.

Mr. Graham: I think that is very convenient.

Mr. REID: For the information of the Acting Premier I have proof here that retrenchments have taken place.

Mr. Graham: That has been going on all over Australia following your Federal Government's financial policy.

Mr. Williams: It is worse in Western Australia than anywhere else.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is.

Mr. Williams: And yet there is this sort of increase in electricity charges.

Mr. REID: There is one point which should not be missed: Costs and wages have escalated to such an extent that the increases have threatened the employment of people in the country, but not of those in the city. In order to create the incentives necessary to attract new industries into country districts and protect those already established, I urge the Minister for Electricity and the Government to give immediate and urgent consideration to reducing electricity costs to major power consumers in country areas. There are different ways in which this can be brought about. One would be by striking a differential rate for country consumers of industrial power in the upper brackets. This would give a real bite to any policy of decentralisation.

I think there is possibly another way; that is, by adopting an incentive system of payment to those who are large consumers of power. I understand that the lower brackets of the consumers of industrial power are given a preference. The main concern of the major employers of labour who are in the higher brackets of the users of industrial power stems from the unit price rise from 1.4c to 1.6c per unit, and the increase from 1.25c to 1.4c for major power users.

To explain briefly some of the new rates, I think they allow a fair and a marked concession to consumers of 56,000 units and over. Therefore, in respect of the industrial rates these country users of electricity pay the same as the consumers in the metropolitan area. These are slightly less favourable than the old rates fixed under the Brand-Nalder Government.

I would like to take the opportunity to make this point: In areas where self-read meters operate—these affect farmers mostly—I urge the Minister to make some announcement to consumers to fill in their classification forms. I believe that in other areas this has been done by the inspectors. I would be the first to agree that the filling in of these forms is the responsibility of the individuals concerned. The consumers have been circularised but if they fail to fill in their classification forms they will be charged the industrial power rate, and not the domestic rate.

To give an illustration of the confusion that presently exists in country areas, and to show the difference between the industrial rate and the domestic rate, I would point out that a consumer using 150 units of power—who has forgotten to fill in his classification form—will be charged the

industrial rate of 6c per unit. This amounts to \$9.00 as against the \$3.45 which a consumer who has filled in his classification form pays on 150 units. The latter pays the domestic rate of 2.3c per unit, or a total of \$3.45. That is a difference of \$5.55 or possibly an average of 250 per cent. overcharge.

I know that those people who self-read their meters have been circularised but some of them, through their ignorance, could be overpaying. I know that confusion exists because of the many inquiries since the reclassification. The people on the domestic rate are automatically classified as industrial.

I have referred to the beach sands industry in Western Australia. It is a very important form of decentralisation and one which I believe we should do everything in our power to foster. The industry has created the type of employment we wish to see in rural areas.

The total production of the industry in the Bunbury-Capel-Busselton area is 750,000 tons a year. That is the total tonnage of the minerals mined and its value is in the vicinity of \$7,000,000 a year. The minerals occur as a natural concentration along the line of an ancient beach which is sub-parallel to the present coastline and some four miles inland. I am referring to one particular deposit. It is about nine miles long, 200 to 300 yards wide, up to 30 feet deep, and is presently estimated to contain 9,400,000 tons of heavy minerals. Those figures indicate the type of operation involved.

Regarding the effect on the environment, which can be significant with this type of operation, we recently inspected an area which had been under mining operations 12 months previously. However, that area was producing again and we were able to inspect a stack of hay which had been harvested from it. The ability of the mineral industry to rehabilitate mined areas has been amply demonstrated.

One of the most unfortunate obstacles is that the railway running between Capel and Busselton happens to be built over some of the richest deposits in the area. As the deposit is only 200 to 300 yards in width it could be that in time the railway line will be shifted.

Mr. W. G. Young: Sink the railway.

Mr. REID: Unfortunately, the problem is not where to shift the railway, but the kangaroo paws—a small seedy version—which grow along the side of the railway line.

Sir David Brand: I would not say they were a seedy version; I beg to differ.

Mr. REID: Well, they are not thriving.

Sir David Brand: That is because of the industry. They were thriving.

Mr. REID: I had thought that for the sake of a little flora and fauna in this area there could be more than a case for the resiting of the railway.

Sir David Brand: It is the most beautiful stand of kangaroo paws I have ever seen.

Mr. REID: The company is successfully rehabilitating the country.

Mr. Williams: How successfully?

Mr. REID: The company is undertaking a very detailed and effective rehabilitation of the area. I do not know, specifically, what it has done regarding the kangaroo paws.

Sir David Brand: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member as I did, but I could not let him get away with that.

Mr. REID: I will mention briefly the value to the area of just one industry. The company to which I am referring, during the last year, paid transport contractors \$260,000, made payments to the port authority in Bunbury of \$160,000, and made payments to local contractors amounting to \$350,000. Building contracts let to local builders for roads, offices, and houses amounted to \$275,000. The value of locally-purchased road vehicles was \$50,000 and fabrication and erection work let to local engineering companies amounted to \$350,000.

However, this particular operation is threatened from two angles: increasing costs on the home front, and a tightening on the world market. Despite the comments of the Deputy Premier this particular company has made retrenchments.

I see a very close resemblance to the rural industry—in the agricultural sense—because the company to which I am referring has very little control over its costs and very little control over the price of minerals on the world market. Together with the other companies it needs every incentive and all the assistance it can get.

I believe it is not necessary for me to mention the plight of the meat industry, and also the plight of the wool industry. The problems confronting these industries are well known to members in this House. The fact that the problem facing the wool industry is to be tackled at a national level adds to the case that it is necessary to protect and assist rural-based industries. Those industries, in line with the mineral companies, are going through a difficult period which is beyond their control.

In conclusion, I urge the Government to give serious and urgent consideration to reassessing the State Electricity Commission charges in country areas in order to assist viable decentralisation.

MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [6.07 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. I compliment the honourable member on the way he delivered his speech because I thought it was very good. I do not know that I should say I hope he has a long stay in this Chamber because he sits on the other side of the House. However, that choice will remain with his electors.

I wish now to comment on a reply which you, Mr. Speaker, gave to a question asked by the Leader of the Country Party last week. The question referred to the removal of coats by members while sitting in the Chamber. I do not wish to criticise you, Mr. Speaker, for the answer you gave—that is your prerogative—but I would like to express my own view.

The climate which we enjoy sometimes makes conditions in this House quite intolerable. This applies particularly to those who sit on the back benches. It appears to me that while the ceiling fans in this Chamber give some relief to those members sitting on the front benches, the fans also force the warm air to the back of the Chamber. I think this effect would also be felt by you, Mr. Speaker, in your position in the House. I know that it sometimes gets very hot in your Chair.

People attend in the public gallery of the House in shirt sleeves or wearing open-neck shirts. I realise the predicament in which you, Mr. Speaker, find yourself because if you gave some people an inch they would probably take a yard. However, I believe you are the kind of person who has sufficient strength to control the situation. I suggest that the rule would need to be broken only once and you would smartly have the offender out of the Chamber.

I think it has been mentioned that the issue relating to the wearing of coats, was raised in regard to the dining room. On that occasion a ballot was held. I suggest that you review your decision and ask members to comment on this issue. For your own information you should find out what the majority of members think. A secret ballot could be held during the hot weather. If a ballot were held during the winter time the result may be different as not many members would want to shed their coats and they would probably have forgotten the hot conditions which prevailed during the summertime.

I put forward my suggestion for your consideration. Perhaps we might have a ballot even if it is just to obtain general information. However, it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to make the decision.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House a few matters of interest concerning my electorate. A matter which is considered to be urgent, and is becoming more urgent every month, is the provision of a new courthouse. This item was placed on the Estimates during the last year of the previous Government. However, it was taken off the Estimates and I made some accusations to the effect that the present Government intended to butter up some of its own electorates.

The situation in Bunbury is that witnesses, and people who are to appear in court in traffic cases and for other minor offences—those who have not been kept

in the lockup overnight—have to congregate on the footpath while awaiting their turn to go into the court. This is a poor set-up.

The present courthouse was renovated to some degree in 1962, and more space was made available and better accommodation provided for the officers. Also, a magistrate's room and a small courtroom were added for the married persons and the children's court. Those additions and renovations sufficed for the time being.

However, the town of Bunbury and the district generally have grown considerably and more accommodation is required. The Crown Law Department was able to lease the old Bunbury post office. Some money was spent on the building and it now houses amenities for the public and the staff, the magistrate's room, and also one courtroom. Because of visits by the circuit district court the building still becomes crowded on occasions and I have seen witnesses, and people who have to appear in the court, standing on the footpath waiting to get into the building.

I sincerely hope that when the forthcoming Budget is prepared money will be made available for the construction of a new courthouse at Bunbury. I also trust that the new courthouse will be built on a different site from that recommended during the reign of the last Government.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Before the tea suspension I was discussing the Bunbury courthouse; the attendant problems regarding the staff; and also the fact that the public have to wait on the footpath before they can enter the courthouse. I was on the point of suggesting that the site which had been proposed about two years ago, and had been confirmed by the Public Works Department, should not be the site for the new courthouse.

The site proposed is adjacent to that—indeed it is one and the same site—on which the police station is situated; it runs at right angles to the police station. The previous Minister for Police had some strong objections to this and I hope the present Minister for Police will feel likewise. It is not that the Minister did not want a nice building to conform with the architecture of the police station in the town, but merely the fact that these two arms of the law do not need to go together. I believe they should not go together.

The police apprehend people and the court goes through the process of seeing whether or not they are guilty and issuing the necessary sentence of imprisonment or fine. I am firmly of the opinion that these two arms of the law should be kept separate.

There are sites in the vicinity of Wittenoom Street and Stephens Street which could be acquired if the right approach were made to some of the people

who own the sites at the moment. I am sure if reasonable conditions were put forward they would be prepared to quit these sites and re-establish themselves elsewhere in the town.

I understand that approaches have been made to some of the organisations and the people concerned but it is not possible to arrive at a figure. This is not uncommon. When one goes to buy a piece of land the buyer naturally wants to obtain it at a cheap price, while the seller wants to get as much as he can for it. But usually these things can be straightened out by reaching a compromise.

I understand that the members of one of the organisations which owns land in this vicinity—and I refer to the trustees of the Masonic Hall—might consider a reasonable figure, because they would like to establish themselves in more modern premises in a part of the town close to the types of persons for whom they cater.

I accordingly suggest to the Government that it has another look at the siting of the new Bunbury courthouse, and I hope the finance for the proposition will be included in this year's Estimates. Also, I hope the Government will be a little more insistent upon establishing the new courthouse somewhere close to, but not necessarily on the same site as, the police station.

I say this, because as the town grows the police station must necessarily grow, and because the site in question is not all that large, it is likely that in a few years' time it will be entirely taken up by the police station.

If the Government has its way and the police take over traffic control in the country areas it will mean that the present building will probably have to be enlarged for that reason alone. The traffic section will get larger and larger and if there is a traffic authority it will be established alongside the police authority and will be able to work in with the police for that purpose.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Does the honourable member believe that police stations and courthouses do not make good neighbours in the eyes of the public.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This is precisely what I am getting at; and I hope the Attorney-General agrees with my view and uses his influence with the Government as, I believe, will the Minister for Police.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It might surprise you to know that I share your view.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am glad to hear that and I hope the Attorney-General will do all he can to promote this aspect when the matter comes up for discussion in Cabinet. The public really believe that these two arms of the law are separate arms of the law; as do the police authorities themselves together with the majority of those

who staff the courthouse—the judges, judiciary, magistrates, the clerk of courts, and the general staff.

I hope the matter will receive satisfactory and favourable attention and that we will see a new courthouse built at Bunbury to relieve the position of the judiciary and the staff. I also hope it will not be built on the site of the present police station.

Another matter causing concern at Bunbury at the moment—and it has done for some months—is the proposed construction of a railway line along the north shore. The area of land between the estuary and Koombana Bay is commonly known as the north shore.

There is a caravan park there at the present time, apart from which it is the only sheltered beach we have in Bunbury where it is safe for young children to swim. It is possibly not suitable for the vocational swimming classes, but it is a suitable beach where parents can take their young children and know that they are reasonably safe. There are no large waves and parents can be reasonably sure that the children will come to no harm provided the usual eye is kept on them.

As I said in this House when the Bunbury-East Perth railway Bill was going through Parliament in 1970, I hope the Railways Department will take a good look at the matter because of the development of the new Bunbury Harbour and the subsequent rail communications which will have to be made.

As I have indicated, this will be necessary because the railway line will go through north shore and, in my opinion, and in the belief of many sections of the public of Bunbury, it will completely destroy the recreational reserve which Bunbury has at present, and which is very close to the heart of the city. It is a matter of less than half a mile from the commercial centre of Bunbury and close to the heart of the city.

Mr. Bickerton: Has Bunbury a heart?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, Bunbury has a tremendous heart—and I might point out that the Minister for Housing is interjecting while not in his place and there is a possibility that he might be pulled into order. However, Bunbury has a heart and the recreational reserve in question is not very far from it.

I would like to see the Railways Department take another look at this proposal. The Bunbury Town Council is very concerned, as are other organisations including the Koombana Bay Sailing Club, which has developed a good clubhouse and facilities for those who like yachting and using their motorboats.

Should the railway section go through the area to link up with the present Bunbury marshalling yards it will have to be

elevated; the “plug” will have to be opened up to allow boat traffic to go through Koombana Bay to the sheltered part of the estuary. The elevation will have to run back for several hundred yards into an “A”-class reserve which, I believe, will be destroyed.

I might also say that the solution which eventuates will not overcome the difficulty which has existed for many years, and I refer to the section of the main railway line from Picton Junction to the marshalling yards. Traffic which is brought in from the north, the south and the east, travels through Picton Junction and into the centre of Bunbury and is then taken out of Bunbury again through Picton Junction.

The present Government is endeavouring to get land to establish marshalling yards at Picton Junction. Should this be done and should the line be connected across the north shore with the Bunbury marshalling yards I can see that we will never get rid of the main line between Picton and Bunbury because it will become one circuit from Picton to the port and from the port to the old marshalling yards back to Picton Junction. This will mean Bunbury will have the problem of a railway line going through the centre of the town, and this in turn will mean considerable expense to the local authorities in their planning. This land can well be used for beautification purposes and roads should this main line be discontinued.

I know it will be many years before this can be done, and I hope the Railways Department will have an eye to the future and not continue with the idea of running the railway line from the north shore to the present Bunbury marshalling yards; because I think every town must seek to preserve its recreational areas, particularly those which are close to the centre of the town. I am sure there is no town which has too much in the way of recreational areas at the moment.

I was absent from the House last Thursday, but I notice from reading *Hansard* that the member for Northam passed a few remarks about something I had said in the House last year in connection with unions and their proposed objectives and the achievements of the trade union movement in Western Australia. I would like to correct the member for Northam in this connection. We all make mistakes and it is possible that he might not have read my speech or, if he did, that he did not remember it correctly. At page 89 of *Hansard* No. 1 the member for Northam said on Thursday, the 10th March, 1972—

The member for Bunbury gave a discourse on one of his constituents who would not join a union, and as a consequence was intimidated by his workmates and other people with whom he was associated.

That is not correct. The discourse I gave concerned a person who had been intimidated by his workmates. He was a member of the union and he was black-balled on the spot. I would like to straighten out the honourable member on that point.

I know that several members made mention of unemployment, and I think the member for Mt. Hawthorn was among those who made reference to it and said that it could not be much of a problem because not many members of the Opposition had made a song and dance about it. I might point out to the member for Mt. Hawthorn that this session has only just begun and there will be plenty of time for that sort of thing. If the honourable member does not believe there is a great amount of unemployment in Western Australia at the present time he obviously has not read his papers, nor has he kept close to the people who are looking for employment.

The member for East Melville asked some questions of the Minister for Labour on Tuesday, the 21st March, concerning unemployment figures for the month of March for each of the years from 1959 to 1971. The Minister gave the figures from March, 1959, which was the last year of the previous Labor Government we had in this State. We see that in March, 1959, the unemployment figure was 2.4 per cent. It then fell considerably to the lowest in Australia, I believe—or certainly one of the lowest. It went down to 1.8 per cent. In 1967 it was 1.1 per cent., and in 1968 it was 1 per cent. It stayed at about that figure until 1970, and in 1971 the percentage of unemployment climbed to 1.46 per cent. On page 1 of *The West Australian* of the 14th March, 1972, however, we are informed that Western Australia has the highest ratio of unemployment in the whole of Australia; running at a figure of 2.94 per cent.

Mr. Blaikie: Do you think it is because of the Government's progressive policy?

Mr. WILLIAMS: It could be. I will have more to say about that later.

Mr. Taylor: Would you like to guess for how many of the 12 years under the previous Government the Western Australian average of unemployment was higher than the Australian average?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I have not checked it out, but I venture to say it probably was not the lowest.

Mr. Taylor: For seven of the 12 years it was the highest in Australia.

Sir David Brand: Definitely not.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will check the Minister's figures and I will have more to say about this later.

Mr. Taylor: If you like to put a question on the notice paper I will supply the answers.

Mr. Bertram: You acknowledge that the unemployment is the work of the previous Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will address you, Mr. Speaker, as the other members should not be interjecting. It seems to be the attitude of the present Government to blame the Commonwealth.

Mr. Taylor: Everybody else did.

Mr. Hutchinson: You didn't say that when you were on this side.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Government of this State blames the Commonwealth for all its ills.

Mr. Bertram: Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Governments of the other States are prepared to accept some of the blame for their unemployment. However, Western Australia has the highest unemployment rate—nearly 3 per cent.—and the Government of the State will not accept any of the responsibility.

From time to time we have heard the present Minister for Development and Decentralisation speak about the wonderful things which will occur in this State. At present we see nothing but a rise in the unemployment rate.

In recent days questions have been asked in this House as to how much money the Commonwealth is making available for unemployment relief in Western Australia. No mention has been made of how much the State Government is willing to contribute towards unemployment relief. The Commonwealth has footed the bill.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Commonwealth granted funds from State loan funds. In fact, this is State money.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This was to help relieve unemployment.

Mr. T. D. Evans: But it was State money.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Commonwealth should be given the kudos for helping the States out, even though some of the problems may have been created by the Commonwealth Government. I believe much of the present problem was created by our State Government.

I would like to refer to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation who seems to have developed a particular style when referring to different projects. In *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 18th March, appeared the Minister's statement about the underground railway. He said he would not give any more details as a result of Press interrogation or questions in Parliament. This is not the first time the Minister has made comments of that nature.

Mr. T. D. Evans: He would not have done that without precedent.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Probably not, but at least our Ministers did not blow their tops before the time was ripe. Our Ministers

would usually pass on the information unless perhaps it would affect the finalisation of an agreement.

In the *Collie Mail* of Thursday, the 28th October, 1971, appears a report of the visit to Collie by the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and the Minister for Mines.

Mr. Jones: They could not have visited a nicer place.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation made a very profound statement. He said that an industry of some magnitude was likely to come to Collie. He added that he hoped to receive advice from the venturers within three months. That was five months ago but as yet we have not heard anything. I imagine we would have been told of any developments. The Minister said—

This project will have features of direct and national benefit to Collie.

We hope this industry might come to Collie one of these days. The member for Collie is well aware of the problems in this area and I am sure the project would be of vital interest to him. The Minister goes on to say—

It would be wrong of me to state anything further, and this I refuse to do . . .

This is a similar statement to the Minister's remarks in last Saturday's issue of *The West Australian*.

On an earlier occasion the Minister for Development and Decentralisation visited Albany and made a great song and dance about the possibilities of a \$1,000,000,000 iron and steel complex. The Minister's comments were reported on this occasion in *The Albany Advertiser* of Monday, the 9th August, 1971.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You must admit he is a mobile Minister.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, but he is a very windy Minister, too. After making a great song and dance about the steel industry in Albany, he subsequently made another statement to the Press.

On Wednesday, the 11th August, 1971, I asked the Minister for Development and Decentralisation about a statement in the *South Western Times*, Bunbury. The question is as follows:—

In a statement to the *South Western Times*, Bunbury on Tuesday, 10th August, 1971, on steelworks for Western Australia, is he correctly reported as saying: "That the company could not afford to be sentimental or sympathetic towards any particular area . . . will be a matter of hard cold economics"?

Before he went to Albany the Minister knew it would be a matter of hard cold economics. However, he had to put on a show and give the people of Albany—and

indeed those in other country centres—the impression that this industry could go to a country centre. I am not saying this is not so, but the hard cold economic fact would be that there is no place like the metropolitan area.

I do not know whether the Minister realises, but many people in numerous country towns went to a great deal of trouble to research information in an attempt to gain this particular industry. I also asked the Minister if he would consider representations from other country towns. The Minister replied that if other country towns presented a case to him, he would pass it on to the company.

I do not know whether the Minister received any representations, but I know for a fact that quite a number of people in many towns spent considerable time and money researching the possibility of gaining this particular industry. These people would have found their work all to no avail because the whole project will be based on cold hard economic facts. The Minister has led them up the garden path. Whichever party is in power, Ministers should not make unfounded statements of this type to the public.

The Minister will find that he can cry wolf once too often. People will greet his ideas enthusiastically at first, but when no results are forthcoming they will refuse to do the work to assist the Government. They will not attempt to put a case for their particular town.

Mr. Reid: Forty men in the Albany district and 40 men in the Bunbury district have applied for unemployment benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This may be so.

Mr. Graham: What is the member for Bunbury complaining about?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am complaining about the Minister visiting country towns and suggesting that industry may be established there.

Mr. Graham: That is a fact.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister is just talking breeze.

Mr. Graham: The member for Bunbury does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister goes around the country making a great song and dance.

Mr. Graham: It would be an historical fact if you tried to do some thinking.

Mr. Court: Oh! That man in the glass house!

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would be very happy to see these industries established, for the Minister's sake, because he has made such a fool of himself around the countryside. The people will not believe a word he says.

Mr. Graham: Tommy rot! You are not Western Australian.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am Western Australian right to the bone—far more than the Minister.

Mr. Graham: Of course you are not; you are a Liberal and nothing else.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WILLIAMS: There is hardly a grain of truth in the Minister's statements. The Minister is grabbing at straws.

Mr. Graham: You will be disappointed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation would do better if he tried to be himself rather than emulate the previous Minister for Development and Decentralisation.

Mr. Graham: God save me from that!

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation will never be as good, as sharp, or as able as Mr. Charles Court.

Mr. Graham: Look who is talking! What an authority!

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister would be better off being himself than attempting to show off and be a better fellow than Mr. Charles Court. I suggest the Minister takes this advice.

Mr. Graham: Advice from you?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, it is strange, is it not?

Mr. Graham: It would be strange!

Mr. WILLIAMS: It would be strange for the mighty Acting Premier to take advice from a back-bencher of the Opposition.

Mr. Graham: Not so-and-so likely!

Mr. WILLIAMS: In the interests of the State, I hope the Minister for Development and Decentralisation will take my advice. Otherwise, he may find his chickens come home to roost!

After that little outburst, Mr Speaker—

Mr. Graham: That is a polite description of your remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I thought it was a good description, too. I thank the Minister.

I imagine the member for Collie is a little perturbed by some of the statements being made by the Government.

Mr. Jones: I do not think he is perturbed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I think the honourable member should be perturbed.

Mr. Jones: We will wait until the member for Collie has his say.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I have no doubt the member for Collie will have a few words to say to this motion. I usually enjoy his speeches as I hope he enjoys mine. We appreciate a chance to have a shot at each other.

Since we last met, Mr. Speaker, a decision has been handed down by the commissioners concerning an electoral redistribution. Perhaps two members of the House were sorry to see this decision. The electorates of Blackwood and Avon will virtually disappear. The member for Blackwood has other pursuits he intends to follow. We wish him well. I believe he has gained a great deal of respect in this House.

I should imagine the member for Collie is not very happy about the redistribution because his electorate will now contain part of the Blackwood electorate.

Mr. Jones: Could you tell us why he is leaving the ship?

Mr. WILLIAMS: The member for Blackwood is not leaving the ship; he is being thrown out of it by the commissioners, or it looks that way.

During the election campaign, and for some time previous, members of the present Government made promises to extend the coal contracts.

Mr. Jones: That is news to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I beg your pardon! The member for Collie stood up many times attempting to persuade our Government to extend the Collie contracts.

Mr. Jones: Are you saying the present Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS: As I remember it was one of the Labor Party's platforms in the election that the Government, if elected, would extend the Collie contracts.

Sir David Brand: Can Hansard see the member for Collie shaking his head?

Mr. WILLIAMS: In the *Collie Mail* last Thursday were reported the details of a letter written by the Minister for Electricity to the South West Regional Council of W.A. This letter was dated the 17th January, 1971.

The Minister's letter was a reply to one from the council asking the Government's intentions about the extension of the coal contracts. It is unfortunate that the Minister for Mines is away at the present time. However, other Ministers can make comments. They are probably aware of the details. No doubt the member for Collie is, too.

Mr. Jones: In fairness to Parliament would you also refer to the front page.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will refer to the letter and the member for Collie may refer to the front page. If he does his work I will do mine.

On page 2 of this letter the Minister for Mines said—

The fuel market is extremely flexible and is subject to continuing changes, and unless it is desired to give a privilege to an industry or a section of

the community, it would be most unwise to commit the Commission to a fuel policy beyond the current three-year contractual period.

To my way of thinking that is as good as saying, "We are not going to extend the contract beyond three years." However, when I asked the Minister for Mines a few days ago about the extension of the Colliie contracts he replied that the matter was still under consideration. This may be so, but I have a suspicion he has forgotten he ever signed the letter I have just read. Of course, somebody else may have written it and he signed it.

I know for a fact this uncertainty about the extension is causing a great deal of concern in Colliie. This does not do the member for Colliie any good. It was reported in the *Daily News* of the 3rd September, 1971, that some railwaymen had asked the member for Colliie to resign from the Labor Party and stand as an independent candidate.

I imagine now that some of the miners might ask him to resign and stand as an independent candidate, because I think he may have a better chance of being elected that way than he would as an endorsed candidate for his present party.

Mr. Jones: Is this jokes time?

Mr. WILLIAMS: However, that is up to the member for Colliie. He will make his own decision in due time, but no doubt he will be pushed by many people. In an area such as the one he represents, which accused the previous Government of doing nothing despite the fact that it was responsible for establishing a power station in the district which used a great deal of coal and kept many miners in employment, the present Government will have to run fairly hard to catch up with the development and progress that took place in Colliie under the previous Government. During the next few years the present Government could be in trouble in Colliie, in the light of the changes that have been made in that electorate. That is about all I have to say at the moment. Other matters that require attention I will raise during the appropriate debate in this Chamber at a later stage in the session.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [8.02 p.m.]: I apologise for my tardiness in rising, Mr. Speaker, but after this side of the House had provided one or two speakers I thought I might have to wait my turn to speak after a member on the Government side of the House had spoken.

Mr. Harman: We are all satisfied.

Mr. Hutchinson: You are easily satisfied.

Mr. STEPHENS: I was about to make the same comment. Most members have had a few words to say on your decision, Mr. Speaker, about the wearing of coats in the House. I do not wish to challenge your decision in any way, but I reiterate

the point made by other speakers; namely, that if we wore light-weight woollen coats the problem could be solved to a great extent. I think our discomfort could be further relieved if we also wore machine-washable woollen shirts. After all, if we were fully clothed in woollen garments, I think we could learn a lesson from the Arabs. I have been told that in the summertime the Arabs wear all woollen clothing to keep cool and so perhaps we could take a lesson from them, and that would be to our advantage.

I have been asked whether I wear a woollen shirt. I am pleased to be able to say that I wear a machine-washable woollen shirt, a woollen suit, and a woollen tie.

I now wish to speak about decentralisation. This subject seems to be popular in the Address-in-Reply debate and before the tea suspension the member for Blackwood made some interesting points and cited some specific examples of certain policies that reacted to the disadvantage of the rural community. I now wish to deal with the subject in a more general way.

I consider that in a country such as Australia, which is the most urbanised in the world because we have 70 per cent. of our population crowded into 31 cities which occupy an area of less than 1 per cent. of the total, decentralisation is a most important subject.

Melbourne and Sydney, the largest cities in the Commonwealth, are suffering from the problems of dust, pollution, noise, and traffic congestion. I therefore believe that decentralisation is one of the greatest economic problems facing Australia today. It is interesting to note that in 1968-69 even in the United Kingdom, which does not have the same problem of decentralisation that we have, an amount representing 1.5 per cent. of the Budget was spent on regional development policies. This percentage is considerably more than what has been spent in Australia or in any Australian State.

Unfortunately, in Australia there has been too much talk on decentralisation without any action being taken. The only possible exception is New South Wales, where the Department of Decentralisation has spent over \$20,000,000 in recent years endeavouring to bring about a solution. I had hoped that, in view of the emphasis placed on decentralisation by the present Government during the election campaign, on its assuming office great emphasis would be placed on a genuine decentralisation policy. Admittedly, the Government changed the name of the Department of Industrial Development to the Department of Development and Decentralisation, but unfortunately the change in name does not necessarily mean a change in policy or a change in emphasis on the implementation of that policy.

Mr. Graham: Did you hear of wool being transported to the Port of Albany at half the usual freight charges?

Mr. STEPHENS: I heard of a discussion between the Acting Premier and the member for Bunbury a little earlier in the evening.

Mr. Graham: I suppose reducing freights by one-half is doing nothing to help the country people!

Mr. STEPHENS: The point I was about to make before I was talked down was that in the Budget for 1971-72 there was an estimate of \$1,045,000 for the Department of Development and Decentralisation. This compares unfavourably with the amount that was actually spent in the previous year by the previous Government; that is, \$1,240,000. In effect, that is the expenditure estimated for the current year under the regime of the present Government which claims to emphasise decentralisation in its policy, but, in fact, it has allocated \$200,000 less to the Department of Decentralisation than was spent by the previous Government. I know that the present Government outlined an incentive plan for industry to decentralise, but I will return to that later.

It is easy to understand why industry has found sites for industry in the city more attractive. This is because of the proximity to markets, sources of technology, and labour. A large city population with extensive technical and tertiary education facilities means a ready-made source of skilled labour and professional assistance. It is usually argued that it is economically undesirable to interfere with the decisions made by industry in respect of location. Industry should be free to establish itself in the optimum location even if this leads to heavy concentration of industry in one area. Such a *laissez-faire* policy is assumed to lead to a minimum of private costs and maximum efficiency for the benefit of the economy as a whole.

However, although private sector costs and returns may be maximised, public sector costs may result in costs to society being rather excessive. I know only limited research has been carried on in Australia on the economics of centralisation, but what has been done points unmistakably to disproportionately increased costs where the city growth has been excessive. The New South Wales Department of Decentralisation searched the world in a vain attempt to find conclusive evidence of the cost of city growth and centralisation. Finally, it was forced to commission Dr. Neutze of the Australian National University to undertake some research on this subject.

In his report Dr. Neutze pointed out that the cost of traffic congestion, involving property acquisition, new road and bridge construction, traffic delays, restricted and

costly movement of goods and people, were major factors in increasing city service costs. To this, of course, we must add the problems that affect the quality of life in an overcrowded city, such as noise, crime and its detection, recreation, and sociological problems caused by an overcrowded environment.

Dr. Neutze, in his study, showed that basic service costs run in a U-shaped curve—that is, they are very high for a small community, reach a minimum in a medium-sized city, and increase when the city grows beyond the optimum size. I realise there could be some argument over what constitutes a city of optimum size. Dr. Neutze was inclined to the view that optimum size for economic service of Government is reached in a city with a population of 150,000 to 200,000 people. Other researchers have differed from this view, and have put the optimum figure on a somewhat higher level. Taking the higher figures of 300,000 to 500,000 as being the optimum population, a city that size could offer no saving in Government costs.

It is interesting to note that Perth has already passed the figure of 500,000 and even if an active policy were implemented now to curb the continued growth there would be a tendency for the city to continue to grow even at a somewhat slower rate. Perth has not yet reached the size of Sydney, but so that we may see what the cost to the community could be as a result of unchecked city growth, it is interesting to consider some of the conclusions of Dr. Neutze as a result of his studies.

He found that a 10 per cent. increase in traffic growth in Sydney would cost \$17,800,000 a year. Expressing this in another way, the cost, as a result of traffic congestion by the addition of each new resident in Sydney, was \$65 a year, whereas in Wollongong the cost would be \$4 a year and 20c a year in Wagga. So we can see what traffic congestion costs in a city that is becoming too large. Dr. Neutze went on to say that if the avoidance of traffic congestion in a city that is becoming too large were the only advantage of decentralisation, there would be a cost saving to the community of about \$300 a year for every worker who was decentralised, assuming that the worker would be followed by another worker to provide the local services that would be required.

From these few examples it can clearly be seen that there is a definite cost to the community with the continued and excessive growth of cities. If we are to succeed with an effective policy of decentralisation, we must divert industry and commerce into areas away from the metropolitan area. In the long run the cost to the community would be lower than meeting the excessive costs brought about by the continuance of the urban sprawl.

According to Mr. Kan, in his paper on *British Regional Policy and Some Implications for Australia*, there is evidence from Britain and other European countries indicating that the more severe regional economic differences become the more difficult it is to effect policy measures to reduce this imbalance. Also, the transfer of existing facilities is relatively rare and is usually extremely difficult to put into effect.

Learning from the European experience, the sooner positive action is taken, the more chance we have of successfully implementing an effective policy of decentralisation. Returning to the changes in the decentralisation policy to give greater encouragement to establish industries in country areas outlined by the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, it will be seen—and of course it is quite clear that these ideas are not to be implemented immediately, but phased in over a period of time—that an analysis of these ideas will indicate that the emphasis is on the reduction of capital costs and not operating costs.

I admit some inducement for industry exists in this plan, but the experience so far in Australia and overseas indicates that largely this approach to the problem—that is, the offering of inducements for the relief of capital expenditure—has failed. What is needed really is a policy which will reduce the operating costs so that decentralised industry when compared with its metropolitan counterpart will not be disadvantaged.

I think it is safe to say that, outside wages and raw materials, the two most costly items would be fuel and freight. All political parties accept the policy of a flat rate for electricity charges. Why cannot we adopt a flat freight rate? Although the transport system serves the State as a whole, it can be argued reasonably that the cost of the system is borne largely by those outside the metropolitan area. If they send anything into the city their returns are metropolitan prices less freight, and if they buy anything from the city the charge to them is the city price plus freight. Under this system it is reasonable to conclude that those living outside the metropolitan area bear the largest part of the cost of our transport system.

We should institute a policy which would enable the whole community to pay all the costs. Such a system could be called a co-ordinating freight equalisation scheme. Under such a scheme goods at the source of manufacture in the State would be levied and also those entering the State. This money would be placed into a fund from which would be paid all the freight costs throughout the State. In this way manufacturers in rural areas would not be disadvantaged by freight costs and a genuine reduction in the operating costs of industry would be effected.

I realise that a few problems would be encountered under such a scheme, but perhaps the Government would be prepared to finance a university graduate doing a Ph.D. course to study them. As I have said, my suggested system would place the manufacturers throughout the State on an equal footing, at least in relation to their raw materials and marketing.

This is only one measure which could be implemented, but further incentives must be offered to encourage decentralisation of industry. The State Government now has control over the payroll tax and this could be used to impose a relatively light tax on those in the country areas and a proportionately heavier one on those in the city.

While on the question of costs, although I realise this subject does not come within the province of this Parliament, I must say I consider some move should be made towards implementing flat-rate telephone charges. At first glance such a suggestion might seem rather ridiculous, but let us remember that a flat-rate postage charge applies throughout Australia. It does not matter whether a letter is sent from Perth to one of its suburbs or from Perth to a place at the top of Queensland, the charge is still 7c. Some research could be undertaken in order to institute a similar flat rate for telephone charges; because once again such a system would assist businesses and industries outside the metropolitan area. We would all then pay the same for our telephone calls.

Mr. Davies: Beyond a certain distance a standard rate is charged. For instance, the charge is the same for a call from here to Brisbane as it is from here to Adelaide.

Mr. STEPHENS: I believe that is correct, but the cost of a call from Albany to Perth is not the same as the cost of a call from Perth to a place much closer; whereas the cost of postage is the same for a letter sent from Perth to Brisbane as it is for a letter sent from Perth to Fremantle. This is the comparison I am making.

While on the subject of decentralisation I would like to make brief reference to the plight of country businesses. I know that, to a large extent, their fate has been tied up with the cash flow in the rural community, and I am pleased an improvement has occurred in this field with a corresponding improvement in the position of country businesses. However, I consider the State could help all country businesses by abolishing sliding or bulk discounts. If this were done, it would not matter whether a business bought one article or a large quantity of that article, the price for each one would be the same.

In effect, this is a form of wholesale price maintenance. I know that to many the expression "retail price maintenance" is a dirty one and it is only right it should

have been removed from the Australian scene; but as a result the problems of the small businesses have been aggravated.

Under the retail price maintenance scheme the businessman at least had a margin on which to work. Admittedly the big retailer or store had a bigger discount and a consequent greater margin; but at least the small man did have a margin. However, with the abolition of retail price maintenance the small businessman quite frequently has to pay a price almost equal to the price for which he can buy the same article from a big shop or retailer. I believe we should abolish the sliding discount system because the benefit to the country businesses would be quite substantial.

Most of the businessmen in the country areas are disadvantaged geographically because of the population distribution. In most instances it is impossible to compete with the big purchaser in the city or large country towns; and this is why I believe we must consider the scheme I have described. Of course, many people would argue that if an article is purchased in large numbers, a consequent saving is passed on by the supplier. I question whether this is always the case.

To give an example, I know one company which employs many salesmen on the road. About 12 months ago the salesmen were advised in a circular to buy one particular brand of fuel from service stations throughout the State. They were to obtain dockets and forward them to the head office in Perth which would then send them to Sydney. The firm would get a rebate of 6c a gallon on all purchases. These are individual sales of petrol, and not bulk purchases. It can be argued that if the petrol company can give a discount of 6c a gallon to certain buyers the price of its product to the whole community should be reduced. The point I am making is that these were not bulk sales, yet a discount was given.

Another case concerned a wholesaler in Albany who received various percentages of discounts depending on the number of packages he bought, and these discounts ranged up to a maximum of 30 per cent. on 500 articles. It did not matter how many multiples of 500 he purchased; he only got the maximum reduction of 30 per cent.

The traveller came around to see this wholesaler and advised him that owing to increased costs his firm would have to reduce the margin of discount. In the conversation the traveller was asked what would be the position of the chain stores, and the wholesaler was informed that there would be no difference in the discounts given to those stores.

From the two examples I have given, I suggest it is possible for the big chain stores, through their volume purchases, to twist the arms of the national suppliers

of goods to obtain discounts. To maintain their margin of profit the national suppliers are forced to increase the price to the small retailers who have no bargaining power. This could be used as an argument for the introduction of legislation to abolish sliding or bulk discounts.

With the introduction of freight equalisation and a wholesale price maintenance scheme along the lines I have mentioned, I feel that the small business established in the country would be saved and we would retain genuine competition, instead of finding that the State is dominated by one or two retail outlets.

Passing on from the question of decentralisation, I now want to make a few comments in regard to agriculture. I am happy to agree with the member for Northam that the rural situation has improved considerably. He went to some length to recount the achievements of the Minister for Agriculture, and I have no argument with what he said, except I think it was agreed by the honourable member that quite a lot of this legislation was a continuation of the work initiated by the previous Government. However, I do give the present Minister for Agriculture credit for continuing with that work.

In my view the improved agricultural position is due largely to two factors, neither of which is controlled by this Parliament or this State. The first is the improved weather pattern which the majority of farmers enjoyed last year. I say the majority of farmers, because I see the member for Avon looking at me! The second was the stand taken by the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) over deficiency payments and the continued operation of the Wool Commission in acquiring wool, so that the returns to the woolgrowers have risen, if not to the level they desire, at least to a more or less payable level. These two points are the principal factors in the present improved agricultural position.

I note also that we are moving towards an acquisition scheme for wool. I do not want to go into this matter at any length, because I realise the matter will be brought forward in the Federal Parliament. However, I would like to make some comments on an article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* dealing with a statement made by Mr. Ernest Lee Steere headed "Top brains for wool authority." The following appeared in that article:—

Mr. Lee-Steere said he did not think the new authority would mean the end of the auction system.

To most farmers in this State that is rather frightening. I question whether there is much point in having the top brains in the wool authority if it has to continue operating under an archaic system. It is like saying we should have the top brains running the transport system,

but it is to be restricted to a horse and buggy situation. That is the only comment I want to make in that regard.

I now want to make a comment on the Lamb Marketing Board. At the outset I make it quite clear that I am in no way reflecting on the man who is a member of the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association and who has been appointed to the Lamb Marketing Board. I indicated in a debate last year that I was a little sorry the growers did not have majority representation on the board. We finished up having two growers' representatives.

What I am not very happy about is that a person who is a member of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association has been appointed to the Lamb Marketing Board. I am opposed to this in principle because the P.G.A. has been, and I understand it is still, opposed to the Lamb Marketing Board and its functions.

This particular piece of legislation will break new ground in Australia. It is being watched virtually by all the States, and it is imperative that this legislation gets off the ground and proves to be a success. In view of the opposition of the P.G.A. I find it hard to understand why the Minister would appoint a man who is a member of that organisation. The pastoralists and graziers are quite entitled to their views, and we cannot challenge that; but what I do challenge is the fact that they, more or less, have stooped to distortion of the facts in their opposition to the lamb marketing scheme. This is the reason I am so much opposed to the appointment of a member of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association to the board.

I refer to one or two points that were set out in a letter which was circulated by the P.G.A. to lamb producers on the eve of the referendum on the statutory marketing authority. The following appeared in that letter:—

The administration costs can only be obtained by increasing the price to the consumer or lowering the return to the producer.

Of course, this completely ignores the fact that it may be possible to restrict the excessive profits that have been made by some processors. I think the fact that the profits are excessive can be borne out not only by my statement but also by a report on the mutton and lamb industry in Western Australia in 1969. In that report the following appears:—

Not all of the lower prices paid to farmers has been passed on to consumers, but increased costs of treatment, marketing and distribution account for some of the difference.

That indicates excessive profits have been made.

I refer again to the circular which was sent out by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association on the eve of the referendum in which the following appears:—

On top of this, the entire proposal has had such poor circulation and publicity (the formal announcement of the referendum was merely made in the public notices section of *The West Australian*) that all lamb producers have not been made aware just what is happening.

I find it difficult to understand this. Many reports appeared in the newspapers prior to the referendum, and one very substantial letter by a Mr. Raymond Rigg of Peppermint Grove appeared in *The West Australian*; that was in 1970. This gentleman was completely opposed to the authority being established.

His reasons were many, but one which he did not state may have been that he was also a member of a company which makes substantial profits—in the vicinity of 45 per cent. on its capital. The letter stated further as follows:—

The PGA has been told that brokers would not be prepared to finance most growers on the same lamb commission basis if an authority is established.

That may be a perfectly true statement; I have no means to challenge it. However, I challenge the implication by the brokers which is, in fact, blackmail: That the growers may not get the same consideration. That is the point.

Further in the letter it is stated, "The proposal is Government sponsored . . ." Of course, that is completely wrong; it was not Government sponsored. It was sponsored by the meat section of the Farmers' Union. Regarding the claim that not enough research had been carried out, I have with me a 29-page report on a submission by the Meat Marketing Committee of the Farmers' Union of W.A. on a statutory marketing authority for lamb. It is dated, March, 1969, and the report was made by the Rural Economics and Marketing Section of the Department of Agriculture, Western Australia. I would say that is an authoritative body.

As a result of that report the Farmers' Union carried out more research and re-submitted its proposals to the then Minister for Agriculture, the present member for Katanning. He took the proposal to Cabinet and Cabinet decided to appoint a three-man sub-committee to investigate the submission. That sub-committee reported to Cabinet in August, 1970, and a referendum was held in that year.

I find it hard to agree with the statement that the proposal was Government sponsored, and sufficient research had not been carried out. Again, that is misleading.

The next point made in the letter reads as follows:—

PGA believes that an authority should be established, as was recommended by Messrs. Towns and Austen in their Government sponsored report, to study the entire meat industry. This authority, representing the whole industry from grower to retailer, could research the aspects which have obviously been avoided in the case of the proposed lamb authority.

The facts here are that the Towns and Austen report was presented in May, 1970, to the Minister for Agriculture. On page 2, under the heading "Recommendations," No. 5 reads as follows:—

The establishment of a Meat Industry Authority to determine the need and capacity of new plants and where such plants should be built.

That was purely and simply in regard to abattoirs, not the meat industry as a whole as the P.G.A. tried to imply.

Mr. Bickerton: I do not think the honourable member likes the P.G.A.

Mr. STEPHENS: It is not that I do not like the association; I like people to keep to facts. I think the letter is an endeavour to confuse the farmers of this State and to entice them into a proposition. The P.G.A. sought to distort the facts. I trust that is the point I have made.

Mr. Bickerton: I still think you do not like the P.G.A.

Mr. STEPHENS: I think it can be appreciated why I object—and I think any sensible grower in Western Australia would object—to a man who is a member of the P.G.A. which put out a pamphlet such as the one I have quoted on the eve of a referendum for the setting up of a statutory marketing organisation. We can have no confidence in a man who represents an organization such as that. I hope I have made my protest.

Mr. Bickerton: You still do not like the P.G.A.

Mr. STEPHENS: The Minister for Housing said that, I did not. Getting away from the P.G.A. for a moment, I want to say a few words on other agricultural matters and I will refer firstly to abattoirs. This is a situation which I feel has been charged with a fair amount of emotion. I will admit that at one time there was an under-capacity with abattoirs. I think this was largely brought about by circumstances beyond the control of the previous Government.

Nevertheless, I feel the previous Government must accept some little responsibility for the situation which developed and which may have been responsible for the farmers losing some money. I am now concerned with the present trend to establish abattoirs throughout the State because the reverse situation could happen.

We could have an over-capacity of abattoirs which could also result in the farmers losing money. If there is an over-capacity of works they will not be working efficiently and the farmers, again, will have to pay.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I will now draw attention to a report published by the Department of Agriculture of Western Australia which gives a break-down of the likely developments which will occur with sheep, mutton, and cattle during the next five years. The actual number of cattle killed throughout the whole of Western Australia during 1971—in metropolitan and agricultural areas—was 377,988. Allowing for the works now under construction, which will come into operation by the end of 1972, the potential for cattle is 784,250. So it will be seen that the potential is in excess of the actual number killed.

Referring now to sheep, once again from the survey made by the Department of Agriculture, the total figure for export and nonexport for 1971 was 5,442,579. Again bearing in mind the works under construction at the present time, which will be in production before the end of 1972, the potential was 9,022,000. Here again, there could be considerable excess capacity by the end of the year.

I urge the Minister for Agriculture to give serious consideration to a recommendation contained in the Towns and Austen report which, at page 11, reads as follows:—

In our view, there is a real need for a Meat Industry Authority representative of the interests involved whose duty and responsibility it would be to continuously review the need for slaughtering capacity and determine when, and where, and the capacity of, new plants required.

I feel we have reached the stage where this should be an urgent consideration. Further in the report it is stated—

The establishment of a statutory authority with adequate licensing powers would of course require legislative action which at the same time should abolish the position of Controller of Abattoirs, a position which would become redundant.

I strongly urge the Minister to give urgent consideration to the implementation of that proposal in the report.

I did wish to say a few words on education as it applied to my area, but as I have already taken up most of my time I will conclude on that note. I support the motion before the Chair.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [8.45 p.m.]: In rising to speak to the Address-in-Reply at this point in the session it is a pity to have to say that we have entered probably one of the worst sessions, so far as Western Australia is concerned, since I have been in Parliament. Certainly it is one of the worst so far as the people of Western Australia are concerned because we now have in Western Australia the highest unemployment level for many years, more people leaving the State, and more insecurity. We have virtually gone from being a State on the move to what we might call a "sorry State". It is virtually a duplication of the 1953-59 era when, under a Labor Government, a glum and gloomy atmosphere prevailed in Western Australia. The Government's greatest achievements then were the same as they are now; namely, increased unemployment and loss of confidence. The Government must do something about this if it intends to get our State on its feet again.

Mr. Bickerton: When will you move the censure motion?

Mr. O'CONNOR: There is no sense in the Government.

Mr. Bickerton: Would it not be better to do it first?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister is very impatient. He has always been a little inclined this way but, more so, since he has become a front-bencher on the back benches.

Mr. Bickerton: There is nothing wrong with the back bench. It contains the cream of the community.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Government has been inactive about trying to create job opportunities and bolster confidence in this State. It must do this to get the State on its feet again. Not only is there great unemployment but, through loss of overtime, many people find their take-home pay is much less than it has ever been.

Mr. Lapham: That is the result of the Federal Government's attitude.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That remark is typical of the Labor Party which states the Commonwealth is not doing something and, in the meantime, sits on its backside and does nothing. It is typical of this Government which has done nothing to help relieve the unemployment position in this State. All that has been done has, in fact, been done by the Federal Government, as explained earlier on in this session.

Mr. Bryce: Instead of using waffling prescriptions why do you not give us some constructive arguments?

Mr. Court: Did the member for Ascot hear the speech made by his Premier at the "Carousel"? I refer to the theme of his speech which was an appeal to restore confidence.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The member for Ascot is not game to stand on his feet and give us his views. Not one member on the other side of the House has spoken to the motion but, instead, they sit and waffle on from the back benches.

Mr. Court: A ban has been imposed on them.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Members on this side of the House have not been beaten into submission; we are allowed to say exactly what we want to say.

Mr. Bickerton: You have certainly changed in 12 months.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I have always been prepared to do this. The Government, as I have said, has been inactive in creating job opportunities and it is high time it tried to do something about it. Whenever anything is mentioned the Government says, "The Commonwealth has done nothing." All the time it tries to blame the Commonwealth for faults it has itself created. Unfortunately a number of people believe what is said and actually think the Commonwealth has done nothing. I say it is high time the Government of this State commenced to programme its work and assist in creating job opportunities.

It was obvious in July last year that the unemployment position in Western Australia was becoming acute; at that time it was worse than in any other State in Australia.

Mr. Bickerton: I thought that was the way you wanted it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is the way the present Government has created it.

Mr. Bickerton: Your Government advocated an unemployment pool.

Mr. Hutchinson: The Minister will not find figures like the present ones applicable to our time in Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In May, 1971, it was quite obvious that this position would exist.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was obvious in January, 1970.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The position was quite good at that time.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Be objective.

Mr. O'CONNOR: On the 21st July, 1971, I asked the Premier a question which appears on page 89 of *Hansard*. I asked—

In view of the increased unemployment in this State, what steps does he intend to take to correct the present unsatisfactory trend?

Mr. Tonkin—not the member for Mirrabooka, but the Premier—replied—

The number of persons registered for unemployment in January, February, and March this year under the Government in which the member for

Mt. Lawley was a Minister, was the highest for each of these three months for the previous six years.

I interjected, I suppose unfairly, and asked—

That includes the school children you are referring to, does it?

The Premier continued—

Similar circumstances to those then existing are responsible for the present situation.

The Government is concerned at the position and has appointed a Cabinet subcommittee to give special attention to the situation at Albany.

What a remarkable performance it is to give consideration to the position at Albany; blow the rest of the State! He continued—

Appropriate steps within the Government's financial capacity will be taken to increase job opportunities

What had the Government done? Absolutely nothing! At that stage it was concerned with only one small part of the State—Albany—because of a kerfuffle at the time involving the local member—a Labor member—who was in a small amount of trouble.

Mr. I. W. Manning: A great deal of trouble.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This session I asked the Premier—

(1) What amount of additional money has been provided by the State Government this financial year to assist unemployment in Western Australia?

(2) How was the money used?

The Acting Premier replied—

(1) and (2) The whole of the \$2,990,000 additional works and housing loan funds allocation made available to this State in February has been directed to works with a high labour content that were able to be commenced at short notice.

I subsequently asked the Acting Premier, without notice, whether the amount of \$2,990,000, had been provided by the Commonwealth and he replied that it had. The position is that the Commonwealth Government has provided almost \$3,000,000 to relieve unemployment in Western Australia, but the Government of Western Australia has done nothing at all to relieve the position.

Mr. Graham: I think the member for Mt. Lawley should understand that every dollar of loan money comes from the Commonwealth. I am referring to every dollar available to the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Acting Premier should understand that Western Australia has the highest percentage of unemployment

of any of the other mainland States and it is high time the Government did something about it. The Opposition is concerned and the Government should be concerned.

Mr. Graham: We are spending every cent of our loan money.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This money comes from the Commonwealth, but your boys are blaming the Commonwealth.

Mr. Graham: It all comes from the Commonwealth, and always has.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It does not.

Mr. Graham: Every dollar of loan money comes from the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Not every dollar of money comes from the Commonwealth.

Mr. Graham: Yes, other than a few bodies which have their own borrowing powers, but these are very limited.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If we had done what the Government suggested in connection with road maintenance tax it would be even more limited, because those bodies would be a few million dollars worse off. The people know this.

Mr. Graham: The Opposition stopped us from giving effect to our electioneering programme.

Sir David Brand: It is not the decision of the Loan Council to make money available to the States under a formula.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The State Government has done very little, if anything, in this field. It is time it took action to stop the unsatisfactory trend and to create job opportunities for people so that the position in Western Australia can be reversed and, at least, brought up to the standard of the other States of Australia.

Another matter I wish to mention is the Ritter Report which was issued in the television and recreation room today. I hasten to say to the Deputy Premier that we appreciate any report which is issued and explained to us as members of Parliament. However, the report and explanation today was the most farcical I have heard since I have been a member of Parliament. Members of Parliament went to the room expecting to hear presented details of the report. When we arrived the booklet I have in my hand was issued to us. I understand it took approximately eight months to compile. To begin with, the Acting Premier got up and explained, in a semi-political way, a few views. That is fair enough. Then the author of this document, Mr. Ritter, got up and spoke for 28 minutes without mentioning anything about the report or explaining any details. Certainly I was present to hear such an explanation. Mr. Ritter went to sit down but, after the Acting Premier had a few words with him, he continued to speak for five minutes and made a few brief comments in connection with the report.

Three or four other gentlemen gave some further explanation and, obviously, they were trying to support the report about which members knew very little because the contents had not been explained to us. I think the Acting Premier himself must have been embarrassed about this. When anyone presents a report he should be prepared to explain it if he has something worth while to tell.

Mr. Hartrey: Mr. Ritter took it for granted that the member for Mt. Lawley could read.

Mr. Williams: One would need to be a quick reader.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I thought the member for Boulder-Dundas had more sense than that. The report was on the table at 2.00 p.m. and the proceedings started at 2.01 p.m. It is hardly possible to read a report in one minute.

Mr. Hartrey: I read it while he was speaking.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Then the member for Boulder-Dundas was lucky, because most of the others went to sleep. I do criticise this aspect quite strongly although I am not criticising the issuing of the report. It is good for reports to be issued but they should be explained to members and we should not be left to guess the details. From my point of view the presentation was a farce.

Mr. Burke: The member for Mt. Lawley is not criticising the report but its presentation?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will have something further to say on the report.

Mr. Burke: Has the honourable member read the report?

Mr. O'CONNOR: As much as I have had time to read.

Mr. Burke: You received it at 4.15 p.m. and you have now read the report?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I have read as much as I could in the time that has been available to me. I am not like the member for Perth. I have other things to do than sit and read reports.

It appeared that no explanation of the report could be given and that those present were trying to justify something they were not prepared to explain to us. I thought that was very bad. At this point of time I am not criticising the report. I am criticising the explanation that was given to us because it was the worst explanation I have heard since I have been in Parliament.

I would like to make a few points about the last page of the report. The 12 recommendations on the last page are worth looking at. The second recommendation is—

The Government should request the MRPA and the PERTS study team, with the help of consultants, to pre-

pare an outline plan for the region on the basis of a directional network and a safeguard plan.

It is not stated who the consultants should be. The next recommendation is—

The Government should request the MRPA, with the help of consultants, to prepare a list of functional criteria on the basis of which submissions for development can be judged, to take the place of urban zoning; recent large scale applications should be re-examined on the basis of points 1 and 2.

Recommendation 7 is—

The Government should ask the MRPA, with the help of consultants, to prepare and design the basic uniform standards for:

- (a) land use,
- (b) road design,
- (c) commercial and industrial layout,
- (d) residential layout,
- (e) open space and path systems,
- (f) service provisions,
- (g) provision of amenities,
- (h) a process for democratic participation.

Mr. Bickerton: Good stuff!

Mr. Hutchinson: Is there an asterisk next to "consultants"?

Mr. Bickerton: Do you remember all those reports your Government used to get?

Mr. O'CONNOR: This document appears to me to be a waste of another couple of years and to provide a job for a consultant and some planners. When their job is completed, another Minister in the position of the Acting Premier could come up with another idea, and this could go on and on. The way this report was presented indicates there is not much in it and that it is something the Government could have let go, when one considers the time it could take to prepare it and the money involved in it.

Mr. Graham: Why did your Government not endorse the previous plan, on which years of work were done and countless thousands of dollars spent?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Acting Premier is talking out of his hat again.

Mr. Graham: You can say rude things.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Acting Premier says them to me.

Mr. Graham: I asked you a question: Why did you not endorse it?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Acting Premier knows why as well as I do. It took 12 months, or a little less, to draw up the report.

Mr. Graham: It took longer.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It did nothing of the kind.

Mr. Graham: I happen to know that.

Mr. Court: What are you talking about?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Nielsen report.

Mr. Graham: I am talking about the Corridor Plan report. You are discussing town planning.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am referring to the Nielsen report.

Mr. Graham: Why did you not endorse the M.R.P.A. plan for the corridors?

Mr. Court: Did not the Premier deal with that in his policy speech?

Mr. Graham: It was on the then Premier's table for a couple of months and at the expiration of that time the Government did not endorse it.

Mr. Court: You are quite wrong, you know.

Mr. Graham: I am quite right.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If we had endorsed the plan at that time, which was a month or two before the elections, the Acting Premier would have been the first to criticise us for taking that action with an election on our doorstep. I see nothing wrong in waiting for two months until the election was out of the way.

I want to comment on the Nielsen report. I ask the Government to shake itself up and get on with the job in the interests of Western Australia. I ask the Government to have something done about this report. Traffic congestion is building up in this State and unless positive action is taken chaotic conditions in the field of transport will exist before long.

Mr. Graham: There was no urgency for 12 years but suddenly, after 12 months, you have become very game.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Acting Premier has more to say now than he has said right through the session.

Mr. Court: He is very toey when he thinks there might be a no-confidence motion.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The previous Government appointed Dr. Nielsen—a very able and competent person—to prepare a report. This man was so highly thought of that he was appointed to do a job in New South Wales at twice the salary he received in Western Australia. In my opinion, the job he did here was first class. His recommendations included a viable central city and corridor system. This is a point on which the Acting Premier and others do not agree. They are entitled to their views.

In 1966, 184,650 vehicles were registered in the metropolitan area. It is anticipated that in 1989 there will be 680,000 vehicles.

One can imagine what the traffic situation will be at that time unless something is done.

Mr. Graham: It will be done.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Not if the present Government remains in office. By the time this report has been completed, the present Government could be out.

Mr. Graham: In 12 years nothing was done.

Mr. O'CONNOR: There will also be a drop in the ratio of people to cars from 3.5 to 2.1 by 1989.

Sir David Brand: It was 12 years of activity that built up the number of cars.

Mr. Graham: Your plans relating to the Pilbara we never saw. The PERTS and Corridor Plans you did nothing about. The power transmission lines you did nothing about.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Nielsen Report is very interesting. Assessments have been made of increases in the population and of the number of vehicles up to 1989. The vehicle and population movements were also assessed by Dr. Nielsen. Town planning and the corridor system are important matters affecting the State. Parking charges were assessed and valued up to 1989.

The plans recommended were developed from five alternative propositions and incorporated operational effectiveness, economic justification, financial feasibility, preservation of environmental standards, and conditions of effective implementation. The component parts of the plan were land use, highway systems, public transport, and parking charges. It can therefore be seen that Dr. Nielsen went into extensive detail.

The report made to us was an extremely interesting and good one. I think this was even admitted by the present Premier after Dr. Nielsen delivered his report at the university. When Dr. Nielsen delivered his report he explained it extremely well so that members could understand what was going on, and at the time they were able to ask questions about anything they did not understand.

The recommendations in the report included a busway on railway land to replace the existing railway line. I do not know whether the unions brought pressure to bear to have that recommendation discarded but I think it is extremely important and should be proceeded with. The Nielsen report contained the following important comments:—

To make the contribution required the busway system must be substantially completed and operational by 1979.

The first important sections—i.e. those on the existing railway reserve leading into the central city—should be operational by 1975.

That gives us a little less than three years from now.

These busways can later be converted to high speed rapid transit systems with through traffic and bypass roads. The plan provides for off-street parking and no parking in the central city area. This will give a much better flow of traffic, particularly in the peak periods. It will certainly increase the capacity of traffic flow and reduce the number of buses on many of the highways. The advantages of a rapid transit system compared with the present system can be understood when it is realised there would be a freeway system from Fremantle to Midland on which there would be buses only which would divert into the freeway from Innaloo, Scarborough, Claremont, and other points.

All buses would be taken off roads such as St. George's Terrace, Hay Street, Barrack Street, and Murray Street, and that would certainly ease the flow for private vehicles. This Government is apparently dallying with the scheme.

I nearly fell over when I opened the paper the other day and saw comments regarding the underground railway in the new PERTS plan. It was stated in *The Sunday Times* that the railway would possibly go under Hay Street and it would cost \$5,000,000 a mile. I do not know who would build it for that amount. It would have to be slave labour.

When the previous Government was considering a sunken railway for three-quarters of a mile, the cost involved was about \$10,000,000. This was virtually an open-cut railway and not a tunnel. To tunnel under Hay Street, leaving a shell on top, would endanger the buildings. The tunnel would have to be very deep to allow proper protection to the buildings and foundations. A number of buildings in Perth are on 130-ft. pile foundations. What do we do with these?

The previous Government looked at these propositions and decided they were impractical. An underground railway is just not possible because the State does not have the funds to proceed with it. We do not have the funds to electrify the system. We already have a fairly good train system operating in the metropolitan area. Our main need is for more passengers to use the system. Most of our trains are fairly new and cost many millions of dollars. If we electrify the system, what do we do with these trains? Do we give them away or sell them at the best price we can obtain? However, we would still have to provide electrified trains. Members can imagine the depth of tunnel required under Hay Street.

A conservative estimate of the cost of an electrified system and an underground railway beneath Hay Street is \$200,000,000. To speak of \$5,000,000 a mile is just rubbish.

Mr. Graham: From where did you get your figures? I did not subscribe to *The Sunday Times* figures.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Perhaps the Acting Premier would check with the Commissioner of Railways. A similar proposition to this one was put forward by Edgar Booth some time ago. In fact, the Premier had copies of this report and asked one or two questions about it at the time. The then Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Horigan), was the man with whom I prepared this report. The Acting Premier will find that a figure of \$5,000,000 a mile for an underground railway system is just tommy rot.

Mr. Graham: I think you should talk to the editor of *The Sunday Times* and not to me.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I again emphasise that the Nielsen Report stressed that important sections of the report should be in operation by 1975, and the busway system substantially completed by 1979. This Government has made no firm decisions. I believe it should become active on this report. The previous Government had made some decisions on this. The Acting Premier asked about some details of the report but I feel he was referring to the town planning report.

Preparation of the Nielsen Report commenced early in 1970, and the report was submitted to me on the 14th December, 1970. A sub-committee studied the report and within four days it, in turn, submitted a report to Cabinet.

Again we have a sub-committee organised by the Acting Premier or his Government to study the report. They have been on the job for 12 months and have reached no conclusion.

Mr. Graham: What decision did your committee come to?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will tell the Acting Premier in a moment.

Mr. Graham: I would be pleased to know.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Our sub-committee took four days to report and the present Government's sub-committee has already studied the plan for 12 months. This goes to show what a slowing-down process has taken place in the Government.

Mr. Jamieson: You do not know what good plans we have prepared in that time.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I would like to quote Sir David Brand's remarks in his policy speech. He said—

In this spirit we will develop a flexible transport plan along the guidelines established by the Nielsen Report released last week:

We will create a Metropolitan Region Transport Authority.

We will replace suburban rail lines with bus freeways.

We will build two major bus stations in Perth—one on the Technical College site, and one completely underground where the Perth railway station now stands.

We will integrate the new bus stations with pedestrian thoroughways being developed by the Perth City Council.

We will provide circulating bus services around the city centre.

We will develop a financial plan to cover what is expected to be a \$400 million programme.

We shall immediately call for public comment and circulate the Nielsen proposals to those especially interested.

By May this year we will begin to make firm decisions.

Mr. Jamieson: Where did you plan to terminate the country 3 ft. 6 in. passenger trains?

Mr. O'CONNOR: These trains would have come to East Perth.

Many people thought the Nielsen Report would cost the State an additional \$400,000,000. That is incorrect; it would have cost something like \$53,000,000 over 20 years. In his report Dr. Nielsen suggested ways in which this additional money could have been found. I do not say they are the best ways, but at least he put forward propositions to accumulate the money from various sources—

Mr. Hutchinson: He anticipated obtaining the majority of the money from the Main Roads Department.

Mr. O'CONNOR: —and some from the Perth City Council in parking fees. He also anticipated obtaining money from the householders because it is these people who create transport problems.

Mr. Jamieson: That is socialistic!

Mr. O'CONNOR: By letting this report lie idle the Government is forgetting the urgency of overcoming the transport problems of this State. It is time the Government did something about the report. We will have traffic chaos in this city while the Government studies the report.

Mr. Jamieson: We will have pretty parks and gardens by that time.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I believe the Nielsen Report is a good one. I have quickly covered the Ritter Report because this was not explained to us today. I will have the opportunity to look into this further. In my opinion the detail relating to transport in the Nielsen Report is very well set out, and I believe the Government should set up a metropolitan regional transport authority to adopt Dr. Nielsen's recommendations in

connection with our traffic system over the next few years. If the Government does not act quickly, the scheme will be useless.

One other point I wish to mention is the unsavoury interference by the Government in police matters. I have never known interference of this sort in any State of Australia, or anywhere else in the world. If the Government continues in this way it will undermine police efficiency.

On one occasion the secretary of the Minister for Police was sent to the Police Department personally to see that photographs taken of demonstrators were destroyed. If people are going to demonstrate and cause trouble in this State they should be identified. Yet when the police took photographs of the demonstrators—and they may be trouble makers; I do not know—so that they could be identified, what happened? An instruction was sent to the Minister's secretary personally to see the photographs destroyed.

Mr. Hartrey: We had all this last year.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Well, we are having it again this year because it is still as bad. The member for Kalgoorlie—I am sorry; I am downgrading him—or I should say the member for Boulder-Dundas, must be equally perturbed about this. That is why it is coming into his mind so much. This involved the moratorium march, the demonstration against the Springbok's tour, and several other demonstrations in this State. I condemn the Government for the action it took in those instances.

If those were the only cases it would be bad enough; but other cases have occurred in which the Government has taken action along similar lines—virtually taking the law into its own hands. We in Parliament make the laws. If they are wrong let us change them. But do not let the Government break them. Good heavens, we send our police out to do a job. Why abuse and confuse them? That is what is happening.

I mention, for instance, the Brockman issue. Last year at the end of the session I spoke on this matter when the Government intervened and instructed the police to let Brockman out on bail. This is a man who cost \$30,000 to catch, and the Government let him out on bail. If the Government felt that way it should have pulled the police away from the search and stopped them apprehending Brockman; instead the Government allowed the police to waste their time, energy, and efforts and then deflated them by saying, "Away he goes."

Mr. Graham: He did not go away.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Did he stay in gaol?

Mr. Graham: No, but he did not go away.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Well, he did not stay in gaol. Last year I spoke on the preferential treatment accorded to Brockman, and

it has become worse this year. I was unable to mention this last year because the matter was *sub judice* at the time; however, I would like to mention now that this man broke out of gaol—in itself an offence—broke into the homes of a number of people, and did irreparable damage to many vehicles. But when he was brought back the Government intervened and instructed the police to drop 29 charges.

Mr. Hartrey: What would you have done?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I would have allowed the law to take its course and, as a lawyer, I think the member for Boulder-Dundas would have done the same. The honourable member is still trying to interject, but he will have the opportunity later to get to his feet and say what he wants.

Mr. McPharlin: The people in the area concerned are afraid that this could happen again.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Government is encouraging it to happen again. If a person goes ahead and commits the same crimes, surely the same treatment should be accorded him. I believe this action on the part of the Government is disgraceful and that preferential treatment such as this should not occur. In my opinion the Government should let the law take its natural course. If it felt that the term of imprisonment was unfair it has the opportunity to take action to reduce it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Isn't that interfering with the course of justice?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am talking about the interference with the law; there is a difference. If the Minister wants to talk about justice, I could mention another case. However, I will not.

Mr. Jamieson: Do not let our feelings interfere with you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Here we have a case in which the Premier has set himself up as judge and jury in order to decide who will be let off and who will not. However, getting back to the point I was making, I believe that the charges should have been proceeded with and if the Government felt that justice was not done after the law had taken its proper course, it would have had the opportunity to reduce the penalty. But here we have Parliament making the laws and the Government breaking them. I think that is disgraceful.

Mr. Hartrey: What law did the Government break?

Mr. O'CONNOR: As the honourable member is a lawyer I know he would not know.

Mr. Hartrey: Tell us which law the Government broke.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We make these laws and we instruct the police to carry them out. However, the police are confused at

the present time because they do not know what to do. We should give the Police Force a lead by providing them with laws to enforce and then correctly supporting them and ensuring that they are properly looked after.

Mr. Burke: Isn't it a fact that the wages and conditions of the Western Australian Police Force compare more than favourably with those of the other forces in Australia?

Mr. T. D. Evans: There have been fewer resignations in the Police Force since we have been in Government.

Mr. Hartrey: The police are not concerned with punishing a man, only with catching him.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I feel very strongly about interference in internal Police Force operations, and I ask the Government to let the law take its course in future. I ask this because I believe the law should take its proper course in all cases. If the Government feels that a person is unfairly treated it has an opportunity to do what it wants to do.

Mr. Hartrey: Quote the law you think was violated.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I know we will be very interested to hear what the member for Boulder-Dundas has to say.

Mr. Court: He has already spoken.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Then his speech cannot have been very interesting because I cannot remember it.

Mr. Graham: You were not in the House.

Mr. McPharlin: If that sort of treatment can be provided, wouldn't it be fair to ask for compensation for the victims of this gentleman's activities?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Government is not concerned about the victims. If someone loses his car or has his home broken into that does not worry the Government. It merely wished to let Brockman out of gaol; it was not concerned with the victims of his operations. I castigate the Government for operating in a despicable way, and I close my speech with that remark.

Adjournment of Debate

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [9.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment of debate) put and negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [9.21 p.m.]: I certainly did not want to take part in the debate on the Address-in-Reply at this late hour of the night. I expected the debate would continue tomorrow and next week. However, it appears that it will collapse tonight. In the circumstances there is one issue I would like to take up.

It relates to a question asked today of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation by the member for East Melville. The question is as follows:—

Since it has generally been accepted that the establishment of Klinger Asbestos of W.A. came about as a result of an overseas mission by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., when a Minister in the Hawke Government, would he confirm or deny the following statement which appears on page 12 of the booklet "Hancock and Wright" by John F. Moyes—

"And they (Hancock and Wright) had persuaded an Austrian firm to establish Klinger Asbestos of W.A., with a factory in Perth for processing Asbestos."?

The reply of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation was to the effect that the statement was incorrect.

I want to say I think that is an extraordinary question. In all Parliaments there is such a thing as a Dorothy Dix type of question. Normally such a question is asked by a supporter of the Government, and when he asks the question he knows full well what the answer will be. But in this situation we have a member of the Opposition asking a Dorothy Dix type of question.

Mr. Court: You are neither fair nor correct. You could hardly imagine the member for East Melville being a tool of the Government.

Mr. Graham: I can vouch for that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is an interesting comment from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I think we will have to pursue that further. Certainly I think we could hardly imagine the member for East Melville asking a question of that kind.

Mr. Bickerton: We will have to give him a tool allowance.

Mr. Court: The Acting Premier would be quick to deny that he had any arrangement with the member for East Melville.

Mr. Graham: I can assure the member for South Perth that there was no collusion whatsoever.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We will see how much truth there is in that.

Mr. Graham: Surely you will take my word for it!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I want to say that it is an extraordinary thing for a member of the Opposition virtually to praise the Government in order to obtain a certain type of answer.

Mr. Graham: He might have thought he was debunking the Premier.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Let us consider the question again. It is as follows:—

Since it has generally been accepted that the establishment of Klinger Asbestos of W.A. came about as a result

of an overseas mission by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., when a Minister in the Hawke Government, would he confirm or deny the following statement which appears on page 12 of the booklet "Hancock and Wright" by John F. Moyes—

"And they (Hancock and Wright) had persuaded an Australian firm to establish Klinger Asbestos of W.A., with a factory in Perth for processing Asbestos."?

Mr. Jamieson: Just as well there is going to be a river to act as a border of the two electorates after the redistribution of seats.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the Hawke Government went out of office in 1959. Subsequently, on the Estimates and the Address-in-Reply there was a great deal of debate on the effectiveness or otherwise of the visit by Mr. Tonkin to Europe. I can recall some members on our side of the House saying that the visit was completely ineffective. Now we have a situation where a member on this side of the House virtually says to the Government, "You are responsible for establishing this and yet Hancock and Wright are claiming credit for it." That is why I say that so far as I am concerned this is insincerity in its worst form.

Apparently there is an understanding between one member on this side of the House and another member on the other side to denigrate two individuals and slander them under privilege in this House. That is what it means, because of what I will tell the House very shortly. I want to be certain that every member knows what precisely is meant, in view of the question and the type of answer that was given to it.

Any member would know it was done to denigrate this 80-page booklet on Hancock and Wright written by John F. Moyes from the Eastern States, and to establish that there were statements in the booklet that could not be substantiated.

In actual fact, the question that was asked represents high praise for the booklet. If someone looked through it and this was the only statement that could be queried—the only conclusion that could be arrived at is that the question is high praise for the booklet, taking into account the circumstances in which the booklet was written. It is an 80-page booklet written by an Eastern States' journalist in 21 days. The author has written a preface to the book. In this preface he says—

This does not pretend to be a biography of Lang Hancock and Peter Wright. No-one could attempt that in 80 pages—or do the necessary research and writing in twenty-one days.

Yet in this House we have a member who looked through this booklet and quoted an extract from it, following which he asked a Dorothy Dix question and obtained the answer he sought.

Mr. Hartrey: Is the answer wrong?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is very wrong and it is slandering Hancock and Wright. It illustrates the pettiness that has been shown towards Hancock and Wright at all levels for many years. It illustrates the pettiness of members of this Parliament.

Mr. Court: If you read again the question asked by the member for East Melville you might put an entirely different construction on it. The Premier took such credit for the industry; thus the member for East Melville was probably trying to embarrass the Premier.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will quote to the House what appears on page 12 of this booklet to which I am referring. It reads as follows:—

Hancock and Wright were mining blue asbestos at Wittenoom and white asbestos at Nunyerry. They had established Whim Creek Copper for the use of its products in the manufacture of superphosphate. They had formed Pilbara Exploration for the extraction of tin near the Shaw River. And they had persuaded an Austrian firm to establish Klinger Asbestos of W.A., with a factory in Perth for processing asbestos.

The quote was taken out of that particular paragraph which is of no real importance at all. Yet here we have a question asked in this House that indicates there are inaccuracies in that booklet. I am horrified at the answer given by the Minister. I do not blame the Minister for Development and Decentralisation. The Premier is absent and it is a question that should have been asked of the Premier, but I should imagine that in view of the Premier's absence it would only be natural for the Acting Premier to say precisely what he did say, especially if he did not know the circumstances surrounding the whole issue.

What I take exception to is that we should have a Dorothy Dix question asked by the member for East Melville directed to a member of the Government in order to get a certain reply in the circumstances to which I have referred.

Mr. T. D. Evans: There was a Dorothy Dix question asked yesterday in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Of course, the facts of the matter make the answer that was given completely untrue.

Mr. Graham: As the reviewer of the book, do you not think you should declare your interest in this matter?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will declare my interest. I certainly did review the book. I want to say that Hancock and Wright are no particular friends of mine. I have disagreed violently with some of the views expressed by this gentleman from time to time on the subject of conservation. I am referring of course, to Mr. Hancock. During all the years I have been a member of

this House the Acting Premier will know that time after time, on the question of conservation, I would go as far as to cross the floor of the House because of my interest in the matter. So I do not think I am a particular friend of Mr. Hancock, especially when we hear on television or read in the Press his statements which decry conservation.

Before today I have said on more than one occasion, prior to the recent controversy, that I have met Hancock only twice in my life. I met him for the first time in the Pilbara in 1950 when Mr. Hancock was a member of the Pilbara Exploration Mining Company. He was inspecting a mining plant on the opposite side of the creek to where we were mining. The expression used in describing him at that particular time was that he was as hard as goats' knees. However, he was also a businessman who was highly respected in the north-west. If he committed himself he honoured the commitment and this is what I respect. In those years, when there was very little mining in the Pilbara, one had to be firm, and Mr. Hancock was firm. This is the reason for his getting the reputation of being hard in business.

Let me now take the opportunity to tell members why the question that was asked today and the answer given to it is slanderous as far as Hancock and Wright are concerned, but before I do and whilst we are on the other aspect, I would like to say that Hancock, in particular, has had a long association with Western Australia. In the early part of last century his relatives sailed from Fremantle to travel to Cossack in the Pilbara district and it was his sister who had the first white child in the north-west. The association of the Hancock family stems from that date. Members of the family took up pastoral properties, and the family has been there ever since.

In the circumstances I cannot begin to comprehend why members on both sides of the House should indulge in the pettiness we have seen to denigrate those whom I regard as being good Australians. We have had a question asked today in a deliberate attempt to indicate that there are inaccuracies in the booklet from which I have quoted extracts, and that, therefore, Hancock and Wright are liars. That is what the question intends to imply. What do we find? We find that a representative of Klinger Asbestos came to this State years before the existence of the situation we are talking about today.

He came to Western Australia at the request of Hancock and Wright who were mining asbestos at Wittenoom Gorge. This representative, after arriving in the State, visited Wittenoom Gorge in the early 1950s. He inspected the asbestos mine at Wittenoom; then he came back and reached agreement with Hancock and Wright to purchase the deposit of asbestos

at Wittenoom and to proceed with the building of a factory in Perth. That was the situation in the early 1950s.

Then another organisation came into the picture. Klinger Asbestos was an Austrian company which had its headquarters or a branch office in Britain. In this way Britain came into the matter. In that country there was a department known as the Controller of Alien Enemy Assets. After Hancock and Wright had reached agreement with that organisation, the department in Britain prevented the money from being taken out of Austria or England. It vetoed the deal. That was how far the association went back.

Certainly it was years later that the present Premier of the State took a hand in inducing the firm to come to Western Australia and establish a factory. I understand that Hancock is in the north-west at the present time. Tonight I rang Mr. Wright and he confirmed what I have said. The important thing is that they had persuaded the company to come to Western Australia years before. That is why I resent the question asked by a member of the Opposition in the following terms:—

Since it has generally been accepted that the establishment of Klinger Asbestos of W.A. came about as a result of an overseas mission by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., when a Minister in the Hawke Government, would he confirm or deny the following statement which appears on page 12 of the booklet "Hancock and Wright" by John F. Moyes—

"And they (Hancock and Wright) had persuaded an Austrian firm to establish Klinger Asbestos of W.A., with a factory in Perth for processing Asbestos."?

I would hope that in the light of those facts all who are parties to this sort of question will realise that Hancock and Wright had an association with that company which went back years previously. That is why I am bringing up this matter this evening; I am also bringing it up because I deplore pettiness which arises from a question of that kind being asked, and answered by a member of the Government, with the sole object of denigrating under parliamentary privilege a person who is not in a position to answer the charge.

After listening to the reply to that question I am sure every member in this House would have gained the impression that Hancock and Wright would put all sorts of wrong statements in this book. I deplore that. As members of a State Parliament we should realise that we are small fish in a fairly big sea. In looking at the legislation that we have passed I cannot see much anywhere along the line which benefits humanity; therefore I think our efforts are of little consequence in the

general scheme of things. When I see Parliament being used under privilege for the express purpose of denigrating people who are not in a position to reply I am horrified. I take this opportunity to speak, only because of that. I wanted to speak at greater length on the Address-in-Reply, but obviously the debate will collapse tonight; therefore I will refrain from going beyond this matter and leave the other subjects I want to deal with to other occasions.

Mr. R. L. Young: Could I ask you this question: What about the extracts of speeches which appear on page 35 of the booklet in question? Paragraph after paragraph have been left out. If this is not inaccurate reporting—a charge which the book makes against *The West Australian*—I do not know what is.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The booklet contains a condensed version of the speeches appearing in *Hansard*. On page 35 some excerpts of the speeches are set out. There has been an inaccuracy, but it is in favour of Hancock and Wright. One passage from page 35 states—

One wonders, too, why other statements in the Legislative Assembly, failed to find room in the "West". Here, for the record, are a few, taken from *Hansard*:

Mr. Grayden (Lib. South Perth): Has the Minister (Mines Minister May) experienced mafia-like tactics from Hancock and Wright?

Mr. May: "Definitely not".

Here we get to the crux of what the member for Wembley has been referring to. He said passages have been left out. That was an extract from a long speech I had made. To continue with what appears on page 35—

Mr. Young (Lib. Wembley): "I am not making this speech on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. My own belief is that the inquiry should be made on all facets.

Then we come to what the Deputy Premier said—

Mr. Graham (Deputy Premier): "Including whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition threatened overseas firms that if they held talks with Hancock and Wright they would be investigated too?"

Anyone looking at that would know these are simply extracts.

Mr. R. L. Young: I hope the honourable member will read further.

Mr. GRAYDEN: To continue with the extracts—

Mr. Young (Lib. Wembley): "The last Government did everything possible to get Hancock and Wright to the table.

Mr. Graham (Deputy Premier): "Are you sure of that. For months the Minister (Court) could not even talk to them."

There is an error there and it is strongly in favour of Hancock and Wright. This is where the error occurs—

Mr. Graham (Deputy Premier): "Are you sure of that. For months the Minister (Court) could not even talk to them."

In actual fact what he said was that he "would not even talk to them," and that is infinitely worse. They did not go to the Press and complain about that error, yet we have a member on this side of the House asking a Dorothy Dix question which indicates there is an understanding between members on this side and members opposite on an issue which I deplore.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Jones.

House adjourned at 9.43 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 23rd March, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION

Kindergarten Assistance

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) (a) What amount does the Government pay by way of annual grant to local kindergarten committees; and
 - (b) on what basis is this money distributed?
- (2) (a) What amount does the Government pay by way of annual grant to the Kindergarten Association;
 - (b) what is the formula for arriving at this figure; and
 - (c) for what purposes is the money used?
- (3) (a) What was the formula for providing for grants adopted; and
 - (b) is it the intention of the Government to consult with the Kindergarten Association with a view to reviewing the needs of the Kindergarten movement, particularly in respect to revising the formula to provide for substantial increases in grants?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1) (a) Building grants	\$54,000
Needy Kindergartens Grant	\$12,000
Total	\$66,000

- (b) Building grants are allocated in order of application. Needy kindergarten grants are distributed on the basis of need.
- (2) (a) The amount varies on the basis of pupil enrolments. The amount paid in 1971 was \$448,567.
 - (b) Annual Grant = College grant + Administration grant + Child subsidy.
 College grant = \$40,000 + 5% cost rise per annum × current maximum teachers' salary at 1st July ÷ Base year salary of \$3,397.
 Administration grant (as for College grant).
 Child subsidy = \$50 × % increase in teachers' salary at 1st July ÷ Base year salary of \$3,397.
- (c) Salaries, college costs and contingencies.
- (3) (a) The original formula was adopted in 1954 and most recently revised in 1970.
 - (b) The Government will consider a request from the Kindergarten Association for a revision of the formula.

2. and 3. *These questions were postponed.*

4.

HOSPITALS

Leonora and Laverton: Office Accommodation

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What office accommodation is provided for the recently appointed Secretary at the Leonora and Laverton Hospitals?
- (2) Is the office accommodation considered adequate?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "no", what action is proposed to improve the situation?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) At both hospitals the Secretary will use existing office accommodation.
- (2) No.
- (3) At Leonora the question of rebuilding certain sections including office accommodation is being investigated at present. At Laverton no final solution to the problem has yet been found, but ways