

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 29th March, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton): I wish to advise members that the time for questions for Tuesday, the 11th April, will close at 12.00 noon on Thursday, the 6th April.

QUESTIONS (20): ON NOTICE

1. TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Rockingham Sites

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he describe the sites selected for a technical school and institute of technology at Rockingham?
- (2) Will he advise whether or not the Tertiary Education Commission has made recommendations in the past as to the establishment of these institutions at Rockingham, and what these recommendations were?
- (3) Have these recommendations been changed in the last 12 months and what are the present intentions now as to the establishment of the institutions?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) As a result of representations by the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission a triangular site of 143 acres, bounded by Day Road, Dixon Road and Mandurah Road has been set aside for future tertiary education development as well as for technical education, the latter requiring about 25 acres of the area. This site is at present in the ownership of the Metropolitan Planning Authority, and the whole or portions of it will be transferred as funds become available.
- (2) and (3) There has been no change in site policy as far as the commission is concerned and the commission will consider the planning of a future tertiary institution at an appropriate time. The commission is not empowered to establish technical schools or colleges.

2. BUNGAREE SCHOOL

Reticulation Scheme

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is the reticulation scheme for Bungaree primary school due to be completely installed?

- (2) Will he advise the details of the contract let including sectionalised costs?
- (3) What has been the contribution by—
 - (a) the department; and
 - (b) the parents and citizens' association?
- (4) Has the department met in full the cost of the reticulation to within 100 feet of the school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Contract completion date 4th April—additional boring and pump variation will necessitate extension to contract period.
- (2) Bore and pump—\$1,173. Reticulation—\$2,860.
- (3) (a) \$2,825.
(b) \$1,208.
- (4) No—the contribution by the parents and citizens' association is being reviewed and adjustment will be made on completion of contract.

3.

TRANSPORT

Urban Needs: July Report

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

- (1) With reference to the report in *The West Australian* 2nd March, 1972 "Transport report in July" has the Government made its submission to the Commonwealth?
- (2) If so, what is the nature and extent of estimated urban public transport needs that have been submitted?
- (3) If not submitted, when is finality expected?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) to (3) At the request of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, which is chaired by the Federal Minister for Shipping and Transport, the Standing Committee of Advisors to A.T.A.C. and the Bureau of Transport Economics have been working to develop a policy framework within which the Commonwealth Government could, if it so chose, provide the States with finance for urban public transport purposes. It will be appreciated that the Commonwealth Government by virtue of the Commonwealth Aid Road Act already provides finance for urban road systems.

The Standing Committee of Advisors and the Bureau of Transport Economics believe that in order to develop a policy framework they must demonstrate the effectiveness of various types of

investment in urban public transport facilities in terms of benefit/cost.

Accordingly for some months there has been a constant flow of planning data from the several States to the Bureau of Transport Economics. Generally the data is available from the transport studies that have been completed for Brisbane, Melbourne, Hobart, Adelaide and Perth and the study which is under way in Sydney.

In addition to the information available from the PERTS study the Director General of Transport, who is a Western Australian member of the Standing Committee of Advisors, has provided the bureau with updated data on a variety of urban public transport investment options that might be applicable to Perth. The Bureau of Transport Economics has been evaluating the effect of investment applicable to these options, together with those received from other States, and has been correlating its findings into an Australia wide picture with the aim of demonstrating the need for Commonwealth intervention, possibly in the form of a long term national policy on urban public transport.

A preliminary document was presented to the A.T.A.C. at its meeting in February. As foreshadowed by Mr. Nixon a more complete document is expected to be presented by advisors at the July meeting. It will be apparent that there has been no formal submission as such; rather there has been a flow of planning and performance data.

4. FRUIT-FLY CONTROL

Baiting Scheme

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In what year did the Belmont fruit fly baiting scheme commence?
- (2) Was there a delay in the commencement date for the 1971-72 season?
- (3) What were the reasons?
- (4) Did the Belmont fruit fly baiting committee receive a Government subsidy; if so, what was the amount?
- (5) Is it correct that the committee has resigned and the scheme discontinued, and, if so, what were the reasons?
- (6) How many fruit fly baiting schemes are operating—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) in the country?
- (7) Have any other baiting schemes been discontinued; if so, what were the reasons?
- (8) Have any of the baiting committees received financial assistance—
 - (a) during the 1970-71 season;
 - (b) during the 1971-72 season; and what were the individual amounts?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 1966.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The uncertainty of the continuance of the scheme.
- (4) The subsidy for the 1971-72 season's operations was \$1,800.
- (5) No. Operations have been discontinued by the committee due to opposition by the council and some subscribers.
- (6) (a) Seven.
(b) Thirty-eight.
- (7) Ten schemes have been discontinued. Reasons for this have included:—

Apathy in maintaining committees.

Lack of finance.

Lack of satisfactory supervision of baiters.

Inability to recruit suitable personnel.

In two instances, due to the opinion that the incidence of fruit fly did not warrant continuation of baiting operations.

			\$
(8) (a)	Applecross	1,000
	Belmont	1,500
	Donnybrook	..	500
	Eastern Hills	1,800
	Dowerin	155
	Koorda	130
	Kwinana	676
	Maylands	1,500
	Newlands	150
	South Suburban	3,000
			\$
(b)	Belmont	1,800
	Kalgoorlie	1,500
	Maylands	2,500
	South Suburban	3,000

5. FRUIT-FLY CONTROL

Transfer to Local Authorities

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it correct that the Government intends to introduce legislation to amend the Act controlling fruit fly baiting schemes in Western Australia?

- (2) Is it correct that the Government intends under the proposed legislation to pass the responsibility of fruit fly baiting to local authorities?
- (3) Have local authorities been requested to consider this proposal?
- (4) If so, has any local authority—
 - (a) supported the proposal; or
 - (b) opposed the proposal?
- (5) Will the authority for the legislation be the responsibility of the Minister for Local Government?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Only to the extent of introducing or maintaining community fruit fly baiting schemes where it is considered they are warranted.
- (3) No, but there have been discussions with the Department of Local Government and it is understood discussions have also taken place at Local Government Association meetings.

- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Yes. Amendments to the Local Government Act for the setting up of the local baiting schemes will be the responsibility of the Minister for Local Government.

The provisions for fruit fly control generally—including baiting—will continue to be the responsibility of the owner/occupier under the Plant Diseases Act which remains the responsibility of the Minister for Agriculture.

6. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Staff and Cost

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many officers and staff were added to the Department of Agriculture for each of the years 1958-59 to 1971-72?
- (2) How many left, transferred or retired from the department during the same period?
- (3) What was the total cost of running the department (not including Agriculture Protection Board) for the same period?
- (4) How many cadets were assisted for the same period?
- (5) How many officers and staff are employed by the Agriculture Protection Board (not including "unemployed" for 1972 period)?
- (6) How many left, transferred or retired for the same period?
- (7) What was the cost of running the Agriculture Protection Board for the same period?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1), (2), (4), (5) and (6) Information regarding staff added, retirements, resignations etcetera, would involve considerable clerical work and there is overlapping where items have been filled more than once in a year.

The schedule hereunder indicates the total staff for each of the years requested.

	Department of Agriculture staff			Agriculture Protection Board
	Public service	Wages	Cadets in training	
1958-59	412	190	31	155
1959-60	411	205	30	150
1960-61	454	237	44	152
1961-62	490	241	49	153
1962-63	523	264	51	150
1963-64	552	269	51	180
1964-65	584	272	55	203
1965-66	651	251	63	205
1966-67	701	267	66	232
1967-68	756	256	68	239
1968-69	823	241	73	243
1969-70	840	235	63	264
1970-71	936	275	49	265
1971-72	n.a.	n.a.	34	258

(3) and (7)—

	Question (3)*	Question (7)
	\$	\$
1958-59	2,948,920	898,508
1959-60	3,246,922	671,480
1960-61	3,434,438	742,586
1961-62	3,836,634	940,748
1962-63	4,231,438	1,118,370
1963-64	4,703,392	1,159,326
1964-65	5,605,912	1,200,630
1965-66	6,012,348	1,273,882
1966-67	6,667,060	1,674,169
1967-68	7,528,478	1,820,434
1968-69	8,937,985	1,917,552
1969-70	9,524,028	2,290,493
1970-71	10,038,667	2,576,155
1971-72 (Est)		3,273,739

*Does not include General Loan Fund expenditure by Public Works Department.

7.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolments

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the enrolment figures for the following high schools—
 - Hampton
 - Kalamunda
 - Governor Stirling
 - Pinjarra
 - Eastern Hills?
- (2) What is the anticipated enrolment for the Kelmscott high school when operational?
- (3) What grades will Kelmscott high school cater for when opened?
- (4) Are there any senior high schools with an enrolment number of less than 800 students?
- (5) If (4) is "Yes" which schools are they?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Enrolment figures as at 1st March, 1972—

Hampton Senior High—1,377.
Kalamunda Senior High—1,069.
Governor Stirling Senior High—1,549.

Pinjarra Senior High—635.
Eastern Hills High—429.

- (2) and (3) Kelmscott High School will commence operation from the beginning of the 1973 school year with an anticipated intake of 241 first year students.

- (4) and (5) Senior High Schools with enrolments less than 800—

Swanbourne.
Busselton.
Carnarvon.
Collie.
Esperance.
Katanning.
Manjimup.
Merredin.
Pinjarra.
Port Hedland.

8. WHEAT QUOTAS

Liaison Committee

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Why did he disband the wheat quota liaison committee last year when he took office as Minister for Agriculture, and on what date did they have their last meeting?
- (2) Is it correct that he has reconstituted the committee?
- (3) Are the representatives on the committee the same as previously?
- (4) Have they had any meetings this year, and, if so, on what dates?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Wheat Industry Advisory Committee was not disbanded. The last meeting during 1971 was on 4th June.

A Wheat Quota Review Committee was appointed to examine the quota allocation system and recommend improvements considered necessary. As the review committee was considering problems which would have been referred to the advisory committee the latter committee was not required to meet last year. Meetings of the advisory committee would have been called if they had been requested by any of the member organisations.

- (3) The representatives of some organisations on the advisory committee have changed.
- (4) Two meetings of the advisory committee were held in February on the 18th and 28th.

9. *This question was postponed.*

10. INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT

Penal Provisions

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) With reference to my previous questions and answers given about fines and penalties under the provisions of the industrial arbitration legislation, will he please advise if any fines and penalties were imposed on other unions or persons about the same time as the remitted fines were imposed?
- (2) If so, what were they and were they paid?
- (3) If paid, have they been refunded, and, if so, when?
- (4) If not refunded, is it intended to do so?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The remitted fines referred to in my answer to Question (11) of 15th March, 1972 were fines imposed on individuals. No fines were imposed on unions. These persons were the only individuals fined as a result of that prosecution.

- (2) to (4) Of the nineteen persons referred to in my answer to Question (11) above, two paid the fines imposed, i.e. \$25 each plus costs of \$2.60 and .70c.

When all fines were remitted, the amounts paid by the two were refunded.

I know this is not the full answer to the question. It was asked when fines were refunded. I think it was sometime in January last, but I can get the full answer for the honourable member.

11. PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY AREAS

Definition and Plan

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he able to define in general terms the area or areas proposed to come within the ambit of the control proposed in clause 7 of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill, 1972?
- (2) If so, would he table a plan of such areas?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) No, but the first area would be in the region of Gnan-gara where extraction of water for domestic purposes is already being undertaken.

The definition of further areas will depend on the result of drilling operations and field testing of bores yet to be out down.

12. UNDERGROUND WATER SOURCES

Metropolitan Residential Areas

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Are there any residential areas within the metropolitan region which rely entirely on underground water sources?
- (2) If so, where are these areas, and what is the estimated annual consumption?
- (3) At what depth is the water referred to above found?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Koondoola, Girrawheen, parts of Balga and Warwick. Approximately 700 million gallons.
- (3) Up to 160 ft.

13. WATER BORES

Augmenting of Metropolitan Supply

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) From how many bores is water drawn for use in the Metropolitan Water Board area?
- (2) How many of these produce artesian water?
- (3) What percentage of bore water was used in supplying the metropolitan area for each of the last five years?
- (4) Is it possible to give the proportion of artesian water as compared with ground water for each of the last five years?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 21.
- (2) 16.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|-------|
| (3) | 1966-67 | | % |
| | 1967-68 | | 6.05 |
| | 1968-69 | | 5.62 |
| | 1969-70 | | 4.33 |
| | 1970-71 | | 10.96 |
| | | | 8.72 |
| (4) | 1970-71 | Artesian— | 8.15% |
| | | Ground— | 57% |

No ground water used prior to 1970-71.

14. NATURAL GAS CONVERSION CONTRACTORS

Assurances against Disruption

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Was it correctly reported that the State Electricity Commission will halt the natural gas connection programme unless it gets an absolute assurance from the conversion contractors that the programme will not be disrupted by industrial stoppages?

- (2) As no doubt every employer in this State would be vitally interested in this, would he please enlighten the House whether the execution and administration of the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act and/or its requirements have been changed in a way which would enable any employer to effectively give such guarantee?
- (3) If (2) is "No" what was the practical value of seeking such an assurance by the State Electricity Commission?

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

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Such an agreement is between the contractor and the union concerned, and in fact means that they agree that where negotiations between the two parties break down, arbitration will be accepted and not direct action.

The commission has accepted the assurance of the contractor that the contractor and the union have agreed to negotiate within this framework for the currency of the conversion programme.

The situation with gas conversion is different from many industrial situations in so much that possible danger and real inconvenience to consumers inevitably follows the withdrawal of labour during the conversion programme.

- (3) Does not apply.

15. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND

Garden Island: Use

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the reported statement in *The West Australian* of 25th March that the State Government's submission on Garden Island has been sent to Canberra mean that Cabinet has had prepared and approved recommendations for Garden Island?
- (2) If "Yes" who prepared the report to Cabinet?
- (3) If "No" what is the factual position?
- (4) Does the reported statement in *The Sunday Times* of 26th March that State Government representatives were objecting to a Navy takeover of Garden Island because of the fear that the Island could become a future nuclear arsenal, reflect the Government's thinking?
- (5) Will he advise the House the background to these reports and the departments making them?

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

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The acting chairman of the Premier's Committee for the Development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana, Dr. D. Carr, in collaboration with the Director of Environmental Protection, Dr. B. O'Brien, and senior officers of the Fremantle Port Authority, the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, the Department of Agriculture, the Forests Department, the Mines Department, and the Tourist Development Authority.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) No.
- (5) See answer to (2). The report also included a submission by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

16. STATE FINANCE

Special Commonwealth Grants and Loans

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

What was the total amount of—

- (a) special Commonwealth grants;
- (b) special Commonwealth loans; allocated to the State Government since it took office in 1971?

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

- (a) \$13,870,441 inclusive of special budgetary assistance.
- (b) Nil.

17. POWER LINES

Easements and Resumptions in Rural Areas

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Electricity:

Is the policy of the State Electricity Commission regarding compensation for easements and resumption of land required for power lines through rural areas to provide goods in lieu of cash?

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

No.

18. MINERAL CLAIMS

Number and Acreage

Mr. GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Mines:

What is the most recent date on which it was known how many mineral claims were in existence in Western Australia, and what was the total acreage involved at that time?

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

The 31st December, 1970.

At that date the number of mineral claims in force was 20,272, involving a total acreage of 5,344,357.

The number and acreage quoted above refers to mineral claims for which title certificates had already been issued.

19. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

School of Veterinary Science

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Education:

Assuming the veterinary school at Murdoch University will be producing its first graduates in 1980, could he answer the following questions:—

- (1) What is the expected number of veterinary surgeons employed as private practitioners in urban and rural areas in Western Australia for 1980 and what annual growth rate does this represent?
- (2) What are the expected employment needs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Primary Industry for 1980?
- (3) How many of the Murdoch graduates in veterinary science might be expected to remain in Western Australia?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Urban 52.
Rural—32.

This represents an approximate annual growth rate of 5% and the figures assume that the present growth rate of about 10% over the last 3 to 5 years will be halved.

- (2) Department of Agriculture—75.
Department of Primary Industry—18.
- (3) I am unable to estimate this figure.

20. ABATTOIRS

Meat Inspections

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What were the numbers of sheep, lambs, cattle, calves and pigs inspected by—
 - (a) State health inspectors;
 - (b) Department of Primary Industry inspectors;
 at—
 - (i) metropolitan abattoirs;
 - (ii) country abattoirs,
 in each division of the State during the last 12 months?

- (2) What are the names of the country shire or town councils where meat is inspected by—
 (a) qualified meat inspectors;
 (b) Department of Primary Industry inspectors,
 in this State?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

I would like to apologise to the member for Bunbury for not having this information yesterday. It had been prepared, but in my unavoidable absence there was no one to bring it along. The answer is as follows:—

- (1) (a) State inspection:
 (i) Metropolitan abattoirs—
 Cattle—58,783.
 Sheep—914,714.
 Pigs—264,666.
 (ii) Country districts—
 Southern areas—
 Cattle—64,692.
 Sheep—527,532.
 Pigs—23,510.
 Northern areas—
 Cattle—2,652.
 Sheep—35,366.
 Pigs—2,075.
 Eastern areas—
 Cattle—21,564.
 Sheep—425,376.
 Pigs—21,695.
 Total country districts—
 Cattle—88,908.
 Sheep—988,274.
 Pigs—47,280.
 (b) Department of Primary Industry Inspection:
 (i) Metropolitan abattoirs—
 Cattle—145,698.
 Sheep—3,371,495.
 Pigs—256,749.
 (ii) Country districts—
 Southern areas—
 Cattle—84,582.
 Sheep—601,590.
 Pigs—5,231.
 Northern areas—
 Cattle—144,042.
 Sheep—253,723.
 Pigs—1,553.
 Total country districts—
 Cattle—228,624.
 Sheep—855,313.
 Pigs—6,784.
- (2) (a) Bunbury.
 Busselton.
 Boyanup.
 Boulder.
 Boyup Brook.
 Brunswick Junction.
 Carnarvon.
 Coolgardie.
 Dardanup.

Denmark.
 Esperance.
 Geraldton.
 Gnowangerup.
 Greenough.
 Harvey.
 Katanning.
 Koorda.
 Kalgoorlie.
 Kojoonup.
 Manjimup.
 Merredin.
 Moora.
 Morawa.
 Mt. Marshall.
 Mt. Barker.
 Nabawa.
 Northam.
 Northampton.
 Narrogin.
 Wagin.
 Wongan Hills.
 Woodanilling.
 Wooroloo.
 Waroona.
 Port Hedland.
 Tammin.
 Toodyay.
 (b) Geraldton.
 Derby.
 Broome.
 Albany.
 Harvey.
 Waroona.
 Bunbury.

NOTE: Department of Primary Industry figures include animals slaughtered on an export works irrespective of whether the animals are for export or local consumption or whether they are examined by State inspection staff or Department of Primary Industry inspection staff.

QUESTIONS (7): WITHOUT NOTICE

1.

STATE FINANCE

Allocations for Education

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

Yesterday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question without notice and I undertook to seek the necessary information for him. The question arose out of part (1) of question 18 on yesterday's notice paper, and referred to a sum of money as being \$735,499. The information sought by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is as follows:—

The whole of the sum of \$735,499 allocated to education purposes was for capital works including works of a minor nature.

The source of the funds was as follows:—

Commonwealth Grant for primary and secondary schools	\$ 620,000
Additional Works and Housing allocation ..	115,499
Total	735,499

2. RAILWAYS

Electrification and Sinking of Line

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Acting Premier:

Following the announcement of the underground railway proposals, will he lay on the Table of the House the overall plans covering the new scheme?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Yes, this will be done tomorrow. I regret that I have not any copies with me otherwise they would have been laid on the Table of the House today. That was an oversight.

3. ALUMINA REFINERY AT UPPER SWAN

Environmental Protection Report

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) In the preparation of the report opposing the establishment of an alumina refinery at Upper Swan has the Environmental Protection Authority collaborated with a W.A. University group styling itself Environment 2000?
- (2) If so, to what extent has there been collaboration, and how many joint meetings have been held with this Environment 2000 body?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is negative, would the Minister explain a great similarity in views, both in facts and errors, between the report of the authority and those frequently voiced by Environment 2000?
- (4) Did anybody belonging to the Environment 2000 body sight the authority's report, either in preparation or when complete, before it reached Cabinet?
- (5) Is any member of the Environmental Protection Authority or its council also a member of Environment 2000; and, if so, will the Minister name those with common membership?
- (6) What steps are being taken to confirm or deny published statements that there are grave technical errors in statements and assumptions in the report?

(7) If it is a fact there are grave technical errors of substance and inference in the report, does this affect the value and reliance which the Government places on the report?

(8) Why did the E.P.A. assume that fuel oil would be used and not natural gas? Was the position checked with Pacminex in view of the possibility of serving the proposed refinery from the natural gas pipeline?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

In reply to the member for Mt. Lawley I would like to say that a question broadly of the same nature concerning the relationship between Environment 2000 and the E.P.A., and the Environment Protection Council, was discussed with Dr. O'Brien on the telephone last night. I do not know what inspired the question, but there is certainly no connection. In reply to the specific questions, the answers are as follows:—

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) To the extent that there is similarity in views on facts between the report of the authority and views frequently expressed by Environment 2000, it is assumed that this is because they are both correct. With regard to possible errors, unless these are specified it is impossible to answer the question at this stage.
- (4) No.
- (5) No. I might say I was unaware of whether or not there was joint membership of the council or the authority and Environment 2000. We had to check each member of the council but we have not been able to contact the Under-Secretary for Mines (Mr. Cooper) who is away, or Mr. Stewart, the Conservator of Forests. Neither have we been able to contact Mr. Ernest Lee-Steere. However, we understand that none of those members is a member of Environment 2000.
- (6) It is assumed that the published statements referred to those in the *Sunday Independent* relating to technical errors. These are being reviewed and a statement will be presented in due course.
- (7) It is not established that there are grave technical errors in the report.

(8) The Environmental Protection Authority report stated, "There seems little prospect of natural gas being used as fuel for the refinery. It seems almost certain therefore that fuel oil will be used." The basis for this statement was in turn a submission from Pacminex to the effect that "Unfortunately the company developing the Walyering natural gas field is unable to give us any assurance of the availability of natural gas as a fuel at this time. Therefore, for the purposes of our feasibility study, Bunker C oil has been chosen as the fuel . . ."

I hope to have a prepared statement available shortly which you, Mr. Speaker, might allow me to table. It sets out some of the developments which have occurred since the report on Pacminex was made available by the Environmental Protection Authority.

4. RAILWAYS

Electrification and Sinking of Line

Mr. COURT: I desire to direct a question to the Minister for Works on the assumption that he is chairman of the committee that announced the underground rail plan today. If the Minister for Works is not the Minister involved no doubt you, Mr. Speaker, will redirect my question. I base my question on a radio statement and on the reference in tonight's Press.

Can the Minister tell me the approximate figures for the division of the costs involved in the expenditure of \$110,000,000, such as the amounts which will be spent on the permanent way, electrification, and rolling stock? In approximate terms, how was the figure of \$110,000,000 arrived at?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Obviously, having had no notice of the question—and in the interests of reasonable accuracy—I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to put the question on the notice paper.

5. RAILWAYS

Electrification and Sinking of Line

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Works:

I address a further question to the Minister which I believe he will be able to answer, even though he is not able to give an approximate

break-up of the \$110,000,000—which, I must admit, amazes me. Could the Minister indicate whether the estimated cost of \$110,000,000 includes additional capital cost by the State Electricity Commission in providing additional electric power which, I understand, will be considerable for an underground system?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Again, for the sake of accuracy, I ask the Minister to resort to the notice paper so that he will receive a full coverage. We have negotiated with the S.E.C. but the exact requirement, and the time of the requirement, are rather distant at this stage.

6. DAIRY INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Legislation

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the legislation to set up a new dairy industry authority been drafted; and, if so, will the Bill be introduced during this session?
- (2) What is the current position concerning the dairy farmers, milk treatment companies, and milk vendors application for an increase in the retail price of milk?
- (3) Would the Minister receive a further submission from the milk vendors on delivery times in the metropolitan area?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question. The reply is as follows:—

- (1) Drafting is in progress. If possible the Bill will be introduced during this session.
- (2) Cabinet is considering the matter.
- (3) Yes.

7. RAILWAYS

Electrification and Sinking of Line

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Works:

Referring to the rail sinking project, does the figure of \$110,000,000 take into consideration the replacement of rolling stock, bearing in mind that the existing locomotives would not be suitable for electrification?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Consideration for the replacement of rolling stock is included in the sum of \$110,000,000.

ALUMINA REFINERY AT UPPER SWAN

Environmental Protection Report: Tabling of Statement

MR. DAVIES (Minister for Environmental Protection): Copies of the statement which I mentioned when replying to a question without notice by the member for Mt. Lawley are now to hand. Could I have your permission, Mr. Speaker, to table a copy?

The **SPEAKER**: Yes.

A copy of the statement was tabled.

BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Justices Act Amendment Bill.
2. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
3. Child Welfare Act Amendment Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General), and read a first time.
4. Construction Safety Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Taylor (Minister for Labour), and read a first time.
5. Land Agents Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Blaikie, and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 28th 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. MOILER (Toodyay) [5.03 p.m.]: I wish to support the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, and in so doing I would like, first of all, to express my disappointment at the results of the investigations carried out by the Environmental Protection Authority in regard to the Pacminex alumina refinery. I daresay this will be one of the few occasions I will agree with the views of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Sir David Brand: It would not be rare.

MR. MOILER: I am disappointed for the people in the Swan electorate and those in the Shire of Swan who come within the Toodyay electorate. One of the aspects

dealt with in the report is the possible pollution of the aquifer. I wonder, as does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, what the position will be at Pinjarra and Kwinana, and also at Collie or Bunbury, when Alwest is established. Should we anticipate or expect pollution, or are we only jumping at shadows?

Mr. Rushton: Are you disputing the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority?

Mr. MOILER: I said I was disappointed with it. I accept the authority's findings. I was in favour of the environmental protection legislation having big teeth, and I am still of the same opinion. That does not alter the fact that I am disappointed.

Mr. Williams: Do you not think the authority should be making recommendations rather than decisions?

Mr. MOILER: Should we expect the aquifers and streams in the Pinjarra area to become polluted in the next 50 years or by the expiration of the life of the refineries, or will someone say in 50 years' time that the report of the Environmental Protection Authority was too severe and the danger did not arise?

Mr. Rushton: Do you think the Government has been weak in making its decision?

Mr. MOILER: I also wonder about the mining aspect and the view which has been put forward that mining could lead to the catchment areas and the like becoming more saline. I think adequate protection was provided in the legislation that was passed. To my knowledge, a large part of the area to be mined was privately owned and had already been cleared. Some areas are still being cleared by farmers. From the point of view of mining, those areas would have been reafforested to the satisfaction of the Minister concerned. I am quite sure that under the provisions of the Act the Government would have had the authority, through the Forests Department and other departments, to take action to counter such possibilities as the streams and catchment areas becoming more saline. Those problems could have been countered before they occurred.

As I said when speaking in support of the establishment of the Pacminex refinery, in the south-west large tracts of karri and jarrah forest are being cleared. That area has a high rainfall, which would lead to faster reafforestation than in the area where the mining would have been carried out by Pacminex. It would not be possible to have jarrah regrowing in the proposed mining area but it would have been possible to establish other vegetation which would have combated the supposed problem in the catchment areas.

I accept the position that this is the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority but it does not alter the fact

that I am disappointed. I feel that for many years the Shire of Swan has been the Cinderella shire of this State. It has now been unfortunate enough to miss out on the Pacminex refinery—at this stage, anyhow. It is another problem which the Government must tackle. I know the Government will surmount the problem, and I ask that in dealing with it consideration be given to the fact that the councillors of the Shire of Swan are making every endeavour to develop their shire.

When drawing up its corridor plan, the M.R.P.A. left the Shire of Swan without a corridor and opposed development in the area. I would like to digress here and congratulate the Deputy Premier on the novel exercise he carried out last week when he introduced the report on the M.R.P.A.'s corridor plan submitted by Mr. Ritter. I think it is good to present a report in this manner so that all members of parliament can ask questions and discuss it.

Mr. COURT: I bet you did not understand it when they had finished.

Mr. MOILER: I was not there at the end but I enjoyed hearing many of the speakers.

Mr. COURT: You must be brighter than I am because I went away completely confused.

Mr. MOILER: I will not argue that one. As I said, the M.R.P.A. was opposed to a corridor running through the Shire of Swan, and the only reason given in its report for its opposition is the fact that vines are grown in a relatively small part of the shire. The M.R.P.A. is not only opposed to a corridor in the shire; it is also opposed to subdivision. In areas where no farming activities are carried out, where there are no grape vines, and where the land is of a poor agricultural standard, the Town Planning Department and the M.R.P.A. are opposed to subdivision.

The SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. MOILER: I think it is unreasonable that people who have 20, 30, or 40 acres of land are unable to divide it into smaller lots of 2, 3, 4, or 5 acres unless they carry out a great exercise of appealing to the Minister, and so on. The Town Planning Department should take a more realistic view of applications for subdivision in this shire.

I would also like to mention my surprise at the opposition which has been expressed by members on the opposite side of the House and some farmers' organisations to the proposal of the United Farmers and Graziers Association and the Trades and Labor Council to establish regional country abattoirs. However, those people support a proposal to establish an abattoir at Baldvis.

I would like to indicate my support for the principle of regional abattoirs as proposed by the Trades and Labor Council and the United Farmers and Graziers Association. On the one hand representatives of the farmers are crying out for decentralisation and requesting assistance from the Government, and on the other hand they are indicating that they wish to establish an abattoir at Baldvis, virtually in the Fremantle area.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: From where did you get that story?

Mr. MOILER: The president of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association indicated very forcibly and definitely that the association should tell the Government it wanted this land.

I am fully aware of the fact that the Government has set aside an area in Baldvis for an abattoir. However, if an abattoir is established on this site I sincerely hope the Government will sell it to a private company at market value and utilise the money so raised for other needs. I hope—and I can only say I hope—that the Government does not grant an incentive to a company to develop this site prior to abattoirs being established in country areas.

I have stated in a previous address to this House that if a Government cannot decentralise the abattoir industry, then it could not decentralise any industry. It is a frightening situation when representatives of the farming community advocate centralisation. If the farmers expect the Government to assist with decentralisation, surely they should be prepared to support the idea themselves.

On another matter I would like to congratulate the Government on the formation of the conservation through reserves committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. W. L. Ride. This is a step in the right direction. I hope the committee will give consideration to the flora and fauna reserve on the north side of the Avon Valley national park and the forestry area abutting the south side of the park.

These three areas—the flora and fauna reserve, the national park, and forestry area—total 30,000 acres, and the committee should give earnest consideration to developing this acreage for the recreation of the public of Western Australia. I suggest that portion of the area should be burnt off every August in an autumn burn. If the growth was properly controlled the flora and fauna would be retained in the area and the farmers whose properties about the reserve would be protected from fires.

At the present time it is almost impossible to drive through the reserve because of the poor quality of the roads. If the roads were improved tourists would enjoy driving through the area, crossing the river, and continuing up to Toodyay.

As the population increases in the metropolitan area, more people will be visiting reserves such as this. Waterholes could be developed to encourage wildlife. I believe this area has a great potential and I hope it will receive every consideration from the conservation through reserves committee.

Finally I would like to touch on the matter of the Bush Fires Board, and make a suggestion concerning insurance companies. Insurance companies were mentioned by the member for Avon last week.

The Fire Brigades Act, which is applicable in the metropolitan area, provides for various contributions towards the upkeep of the fire brigades. The Government contributes 16 per cent., local authorities 20 per cent., and the insurance companies 64 per cent. However, the insurance companies make no contribution towards the Bush Fires Board or the local authorities who assist in the running and maintenance of volunteer fire brigades.

The Mundaring Shire Council is considering the allocation of \$20,000 from next year's loan funds for the purchase of fire-fighting equipment. I contend that insurance companies should contribute a percentage of the cost of fire-fighting equipment in the same way as they contribute under the Fire Brigades Act. This matter should have been raised years ago, and I sincerely hope the Minister considers it now.

The volunteer fire brigades are made up of responsible men who risk life and limb to save properties. They have an excellent record, particularly in the Mundaring Shire. The brigade keeps strict control in its area, enforces burning off, and in many ways probably saves insurance companies thousands of dollars. It is reasonable that the insurance companies contribute to the local authorities' costs incurred in the provision of fire-fighting equipment.

I have spoken tonight on four topics. I would like to say in closing that I cannot sufficiently express my disappointment at the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority which will prevent the establishment of the Pacminex refinery in the Swan Shire.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [5.27 p.m.]: I share the concern of the previous speaker and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority regarding Pacminex. Although I have not made a careful study of the report, I have looked at it sufficiently to make reference to two or three aspects. I admit I am not qualified to argue authoritatively on environmental protection, but I feel I have the right to make comments.

The smokestack at the refinery would have been in excess of 400 feet high. I suggest that fumes from the smokestack would have been dissipated at a height which would result in a minimal deposit

of dust over the metropolitan area. The fumes would dissipate to such an extent that the pollution would be miniscule. I admit that the proposed site was north-east of the city and with our prevalent north-east winds there would have been some deposit in the metropolitan area. Perth is unfortunately situated as the south-west winds already bring deposits from the industrial areas of Kwinana and Medina.

It is reasonable to assume there would be some fall-out with a refinery at the proposed site, but I suggest it would not be sufficient to prevent its establishment.

Members may recall when we accompanied the previous Minister for Industrial Development to the Alcoa refinery we saw vegetable gardens and even a nursery in the vicinity. One market garden was a stone's throw from the refinery and yet there was no complaint of a fall-out of dust. Mr. McWhirter is the proprietor of the nursery near the refinery and he claims the small plants are not deleteriously affected. If there is no damage to plants in such close proximity to an existing refinery, I wonder at the authority's decision on that basis. I hope the State does not lose this industry.

This particular site was chosen because the ore was of a low grade and economically it should be placed upon a conveyor belt for transporting direct from the elevation of the range to the plant below that point. That is below the escarpment, and if this bauxite ore were transported by road or rail it would interfere with the economics of the refinery. I wonder why ore cannot be economically transported by the same system; that is, by conveyor belt behind the escarpment to a point that is handy to rail and perhaps to the Toodyay area where employment could be created for those who are now out of work in that locality. Also, this site would be close to the natural gas main pipeline, as mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This is clean gas with a high calorific content and no smoke would emanate from the smokestack if this gas were used as a fuel. Therefore I cannot help but wonder at the attitude adopted by the Environmental Protection Authority towards this site. I cannot understand why this aspect was disregarded, because there would not be any complaints about CO¹ drifting across the city from the smokestack.

I have asked the opinion of a very competent person in respect of this and the opinion I have expressed to the House came from a reliable source; our Minister for Fuel. I think all members will agree that he is the best Minister for Fuel this Parliament has ever seen! Joking aside, the use of natural gas as a fuel would, I am sure, prevent any contamination of the atmosphere. I admit I am not an expert

on these matters and therefore there must be some other reason that was put forward by the qualified people who are members of the Environmental Protection Authority for rejecting this site on which to establish the refinery.

With respect to the red mud deposits and the possible contamination of underground water supplies, I would point out that when we visited the site for the Alcoa refinery at Pinjarra, in company with the Minister for Industrial Development at that time, I made a point of asking a question about these red mud ponds and the engineer who was accompanying our party told me that in the vicinity of these ponds there were spears from which water was drawn and therefore the plant operators would be immediately alerted of any contamination. They said that the system was absolutely foolproof.

I also asked how the red mud ponds were constructed, and I was informed that the ponds had a clay bottom which was impervious to water, and also that the red mud became solid with the effluxion of time and so the water merely sat on top of the red mud. Further, this water was recirculated backwards and forwards from the dam to the plant. Therefore I still cannot understand how the red mud deposits could be regarded as being an impediment to the selection of a site for the Pacminex refinery in that particular locality. I will admit that the refinery would have been built on sand. I suggest that perhaps it is now possible that the best place for the siting of the plant would be behind the escarpment where the underground water would not be contaminated, because the subsoil there, being of rock, would be impervious to any water.

Those are my opinions on the siting of this plant, and I am concerned that the refinery will not be built in the near future to create job opportunities that were hoped for in that particular locality.

Turning to traffic control, I notice that those members on the opposite side of the House representing country districts—and particularly the member for Narrogin—had a great deal to say when criticising the likelihood of traffic control throughout the State coming within the jurisdiction of the Police Department. I endorse the taking over of traffic matters by the police, even if this does concern some of my friends opposite. I say this on behalf of the people of the State, feeling quite sure that in those areas where traffic is controlled now by the local authority the number of accidents would be reduced.

Mr. W. G. Young: Is there any proof of that or is it only guesswork?

Mr. FLETCHER: No, it is not guesswork. I am often subjected to criticism because I quote from the Press, but from what other source can I obtain statistics? I have here a subleader from *The West*

Australian and because it is a subleader I cannot quote the date on which it was published, but I deliberately kept this article as a consequence of the speech made by the member for Narrogin in support of local authorities retaining control of traffic. One paragraph of this article reads as follows:—

But their case, never strong, was not helped by the news from Lake Grace where control passed to the police on July 1. Of the first 150 vehicles the police inspected for relicensing, only 28 were found to be roadworthy; the others were rejected mainly for defective lighting (particularly on trucks), bald tyres, faulty steering or other dangerous defects.

Mr. W. G. Young: I will tell you something about that later.

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Roe will not tell me anything. I am running out of time and if I listen to all these ridiculous arguments I will not be able to say all I wish to say. I am reasonably well informed on the subject of traffic control as I happen to be convener of the traffic committee within my own party. I have taken a keen interest in this subject and I can quote many examples to support my contention. I will offend my friends opposite even further by saying that the country traffic inspectors are nothing more than Ned Kellys and bushrangers, and they look upon the motorist merely as a source of revenue for their local shire.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Especially visitors.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, especially visitors. I will quote two examples.

Mr. McPharlin: All members will be interested in this.

Mr. FLETCHER: I hope they are. My son drives a sports car which attracts attention, and because he was driving a few miles an hour over the speed limit on the Northam road in an area where there are graduated speed limits, the traffic inspector pulled him up. It turned out that he knew my son because they had played rugby together and they had a friendly discussion. However, before they parted the traffic inspector took \$20 from my son.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FLETCHER: The fine went to the local authority for that district. I can quote another example of my nephew who teaches in the Pinjarra area. He was driving at a speed two or three miles above the speed limit and was pulled up by the traffic inspector. My nephew spoke to the traffic inspector and he seemed to be quite friendly over the matter, but he parted company with him after paying the same amount as my son had paid purely for the purpose of reducing the liabilities of the

local authority of the area. Those are two examples I can quote of traffic control by local authorities.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fremantle has the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I maintain that this is an easy source from which the country local authorities can obtain revenue at the expense of those motorists who travel through their districts from the metropolitan area. That justifies my saying that local authorities are a lot of bushrangers and Ned Kellys in trying to augment their coffers. However, that alone does not cause me to take exception to their tactics. I take exception to local authorities being in charge of traffic in their own areas because of the high rate of accidents arising from reasons quoted earlier in my speech. If the police took over traffic control in country areas they would exercise their authority in a way that is more legal than that exercised by traffic inspectors at the moment.

In returning to the subject of farmers, I do not want to offend them, but I get a little sick of the "cockies' lament." I listened to a rendering of it the other evening by the Leader of the Country Party. Our Government has been in office for only a short time and yet thousands of dollars have been spent in country areas to help local authorities. A special fund has been created for that purpose and the Government is doing the best it can.

Mr. Reid: It is Commonwealth money.

Mr. FLETCHER: All right, it is Commonwealth money, but the farmers are getting it. That is the main point. It would not matter how much we gave the farmers, they would still want more. A great deal of the trouble experienced by farmers in country areas has been self-inflicted. I said this last year and I say it again. They are suffering from self-inflicted wounds.

Mr. Rushton: That is all you know about it.

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Dale is not a farmer and he does not know any more about the subject than he knows about any of the other subjects he discusses. I made the same point last year. I am talking of those whom the country members represent, and I say that had farmers consolidated their position during the flush period and made an effort to own their own farms instead of buying a car for every member of their families they would not be in the position they are in today. Also, instead of leaving a tractor in the paddock to deteriorate, and so being obliged to buy a new one, and using this purchase as a taxation dodge, the tractor could have been better cared

for and used again. If they had followed such methods of economising they would not have found themselves in the position they are in today.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FLETCHER: I maintain that the difficulty in which farmers now find themselves can be regarded as a self-inflicted wound, and I go further to say that those members representing country districts sit in coalition with members of the Liberal Party, not only in this House but also in the Commonwealth Parliament, and as a consequence of the ridiculous policy that that Government has espoused we have lost many overseas markets. Let me read what a wise man had to say on this subject. On page 1381 of the 1970 *Parliamentary Debates*, Mr. Harry Fletcher, the member for Fremantle, had this to say—

One issue which concerns me touches on the rural industries. In brief, Canada has now recognised mainland China—a traditional market for Australian wheat exports. Canada has leapt across the Pacific onto mainland China and has ignored the existence of Taiwan.

I will not get onto that subject, but there are 800,000,000 people on the mainland of China and 14,000,000 on Taiwan. In this speech, I went on to say—

Let me point out to the House that 46 nations, including all the Scandinavian countries, Britain, France, and Holland, recognise mainland China. But because we are tied to America through various arrangements and agreements, including our involvement in Vietnam, we are apparently not in a position to dissociate ourselves from America's attitude of opposition to Communist China.

To my way of thinking it is not a matter of with whom we trade. China has honoured its obligations so far and I am now concerned that Canada could presumably receive the trade which we enjoyed in the past in respect of wheat exports.

I continued my speech as follows:—

If that could happen in relation to the trade between Canada and China, then it is conceivable that other countries will commence to trade in wheat which would be to the detriment of Australia, and Western Australia in particular—a portion of which I represent.

I do feel concern. I felt it then and, as a result of the foreign policy adopted by the coalition Government in Canberra, the trade in that area has been lost.

Mr. Rushton: What about—

Mr. FLETCHER: Oh, shut up! If it had not been lost it is conceivable that wheat quotas would not now apply in this State.

Mr. Court: That is very unparliamentary!

Mr. McPharlin: You are being very unfair to the Wheat Board.

Mr. FLETCHER: We would not have wheat quotas in this State—or it is reasonable to suggest there is every prospect we would not have them—if the Commonwealth Government had not adopted such a ridiculous foreign policy when all the nations I have referred to recognised China. Britain has recognised China for years, but because we are tied to the coat-tails of America in respect of foreign policy, Canada stole the march on us by recognising China unobtrusively. Had a Whitlam Labor Government been in office we would not have been in this position. Australians are made to appear as a lot of crawlers in respect of Government foreign policy concerning China. We have hung onto America's coat-tails and have been left lamenting. No wonder we have so many moaning farmers! Enough of that.

I now wish to deal with housing. The Minister for Housing has given us good advice in respect of fuel, as I mentioned earlier, and he has also taken a very sensible attitude in respect of housing; and I believe that in one respect the Fremantle City Council has had something to do with this. I will read from a minute of the council because I believe that the information contained in it is far more interesting than any comments I might make. The project under discussion is the State Housing Commission development in Stevens Street, Fremantle.

The plan, seen and approved by the previous Minister for Housing, provided for multi-storey buildings and overcrowding in a very limited area, but the present Minister for Housing in co-operation with the Fremantle City Council has scrapped that plan altogether and has adopted an entirely new policy. The minute reads—

It will be recalled that Miss Cattalini, in her last report to Council,—

It will be recalled that the member for Canning last night stated that only one local authority employed a welfare officer. However, he is wrong because the Fremantle City Council also employs one (Miss Cattalini) and has done so for many years; and I know who was responsible for the creation of that particular office. The minute continues—

—expressed concern being felt in the community about the proposed State Housing Commission complex to be built in Stevens Street.

An interim report from the Western Australian Institute of Technology is now to hand, in which is set down the results of the three areas of investigation they have so far been able to undertake. A copy of this report is included in the list of reports to each member.

The report contains about five or six paragraphs covering the three issues.

Mr. Williams: Read them all.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will because I think the member for Bunbury can learn something from them. I would not like the type of building which has now been scrapped inflicted on the area represented by the member for Bunbury or on any other area in Western Australia.

Mr. Williams: I appreciate that.

Mr. FLETCHER: The report reads—

The following report encompasses three areas of investigation:

1. Physical.

- 1.1. There is a danger to children of families occupying the upper storeys.
- 1.2. There is a lack of space for family-oriented activities.
- 1.3. There is a lack of privacy, both acoustically and in design for living; for example, distinct division between bathroom and toilet.

2. Social.

- 2.1. These people lack social skills such as initiative and family stability and Stevenson *et al* (1967) feels that this inculcates inferiority and a sense of ostracism by the rest of the community.
- 2.2. Experiments in high rise flats overseas have indicated a marked difference in adaptation and residents depending on their financial and social standing. There appears to be an X-factor which determines the degree of adaptability to life in high rise flats. A study by sociologists at Bentley has indicated that a significant proportion of residents are welfare cases or people already "at risk" and therefore this X-factor should be taken into consideration in any future projects.
- 2.3. A lack of worthwhile social facilities available in high rise flats has contributed to the incidence of delinquency and wilful damage.
- 2.4. A withdrawal from social situations by residents has been observed, for example, broken lifts, noise, etc., often deter relatives from visiting.

3. Psychological.

- 3.1. Overcrowding — Recent psychological studies suggest that individuals who commit

violent crimes may have a lower than normal tolerance for overcrowding.

I hope members are listening to this. To continue—

In an intensive study done in late 1960's in Manhattan on effects of crowding on people, all but 18.5 per cent. of the people interviewed were found to be suffering from some degree of neurotic or psychotic disturbance. This survey did not include poorest neighbourhoods or include people who were hospitalised. Poverty and discrimination were found to be associated with mental disturbance, especially after onset of adolescence. But evidence is conflicting and some studies tend to indicate that little or no mental illness accompanies urbanisation.

Urban renewal has been found to have extremely disruptive effects on the lives of the people involved. Many of the present hazards of city life could be eliminated by more creative design of houses and neighbourhoods (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 197).

Ehrlich and Ehrlich 197 is the authority used. Many people may have seen him on television when he gave a splendid discourse on overcrowding in the world as a whole. To continue—

Social workers working at Bentley have found that many residents with a prior history of mental illness have reacted unfavourably to the added stresses and strains of high density living.

- 3.2. Social workers at Bentley have also noted that the social isolation of some residents, for example, deserted wives and aged, has resulted in depression and threatened suicides. Mental health services have rented a house adjacent to the Bentley complex to cope with the increased number of psychiatric patients.

The SPEAKER: I hope there is not too much more.

Mr. FLETCHER: No, Sir. To continue—

- 3.3. Studies have indicated that the effects of height, thermal control, window-less rooms, etc., result in a lowering of general performance, headaches, dizziness and depression although the degree of effect varies among individuals.

The literature to date indicates that "there is no appropriate meeting-point for the town planner, the architect, the engineer, the social worker, the health administrator and others whose skills in community planning and organisation of services, if co-ordinated, would obviate many of the above problems (Stevenson *et al* 1967).

The SPEAKER: I hope the Minister has concluded.

Mr. Graham: He is not a Minister yet!

Mr. FLETCHER: That is not my opinion. I do not make a habit of reading editorials to this House, but I do make a habit of reading opinions of such authorities as Stevenson, Ehrlich, and the social worker for the Fremantle City Council.

I admit I did read at length, but what I have quoted contains a message. We must stop the erection of this type of building in this State. On previous similar occasions I have spoken in a like vein and have taken exception to the erection of these buildings in my electorate. I indicated that many of them reminded me of similar buildings in Singapore. I have even seen washing hanging on the verandahs and porticos out front. This is why, with your indulgence, Sir, I quoted that expert opinion opposing the erection of this type of building. Our present progressive Minister for Housing has upset a decision of the previous Government to erect an obnoxious type of building in the street I have mentioned.

Mr. Bickerton: Any chance of getting together with the welfare officer (Miss Cattalini)?

Mr. FLETCHER: It is unusual for me to find I have the same idea as the member for Dale on any subject, but this was the case in connection with his objections to the proposals for Garden Island. I have here a map which appeared in *The West Australian* on Saturday, the 25th March, this year. It indicates that the whole island will be, for want of a better word, gobbled up by the Navy. I know I will fall out with some of my naval friends whose names I will not mention. The Leader of the Opposition and I were with the previous commodore a few nights ago, but even at the risk of falling out with such a delightful gentleman I must express my opposition on behalf of the people of Western Australia in general and Fremantle in particular.

This map indicates that a danger area for explosives ships will be set aside on the northern end of the island—whatever the expression means. A huge circle has been drawn around an area which occupies approximately one-third of the island. The

following is a list of the other purposes for which sections of the island have been allocated:—

- Possible future receiving station.
- Danger area armament depot.
- Another armament depot.
- Historic reserve—the circle goes right at that point.
- Non-explosives area.
- Training for fire-fighting and damage control.
- Sewage treatment works.
- Possible future oil depot.
- High-level water storage.
- Possible alternative future transmitting station.

I hope that is not another very low frequency signal station such as the one at Exmouth Gulf.

Mr. Court: Why not?

Mr. FLETCHER: To continue—

- Possible future air field.
- Possible alternative future transmitting station.
- Barracks accommodation.
- Wharf and workshop facilities.
- Possible future repair base.

As I have said, the whole island is to be gobbled up. It is seldom I commend the member for Dale for anything, but I supported with enthusiasm his motion concerning public access to Garden Island; and I still believe what I said then. The whole island should not be used for the purposes envisaged. When the motion was being discussed, I said that I have seen a similar set-up in Sydney, but an area of only a few acres is involved there. In this State the Navy wants the whole island. I take exception to this. I might fall out with my own party because I believe it has condoned as an alternative to the naval dockyards, a dockyard capable of coping with merchant shipping repairs and the requirements of the Navy.

My opinion regarding ship repair facilities has always had a merchant shipping bias. I have seen ships towed from Fremantle to Hong Kong or Singapore for attention which they should be able to receive at Cockburn Sound. That is why I favour a merchant shipping dockyard in that area, but not a naval dockyard. I have said before, and I do so again now, that even though Senator Drake-Brockman is on record as saying that there were no plans for nuclear or dry-docking facilities at the Cockburn Sound Naval Base, I do not believe him, and I do not trust the Federal Government.

It was not believed that these facilities would be established in other parts of the world, but they have been; and once the huge area at Garden Island is alienated for explosives, I suspect that nuclear missiles will be loaded onto submarines at that point and as a consequence Garden Island and the industrial complex at Kwinana will become one huge target for any hostile action.

Mr. Court: I think you are completely out of step.

Mr. FLETCHER: I might not be here at the time, but we must think of future generations.

Mr. Court: You are completely out of step with the defence report.

Mr. FLETCHER: My speaking time is running out. As I have said previously, we should not have all our eggs in one basket. To place a naval dockyard in that locality would be asking for trouble because everything could be destroyed at the one time. As I have already suggested, let the naval base be established at Exmouth Gulf where the very low frequency radio station has already been established with the air base. Let that area be the target and not the area on my doorstep. I am not saying this with any selfish motives, either. My acquaintance with the war was gained in an engineroom. I am no armchair strategist, but I know very well that if a ship were sunk in the channel between Garden Island and the mainland the channel would be sealed just as securely as is the Suez Canal at the moment.

Mr. Court: You cannot have it away from the engineering facilities.

Mr. FLETCHER: I expect the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to take exception to almost anything I say. I agreed with him initially on the Pacminex issue so, as my time is running out, I would like his indulgence and his ear rather than his voice.

Mr. Court: We want to know whether you are opposing the establishment of the naval base.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am opposing it at the proposed site.

Mr. Court: We want to know this because this is very important.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not see how the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can be in any doubt. I guarantee no other member in the House is in any doubt. When the matter was originally raised I took exception to it. I agreed to the establishment of a dockyard, yes; but not to the establishment of a naval dockyard encompassing all the facilities envisaged and of which I have just given a list. Apparently the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not listening.

Mr. Court: I want to be quite clear that you are opposing a naval base.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am not opposed to one at Exmouth Gulf, which is far removed from the metropolitan area. If such a base became a target it would not be the end of the world. Perhaps the V.L.F. radio station would be blown up but I would rather see that blown up than Perth or the Kwinana industrial complex. Alternatively, although I do not wish this on the local member, Albany has a harbour with a channel of unlimited width.

It could, in fact, accommodate the navies of the world, except, of course, the Russian navy.

Mr. Court: Which navy would you like to see?

Mr. FLETCHER: The channel at Albany could not be blocked. To me it is poor strategy to establish a dockyard inside a closed area; one ship sunk in the channel would close off the area to all other shipping. If the naval base were established at Albany instead, there would be less prospect of its becoming a target, because Albany is away from heavy industrialised areas.

Mr. Court: It is not possible to have a base without industry.

Mr. FLETCHER: It would bring economic advantages to the district of Albany as well. We do not need the base in Cockburn Sound, but we do need Garden Island and public access to that island.

Mr. Court: It is not possible to have a base without industry.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is.

Mr. Court: It is simply not possible.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may be sympathetic towards the services. For my part, I put up with them for long enough and I do not want the naval base on my doorstep. Further, I do not believe there should be a rifle range right in the middle of the prime part of the metropolitan area with a coast road deviating around it.

Mr. Reid: I hope you are not wingeing like the farmers you accuse.

Mr. FLETCHER: Perhaps the rifle range could be re-established in the Blackwood electorate. I hope I have made my point. I am certainly not wingeing and never have.

Mr. Blaikie: Don't start.

Mr. FLETCHER: I think the rifle range should be taken away from the metropolitan area and the naval base established at Exmouth, Albany, or somewhere else which is removed from industry.

Mr. Court: You will be popular with the servicemen.

Mr. FLETCHER: I noticed that the member for Subiaco was trying to attract my attention, but perhaps he can speak to me outside.

I want to mention that I am at variance with my Federal leader on this subject. When he was in Western Australia he looked at Cockburn Sound and said it would be an ideal place for a naval base. However he does not have to live here. If he were to speak to me, or could listen to my speech tonight, I am sure I would convince him that the right place for a naval base and dockyard is Exmouth Gulf or, as I have said, Albany. With those remarks, I support the motion.

MR. LAPHAM (Karrinyup) [6.04 p.m.]: I have only a few comments to make to the Address-in-Reply debate. Unlike the member for Canning I consider the Address-in-Reply is of advantage to members. If a member uses his full time of 45 minutes in speaking about nothing he is wasting the time of the House, but on many occasions it is difficult for a member to express his views on parochial matters concerning his district. If the Address-in-Reply were confined to these matters alone it would be of some benefit to members.

The subject I want to discuss should not present any problems, because I think almost all members will agree with me. Perhaps country members will not because they do not have any beaches within their areas.

Mr. Blaikie: Yes we have.

Mr. W. G. Young: Cut it out.

Mr. LAPHAM: I am speaking of metropolitan beaches which are beset with many problems. Most of our beach areas grew like Topsy. People flocked to the seaside for recreation and many built their homes there; in summertime they enjoyed the sea breezes and in the winter months the boisterous nature of the wind and the waves. Originally beaches were nice secluded localities but today they are not. People have paid a great deal of money to build near the sea.

Over later years our population has grown tremendously and, in consequence, there has been a great influx of people into these areas. Initially roadways were constructed along beachfronts and followed the beach contours. Originally, the roadways were almost scenic driveways.

In my electorate, between Scarborough, Sorrento, and further on, there are miles of beaches. Today I wish to refer mainly to the area between Trigg Island and Sorrento. Here we have a little scenic driveway which, at some time or other, has been renamed West Coast Highway, but the only resemblance it has to a highway is in its name. It has no other resemblance whatsoever. This road is the only outlet from the newly developed northern area. Vehicles must traverse the so-called West Coast Highway if people want to go to Scarborough or the southern districts. There is a tremendous amount of traffic in the area which is frequented by thousands of people.

People of all ages use a portion of this beach—toddlers, teenagers, newly-weds, the middle-aged, and elderly people. Even the Education Department uses it for the teaching of school children. The beach is situated on the west side of a roadway and, rather peculiarly, on the eastern side of the road is the small amenity in the form of a shop which sells ice creams, afternoon tea, milk, and all the things stocked by

a small shop. Patrons of the beach who want to purchase anything from the shop must cross this so-called West Coast Highway, which carries a great deal of heavy traffic and is, as a consequence, dangerous.

I impress upon the Government and members that if something is not done in this area a real tragedy will occur. It is a very popular area where many sun and surf worshippers congregate and they are continually crossing the road to visit the shops. Very soon someone will be killed there. It will not be another statistic of road deaths; it will be a statistic of poor planning of the approaches to a metropolitan beach.

I come to a question which has been discussed in this House on numerous occasions; that is, the setting up of a beach authority. I do not want the beach authority completely to control beaches. I want a beach authority composed of individuals who know what they are doing and who can plan not only the amenities, and so on, for beaches but also the approaches to beaches. If they can do that they will accomplish something worth while. The longer this matter is delayed the more difficult it will become. If we had given consideration to our beaches many years ago and set up an authority to plan, protect, maintain, and develop them, we would have been in a better position today.

As far back as 1925 The Hon. C. F. J. North, who was then the member for Cottesloe in this House, sought to have a beach trust created. He did not get to first base. In 1958 the matter was again raised by Mr. Fred Marshall, who was then the member for Wembley Beaches. I thought he put up a good case. He did not win it but I think members realised something had to be done. Later on the member for Fremantle raised the matter. I am now raising the matter and I suggest to members that they should take heed of it.

The population of this State has increased tremendously. We are sun and surf worshippers. Many people frequent the beach areas but we have not provided for them, especially in relation to road safety. Some parts of the West Coast Highway are so narrow that if vehicles are parked on the side of the road buses cannot get through; yet the road is misnamed a highway.

Added to this problem is the development in the north where Sorrento and Whitford have been opened up. At Mullaloo there are mineral sands which are used by industry at Kwinana. Therefore, heavy haulage vehicles now travel from Mullaloo to Kwinana on this West Coast Highway—which is little more than a track—and they pound the road from four o'clock in the morning until late at night. They are pounding the road during peak periods when the children are attending swimming classes at these beaches and crossing

the road to buy ice creams. The pounding goes on day-in, day-out. Residents in the areas are continually complaining. I have had calls from the medical fraternity and others in this district objecting to the dangers to children and elderly people, and the noise created by the pounding of the heavy vehicles.

In order to cart mineral sands from Mullaloo to Kwinana the vehicles must use this so-called West Coast Highway. There is no other route. I do not want the West Coast Highway to be widened; I want a new road to be constructed to provide an outlet away from the beach to cater for the heavy vehicles and leave the scenic drive known as the West Coast Highway alone.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. LAPHAM: I have just seen a film dealing with population growth, but looking around this Chamber one would not think this is a problem.

Mr. Court: Look at the Ministers.

Mr. LAPHAM: Before the tea suspension I was speaking of the need for a greater beach authority, and I referred particularly to the area between Trigg and Sorrento.

The West Coast Highway is a highway in name only. It was formerly a scenic drive and provided a pleasurable outing for people wishing to look at the sea. It is still only a roadway but it now carries a great deal of traffic which creates dangerous conditions. When the West Coast Highway was constructed it followed the lines of the beach.

I wish to deal with a development a little further north, towards Whitford. This development is a departure from the old concept of beach expansion and involves three developers: Estates Development Co. Pty. Ltd., General Agency Co., and Taylor Woodrow Corser Pty. Ltd. As part of an agreement with the previous Government the developers provided the land and contributed \$50,000 a mile for the extension of West Coast Highway.

The extension of the highway differed considerably from methods of beach development to the south. Instead of the highway following the contours of the beach frontage, the new highway made periodic sweeps to the east and then back to the regional coastline. The idea of the sweeps to the east was to provide an area of building land between the roadway and the beach. This is good thinking and it would overcome the type of problem now existing in West Coast Highway where the highway separates the beach and the shopping facilities.

By using this new concept development could take place between the roadway and the beach and all the facilities could be provided for swimming. However, a problem has developed with regard to these

nodes, which are called nodal areas, although I do not know the origin of the term. Development in the nodal areas is subject to negotiation with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

The residents of Wanneroo, Sorrento, and other nearby areas, are a little concerned because they feel that high-rise buildings to the west of the newly constructed West Coast Highway will tend to limit the beach area to the occupiers of the buildings. These people are worried that there will be less beach available for the general public.

About a month ago I attended a meeting at Sorrento regarding this problem. The residents of the south-west ward of the Shire of Wanneroo passed a resolution in opposition to nodal development. Their opposition was mainly on the basis that the general public could be impeded in the use of the ocean foreshore and that the development will reduce the availability of the beach areas. I feel these fears arise because there is no person in authority to plan future development. Future planning must also be considered and this was stressed at the meeting.

Our population has expanded considerably during the last few years, and I could not even guess at the population of Perth in 20 or 50 years' time. The local residents posed the question whether the beach frontage will be sufficient in the future to provide the facilities for the residents of the State who desire to use them.

It is vital that we have a beach authority. I believe these developers commenced on the right track. I would like to see the development proceed, but before it does the whole project should be looked at by experts, and the experts must plan for future development.

The development area which embraces Whitford is worthy of special consideration because Whitford beach is a natural harbour for small craft. In my opinion Whitford beach is one of the nicest beaches in the metropolitan area. Small craft can easily enter and leave the area. To my knowledge it is the only true harbourage between itself and Fremantle.

Members will be aware of the tremendous number of small craft operating on our waters now. Therefore, from the point of view of the general public we should ensure that there is a planning authority to protect this area in future years. I do not mean merely to protect it by doing nothing with it, but to plan for it and to install facilities for small craft; and in the planning, of course, to provide for the population increase for at least 20 or 30 years.

Mr. Lewis: In whose electorate is this beach?

Mr. LAPHAM: As a matter of fact, it is a toss-up. I have never really studied it to see whose electorate it is in. I think possibly it could be in the electorate of the member for Moore.

Mr. Lewis: It is.

Mr. LAPHAM: All right; but it is a nice area and I have often wandered into it, even without the honourable member's permission.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you for the commercial.

Mr. LAPHAM: One day, of course, this part of the honourable member's electorate will be excised and attached to the electorate of Karrinyup. Many of my constituents who live in Sorrento, Duncraig, and areas a little further north visit this beach. I have visited it for many years.

I consider that a knowledgeable planning authority should be available to review this projected development, as well as all the other matters I have mentioned, and perhaps to modify the developers' plan—if it needs modification, and I do not say that it does—and to overcome the disabilities thought to exist by the special meeting held at Sorrento. The authority would also zealously protect the interests of the public with regard to the natural boating assets at Whitford. I think it would be a simple matter to hand the details of this project over to a planning authority and say, "What are your recommendations?"

But unfortunately there is no such planning authority and when the time comes for a decision to be made it will be made by the Minister. I do not like that despite the fact that I know the Minister and I think he is a wise Minister. He is still just one human being and, believe me, human beings make mistakes. As far as I can see, we are constructed to make mistakes.

Then, of course, beaches themselves in many instances call for some consideration and some specialised knowledge. All members with beach frontages in their electorates will realise the problems connected with them. I have two such problems in my electorate only 100 yards apart. I think all members will know of them; they are in the Trigg area. One problem associated with one of the beaches has existed since I was a boy. It is an area known as the Blue Hole; it claimed the lives of people when I was a lad, and it has since claimed the lives of many other people over the years. It is one of the nicest looking spots. On a lovely sunny calm day one would love to swim at this area. It is a glorious spot, and one feels like diving into the water. However if anybody dives in there he does not get out because it is the most treacherous spot on the coast.

Yet the danger has existed for years. The local progress association has made recommendations about what should be done. The association wants to blast the Blue Hole. It may have the right idea; I do not know because I am not an authority. That is why I say we should have some knowledgeable authority to

say, "It is a danger to swimmers. Get rid of it." Instead of that we dodge the issue. We constantly dodge the issue. It is rather peculiar that each time a Government shelves its responsibility, whether by evasion, neglect, omission, or by any other means, and whether its problems are direct or indirect, financial or otherwise, the problems ultimately increase. However, they do not increase proportionately; they increase threefold or fourfold. Ultimately it is extremely costly to rectify them.

So I say it is up to us at this time to create a beach authority, but not to make it an authority which may override the local authority or any body of that nature. We need purely a beach authority composed of knowledgeable people which can plan the development of the beaches and the approaches to them. Such an authority could consider a question and then say to the local authority, "It is advisable to develop a beach along such-and-such lines." Or, in regard to the Blue Hole, it could say to the local authority, "You should fill it"; "You should blast it"; or "You should install a groyne." The authority would make the decision.

It is indeed hard to get local authorities to do anything around beaches. They do spend money, but each local authority spends it in its own particular fashion. Each engineer has his own ideas about what should be done. The financial position of a local authority in a sparsely-settled area is such that the council does not plan a job for many years ahead, but rather it plans a job to overcome the disability of the moment. This is not a good operation.

We should remember that all our beaches are used not only by the people who live adjacent to the beachfront, but also by the people who travel from the hinterland to the beaches. Certainly the beaches are not visited only by those from regions associated with the coast.

At Trigg Island there is an opportunity to install a lovely pool for youngsters to swim in. In 1963 Police Constable Tony Martin—he might have been promoted to sergeant since that year—was the past president of the Trigg Island Surf Life Saving Club. He put forward a plan to provide swimmers with a safe pool not far from the treacherous Blue Hole. The proposed site is in a wonderful area and extends 100 yards down the beach. Tony Martin planned to free the area of rock with the use of a bulldozer at low tide. I looked at the area myself and I thought it would be quite simple for a skilled bulldozer operator to remove the rocks.

Mr. Cook: What is the fishing like?

Mr. LAPHAM: There is no fishing. All that is necessary is to pull the rocks out and the area would be suitable for children to swim in, and it would be at least 100

yards in length. This plan was put to the local authority in 1963 and, after much debate and argument—members know what goes on; any member associated with any Government knows how hard it is to have changes made—no action was taken.

As a consequence of that type of thing I say it is absolutely necessary to consider this matter factually. We are people who love our surf. We are sun worshippers. We love our beaches and it will be forever thus. Mark my words, it will always be thus. So it is up to us when we know things are going wrong to rectify them. I have outlined tonight only a few of those things which are wrong, and I have asked members to agree to the creation of a beach planning authority. I indicate to members that the authority would be more concerned with planning than with anything else.

I would like to give the authority some teeth and some money with which to do something worth while. However, I know that trying to get something like that through this House would be a hopeless proposition. So I would say to members: Let us create a beach authority composed of knowledgeable people so that they may plan our beaches for the local authorities and people concerned.

The members of that authority could make suggestions to local government. The Minister would then have available to him an authority which he could approach when he needed advice in regard to project development alongside beach areas.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Lands) [7.51 p.m.]: I intend to contain my brief remarks in this debate to supplying some factual information in answer to speeches made by several previous speakers. I regret the member for Vasse is not in his place in the Chamber because he made some remarks about the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme and, in essence, he was somewhat wide of the mark. I would like to quote some up-to-date statistics relating to this scheme.

Firstly, there have been 98 applications to sell, and as 35 of these were ineligible, this left a total of 63 which can be classified as eligible. Twenty-seven properties have been withdrawn either for private sale or because the price did not prove to be satisfactory. There is a great deal of conjecture on this aspect, but it is sufficient to say that a fair and realistic price must be maintained.

At the moment nine applications are being processed, leaving a total of 26 actively under consideration and 27 sales being concluded. I should point out that of the 250 farms in the dairy areas of this State that are eligible, only 25 per cent. have been offered for sale and I feel it is rather nonsensical for the member for Vasse to

say that the disappointing response of eligible farmers can be attributed to lack of liaison.

In 1971, the authority had three officers in the field for nine months, and a fourth officer in the field for three months. Those men spent their entire time, in the main, in an effort to locate sellers with a view to introducing them to buyers. Considerable effort was involved in this work with quite a degree of advertising carried out which has been absent in most of the work done by other States. At this point I would like to mention that the remarks made at a conference to which the member for Vasse alluded in the course of his speech were the subject of a further discussion between the Chairman of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme, the General President of the Farmers' Union, and the president of the dairy section of that union, with the result it was shown that there were many disparities in the remarks made at that conference. However, at that time the disparities were acknowledged and cleared up by both the representatives of farmers to whom I have referred.

I would also point out that, in addition, liaison has been established with the farming community and this liaison is now being fostered by a senior officer being in attendance at all meetings of the butter-fat section of the Farmers' Union. This is a fairly new innovation and was certainly introduced prior to the member for Vasse making his remarks. The member for Vasse put up a fallacious argument in comparing the figures he had obtained from other States with the Western Australian figures. For example, in Queensland there are 10,000 registered herds, whereas in Western Australia there is approximately only 2,300 in both sections of the dairy industry. Therefore, to try to make a comparison on results alone is, I think, invalid to say the least.

The same can be said of Victoria where there are a large number of dairy farms close together, which leads to ease of amalgamation. The member for Vasse knows full well the difficulties that are created in this State by the isolation of dairy farms, and the fact that there is a considerable distance between two farms, when an effort is made to amalgamate them.

All in all, at this time there were 27 satisfied buyers, and about 50 per cent. of those properties would be purchases of other farms. Therefore, there are at least 40 satisfied units in the dairy industry at the moment. However, I reiterate that the scheme will only be as good as the dairy farmers allow it to be. There must be a desire on the part of a dairy farmer to participate in this scheme. He must be desirous of quitting his farm to enable

him to leave the industry and in regard to this it is obvious that compulsion cannot be brought to bear.

Mr. Blaikie: Can you explain why the numbers have shown a dramatic decline recently?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I would point out that unless farmers are willing to participate in this scheme it will come to an abrupt end. There are many reasons why farmers will not participate in this or in any other scheme. One of the important reasons is that they have insufficient equity with which to re-establish themselves comfortably elsewhere. There is, too, a reluctance to accept any change. These people have become part and parcel of a way of life and have not the incentive to move out of their own little field however distressing it is to them economically. Many dairy farmers are working in the timber mills. This applies right throughout the south-west in such places as Denmark, Northcliffe, Walpole, and Nannup. Further, the elders who are likely to be involved are not very interested in making a move at their time of life.

I think the member for Vasse was a little unkind and uncharitable in some of his remarks when he suggested that the Minister had shown a lack of interest in agricultural matters in his particular area.

Mr. Blaikie: I do not think I said that.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I draw the attention of the honourable member to several aspects, one in particular being dairying. Considerable advances have been made by introducing new legislation to create a single authority to look after the affairs of the dairy industry. A great deal of preparatory work has been performed and discussions have been held with members of the Farmers' Union and representatives of the dairy industry itself. At this time legislation is being drafted which I hope will be introduced during this session.

The potato industry vitally concerns the member for Vasse, and in this sphere a considerable amount of work has been done during the past year. The seed issue has probably been one of the most disturbing for him. A great deal of research has been conducted into the production of potato seed and perhaps proposals can be put forward to bring about a sufficient quantity of approved seed to meet the needs of Western Australian growers.

Perhaps I can also mention the work that has been done in the apple industry. This, of course, does not concern the member for Vasse to any extent at the moment, but when he embraces the Capel area in his electorate he will become vitally involved in this industry. I would point out to him, therefore, that the contribution made to the apple industry is fairly considerable, which I think is acknowledged by his colleague, the member for Blackwood. The reorganisation of the research

station in the south-west to make the best use of the available facilities has been undertaken and, administratively, is, I think, a step in the right direction. Further, this is coupled to the upgrading of the Bunbury research facilities and the departmental premises on that site.

Some effort has also been made in the timber industry, although this lies outside the field of agriculture at the moment. All in all, I feel that perhaps the member for Vasse, upon reflection, will find that he spoke without proper thought to the issues that are at hand.

The other member to whom I would like to address several comments is the Leader of the Country Party. I regret he is not present. To clarify the issue of the report of the Wheat Quotas Review Committee I would point out to him—and I made a point of checking this with an honourable member in an official capacity in another Chamber—that although he disclaims knowledge of my phoning him in January mainly for this specific purpose, he does recall the secondary issue on which I spoke to him at the time. As far as I know the report was despatched, and it seems passing strange that this is the only report that did not reach its destination. However, I made a point of delivering a copy to him personally, and that at least has settled the matter.

Mr. Court: Why are those copies issued with some restrictions, and yet other people—I refer specifically to an endorsed Labor candidate—got their copies without restriction?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: When the honourable member raised this question previously I said that I had no knowledge of such a circumstance. The Leader of the Country Party made a further comment that he was concerned with one matter in that obviously there is some problem associated with the rural reconstruction programme. I do not know from where he got this information, because there is no greater problem with rural reconstruction in Western Australia than in any of the other States.

I admit there are problems, but let us not beat about the bush and let us not minimise the problems. Western Australia has its share, but we have no greater difficulties than are being experienced in the other States.

Mr. McPharlin: Would you say they were a little restrictive in their allocations?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I will deal with the two examples raised by the Leader of the Country Party. In comparison with the other States the figures relating to all aspects, in fact, acquit themselves most favourably, and the scheme has been operated under the terms of the agreement. Of course, this is obligatory and there is no possibility of departing from

such a course. However, it must be remembered that rural reconstruction is not regarded as a cure-all by Commonwealth circles. That every endeavour is being made to render assistance where it is warranted can be demonstrated by the fact that of the \$14,360,000 to which Western Australia was entitled, about \$8,100,000 is committed at this stage. This amount has been committed in the first year of operation.

Mr. Blaikie: Of the figure of \$8,100,000 how much actually has been granted physically to the farmers?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: An amount of \$1,000,000 is actually out. An amount in excess of \$3,000,000 will, I hope, be distributed at the end of the financial year.

Mr. Blaikie: Why only \$1,000,000 when \$8,000,000 has been approved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: There is a physical disability. The difficulty of preparing legal documents, negotiations between solicitors and banks, negotiations between banks and banks, and drawing up of securities, etc., must be taken into account. A month ago another experienced full-time security officer was appointed to the staff of the reconstruction authority, and it is hoped this will assist in getting the finance out.

Although some inconvenience has been caused, nobody has been jeopardised by the fact that there is a physical limitation in allocating this money and in dealing with the number of applicants.

Mr. Gayfer: Have you the \$8,000,000 in this State?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The financial arrangements are assured under the Commonwealth-State set-up; there is no worry on that score.

Mr. Reid: There has been a measure of inconvenience.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: A large measure of inconvenience, and I make that point. The Leader of the Country Party also pointed out that a considerable number of applicants had their applications rejected. He gave the figure of 343 applications as having been accepted, and said that 599 applications had been rejected. He did not point out—and he should have done so in all fairness—that of this number 110 were not considered to be in need; in other words they did not comply with the eligibility qualification. There were another 52 applicants who were not eligible, because their farms could not reach viability; and in the course of processing there were another 105 applications. So, the figure which the Leader of the Country Party gave should have been qualified in that regard so as to give the full picture.

I think he cited the case of a farmer who had been refused a loan of \$4,000, and claimed on that score he was shocked.

Actually there were two applicants for a loan of \$4,000, who have been rejected. One was a comparatively well-to-do farmer seeking to have a stock firm debt paid off; and the other concerned a farmer whose case, as it was presented, was considered to be unacceptable on the grounds of mismanagement.

I know members opposite have availed themselves of the invitation to attend the office of the reconstruction authority to obtain information on any specific point with which they are not satisfied; I understand several members have done this. I also understand that those members have been satisfied with the information given on the queries they raised.

If they would like any further details on questions such as this, I suggest it is only right that they satisfy themselves on the particular circumstances before they make a generalisation of the kind that reflects on the administering authority. On balance the authority has done a job that is comparable with the job that has been done in any other State. In its treatment of applicants the authority has acquitted itself very well.

Mr. Reid: Would you be able to answer this question: Why have some applicants to make two, three, and sometimes four applications before they are successful? Nothing has changed. It was only a matter of rephrasing the applications and juggling the figures.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The juggling of the figures is the significant factor. This reflects favourably on the authority in that it gives applicants such thorough treatment and does not reject an application out of hand. The authority does make suggestions and does give advice to applicants. I know of several instances where a considerable amount of time was spent by the officers of the authority to assist applicants in this way.

Mr. Blaikie: Do you believe that the rural reconstruction authority deals with cases as expeditiously as can be expected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I would like specific instances of where it has not operated satisfactorily. If I am given the instances I would be able to check the cases.

Mr. Reid: In regard to the resubmission of claims would it not be fair to say that the applicants with tenacity stay on?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Fair go! There is an obligation on an applicant to put up a case to the authority in a way that will assist him. He is responsible for this. The fact that the authority takes great pains to make every facility available to an applicant in giving him direction indicates a very worth-while aspect of its operations.

Mr. Reid: Sometimes an applicant, having been knocked back, goes on his way; but he should be encouraged to continue

with his application in view of the high degree of success of applications that are resubmitted.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: There must be a limit. An applicant must be expected to go to his financial advisers, his bankers, his stock firm, or farm adviser; he has to take some responsibility himself. The authority can only go part of the way, and it is doing that very well.

Mr. McPharlin: Can you give an indication of why so few applicants have been given the special interest rate?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I presume that in referring to the special interest rate the honourable member is speaking of the amalgamation aspect of the scheme. In respect of the balance of applicants—and this is a matter which is a cause for review—the agreement states that 50 per cent. of the money shall be used for farm build-up, and 50 per cent. for debt readjustment.

The number of applications received for farm build-up is minimal. Do not hold me to this exact percentage, but I would say approximately three times as many would be received for debt adjustment at this stage as are received for farm build-up. Probably later on the trend will be the other way and as time passes the emphasis will swing towards the farm build-up side.

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [8.11 p.m.]: I was very pleased the member for Canning last evening raised the topic of the merits or otherwise of the Address-in-Reply debate because I, and no doubt other members, have questioned whether any changes are desirable in the form of this debate, having in mind that the calendar year of Parliament has now been adopted. I have found the Address-in-Reply debate to be a negative one in the sense that after all members wishing to speak have done so, the question is merely put and passed and the address delivered to the Governor. It is difficult for members to sit in their seats and listen to speaker after speaker, day after day, ranging over all sorts of topics. It might be goats one moment while the next moment the subject might be coal, railways, or something to do with agriculture. It is most difficult for members to absorb all the facts contained in the many speeches.

Mr. Rushton: You did not find it so difficult when you were on this side.

Mr. HARMAN: Most of the speeches are somewhat stereotyped and predictable. When a member rises to speak we can almost predict what he will say, and I could spend the next five minutes enumerating what the various members on the other side will say and also what the members on this side will say, in the same way as most members would be able to predict what I will say when I rise to my feet.

Mr. Court: How did you guess?

Mr. HARMAN: I will not disappoint members tonight because I am going to speak about a section of the community in this State to which I have referred on several occasions in the past. I hope it will be interesting because in every electorate in this State—including that of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—are to be found people in the category to which I refer.

Mr. Court: You have not heard me complain.

Mr. HARMAN: I am referring to those in Western Australia who are living in poverty.

In 1966 Professor Ron Henderson of Melbourne, after a painstaking survey in that city which he carried out with the assistance of various experts, indicated that about 5½ per cent. of the people in Australia live on or below the poverty line he had selected. I will not go into the details of the survey, but merely give a broad outline. In 1966 the poverty line he selected was an income of \$33 a week for a man, his wife, and two children.

Mr. Rushton: Has your party not a vested interest in poverty?

Mr. Taylor: That type of interjection is pathetic!

Mr. HARMAN: In 1966 it was established that 5½ per cent. of the people in Australia were living on or below that figure. This meant that in all something like 660,000 people in Australia belonged to this group.

Mr. Lewis: Where did you get that figure from?

Mr. HARMAN: This is the figure estimated by Professor Ronald Henderson.

Mr. Lewis: I heard the 5½ per cent. but not the authority.

Mr. HARMAN: It is Professor Ronald Henderson who made a survey in Melbourne in 1966. I am unaware of any studies having been made in Australia since that time, but some commentators on this subject have updated the figure of 1966, basing it on the increased cost of living and the average weekly wage. They have observed that there are now nearly 1,000,000 in Australia living on or below this pre-determined poverty line which has now been updated.

Mr. I. W. Manning: Does your Government know about this?

Mr. Court: You would be battling to prove that one.

Mr. Lewis: You refer to some commentators.

Mr. HARMAN: I am referring to those studying this particular subject.

Mr. Lewis: Is it an authentic source? Can you name the authority?

Mr. HARMAN: I cannot at the moment.

Mr. Court: You would be battling to prove that figure.

Mr. HARMAN: I am indicating what the commentators throughout Australia have said. It is a matter of disappointment to me that I cannot quote any recent studies made in Western Australia on this subject, but for the exercise I have in mind I hope members will accept the fact that in Western Australia many people are living in poverty, although I have no idea of the actual number.

Mr. Lapham: Especially widows and deserted wives.

Mr. HARMAN: Who are these people in Western Australia who are living in poverty? I believe the biggest proportion of this group would comprise Aborigines and migrants. These two large groups, together with several minor ones, would make up the total number.

Special provisions are made by the State and Federal Governments to combat poverty throughout Australia, but I have often questioned whether these payments and schemes are effective only as a palliative to this problem rather than in reducing the number of people in this category. My impression is that the present steps being taken only perpetuate poverty and do not reduce it. It is also incongruous to me that so many people should be living in poverty when it is obvious that a high standard of living exists and people do have the opportunity to purchase homes and motor vehicles and all the other amenities available in modern society. Amid all this affluence many people in Western Australia are living under intolerable conditions and on a very low nutritional diet. They have limited access to education and employment. In other words, they have an unequal opportunity compared with the rest of the community.

I heard the member for Wellington interject a while ago. In effect, he desired to know what we were doing about this. I would point out to him that poverty is not something which was evident only after the Labor Government came into office, as the honourable member might imply. People have been living in poverty in this country and, indeed, in every other country in the world since time immemorial.

The New Testament records that the poor will always be with us, and that has been the case right throughout the history of the world. It is useless for the two members concerned from the other side of the House to suggest that I am trying to knock the present Labor Government, because that is not so.

The question arises: What further steps are necessary by the Commonwealth Government and by our State Governments in an effort to reduce the number of persons who are living below the poverty line? Before I enlarge on what I think we ought to be considering, I want to illustrate some

of the attempts I have made in this House during the last four years to have some areas of this subject examined.

It will be recalled that in 1969 I moved a motion in this House that a Select Committee be appointed to examine all aspects of our State laws and our administrative practices concerning the care and maintenance of one-parent families. I thought I developed a reasonable argument when I called for an inquiry into such aspects as maintenance, education, housing, and child care centres. My argument was supported by members of the Opposition at the time, but the Government of the day—the Brand Government—rejected my motion saying it was completely unnecessary.

Mr. O'Neill: Have another go.

Mr. HARMAN: The previous Government said there was no need to conduct an inquiry into the welfare of one-parent families in Western Australia, only so far as our own State legislation was concerned.

In 1970 I again moved a motion calling upon the Government to agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to examine land rights for Aborigines in Western Australia. At that time I argued that if we were to raise the sense of values of those people, and their attitudes to responsibility, we ought to settle the fundamental question of land rights as soon as possible.

Mr. Rushton: The honourable member wants them to be equal with white people?

Mr. HARMAN: I want them to have equal opportunity, that is all we ask. On that occasion I put forward a reasonable argument. The question was on the lips of most people in every State of Australia: Land rights for Aborigines. The subject was being discussed by Aborigines and by administrators, and a case was already under review in the national court in Canberra. However, on that occasion the Government came back with the reply that such an inquiry was not necessary either. The Government said that it did not want to have any inquiry at all into land rights for Aborigines.

Mr. O'Neill: The honourable member could get a motion such as that carried now.

Mr. Lewis: Would giving land rights improve the economic position of the Aborigines?

Mr. HARMAN: I am saying the question is something which is really fundamental to the Aborigines. If we could reach a favourable decision on the question of land rights I feel it would improve their sense of values, and they would develop a sense of responsibility.

Mr. Lewis: Do you agree this is mainly psychological?

Mr. HARMAN: Yes, this is one of the problems I have experienced both in the north and the east of Western Australia. This is the attitude which the Aborigines adopt.

Mr. Lewis: Mainly psychological.

Mr. HARMAN: Their attitude is that the land has been taken away from them.

Mr. Lewis: Do you mean it is mainly psychological?

Mr. HARMAN: Yes, it would be a psychological benefit. Having achieved the first step, their sense of values would be raised, and they would respond with a sense of responsibility. Of course, my second motion was also rejected by the then Government.

I have been in this Parliament since 1968 and during the three years I was in Opposition I recommended to the Government, on many occasions, that it consider the establishment of a unitary welfare department; that is, the amalgamation of the Native Welfare Department, the Child Welfare Department, and some of the minor Government agencies to form one social welfare department. Such a department would be regionalised throughout Western Australia, and would have the ability to deal with people in need, irrespective of their race, colour, or religion.

On each occasion I made my suggestion it seemed to me that it fell on deaf ears. At one time, knowing there was so much fragmentation and such little co-ordination among the various Government agencies, I became quite frustrated and suggested to the Government that if it did not intend to take any action to amalgamate the welfare departments and form one unified department, it might consider establishing a social welfare commission. At least that would mean some unity, whereas there was no unity in the existing system. Of course, that suggestion, too, fell on deaf ears.

Mr. Lewis: The honourable member says the suggestion fell on deaf ears, but he must admit that a lot of real progress was made towards a solution.

Mr. HARMAN: That may be so, but fortunately there was a change of Government.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARMAN: The then Leader of the Opposition—the present Premier—set out in his policy speech that a community welfare department would be formed by amalgamating the Native Welfare Department and the Child Welfare Department.

Mr. Jamieson: This is good stuff.

Mr. HARMAN: Already a Bill is before the other place, and that Bill will give effect to the undertaking given by the Labor Party. I understand that various reports have already been received which indicate that the proposed change is a wise and prudent step.

I congratulate the Government for pressing ahead so quickly for this very necessary amalgamation within our State. It will be a basis—a Government basis and a departmental basis—on which we can begin to tackle in earnest some of the problems which confront people who live in poverty.

I now wish to deal with some of the recommendations which I think we should be considering in an effort to reduce the number of people living in poverty. Firstly, we have to know our problem. The only way to know the problem is to carry out adequate surveys by qualified people. Such people must be able to go out into a certain area, carry out investigation, establish what problem exists, and come back with a result.

Secondly, remedies must be available for the problems discovered. Many countries throughout the world have already tackled this problem of poverty. In America, during the last eight years, there has been conducted what is referred to as a "War on Poverty". It was started by the late John Kennedy just prior to his death, carried on by President Johnson, and carried further by President Nixon. Plenty of evidence is available which illustrates the way in which America began to tackle this question of poverty.

Those responsible in that country have already begun to evaluate their methods and are questioning whether they are successful, could be improved upon, or should be discarded. In Australia we have all that experience to draw upon when determining ways and means to adopt.

Most of the effort in Australia should be made at Commonwealth level. Perhaps the Commonwealth could consider such things as the principle of negative income tax and of a family maintenance allowance. As I understand it, the principle of negative income tax is that if the poverty line is fixed at, say, \$3,000 a year and a breadwinner's total income is \$2,500, when he submits his taxation return the Government pays him \$500 to bring him up to the \$3,000 level. This principle has been given serious consideration in America and may have been adopted by now.

The Commonwealth Government should make every endeavour to ensure that children of parents who are on or below the poverty line have the opportunity to attend kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools, and to receive tertiary education. Those children should not be disadvantaged in any way by comparison with other children in Australia. Nothing prevents a child more from responding to education than the fact that he is disadvantaged. I must pay tribute to the previous Minister for Education because Western Australia has made every endeavour to ensure that, wherever possible, children—particularly Aboriginal children—can attend kindergartens and

schools, and not be at a serious disadvantage. I have great respect for the decisions the former Minister made some years ago to ensure that this would happen.

Despite all that, I understand only 12 per cent. of those eligible actually attend kindergartens in Western Australia. If we believe in kindergartens and in the advantages to be derived from attending them, particularly for children in poverty areas, then the Commonwealth Government together with the States ought to be able to work out a system whereby more of these children have the opportunity to attend them before going through the other stages in their career of education.

Some attempts have been made in the field of vocational camps for school children during the summer holidays and at the spring and autumn breaks during the school year. Are we satisfied that children from poverty areas are attending those camps and receiving the advantages which they give? It has been shown that children from poor families would receive the most benefit from attending camp schools.

I believe there is also a need to consider schemes to retrain the poor, particularly the breadwinners. In the past we have seen schemes such as the rehabilitation scheme after the war. I do not think it would be beyond the Commonwealth Government to introduce a scheme of subsidy to the public and private sectors of industry to enable people in the poverty group to be retrained in industry. The tab should be picked up by the Government.

We have seen some success in this State with what are known as citizen groups. For want of a better term I would call them "community action" groups. In some country towns groups have been established by Aborigines and, in other cases, by white citizens as well. The groups operate on the idea of trying to solve local problems.

Thousands of community action committees have been established in country towns in America. Normally they comprise representatives of the poor, the Government, and the private sector. I must admit that some have become political and have turned into pressure groups with the result that they have not been really successful in solving their own problems. However, a number of community action groups have been successful. The people they are trying to assist are actually represented on the committee and, from what I can gather from the amount of research I have undertaken, it seems they have achieved quite worth-while results. It is not beyond our capabilities in Western Australia to establish this kind of committee if investigation and study indicate that it could have some success in lessening the problem of poverty.

Poverty seems to affect three groups of people. It very suddenly affects a normal household if the husband is stricken by an

accident either at work or on the roads. Alternatively, a man may lose his job or go to prison. Whatever the circumstances, in this category the effect of poverty is very sudden and may be temporary or permanent. In every case where the breadwinner is affected poverty can result. Deserted wives come into this group.

The second group I would refer to are people who retire and find their income has been reduced and they are unable to live on the lower money. Of course this group would comprise the older people in our community.

The third group comprises people who are born into poverty. I think this has been called inherited poverty. Children grow up in the same environment of poverty and adopt the same norms as their parents. This could apply particularly to many Aborigines and perhaps some of the migrant population. They remain at the same level and unless we can get to them in some way or other and give them the equal opportunities to which I have referred they will continue to live at a poverty level.

I mentioned previously that it has been said poverty will always be with us, but for God's sake let us try to reduce the number of people who live in poverty and let us do it as soon as we possibly can.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper: Assembly's Message to Council

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Works) [8.40 p.m.]: I move—

That a Message be sent to the Legislative Council as follows:—

In accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to Lapsed Bills, adopted by both Houses, the Legislative Assembly requests the Legislative Council to resume consideration of the following Bills:—

Main Roads Act Amendment Bill; and

Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill.

Members will recall that in the last session of Parliament a number of Bills were partially completed when Parliament went into recess, and as a consequence they lapsed. In order to assist the Legislative Council to get on with the legislative programme, it is now intended to ask the Legislative Council to restore these Bills which have been successfully dealt with here, and the same members still being members of this Chamber.

During the last session I introduced the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill, the intention of which was to make provision

for vesting in the Commissioner of Main Roads the control of advertising signs on or in the vicinity of controlled-access roads and main roads; also the control of the road reserves of main roads. Members will be well aware of a newspaper article which has since appeared in the *Daily News* of the 13th March. It was datelined Mexico City and reads—

The U.S. Government is contributing \$18.5 million towards the cost of removing advertising billboards from the sides of the roads to improve the scenery.

Nearly 30,000 billboards have already been removed.

The Main Roads Act Amendment Bill was intended to prevent such a situation occurring in this State.

The other Bill which it is desired to have restored is the Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill, the intention of which was to make provision for the prescribing by regulations that radio telephone equipment and qualified operators be carried on board the vessels to which the relevant section of the Act applies when those vessels are operating within the limits of ports where the carriage of such equipment is considered to be essential for reasons of safety.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.43 p.m.]: I have no desire to adjourn the debate or delay this motion. The Opposition raises no objection to what is proposed by the Government.

The Minister made some observations regarding the contents of the Bills. We in this place have already said our piece prior to the Bills going to another Chamber, and I do not propose to reiterate that. However, I cannot speak for what the other place will do but as far as we are concerned we do not oppose the motion.

Question put and passed.

ABATTOIRS

Comprehensive Statement by Government: Motion

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [8.44 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House because of the importance of adequate abattoir and meat processing facilities both in the immediate and longer term future, a comprehensive statement should be prepared by the Government and tabled in Parliament setting out details of:—

- (1) (a) installed capacity in W.A.;
- (b) the current rate of usage in each case;
- (c) the livestock areas served by each facility;

- (d) the main markets served by each facility;
 - (e) the status of each abattoir so far as exports or any other special markets are concerned (e.g., Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry licenses for export);
 - (f) the feasibility and intentions for expanding and/or upgrading in each case;
- (2) the Government expenditure on the establishment or expansion of abattoir and meat processing facilities with a summary of each case 1960/1972 including dates when decisions to undertake expansion were made;
 - (3) the private abattoir and meat processing plants that have been established or expanded in the same period including date when a decision was made to establish or expand in each case;
 - (4) current Government and private enterprise projects for new and upgraded abattoir and meat processing capacity, including details of Government guarantees or other Government assistance involved in each case;
 - (5) the capital needs and the economic and other particulars of the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. project which awaits a decision on Government guarantees prior to consideration by Parliament; and
 - (6) the capacity—including location by areas—the Government considers desirable and necessary to be established and the desirable dates for installation of such capacity to fit in with future planned rates of livestock increases.

As is clearly indicated in the motion, it is seeking a clear and complete statement from the Government of the situation in the meat industry in Western Australia, with particular reference to the production of livestock for the meat trade, abattoir facilities for the slaughtering and treatment of livestock, and the present and potential consumer markets for our meat and meat products.

In the main, I have itemised the salient points, which are those on which most questions are being asked today; but the very important point is, of course, to have a comprehensive statement made which will guide every section of the industry. If such a statement were made promptly, it could be very timely, because currently

a number of groups are holding discussions on the desirability and feasibility of establishing abattoirs. Without a clear and early statement on the situation we could easily find every interested group backing off and leaving it to someone else.

The matters that must be clearly stated are—

What is the capacity of existing abattoirs?

Are these being fully utilised?

Could they be readily expanded?

In which districts are they located and what is the present and potential production of livestock in these areas?

Can it be anticipated that in certain areas stock production will move from principally sheep to mainly cattle; or from dairying to beef production?

Can the abattoir facilities in these areas cope with the change?

What impact will the improved wool prices have on the availability of sheep for the meat trade and on abattoir throughput?

Undoubtedly, we can expect a changing pattern in the outlook of many farmers arising out of the low wool prices and the poor returns for mutton, sheep, and lamb. These changing patterns show up in the diversification of farming activity, and one of these changes is the introduction of beef cattle at the expense of sheep numbers. In some instances cattle are replacing crops because of wheat quotas.

Without a doubt the upturn in wool prices will, to a degree, slow down the volume of mutton sheep which has flooded the market over the past two or three seasons. However, a good season in the sheep-producing areas will also have an impact on the volume of sheep coming to the market.

It is very important that Parliament and the people should be informed of the situation regarding the availability of livestock and the capacity of abattoirs to handle the livestock. The public needs to be told of Government expenditure and to what extent the State is committed to assist in the expansion of abattoir facilities and meat processing plants.

Mr. Graham: You did not show much concern about abattoirs in the 12 years that your people were in power.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The Minister is speaking to somebody who might easily have expressed a great deal of concern.

Mr. Graham: There has been a remarkable increase in activity since your party was bundled out of office.

Mr. Court: We are all agog with excitement to know what your Government has done. We have heard a lot of talk.

Mr. Graham: We hope to be opening an abattoir in three months.

Mr. Court: One that was commenced in our time.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I would like to remind the Acting Premier that by moving this motion I am presenting him and the Government with the opportunity to make a statement on the situation today. It is no good being wise by hindsight in such a situation. The need today is for a statement of the planning to meet future requirements.

Mr. Graham: There is greater activity than at any time in the State's history.

Mr. Court: There has been a great deal of talk. We expect to pick up the paper next week and hear Baldivis raised for the third time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Why did you not raise this matter in 1969?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): Order!

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I would like the Acting Premier to tell us the factual situation with regard to the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposition. What is the anticipated cost of this project, who is subsidising it, and for how much? What is the suggested contribution by the State?

Mr. Graham: Why do you hate the idea so much?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I would like these questions answered and I thought the Acting Premier was in a co-operative mood.

Mr. Graham: As usual.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Perhaps he will tell us something of the feasibility study which is taking place and who is footing the bill?

Mr. Graham: If the honourable member wants that question answered, it is the U.F.G.A.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I have been led to believe that the feasibility study will cost somebody \$40,000. Who is going to pay this? There are three parties who could pay it and one of them is the U.F.G.A.

Mr. Graham: Yes, and it is financially responsible. The U.F.G.A. will pay the bill if it has not already done so.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The U.F.G.A. will pay for the feasibility study. And that is the clear statement of the Acting Premier?

Mr. Graham: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Why did you not ask a question about it? That would have been easier.

Mr. Hutchinson: Has the account been paid yet?

Mr. Graham: That would be the business of another organisation. I do not think it concerns us.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I am very pleased to know the feasibility study will not be a charge on the State.

Mr. Court: We have the answer: The State is not going to pay.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: What other groups have sought assistance from the State and with what result?

On the 1st December, 1971, I clearly remember an occasion when the Acting Premier, the Minister for Agriculture, and other members met the Pastoralists and Graziers Association.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is a wonder you showed your face there, as a matter of fact.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The association was concerned with the crisis existing in abattoir facilities. No-one disputed there was a crisis.

Mr. Graham: What did your mob do about it?

Mr. Rushton: Your what?

Mr. Graham: Mob.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It is one thing to have a crisis and another thing to do something about it.

Mr. Graham: Something very definitely has been done.

Mr. Court: We are all agog to hear it.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: After the Acting Premier held the portfolio of Development and Decentralisation for some nine months, he discovered there was a crisis and he said he was going to resolve it. Again I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the presentation of this motion to Parliament is to seek the Acting Premier's solution of the problem.

Mr. Graham: You are trying to create some mischief.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I am amazed—

Mr. Court: If the cap fits you must wear it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: He would not do that!

Mr. Graham: You saw some movement after 12 years of sleeping.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: —that the Minister for Development and Decentralisation could read mischief into this motion. Let me state this, Mr. Speaker: The meat industry is probably the greatest industry in the country. It involves abattoir facilities, processing plants, and retailing systems.

Mr. Graham: Yes, it should have been looked after.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It has certainly been neglected for a long time. It is probably the biggest industry in the country.

Mr. Hutchinson: It ill-becomes the Government to cry mischief on this problem.

Mr. Graham: What did the previous Government do?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: To say this is mischief is a long way from the truth.

Mr. Graham: What a pitiful situation we inherited! One of the most important industries completely neglected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. I. W. MANNING: If the Government is prepared to tell us what the facilities were in 1971 and what they will be in the flush season of 1972, we will be making progress.

The Acting Premier is not the only person to show concern about the abattoir facilities. The trade has also been active on this problem. I hope the representative of the Government who replies to my motion will tell me the extent of the contribution of the trade towards resolving the crisis in abattoir facilities. Almost all of the abattoirs and meat processing groups have undertaken expansion at their own works. Perhaps overall this is only a small contribution to the problem we are facing, but it is an attempt on the part of the industry itself to do something to improve conditions generally.

Of course, there are also the proposed new works. Will the Government inform us which works will be in production this year? Will the Katanning abattoir come into production? Will the group sponsored by Westralian Farmers Co-operative Limited make progress? How far has the planning of the meat industry complex at Baldvis developed? This project was mentioned earlier tonight by the member for Toodyay. The Government should supply the answers to these questions.

Mr. Graham: Do you want a decentralised abattoir?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Graham: It is only a question.

Mr. Williams: It depends on the 10 per cent. for export.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: In the flush season last year problems arose due to the flood of stock, strikes, and that sort of thing; but we did not see those problems at the country killing centres. The privately-owned abattoirs seem to run very well and without strikes. I do not know where the public of Western Australia would be without them.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I do not know where the private section would be without the service abattoirs; nor do you.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The Minister for Agriculture has touched on a very important point. A great deal of the success of the cattle industry today is due to the fact that a great number of stock is killed and

treated in the areas of production. Certainly, if we did not have these country killing facilities the cattle industry would run into the same bother as the sheep farmers have run into at Midland Junction as a result of gluts and absolute congestion of stock at different times.

Mr. Graham: I think it is more desirable that the abattoir should be at, say, Katanning rather than at Baldvis.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It would seem to me that Katanning would be a very good place.

Mr. Graham: That is something which has taken place.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: If water supplies and other necessary facilities such as transport are available at Katanning, then I suggest that as Katanning is in a big stock district it would be ideal for the purpose.

Mr. Court: You must have both to have a complete set-up.

Mr. Graham: Yes, but I was wondering why there is all the concern about Baldvis whilst forgetting the country. It is only in the last few weeks that the Government has been able to acquire the land to make the Baldvis site worth while.

Mr. Williams: That is not the point.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wellington.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: If I can make a speech with the assistance I am receiving, perhaps I will continue. I hope the Government never overlooks the contribution made to the meat industry today by privately-owned country killing centres. I will make a further point.

Mr. Moiler: Which abattoirs are you talking about?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: There are many of them.

Mr. Moiler: Which ones?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Does the member for Toodyay wish me to name them?

Mr. Moiler: Yes, that is what I am asking. Name a few if you can.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Well, the abattoir at Waroona does a mighty job in that district. The buyers from that abattoir range far and wide. Then there is Green's abattoir at Harvey, which has a throughput of over 150 cattle a day. That is in round figures; and it is a calculated guess on my part. However, that abattoir buys within a wide arc from Harvey and plays an important part in the industry. Both those abattoirs are good abattoirs. There are many other smaller abattoirs. Does the honourable member wish me to name more?

Mr. Moiler: The smaller ones provide only for the local market, don't they?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Unfortunately, the member for Toodyay is displaying a complete lack of knowledge of what is going on in the country, because the abattoirs I mentioned first are exporting abattoirs.

Mr. Moiler: Apart from the two you mentioned, there is not a great number which do export.

Mr. Blaikie: There are three to start with.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I will not get involved in that argument. I think I have said sufficient to demonstrate that those people are important to the industry. If the Government has money to offer as backing to abattoirs then it should look first to the assistance of privately-owned abattoirs which could be expanded. I do not want to say a great deal more on this motion at the moment.

Mr. Jones: You haven't made out a very strong case.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Well, I am surprised at that interjection because, as I said earlier, this motion is designed to present an opportunity to the Government to answer the questions I have raised, and to mention any other points of interest about which it might wish to inform the Parliament and the people who are interested in abattoir facilities. Perhaps the Government could inform us about what is happening in regard to the prices about which the Acting Premier spoke so loudly last year. I think that is a case in itself, and I rest my argument there.

Mr. Graham: I think you have been led up the garden path by Doug Cash.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr. COURT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.06 p.m.]: I would like to speak in support of the motion because, like the member who moved it, I feel it is desirable that some report should be made to Parliament to give us definite information about how far negotiations have gone and to what extent the Government may be committed to some projects, and to give us an outline, as the motion suggests, of the extent of the facilities.

I have always had a fear in the back of my mind that perhaps we may have a proliferation of abattoirs before long and we might not have sufficient stock to keep them working in the way we would like them to work. Also, of course, we must look to exports today, and any abattoirs that may be established must be export abattoirs because the home market is insufficient to keep any other abattoirs working.

The meat industry is, of course, a vital one. The section in the greatest degree of trouble of late has been the mutton section.

The beef section seems to be rather more buoyant than the mutton section. The lamb section has fluctuated, but nowhere near as badly as the mutton section of the industry.

Some questions were asked a moment ago whilst the member for Wellington was speaking about the location of existing slaughtering facilities in Western Australia. I took some time out to locate these and to ascertain the number, whether or not they were exporters, and whether they were local abattoirs. I have taken my figures from the Australian Meat Board annual report for the year ended the 30th June, 1970. Unfortunately I was not able to obtain the 1971 annual report in time for the debate tonight. The location of export slaughtering establishments is included in each annual report of the Australian Meat Board. The locations are given in each State.

Altogether there are 12 licensed export slaughtering establishments in Western Australia. At Coogee we have Anchorage Butchers Pty. Ltd.; at Robb Jetty we have a State Government abattoir; at Midland Junction, once again the abattoir is owned by the State Government; at Spearwood, Watsons Foods Pty. Ltd.; at Albany, Thos. Borthwick and Sons (A/sia.) Ltd.; at Broome, Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd.; at Bunbury we have Bunbury Beef Exports (1967) Pty. Ltd.; at Derby we have Derby Meat Processing Co. Ltd.; at Narn-gulu, Geraldton Meat Exports Pty. Ltd.; at Harvey we have Harvey Meat Exports, also trading as E. G. Green and Sons; at Waroona, Wynne Meat Industries Ltd.; and at Wyndham we have Wyndham Meats (1967) Pty. Ltd. Those are our export slaughtering establishments. We have others in the process of construction at Katanning and Wooroloo, but as yet they are not export establishments.

Mr. W. G. Young: But it is their aim to become exporters.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Yes, their aim is to become exporting establishments. On top of that we have other meat outlets.

Again, this report issued by the Australian Meat Board on the 30th June, 1970, has a list of Australian meat exporters and they have facilities to process meat in different ways for the export trade, which means that they are not slaughtering establishments. There are many of these meat exporters, but nine of the premises occupied by them are not slaughtering establishments. So all in all there is a considerable number of establishments engaged in the processing and slaughtering of meat in Western Australia, but the criticism seems to be that in the past not enough has been done to meet the demands placed upon them. However, one must not forget that the standards of hygiene in the United States of America which were introduced into this State a few years ago are very high, and there is

no doubt that the introduction of those standards to this State affected the meat production considerably by slowing up the works for some time.

The member for Roe has also made a point to me as an aside that the drought brought about a tremendous influx of stock numbers to the metropolitan area, causing the abattoirs to be overworked at that time, and they could not cope with the increased demands that were made upon them. It was unfortunate that this happened at that particular time, and every effort was made to introduce slaughtermen from New Zealand to Western Australia to cope with the pressing situation. Eighty of these men were employed and we saw what happened as a result. All kinds of industrial disputes occurred at the abattoirs and several hundred head of stock were not processed.

We witnessed a situation developing which, to some extent, was unfortunate and did not react to the advantage of those people who were desperate in trying to get their stock onto the market as a result of drought conditions. It was a case of either letting them die in the paddocks or consigning them to the abattoirs. We have heard a great deal of criticism about this in the past and we also heard the Government claiming it is making every effort to rectify the situation. I hope it is able to carry out its promises. If it does I will give it every credit for doing so.

However, since the Government has been in office nothing has been done. I have here an article from *The West Australian* dated the 30th June, 1971. This report was made since this Government has been in office.

Mr. Graham: Three months.

Mr. McPHARLIN: It is a report of a Kojonup farmer who sent 242 sheep to market for sale and made a loss of \$19.18 on the deal. So there is no magic solution in the mind of the Government to any of these problems.

Mr. Graham: The solution is to build more abattoirs and this is exactly what is taking place.

Mr. W. G. Young: Where?

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Government is well aware that there is no magic solution to these problems.

Mr. Graham: It was shocking neglect on the part of the previous Government.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Nothing of the sort! The extension of the facilities at the Midland Junction Abattoir was well on the way when the present Government took office.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The previous Government went ahead with that work although Towns and Austen advised against it.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The present Government has the same advisers as did the previous Government.

Mr. Graham: The difference is that this Government is making the right decisions.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Who does the Government take advice from now that it has assumed office? Where does it go for the recommendations that are made? It goes to the same men who have been in the industry for 20 or 30 years. Perhaps the Government goes to U.F.G.A. for advice.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You brought consultants from Melbourne in the form of Towns and Austen, but you disregarded their advice.

Mr. McPHARLIN: It would seem that the present Government has made a pact with U.F.G.A. I am asking the Government who advises it. I suggest it is the same men who have been in the industry for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Towns and Austen advised you and you ignored them.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Towns and Austen report contained the recommendation to build a new abattoir, but the situation was so serious at the time we could not wait, and that is why the extensions to the Midland abattoir were made. What would the Minister have done? Would he have carried out the extensions to the Midland abattoir, or would he have waited for two or three years for a new abattoir to be constructed?

Mr. H. D. Evans: We would have done something long before your Government took action.

Mr. McPHARLIN: If the Minister had waited two or three years for the construction of a new abattoir he would have done a disservice to the farming community because there was an immediate need at that time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Why? Because you let it happen. You fouled this up for 12 years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McPHARLIN: What has the Government done?

Mr. Court: Talk!

Mr. Jamieson: Do you want us to turn this place into an abattoir?

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Government has not done anything.

Mr. Graham: Oh yes we have!

Mr. McPHARLIN: Let the Minister tell us what the Government has done.

Mr. Graham: You will be told in due course.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Government has done nothing that was not planned previously.

Mr. Graham: You ought to belt your own leader for his neglect over the years.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The abattoir that is being extended at Wooroloo is a private concern and it will be a very effective and efficient works. Already a representative of this concern has made a trip overseas and it has been given an assurance that it can obtain markets in other parts of the world. This concern is an example of a very efficiently conducted abattoir.

However, during these peak periods with large stock numbers coming onto the market and despite the facilities for their slaughtering being increased at Robb Jetty and at the Midland Junction Abattoir, these abattoirs are still not able to cope with the slaughtering of the stock because a rationalised system has had to be introduced to contain the stock numbers to a certain point each week.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We inherited that, too!

Mr. McPHARLIN: There is definitely a lack of slaughtermen and I hope the Government has a solution when it comes to facing these new problems. At the present time the Government has no method it can use. I asked a question in this regard and the answer I received indicated that the abattoirs are still short of the total number of slaughtermen that could be employed. All these factors only add to the present problem. There is a need for the people to be informed by Parliament of the progress that is being made at the abattoirs in meeting the demands being made for the slaughtering of stock.

The establishment of an abattoir by U.F.G.A. is a question which I think is causing a deal of unrest in certain quarters. From what I have been able to read in the past and from the observations I have been able to make it is not suggested there is anything of a substantial nature in the proposition. I can only hope that if the motion is agreed to the Government will submit a comprehensive report to clear up some of the doubts that exist in the minds of responsible people as to what stage the U.F.G.A. proceedings have reached, what is the real standing of the prospectus it issued, and whether it is a legal document and in order. Further information on this aspect is desired.

Quite a number of people have made inquiries about this matter and in this respect I refer to a letter which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 6th December, dealing with the discussion between the President of the United Farmers and Graziers Association and the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council on ABW 2. The letter states—

I have never heard two men discuss a subject with less knowledge of it than the president of the United Farmers and Graziers' Association and the secretary of the Trades and Labor

Council when being interviewed on ABW 2 about the proposed two new abattoirs.

Mr. Brown: Who was that letter written by?

Mr. McPHARLIN: By a Mr. Torrent from Scarborough.

Mr. Brown: Is he an authority on abattoirs?

Mr. McPHARLIN: It is a fair statement.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Who is this person?

Mr. McPHARLIN: Another newspaper report contains figures which indicate that if a $\frac{1}{4}$ a pound were to be taken by the U.F.G.A. and another $\frac{1}{4}$ were to be taken by the T.L.C.—that is, if the proposal got off the ground, if the stipulated number of animals were treated and if the organisation obtained the sales anticipated at the prices it expected—then both of those organisations would receive something like \$1,000,000.

Mr. Gayfer: Rather than referring to the first organisation as Ufga, it should be referred to as Afghan!

Mr. Jamleson: Some of your members have supported this proposal. Some of them have been on deputations to me seeking assistance for the venture.

Mr. McPHARLIN: That was the sort of money they were after. The figures mentioned in the newspaper report were queried by some people who have been engaged in the meat industry for many years. They could not agree with the figures; they did not think the figures were correct or that they could be substantiated.

In a report which appeared in *The Countryman* of the 9th March, 1972, the author of which was John Lawson, the same query was raised. I am sure that a number of members have seen it. He queried the figures quoted by the U.F.G.A. and the T.L.C. group. These are the reasons for my support of the motion before the House. I think that a report which contains more information and a greater understanding of what is going on should be issued, because I am of the opinion that this group will not get any support.

If I remember correctly I read in the prospectus that it is anticipated the group will be operating in July this year. That is utterly impossible. To make this statement around the country is improper, because it is not correct. It indicates how much the two gentlemen who were interviewed on ABW 2 knew about the subject. I give my support to the motion and hope the Government will provide the details which the motion seeks.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE*Printing of Report*

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [9.25 p.m.]:
I move—

That Report No. 2 of the Public Accounts Committee relating to the Auditor General's Report for 1971, laid upon the Table of the Legislative Assembly on 15th March, 1972, be printed.

With the indulgence of the House I want to state briefly why I have moved the motion that the report be printed. The reason is fairly obvious. We want this report to be distributed within the departments of the State Government, so that the officers will have the opportunity to study the manner in which the Public Accounts Committee has examined the criticisms that are mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1971.

At the same time I would like to have recorded in *Hansard* the excellent manner in which the witnesses appeared before the committee, and provided in a most detailed form the evidence which was required, so that the committee could then make a determination on the matters before it.

The officers of the departments who came before the committee were quite frank, and were able to give the committee a great knowledge of Government accounting. I myself have had many years of experience with Government accounting, but continually I am receiving further education in this system. I believe this goes for all the other members of the committee.

We are fortunate to be serving on this committee, as a result of which we are increasing our knowledge and our understanding of the manner in which the Government accounts are prepared and presented in the various reports which come before this Parliament.

I would like to thank the other members of the Public Accounts Committee and its secretary (Mr. Thornber) for the excellent way in which they have attended the meetings and studied the evidence that has been presented. We are quite hopeful that the work undertaken by this committee has already made a mark in this particular area of public accounting, and we hope the committee will achieve the success that was intended when it was originally decided by this Parliament that the committee be established.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.29 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 30th March, 1972

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

LAPSED BILLS*Restoration to Notice Paper: Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting that in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to Lapsed Bills, adopted by both Houses, the Legislative Council resume consideration of the following Bills:—

Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.

Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.35 p.m.]: I move—

That leave be granted to deal with the message forthwith.

The **PRESIDENT**: When I put this motion, if there is a dissentient voice we cannot proceed with the matter. There being no dissentient voice I declare the question carried.

Question thus passed.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.36 p.m.]: I move—

That the Assembly's message be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

POTATO INDUSTRY*Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion*

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the Potato Industry in Western Australia and to make such recommendations as are considered desirable to encourage greater productivity and expansion of the industry, including processing and export trade opportunities, with view to bringing further benefits to growers and the general public, and that the Select Committee be empowered to utilise the evidence received by a similar committee appointed in the previous two sessions of Parliament.