

their attitude towards zone allowances granted to people in remote areas of Australia. We are losing many people from the north; people who cannot afford to live in these remote areas, and this is not good for the stabilisation of the towns in which we expect development to occur. It was my realisation of this trend that led me to make application to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to allow me to engage in this tour of other countries and I thank the association for approving my application.

I would like to mention that the foreword, a summary of my report, plus the *Hansard* report of the speech I am now making will be forwarded to all those departments, Governments, and individuals who assisted me throughout the trip so that they may see the fruits of that trip and what I have brought back to Australia. I would also like to extend my thanks to the members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the Western Australian State Government, the Governments of other countries, and the many individuals who enabled me to speak in this House dealing with the findings I have made following my tour.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley.

## **PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this Bill is to give the Public Trustee the authority to dispose of records that serve no useful purpose. Section 47 (1) of the Public Trustee Act as it stands at present requires the Public Trustee to retain forever records relating to all estates administered by him.

Retention of records for a reasonable period is desirable from the point of view of the Public Trustee, and of persons dealing with his office. However, permanent retention of all records is considered to be unnecessary and too costly.

Section 46 of the Public Trustee Act provides for inspection and audit by the Auditor-General and this has relevance in consideration of the proposed amendment to section 47.

The substitution of the new subsection (1) of section 47 will permit the Public Trustee to plan a programme for the destruction of records according to the nature thereof at the expiration of an appropriate period after an estate is finalised and cleared by the Auditor-General. In effect, important documents could perhaps be kept for a minimum period of 20

years and the bulk of files destroyed after a period of not more than six years, although ledger cards or micro films relating to estates would be retained permanently.

Advantage has also been taken of this opportunity to amend the Public Trustee Act as a consequence of part V of the Administration Act being repealed and embodied in the Death Duties Assessment Act in 1973. At that time the consequential amendment to section 19 (1) of the Public Trustee Act to substitute "Death Duties Assessment Act" for "Administration Act" was not considered necessary by virtue of section 14 of the Interpretation Act, 1918.

Section 19 (2) similarly requires the substitution of the relevant corresponding provisions now contained in the Death Duties Assessment Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition).

*House adjourned at 8.03 p.m.*

## **Legislative Assembly**

Wednesday, the 19th March, 1975

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

### **QUESTIONS (96): ON NOTICE**

#### **1. TRAFFIC**

*Great Eastern Highway, Greenmount:  
Speed Limit*

Mr **MOILER**, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) What was the previous miles per hour speed limit when travelling east on the Great Eastern Highway, between Buninyong Road and Bullara Road, Greenmount and Buninyong and Innamincka Roads, Greenmount, before the changeover to metric speed limits?
- (2) What is the present kilometres per hour speed limit for the two areas listed above and what would be the equivalent miles per hour?
- (3) How many speed traps have been set in the area listed, since the change to metric speed signs and how many drivers have been fined for exceeding the speed limit in the area listed and what is the total amount of revenue raised?
- (4) Is the area concerned considered to be a hazardous stretch of road, and if so, what is the basis for such assumption?

- (5) For what duration of time and from what hour was a speed trap established in the area on Friday, 21st February, 1975?
- (6) How many drivers were stopped by police officers at the speed trap?
- (7) How many were issued with infringement notices?
- (8) How many were charged with having exceeded the speed limit by—
  - (a) less than 5 kilometres per hour;
  - (b) less than 10 but more than 5 kilometres per hour;
  - (c) less than 20 kilometres but more than 10 kilometres per hour;
  - (d) more than 20 kilometres per hour?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) 40 mph (64.4 km/h).
- (2) 60 km/h (37.3 mph).
- (3) (a) 52 by staff of Midland Traffic Office plus a small number of intermittent patrols from Perth Traffic Office.
- (b) 380 approximately.
- (c) \$7 600 approximately.
- (4) Yes, undesirable accident history.
- (5) 11.50 am-12.35 pm.
- (6) 15.
- (7) Six.
- (8) (a) Nil.
- (b) Nil.
- (c) Six.
- (d) Nil.

## 2. POLICE STATION

### *Mundaring*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) In view of the police takeover of traffic and the eventual absorption of the Mundaring Shire area under that control, would he indicate whether this will affect the decision to build a new police station and quarters at Mundaring?
- (2) Will he explain his department's intentions with regard to a new police station at Mundaring?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Traffic control in the Shire of Mundaring will eventually be taken over by the Road Traffic Authority, which is at present making investigations into the question of accommodation. Until these investigations are completed, I am unable to indicate what effect this will have on the building of a new police station and quarters.

- (2) The construction of a new police station is programmed for 1977-78, subject to funds being available.

## 3. SWAN VALLEY

### *Government Study: Report*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

With reference to the State Government's study of the Swan Valley and in view of the fact that some weeks have elapsed since he was reported, in *The West Australian* as saying: "I expect a report in a few weeks", will he advise whether the report has been received by him, and if so, will he table the report?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

An assessment of the agro-economic trends in the Swan Valley has confirmed the interaction of various interests such as rural, industrial, housing, mining, environmental protection, tourism and recreational.

The Department of Agriculture has made a preliminary study and following discussions with the Town Planning Department a detailed survey of the various forms of intensive agricultural production in the valley is planned.

Information obtained will be collated on an interdepartmental basis by the Town Planning Department which is undertaking an up-to-date study of the region for consideration by appropriate authorities.

## 4. MEAT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### *Membership*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Would he list the members comprising the Meat Industry Advisory Committee and which section, groups or association, within the community, each represents?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

Members of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee and the interests which members represent are as follows—

Mr C. C. Bennett (Chairman)—Government Abattoirs

Mr R. Boylen—Department of Industrial Development

Mr M. E. Burns—Meat Industry Employees' Union

Mr J. Craig—Controller of Abattoirs, Department of Agriculture

Mr R. L. Lewis—Beef Producers

Mr M. T. Locke—Meat and Allied Trades Federation  
 Mr H. G. Neil—Department of Agriculture  
 Mr J. Phelan—Mutton Producers  
 Mr R. Trevaskis—Private Abattoirs and Exporters  
 Mr R. D. Hartwell—Co-opted Member, Australian Department of Agriculture

Koongamia	39
Middle Swan	67
Midland	40
Midvale	46
Swan View	42
Upper Swan	20
West Swan	9

(3) Intake year 8 only—181.

#### 5. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL Canteen

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

(1) Is it the Minister's intention to include a refrigerated cold room store in the canteen at present being built at Eastern Hills High School?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) Under existing policy the Education Department provides a commercial type refrigerator and space for a cool room. Completion of the cool room by the school is subsidised on a dollar for dollar basis.

#### 6. SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS Enrolments

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

(1) What are the present enrolment figures for first, second, third, fourth and fifth year students at Kalamunda Senior High School?

(2) What are the present enrolment figures for seventh grade at the following schools—

Bellevue,  
 Greenmount,  
 Guildford,  
 Helena Valley,  
 Herne Hill,  
 Koongamia,  
 Middle Swan,  
 Midland,  
 Midvale,  
 Swan View,  
 Upper Swan,  
 West Swan?

(3) What is the present student enrolment for Forrestfield High School?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) —

(as at 19th March, 1975)	8	9	10	11	12	Total
	225	401	343	200	136	1 310

(2) Bellevue ..... 13  
 Greenmount ..... 37  
 Guildford ..... 49  
 Helena Valley ..... 12  
 Herne Hill ..... 15

#### 7. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Extensions and Improvements*

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

(1) In view of the Minister's Press statement of more than six months ago during August 1974, in which he advised that Eastern Hills High School would be up-graded to a senior high school for 1976, would he now indicate—

(a) to what stage has the building programme for the school progressed to ensure that there will be adequate accommodation at the school for the 1976 intake;

(b) what designing and planning has taken place, additional to that being presently constructed?

(2) With regard to the improvements presently being carried out at Eastern Hills High School under contract with Dietrich Bros. at a cost of \$137 200—

(a) how much of the contract price is being made available from Schools Commission funds?

(b) from what source is the remainder being obtained?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Planning for additional rooms is being undertaken but the date of commencement of construction will be determined by finance available.

(2) (a) and (b) The total contract price is being met from Schools Commission funds.

#### 8. MT. HELENA SCHOOL

##### *Resource Centre*

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

With regard to the resource centre being constructed at Mount Helena Primary School at a contract price of \$53 000, would the Minister advise what amount of the contract price is being met out of Schools Commission funds?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The full funding is being met from Schools Commission funds.

## 9. HIGH SCHOOLS

*Prevocational Centres*

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

Would the Minister list those senior high schools which do not have a pre-vocational centre built within the school grounds?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Albany  
Bunbury  
City Beach  
Eastern Goldfields  
Esperance  
Geraldton  
Hollywood  
John Curtin  
Karratha  
Kewdale  
Manjimup  
Merredin  
Mount Barker  
Narrogin  
Northam  
Tuart Hill

## 10. MEAT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Inquiry: Report*

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

(1) Has the Government, since December 1974, directed the Meat Industries Advisory Council to undertake an inquiry into the following facets of the meat industry—

- (a) meat classification;
- (b) distribution systems and costs at the domestic market level;
- (c) livestock potential;
- (d) abattoir and other processing needs; and
- (e) organisation of marketing?

(2) If "Yes" to (1), when was the directive issued and what was its precise wording?

(3) Has the Government received an interim or final report on the results of any such investigation as referred to in (1), and will he table a copy of such report?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) and (2) Yes, on 6th December, 1974.

The request stated—

December 6, 1974

Mr. C. C. Bennett,  
Chairman,  
Meat Industry Advisory  
Committee,  
c/o W.A. Meat Export Works,  
Post Office Box 49,  
FREMANTLE. 6160.

Dear Mr. Bennett,

You are no doubt aware of the recent motion by Mr. B. R. Blaikie, Member for Vasse, to have a select committee appointed to enquire into certain aspects of the meat industry in Western Australia.

In considering this proposal the Government has decided that in the first instance the Meat Industry Advisory Committee would be invited to report to it on aspects of the industry.

I would be pleased therefore if you would arrange for the committee to enquire into and report on the following:

- \* Livestock production potential
- \* Abattoir and other processing needs
- \* Organisation of meat inspection
- \* Market opportunities
- \* Organisation of marketing
- \* Meat classification
- \* Distribution systems and costs at the domestic market level.

It is desirable for you to ensure that the committee's report is completed and forwarded to me by March 15, 1975. The Government will then consider Mr. Blaikie's motion against this background.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. McPharlin,  
MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE.

(3) The report is now being studied and it is expected that it will be tabled next week.

## 11.

**BEEF***Minimum Price Scheme*

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

(1) With whom does the responsibility for policing the provisions of the minimum price beef scheme rest?

(2) How many contraventions of the conditions set down in the Act and regulations have been reported, and how many legal actions have been indicated?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) The Beef Industry Committee administers the minimum price beef scheme.

(2) The committee is aware of a number of allegations that cattle in classes within the scheme have been sold at below the scheduled minimum prices. No documented evidence in this respect has however been presented to the committee.

One apparent contravention of the provisions of section 8 (2) of the Act—which relates to the buying or selling of beef—has been drawn to the attention of the committee. Further investigation failed to obtain sufficient information to initiate a prosecution.

## 12. COURTS

### *Bridgetown and Nannup: Ministerial Visit*

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

- (1) Did the Minister include a visit to the towns of Bridgetown and Nannup in his tour of inspection of court facilities during 19th and 20th February, 1975?
- (2) Were the Members of the Legislative Council for the particular provinces notified?
- (3) Does the fact that the Member for Warren in whose electorate the towns referred to in (1) above was not notified indicate that the Minister is dispensing with the long established courtesy closely followed by the Ministry of the Tonkin Government?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Minister's itinerary included official visits to Kojonup, Albany, Denmark, Mt. Barker and Busseton.

An unofficial stopover was envisaged for Bridgetown, time permitting, and the shire clerk was informed in such terms. Nannup was not visited.

- (2) All Legislative Council Members in the provinces concerned were notified, more particularly in respect of official visits to those areas indicated in (1).
- (3) It is not accepted that the long established courtesy referred to was always closely followed by the Ministry of the Tonkin Government. However, if the Honourable Member is of the opinion that circumstances in this instance warranted such advice to him, the Minister wishes to express his regrets for the omission.

## 13. HOGGET

### *Lamb Marketing Board Jurisdiction*

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

- (1) On what date did the Government first refer the proposal that the Lamb Marketing Board should have its trading powers extended to include hogget to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee?

- (2) On what date was a reply received from the Meat Industry Advisory Committee?
- (3) What recommendations did the Meat Industry Advisory Committee make to the Government?
- (4) Will he table a copy of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee's report?
- (5) Following receipt of the first report from the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, was the proposal referred to the committee subsequently for further consideration?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), was the report or proposal reconsidered by the full Meat Industry Advisory Committee, and if not, what members did consider it?
- (7) Did the Chairman of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee place a further report before the Government based on reconsiderations of the initial report or recommendations, and if so, what was the context of the further report and will he table it?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) The 10th February, 1975—apart, of course, from the wider reference in respect of the meat industry generally on the 6th December, 1974.
- (2) The 10th February, 1975.
- (3) The committee indicated that it was not opposed in principle to an extension of the board's powers to include hogget subject to the role of the board being limited to the development of potential overseas markets and the co-ordination of supplies where necessary.  
It was also stated that there should be a fixed date of termination of any notice prepared under part IV of the Act; and that the board should maintain its intention to trade through private exporters whenever possible.
- (4) A copy of the statement made by the committee is tabled.
- (5) to (7) On the 11th February, the committee was asked to provide specific comments on a series of questions relating to the proposal to extend the board's trading powers. These questions had been discussed in detail at the Committee's meeting on the 10th February.

Draft comments which were prepared as a basis for reply in relation to the questions were unanimously endorsed by the full committee.

The committee indicated that it had been given no factual evidence from the board establishing a precise case why it was essential that the board should be given authority to trade in hogget.

The committee understood that contracts for hogget had been successfully arranged by private exporters in the absence of any consultation with the board; and further the sale of lamb was not contingent upon inclusion of a proportion of hogget but rather the question of a contract naming the sheep as being younger than 18 months.

There was already provision under the Australian Meat Board regulations for "off season" lamb to be shipped as "summer lamb" to any market except the UK and EEC.

*A copy of the statement was tabled (see paper No. 76).*

#### 14. LAMBS

##### *Throughput, Price, and Imports*

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

- (1) How many lambs were slaughtered for—
  - (a) local consumption;
  - (b) export,
 in Western Australia in each of the years 1972, 1973 and 1974?
- (2) What was the average monthly price per lamb paid to producers in 1973 and 1974 by the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board?
- (3) What was the average price estimated per lamb on a monthly basis received by producers in 1972?
- (4) How many lambs were imported into Western Australia in each of the years 1972, 1973 and 1974, and from what source did they come?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) 1972: Total slaughterings were 1 580 814. Available statistics do not provide a division between local consumption and export.  
 1973: (a) 816 235.  
 (b) 440 751.  
 1974: (a) 727 135.  
 (b) 580 769.
- (2)
 

	1973	1974
	\$	\$
January	6.13	9.21
February	7.20	10.59
March	7.66	10.00

	\$	\$
April	8.23	9.78
May	9.21	9.51
June	9.58	8.81
July	8.96	8.08
August	10.16	8.00
September	9.14	7.01
October	9.10	6.12
November	8.29	5.90
December	9.26	6.16

Note: The above prices do not include the value of skins.

#### (3) 1972

	\$
January	4.97
February	5.84
March	6.20
April	6.02
May	6.30
June	8.48
July	9.72
August	10.30
September	6.33
October	5.18
November	5.12
December	5.33

Note: The above prices have been estimated from Midland quotations on a cents per kg basis, using the average annual carcase weight of 14 kg.

The prices do not include the value of skins; saleyard fees and sales commission to be deducted in order to reach a net price to producers.

- (4) Statistics on quantities of lamb carcasses imported from other States are not available to my department. Statistics in this respect are maintained by the Public Health Department.

Department of Agriculture records show 657 sheep and lambs were introduced from the Eastern States into Western Australia in 1972. There were no records of live sheep/lamb introductions either in 1973 or 1974.

#### 15. TRAFFIC LIGHTS

##### *Benningfield Road-Leach Highway Junction*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he advise when the traffic lights will be in operation at the junction of Benningfield Road and Leach Highway?

Mr Grayden (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

It is expected that traffic control signals will be commissioned on Monday, the 24th March, 1975.

## 16. SEWERAGE

*Gosnells*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has finance been made available to the Town of Gosnells by his Government to construct sewerage development in the Town of Gosnells district?
- (2) If (1) is "Yes" what areas are considered to be top priority?
- (3) If (1) is "No" why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No: however, due to difficulties experienced by the Town of Gosnells, the board assisted in the construction of some installations initiated by the local authority in its inaugural interim sewerage scheme.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) It is not board policy to make funds available to local authorities for this purpose: the board has committed substantial funds in recent years for the provision of sewerage headworks to serve the Gosnells-Armadale area.

## 17. RAILWAYS

*Murdong Siding*

Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Railways Department to close Murdong siding?
- (2) If so, would he please advise the tonnage of goods handled at this siding over the past 12 months?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No. However, consideration is being given to closure of the siding for less than car load traffic.
- (2) Tonnage handled in year ended 30/6/74 was 1 903 tonnes.

## 18. TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES

*Lecturers: Payments to Teachers Credit Society Ltd.*

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Teacher Education Authority agreed to make deductions from the salaries of lecturers in the teachers colleges, for life assurance companies and hospital benefit societies, for transfer to the Teachers Credit Society Ltd.?
- (2) Are these transfers of moneys to the Teachers Credit Society in arrears?

## (3) If (2) is "Yes"—

- (a) when was the last date on which these payments were made to the credit society;
- (b) how many lecturers are involved in these arrears of payments;
- (c) what sum of money is involved in these arrears?
- (4) Will the Minister give an assurance that the lecturers concerned will not be disadvantaged in any way by the failure of the Teacher Education Authority to make these payments to the credit society?
- (5) What arrangements have been made to ensure that lecturers receive interest on the sums which should have been transferred to the said society for investment?
- (6) Will the Minister ensure that the Teacher Education Authority keeps up-to-date with its transfer of funds to the Teachers Credit Society Ltd.?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The Teacher Education Authority agreed to make deductions from the salaries of lecturers in the teachers' colleges for life assurance companies, for hospital benefit societies and for transfer to the Teachers Credit Society Limited.
- (2) No.
- (3) to (6) Not applicable.

## 19.

## KANGAROOS

*Quotas and Tags*

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

For the period 1st February, 1974 to 31st January, 1975—

- (1) What was the quota of kangaroos in the Gascoyne catchment area?
- (2) How many were actually shot in this period?
- (3) How many damage tags were issued during the period?
- (4) How many damage tags were applied for?
- (5) What is to be the quota for the 1975 management year?
- (6) On what date will the Red Kangaroo Advisory Committee next meet?
- (7) Are kangaroo quotas set by the Red Kangaroo Advisory Committee?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Initially, 28 500 red kangaroos, but this was later amended on the recommendation of the Biological Working Group to 30 000.

- (2) 26 370.
- (3) 700.
- (4) Two applications were recorded—one for 1 000 tags and the other for an unspecified number. After inspection, 500 tags were issued to the first applicant and 200 tags to the second.
- (5) Tentatively 30 000 red kangaroos in the Gascoyne catchment area. This may be amended if circumstances warrant.
- (6) Field data collected by research personnel of the Biological Working Group is being processed for the information of members of the Red Kangaroo Advisory Committee. A meeting will be called as soon as practicable—probably in May or June to recommend quotas up to December, 1976.
- (7) Quotas are set by the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife on the recommendation of the Red Kangaroo Advisory Committee. The Commonwealth Government has indicated that before export of kangaroo products will be permitted the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Conservation, among other things, must be satisfied by the State Minister in charge of wildlife conservation that the State's annual quota is reasonable bearing in mind the status and condition of the kangaroo populations in that State.

## 20. KANGAROOS

### *Legislation and Revenue*

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What is the cost of administering the kangaroo legislation in Western Australia?
- (2) What is the amount of revenue collected under this legislation?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) It is not possible to determine precisely the cost of administering the Fauna Conservation Act in respect only of kangaroos. Estimates will vary widely according to the criteria used. An estimate prepared for submission to a meeting of the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers on the 9th March, 1973, to support an application for financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government is tabled.

- (2) Revenue from the sale of tags for red kangaroos and grey kangaroos and from fees for shooters' and processors' licenses in the 1973-74 financial year was \$32 000 (approximately).

*The estimate was tabled (see paper No. 77).*

## 21. MOTOR VEHICLES

### *Trailer Licenses: Recording Fee*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Traffic:

Will he advise why the public were not notified in the Press that vehicle trailer licenses were going to include a \$4 recording fee after the trailer license had already risen by \$2 from \$3 to \$5 for the license fee?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

It is not customary to publicise such increase in fees when the matter has been fully debated in both Houses of Parliament.

## 22. SCHOOL AT SOUTH WILLETTON

### *Site*

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

- (1) Will the Minister advise if an area of land has been purchased by his department on which to erect a primary school at South Willetton in order to relieve the overcrowding at Willetton primary school?
- (2) If "Yes" what is the exact location and when will building commence?
- (3) If "No" why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Two primary school sites and a combined primary-high school site have been considered in the Canning Town Council's town planning scheme 24. As yet, the site for the South Willetton Primary School, located in Portcullis Drive, has not been fully acquired.
- (2) and (3) The property and valuation office of the Public Works Department is proceeding with acquisition of the above site.

## 23. ALBANY HIGHWAY

### *Gosnells-Kelmscott: Widening*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Main Roads Department to widen Albany Highway from Fremantle Road through Gosnells to Kelmscott?
- (2) If "Yes" when will this work commence?



- (3) Will there be many businesses affected by this widening?
- (4) If "Yes" what businesses will be affected, and to what extent?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The department has no plans to widen Albany Highway from Fremantle Road through Gosnells to Kelmscott.
- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

## 24. FRUIT-FLY BAITING SCHEMES

### *Withdrawal of Districts*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many districts as defined in the Plant Diseases Act comprise the south suburban district fruit-fly baiting scheme?
- (2) Is it possible for part of a district to withdraw from any particular district as defined; if so, what is the procedure?
- (3) If part of a district wishes to withdraw, is not the whole of the district entitled to vote if a referendum is held?
- (4) Is it possible for a district or part of a district to withdraw other than by a referendum?
- (5) From where is a list obtainable of persons who would be entitled to vote at a referendum?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Portions of two Municipal districts, that is, Armadale-Kelmscott and Gosnells, the areas of which are delineated in *Government Gazette* of the 6th September, 1974.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes, providing a request as defined in the Act by at least 10 per cent of those qualified to vote in the district is received.
- (4) Yes. The discontinuation of a scheme is provided for under section 12C of the Act but applies only to a district as "a whole". However it is at the committee's discretion as to whether all or any fruit trees are treated.
- (5) A roll of persons entitled to vote is prepared only for the purpose of a poll. At other times a roll is not maintained. All owners or occupiers of registered orchards are entitled to vote.

25. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 25th March.*

## SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME

### *Inquiry*

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

- (1) Reference is made to my questions without notice dated 19th and 20th November, 1974, concerning school building programme—where the Minister replied to the latter question "Cabinet has approved a sub-committee to continue the investigation which will result in changes in planning procedures"—and ask whether the sub-committee has completed its deliberations?
- (2) If so, what changes in planning procedures have been taken or will take place?
- (3) Has the W.A. Council of State School Organisations been notified?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Has the said council subsequent to its telegram to the Minister dated 14th November, 1974 relating to the school building programme sought an open inquiry into same?
- (6) If "Yes" why has not this request been met?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The sub-committee has not completed its deliberations but continued investigations are leading to a modification of the previous procedures.
- (2) The most significant change effected relates to the early commissioning, planning and financing of projects.
- (3) and (4) The council has not been notified as the deliberations have not been finalised.
- (5) and (6) The interest of the council is known but an open inquiry is not necessary to adapt the building programme to the current supply of materials and the utilisation of resources.

## 27. NORTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

### *Repairs and Renovations*

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

- (1) When was the last occasion that a "repair and renovation" was performed at North Kalgoorlie school?
- (2) When is the next "repair and renovation" at this school programmed to take place?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 1967-68 financial year.
- (2) Tender for the repairs and renovations is about to be let.

## 28. HIGH SCHOOLS *Driver Instruction*

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

- (1) In how many senior high schools is motor driver education available, and on what basis is it available?
- (2) Are there any senior high schools where instruction in driver education is not available, and if so, how many, and why?
- (3) Has the Minister either initiated or supported moves by any other State or Territory of Australia for top level consideration to be given to the introduction of a co-ordinated uniform nation-wide programme of upper secondary school driver education?
- (4) If "Yes" would he please advise what has taken place and what are the prospects for implementation of such a scheme?
- (5) If "No" would he likewise make an appropriate statement?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) 44 senior high schools offer motor driver education. The course is available if there is a member of the school staff who is both willing and qualified to give such a course and if, in addition, a motor vehicle has been made available for instructional purposes.
- (2) 9 senior high schools do not offer motor driver education because there is no qualified driver instructor available to give such a course.
- (3) to (5) Western Australia has made significant progress in driver education and would support proposals for its extension and development.

Other States are aware of the progress in Western Australia and it is believed that the programmes might well form the basis for developments in these States.

## 29. HOUSING *Kalgoorlie-Boulder*

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

- (1) How many rental homes owned by the State Housing Commission are in Kalgoorlie-Boulder?
- (2) How many such homes have been constructed since 1971 (including that year)?
- (3) How many current applications for homes in the above district are outstanding?

- (4) How many new homes are to be built in the said district during the balance of this calendar year?
- (5) Is he able to indicate on a State-wide basis (excepting the metropolitan area) what proportion of the aggregate number of SHC tenants in the affected area would be tenants comprising school teachers, civil servants, police officers, bank officers, and other personnel residing temporarily in a given district?
- (6) If so, what is the ratio?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 89 rental homes includes housing provided under the Aboriginal housing scheme.
- (2) 70.
- (3) 210 includes Aboriginal applicants.
- (4) Tenders have been called for 10 family units and arrangements are in hand to invite tenders for a further 38 units of family and pensioner accommodation.
- (5) No—houses are allocated on an individual basis and the occupation of tenants could only be ascertained by a detailed check of all tenancy records and/or a physical check of all houses.
- (6) Answered by (5).

## 30. TEACHERS

### *Housing: Kalgoorlie-Boulder*

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

- (1) How many teachers in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder district are known by the department to be seeking suitable and reasonably priced accommodation?
- (2) Are any such teachers in receipt of a subsidy in the matter of their accommodation?
- (3) If so, how many?
- (4) How many Government Employees Housing Authority homes or units are available in Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and how many teachers are thus accommodated?
- (5) How many teachers are in service in Kalgoorlie and Boulder?
- (6) Does the department maintain an up-to-date list of available private accommodation to which teachers seeking accommodation may have access in Kalgoorlie-Boulder and elsewhere?
- (7) Would the Minister please ascertain from his appropriate ministerial colleague the number of additional GEHA homes and units that will be available in Kalgoorlie-Boulder at the commencement of the 1976 school year?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The Education Department established special procedures to meet housing requirements in Kalgoorlie and it is believed that teachers are satisfactorily accommodated. The department is not aware, however, of any teachers who wish, for personal reasons, to seek other accommodation.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Forty-one houses occupied by 40 married male teachers and 1 married female teacher. Nine duplex units occupied by 27 single teachers.
- (5) 203.
- (6) Yes. A survey of available private accommodation is completed prior to the long vacation. In addition, a local departmental representative is on duty during the long vacation to assist teachers.
- (7) Currently the purchase of an existing six-bedroom duplex is being negotiated by the GEHA. One 3-bedroom house is under construction. These units should be available by February 1976. Advance requirements for two 3-bedroom houses and two 6-bedroom duplexes have been listed for inclusion in the 1976-77 GEHA housing programme.

If purchase of existing units is possible, one or more could be available by the commencement of the 1976 school year.

31.

### POLICE

#### *Housing: Kalgoorlie-Boulder*

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

- (1) How many police officers, including constables, are stationed in Kalgoorlie and Boulder?
- (2) How many of these personnel are known to be experiencing difficulty in acquiring suitable and reasonably priced accommodation?
- (3) How many homes and units exist in Kalgoorlie-Boulder which are used to accommodate police officers, in which the Government has an ownership interest?
- (4) When and how many additional homes for use by police in the above district are to be acquired?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Kalgoorlie—44  
Boulder—7
- (2) Kalgoorlie—5  
Boulder—Nil
- (3) Kalgoorlie—20  
Boulder—1

- (4) Kalgoorlie—1 for 1975-76 housing programme  
Boulder—Nil

32.

### EDUCATION

#### *Free School Books Scheme*

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

With regard to a report in the *Sunday Independent* of 9th February, 1975, wherein the Minister stated that schools would be able to choose from 3 000 titles to supplement other learning material supplied by the Government, would he please advise—

- (a) the cost of supplementary material;
- (b) the names of the private printing companies which were involved in the preparation of this material;
- (c) the global cost of such private company work;
- (d) was the Government advised that the Government Printer would have been unable to perform the additional work?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) The right of schools to choose from a very wide range of reading materials was continued in the 1975 school year. In addition, consistent with the Government's expressed policy of widening choice, primary schools were able to purchase social studies material produced either by the Education Department or commercial publishers.

Orders were placed for reading materials with a total retail value in excess of \$465 000. To the end of February the cost of learning materials supplied through the Government Printer was \$238 000.

- (b) to (d) All printing required by the Education Department is submitted to the Government Printer who makes whatever arrangements are appropriate with due concern for cost, quality and delivery dates.

33.

### RAILWAYS

#### *Kalgoorlie Booking Office: Improvements*

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

- (1) Is he now in a position to advise if improvements for both staff and patrons are to be effected to the Kalgoorlie railway booking office?

- (2) If so, when is the work expected to commence?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes. The improvements will be effected. Planning for renovating Kalgoorlie station building is almost completed and the work proposed for the booking office is included.
- (2) Subject to adequate funds being available it is hoped the renovations can be undertaken in the 1975-76 financial year.

### 34. GIRRAWHEEN SCHOOL

#### *Opening*

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

- (1) What have been the reasons for the delay in effecting proper and timely occupation of the Girrawheen Primary School?
- (2) Is electricity now connected to this school?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Unavailability of ceiling panels has delayed the completion of the school buildings.
- (2) No.
- (3) Until such time as the ceilings are completed and electrical fittings are installed, the connection of power is not possible.

### 35. SOUTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

#### *Building Project*

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

- (1) What have been the reasons for the delay in completion of the latest building project at South Kalgoorlie Primary School?
- (2) Has the said project now been completed to the satisfaction of all concerned?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The contractor, through shortages of certain materials and difficulties in obtaining labour at required stages, has not been able to complete his contract as planned.
- (2) No.

### 36. KALGOORLIE AND BOULDER POLICE STATIONS

#### *Staff*

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

- (1) What was the total number of police personnel (inclusive of uniform, plainclothes, C.I.B. and women) at the commencement of each of the years 1964 to 1975 at the Kalgoorlie and Boulder police stations?

- (2) How many of the present staff total at Kalgoorlie station can be required at any time to perform relieving duties at stations out of Kalgoorlie?

- (3) How long is it since regular foot patrols of police took place in Kalgoorlie?

- (4) Why were foot patrols discontinued?

- (5) Is he satisfied that the Kalgoorlie station is adequately staffed with police personnel?

- (6) Would he please itemise the items of duties such as collection of statistical data, which might be regarded as extraneous to the proper duties of a police officer but which duties are required to be performed by police personnel?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1)	Kalgoorlie	Boulder
1/1/64	37	7
1/1/65	38	7
1/1/66	38	7
1/1/67	38	7
1/1/68	38	7
1/1/69	38	7
1/1/70	39	7
1/1/71	39	7
1/1/72	41	7
1/1/73	42	7
1/1/74	44	7
1/1/75	44	7

- (2) Two.

- (3) Ceased end of December 1974.

- (4) Shortage of staff due to relief for annual leave and supplying of men for Laverton disturbance. This has now been rectified and regular foot patrols resumed.

- (5) Yes, in relation to present strength of force.

- (6) Collection of late returns of agricultural and pastoral statistics once a year. Inspection of shearers' accommodation during regular patrols.

### 37. TOTALISATOR AGENCIES

#### *Kalgoorlie*

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

- (1) Is the Totalisator Agency Board the registered proprietor of premises formerly used as a T.A.B. agency (No. 104) in Boulder Road, Kalgoorlie?

- (2) If not, did the board rent or lease the said premises?

- (3) Is the board still paying a rental or lease fee, and if so, how much per given period of time?

- (4) For what period of time is the board committed to pay such a fee for the said premises, notwithstanding that such premises are not being used?

- (5) How does the board justify paying such lease or rental fee and maintaining the building on a non-remunerative basis?
- (6) If the answer to (5) is of the essence that the operation of a T.A.B. agency at the said premises at the present time cannot be economically justified, has the operation of an agency at the said premises ever been justified?
- (7) What is the reason for maintaining the closure of former agency (No. 99) in Hannan Street, Kalgoorlie?
- (8) If former agencies (Nos. 99 and 104) cannot now in the opinion of the board be justified, were the operation of these agencies ever justified; if so, for what periods of time (months and years) for each agency?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) \$250.00 per annum.
- (4) 25 years.
- (5) As a result of the sudden termination of their contracts by 3 agents in Kalgoorlie and Boulder a review was carried out.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) Answered by (5) above.
- (8) Yes—during the period they were open.

### 38. STATUTORY AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

#### *Loan Programmes*

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Did he complain recently that difficulties were being experienced by some authorities in filling their borrowing programmes?
- (2) Has this situation improved and to what extent?
- (3) Has this improvement been achieved because of measures taken by the Australian Government?
- (4) If "Yes" what were the measures?
- (5) If not, what factors caused the improvement?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Earlier this financial year most Government authorities were experiencing difficulty in filling their borrowing programmes.
- (2) Yes. Up to the end of December, larger authorities had succeeded in raising only 24.7 per cent of the approved borrowing programme for this financial year. By the end of February, 77.3 per cent had been raised.

- (3) to (5) The higher liquidity of financial institutions in recent months and the expectation of a change in interest rates for shorter term borrowings, led to increased support of semi-governmental loans in January.

### 39. COAL, NATURAL GAS, AND OIL

#### *Reserves and Consumption*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What are the known reserves of coal, natural gas and crude oil in Western Australia both on-shore and off-shore?
- (2) How many tonnes of coal were mined for—
  - (a) export;
  - (b) local use during the financial years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74?
- (3) How much natural gas was used in the same financial years?
- (4) How many barrels of crude oil were obtained in the same financial years?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Reserves of Coal

The total reserves of coal in the ground in the Collie coalfield are estimated to be 1 915 million tonnes of which 282 million tonnes have been tested and considered extractable under present economic conditions.

The only other occurrence in Western Australia which may be considered extractable is at Eneabba where about 35 million tonnes may occur.

#### *Reserves of Natural Gas*

Total known recoverable reserves of natural gas on-shore and off-shore as at the 1st January 1975—14 trillion standard cu ft (396 billion cubic metres).

#### *Reserves of Crude Oil*

Total known recoverable reserves of crude oil on-shore and off-shore as at the 1st January 1975—142 million barrels.

(2) (a)	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	tonnes
	Nil	616	10 719	
(b)	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	tonnes
	1 187 506	1 152 999	1 186 192	
(3)	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	thousands cubic metres
	281 905	831 425	795 809	
(4)	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	bbls
	16 279 122	14 557 421	14 542 396	

## 40. STATE ENGINEERING WORKS

*Relocation*

Mr FLETCHER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) In view of the present state of the State Engineering Works in North Fremantle, has the Government any plans either to relocate or upgrade the complex?
- (2) If the works are to be relocated, has the industrial land in the vicinity of Robb Jetty been investigated as a possible site?
- (3) If not, what alternative sites have been considered?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Relocation has been under consideration but no definite decision has yet been made.
- (2) Yes, but the land is considered unsuitable in view of its proximity to the W.A. Meat Export Works.
- (3) Answered by (2) above.

## 41. STATE ENGINEERING WORKS

*Rezoning of Site*

Mr FLETCHER, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

As it is understood that an approach has been made by the City of Fremantle to rezone the State Engineering Works' land in North Fremantle to urban, could he indicate what progress has been made in respect of this request?

Mr Ridge (for Mr RUSHTON) replied:

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is investigating the recommendation made for rezoning proposals in the North Fremantle area. Consultations with affected authorities are taking place.

## 42. MEAT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Inquiry: Report*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does he propose to table the meat industry inquiry report prepared by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The report will be tabled as indicated in my reply to question 10.
- (3) Not applicable.

## 43.

## BEEF

*Minimum Price Scheme*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does he believe the voluntary minimum price scheme for beef to be working satisfactorily?
- (2) If "No" is he able to indicate where the scheme is inadequate and what he proposes to do to implement improvements?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) It is considered that the minimum price beef scheme introduced at the beginning of 1975 has contributed towards maintaining the prime quality cattle for domestic consumption.

It is acknowledged that the scheme has been under pressure when higher than usual numbers of trade cattle have been forwarded for sale and some cattle have been returned to the properties of origin when they did not reach the "reserve". As a consequence the scheme was recently extended to include trade baby beef.

The honourable member will recollect that the initial minimum price schedule determined by the committee was maintained until the 17th March when the minimum price for all classes of beef was increased by 2 c per kg.

The Australian Meat Board has indicated that domestic beef prices in Western Australia for the classes of beef in the scheme have since January, 1975, been consistently higher than the prices obtainable in other States. The present difference is in the order of 6 to 15 c per kg.

- (2) Not applicable.

## 44.

## POULTRY FARMERS

*Registrations*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many registered poultry farmers are now in Western Australia?
- (2) Will he table a list showing the registered farmers, the number of hens which each is licensed to carry, and their address?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) There were 350 producers in the industry at January, 1975, based on producer returns to the W.A. Egg Marketing Board under the provisions of the Poultry Industry Levy Collection Act.

- (2) No. This information is considered to be confidential and cannot be divulged for this reason.

#### 45. SCHOOLS

##### *Mundaring Electorate: Resource Centres*

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

- (1) At which primary schools will resource centres be established this year?
- (2) When is it anticipated that resource centres will be built at the following schools—

High Wycombe,  
Swan View,  
Mundaring,  
Darlington,  
Helena Valley?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Subject to fund availability, resource centres will be undertaken at—

Baler  
Beachlands  
Busselton  
Callsta  
Churchlands  
Craigle  
Fitzroy Crossing  
Forrestfield  
Graylands  
Kambalda  
North Inglewood  
North Innaloo  
North Perth Junior Primary  
Pinjarra  
West Kambalda  
Winterfold

- (2) The schools listed will be considered in future building programmes.

#### 46. MEAT INSPECTION FEES

##### *Report*

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

Will the Minister table the Treasury report on financial aspects of meat inspection fees; if not, why not?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Yes. The report referred to was commissioned by the Commissioner of Public Health and was prepared jointly by officers of the Public Health Department and the Treasury. It is tabled herewith.

*The paper was tabled (see paper No. 78).*

#### 47. MENTAL HEALTH

##### *Tresillian Hostel: Resiting*

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

Is it the Government's intention to resite the Tresillian Hostel?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Consideration has been given to the relocation of residents in the Tresillian Hostel but a decision to do so would depend upon satisfactory alternative accommodation.

#### 48. SCHOOLS

##### *Mundaring Electorate: Dental Checks*

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

- (1) Is it intended that dentists or dental therapists will visit any of the primary schools situated within the Mundaring electorate during 1975?
- (2) When can it be anticipated that dental checks will be commenced at schools within the Mundaring electorate?
- (3) Which State schools have been or will be attended this year?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) Dental checks in State schools are carried out by dental personnel and personnel of the School Health Service, and it is anticipated that dental inspections will be available to children in the Mundaring electorate during 1975.
- (3) As the member is apparently interested in visits in the Mundaring electorate, it is anticipated that all schools in the electorate will be visited this year.

#### 49. METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD

##### *Financial Result*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the profit or loss for Perth metropolitan water supplies activities of Metropolitan Water Board for the most recent available year?
- (2) Does the accounting allow for interest and amortisation charges on all capital invested on water services?
- (3) If so, what rate of interest and amortisation is assumed for these water services?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) A deficit of \$683 472 in 1973-74.
- (2) Yes.

- (3) This depends on the source of the funds; Treasury loan funds are charged interest at 6½ per cent and amortised over 53 years and private borrowings are subject to interest rates up to 10.3 per cent amortised over varying periods depending on conditions agreed to at the time negotiations are made.

## 50. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Carilla*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it now intended that a water supply for the township of Carilla will be provided?
- (2) What is the estimated cost per service to finance this venture?
- (3) Could he supply detail of cost per service to the last five country towns to be supplied with a reticulated system?
- (4) How is it intended to finance the Carilla scheme if it is proceeded with?
- (5) From what source will water be obtained to service such a scheme?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$2 887.
- (3) Cervantes—\$1 650.  
Cowaramup—\$1 560.  
Ledge Point—\$740  
Moulyinning—\$1 670  
Pingrup—\$7 500
- (4) The scheme will be financed from State loan funds.
- (5) Water will be obtained from the Metropolitan Water Board system.

## 51. WATER SUPPLIES

### *South-West Land Division: Financial Result*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the loss for country water supplies activities of the Public Works Department in the South-West Land Division or comparable region for the most recent available year?
- (2) Does the accounting allow for interest and amortisation charges on all capital invested on these water services?
- (3) If so, what rate of interest and amortisation is assumed for these water services?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The loss for Country Areas Water Supply (other than North-West towns including the Pilbara) for the year 1973-74 was \$12 546 866.

- (2) Interest is charged on all loan funds expenditure. Depreciation is charged on all capital expenditure, including loan funds and contributions from private sources.

- (3) The rate of interest is the current calculated figure as advised by the Treasury Department. For 1973-74 this figure was 6 per cent.

The rate of depreciation is calculated on the basis of the estimated remaining life of the assets of the schemes, and varies from year to year.

## 52. WATER SUPPLIES

### *North-West and Pilbara: Financial Result*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the loss for water supplies in the North-West and Pilbara area activities of Public Works Department for the most recent available year?
- (2) Does the accounting allow for interest and amortisation charges on all capital invested on these water services?
- (3) If so, what rate of interest and amortisation is assumed for these water services?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) \$2 402 730 for the year 1973-74.
  - (2) Interest is charged on all loan funds expenditure. Depreciation is charged on all capital expenditure including loan funds and contributions from private sources.
  - (3) The rate of interest is the current calculated figure as advised by the Treasury Department. For 1973-74 the figure was 6 per cent.
- The rate of depreciation is calculated on the basis of the estimated remaining life of the assets of the schemes, and varies from year to year.

## 53. ROAD TRANSPORT INQUIRY

### *Recommendations: Implementation*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any of the recommendations made in the Sander road transport inquiry?
- (2) If "Yes" will he outline the recommendations that will be adopted by the Government?
- (3) If "No" will he advise if the Government intends introducing any changes which will assist to overcome the problems in the road transport industry?



Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) The report which resulted from the inquiry did not make any recommendations. The main conclusion drawn from the report is that there should be some system to stabilise the transport industry by control over entry and prevention of uneconomical operation of vehicles through overcrowding in the industry. This is currently receiving attention.

There are a number of aspects to be examined before a workable scheme can be devised but when this is finalised consideration will be given to the drafting of the necessary legislation.

Another point which became evident from the inquiry was the desirability of a manual or set of rules to assist small transport operators in the organisation and management of their businesses. Consideration is being given to the preparation of a small booklet along those lines.

54.

## RAILWAYS

### *Derailments*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will he list the derailments which have occurred in the WAGR since the Government took office in 1974?
- (2) Will he advise the number of inquiries that were carried out in connection with the derailments and what action he intends taking to reduce the number of derailments occurring?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Since the present Government took office in April, 1974, eighty (80) derailments have occurred.
- (2) Specially constituted departmental boards inquire and report immediately into the causes of all derailments.

The action taken and which will continue to be taken to minimise the number of derailments is a continuous process commencing with the inquiries described, which are held to ascertain the cause of the individual derailment. These causes, whether they relate to condition of rolling-stock, condition of track, design features of rollingstock, effect of loads, speeds etc., are constantly under review by engineering and technical staff with the objective of minimising or obviating the particular cause.

55.

## POLICE

### *Laverton Incident: Charges*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many people were charged by the police during the recent Laverton dispute?
- (2) How many of the charges were withdrawn and what were the reasons for the charges being withdrawn?

Mr O'CONNOR replied

- (1) If reference is being made to the Skull Creek incident on the 5th January, 1975, then 27 persons were charged and 28 charges preferred. However, there were incidents at Laverton on the 21st December, 1974, and the 2nd January, 1975 which precipitated the Skull Creek incident.
- (2) No charges were withdrawn and no application was made by the police to have any charges withdrawn. As costs cannot be awarded unless a conviction is recorded, it can only be construed that because costs were in fact awarded, the defendants were convicted.

56.

## POLICE

### *Laverton Incident: Report of Inquiry*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Will he table the report conducted by Magistrate Syddall into the Laverton dispute in order that Members of Parliament and the public generally can be informed of the nature of the report?
- (2) If "No" will he please inform Parliament the reasons why the report cannot be tabled?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Confidentiality was the prerequisite to the effectiveness of Mr Syddall's work.

57.

## RAILWAYS

### *Perth-Country Passenger Services: Inquiry*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In view of the fact that he informed me by letter dated 18th December, 1974 that he was having an inquiry into the Perth-Geraldton, Perth-Albany and Perth-Bunbury rail passenger services, will he kindly advise if the investigation has been carried out and the decision reached by the Government in connection with these services?

- (2) If a decision has not been reached, in view of the concern being expressed by residents in these areas, will he advise when a firm decision will be made?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The results of the inquiry which has been made into the rail passenger services referred to by the honourable member are being examined by Cabinet and a decision will be given in due course.

## 58. MUJA POWER STATION

### *Extensions*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) In view of the statements made by the Premier during his recent visit to Collie in connection with the extensions to the Muja power house, will he kindly advise whether the extension programme will be changed to fall in line with the programming earlier determined by the Tonkin Labor Government?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" will he advise when the additional unit will come onto load and also the different employment figures at various stages of construction;
- (b) If "No" will he advise the reasons for the delay in programming in view of the oil crisis?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The commission recommended to the then Minister for Electricity on the 30th March, 1973, that Muja power station be extended by two 200 mW units. The first unit was to be commercially available for the winter of 1980. The second unit would be installed later depending upon the scheduling of a pumped storage development being considered at that time. Generally it was envisaged that the second unit would be available for the winter of 1982. This recommendation was approved by the then Premier in Cabinet on the 2nd April, 1973. The present programme is for the first unit to be in service for the winter of 1980 and the second unit to be in service for the winter of 1981. This is somewhat earlier than the original approval given by the Tonkin Government.

The programme, however, is currently under review as a result of the lower trend of growth in the electrical demand. Further, as indicated by the Premier, investigations are currently also in progress to assess the practicability

and cost of converting some generating units at Kwinana to coal firing. Should this course of action be adopted it may also influence the timing for bringing into service the Muja units.

- (2) (a) If the construction of the Muja units proceeds on the basis of the present programme as elaborated in the second part of the answer to the first question, then the estimated employment figures at various stages of construction would be as follows—

December 1975—40
December 1976—170
December 1977—360
December 1978—570
February 1979—600
June 1979—470
December 1979—260
December 1980—20

- (b) Not applicable.

## 59.

## POWER STATIONS

### *Coal Consumption*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Will he please advise the monthly tonnages of Collie coal that have been used at the East Perth and South Fremantle power stations since they were converted back to coal burning stations?
- (2) Will he please advise the monthly tonnages of coal delivered to the Bunbury power house for the period 1st April, 1974 to 28th February, 1975?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Collie coal used—

1974	East Perth Power Station	South Fremantle Power Station
August .....	387	1 794
September .....	4 359	7 704
October .....	7 354	12 722
November .....	10 289	13 632
December .....	9 401	12 995
1975		
January .....	11 391	15 891
February .....	10 894	16 360

- (2) Coal delivered—

1974	Bunbury Power Station
April .....	13 601
May .....	17 850
June .....	19 010
July .....	29 063
August .....	29 861
September .....	26 907
October .....	31 937
November .....	43 738
December .....	28 266
1975	
January .....	24 569
February .....	34 984

## 60. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

*Staff, Areas, and Expenditure*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) At what date did the new traffic authority commence to operate?
- (2) How many men have been transferred or employed in this new authority since it commenced to operate?
- (3) What additional areas formerly controlled by shire traffic control have been taken over by the new authority and what are the names of the local authorities involved?
- (4) How many additional policemen or patrolmen have been engaged at centres where takeovers have occurred?
- (5) What has been the expenditure involved in the changeover to the traffic authority control and the individual expenditure in each case?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Although members of the authority have been appointed it will not commence operations in the full sense until the Road Traffic Act is proclaimed in its entirety.
- (2) to (5) Answered by (1).

## 61. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

*Uniforms*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) During the debate on the setting up of the new road traffic authority and prior to the debate, the Minister made various Press statements, that the patrolmen would wear a blue or different shade uniform to policemen: would he please advise if any decision has been made on the colour of the uniform and when the new uniform will be introduced?
- (2) If it is not intended to now change the colour of the uniform, will he give the reasons why?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No decision has yet been made as to the colour of uniforms.
- (2) Answered by (1).

## 62. RADIO AUSTRALIA

*Relocation at Carnarvon*

Mr LAURANCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the Postmaster General's Department is considering relocating the Radio Australia facility from Darwin following damage caused by cyclone Tracy?

- (2) As the tracking station site at Carnarvon is available and would appear to be ideally suited, would he give an assurance that everything within the State Government's power will be done to attract the establishment of the facility to the Carnarvon site?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The only notification I have is what appears in *The Australian* of Friday, the 14th March.

It refers to the fact that the Federal Cabinet last Tuesday—the 11th March, 1975—approved the Postmaster General's Department funding the installation of two temporary transmitters, one of 250-kilowatt and the other of 100-kilowatt, at Gnangara, north of Perth, at a cost of \$2.5 million, to replace the four transmitters destroyed by cyclone Tracy at Darwin.

- (2) The State Government will bring to the attention of the Commonwealth Government the facilities available at the Carnarvon Tracking Station site for the setting up of permanent transmitters.

Obviously, we would prefer to see a site like Carnarvon used, to one close to the city. Also, we would have thought it had some technical and geographic advantages.

53. This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 25th March.

64.

## PREMIER

*Flights in Private Jets*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that, as detailed in *The West Australian* of 20th January, 1975, he was a guest passenger in the private jets of several large American companies which have invested in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes" will he detail each and every one of the flights referred to, including the names of the companies concerned?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The comments in *The West Australian* of the 20th January, 1975, and referred to in this question, suggest that I was a guest passenger in private jets across America to Washington.

In fact, the party travelled by commercial airline across America from San Francisco. We did avail ourselves of the opportunity to make several very early morning short flights between eastern cities in private jets in company with in-transit officials.

Such arrangements certainly afforded me the full utilisation of my time in the USA.

Offers of more extensive use of private jet aircraft were declined.

- (2) The above explanation is sufficient I consider in the circumstances. If the honourable member confers with some of his Opposition colleagues, he will find that they availed themselves of this, and other types of private aircraft transport when offered in the normal course of their travels.

## 65. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Artesian Wells and Bores: Meters*

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

Have any meters been installed on artesian wells or on bores from any underground source or any other private or commercial water supply system in the metropolitan area?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The Metropolitan Water Board advises that an artesian bore operated by Cockburn Cement Ltd. is metered by the company and monthly returns of water drawn are rendered to it. The information is for monitoring purposes only and no charges are raised. The board is not aware of meters being installed on any other private or commercial water supply system in the metropolitan area.

A Public Works Department bore gauger has been measuring flow rates, salinities and shut-down heads on artesian bores in the Swan Valley using temporary flow meters.

## 66. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

### *Meetings of Authority and Council*

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

- (1) What are the dates of the meetings of the Environmental Protection Authority for 1974 and so far for 1975 and who was present at each of those meetings?
- (2) What are the dates of the meetings of the Environmental Protection Council for 1974 and so far for 1975 and who was present at each of those meetings?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

I would ask that the answers to this question be tabled.

*The answers were tabled (see paper No. 79).*

67.

## BUILDING BLOCKS

### *Urban Land Review Committee*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Has he created an urban land review committee to advise him on the supply of building lots?
- (2) If "Yes" who are the members of the committee and what interests do they represent?
- (3) When is it expected that the committee will present its first report to the Minister?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mr K. Meyer, Co-ordinator of Urban Development.  
Mr L. Graham, Co-ordinator of Planning, Town Planning Department.  
Mr W. Harse, Senior Engineer, Land Planning and Development, Metropolitan Water Board.  
Mr M. G. McDonald, Urban Development Institute of Australia representative.
- (3) The membership of the committee has only recently been determined. Its first meeting will be held shortly and the first report to the Minister will be submitted as soon as practicable.

## 68. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

### *Wetlands: Sanitary Landfill*

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

- (1) What is the policy of the Environmental Protection Authority with respect to wetlands and their continued use for disposal of waste products by the sanitary landfill method?
- (2) Is the Government fully in accord with this policy?
- (3) What action is contemplated so as to reduce the incidence of the destruction of our wetlands by the sanitary landfill method?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) The Environmental Protection Authority desires protection of wetlands and to this end on the 12th February, 1974, all Government departments were requested at ministerial level to ensure that proposals for changes in wetlands are referred to the Environmental Protection Authority.
- (2) The present Government has had no reason to change this policy.
- (3) Answered by (1).

**69. UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES***Contamination*

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

- (1) Have there been any complaints that waste products from any source have contaminated or may have contaminated underground water in use in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Is there any evidence revealed by the monitoring programme that such contamination has occurred?
- (3) Will he table the Fried report into the pollution of underground water in the metropolitan region?
- (4) Is he concerned that continuing disposal of waste substances in the metropolitan area may contaminate Perth's water supply?
- (5) If (4) is "Yes" which local government authority areas are the cause for concern?
- (6) What action is to be taken to circumvent continued contamination?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No, not in so far as public water supplies are concerned.
- (2) No.
- (3) The Fried Report is concerned with a study made at one particular land fill site and is only of preliminary nature which serves to indicate the need for further extensive studies associated with sanitary land fill. Implications of the report are still being studied by the board. I wish to say that "board" here refers to the Metropolitan Water Board. No purpose would be served in tabling the report at this stage.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The local authorities are those in whose areas the board is either currently extracting water or is investigating potential underground water supplies. The local authorities are: City of Stirling; Shires of Wanneroo, Swan, Kwinana, Rockingham and Murray; Town of Cockburn.
- (6) The Metropolitan Water Board proclaims underground water pollution control areas when and where this is appropriate: two have been proclaimed to date. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Water Board confers with the Public Health Department regarding the location of waste disposal sites.

**70.****WATER SUPPLIES***Metropolitan Consumption and Future Requirements*

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

- (1) What has been the total use of water provided by the Metropolitan Water Board per year for each of the years 1904, 1914, 1924, 1934, 1944, 1954, 1964 and 1974?
- (2) What was the population served by the Metropolitan Water Board in each of those years?
- (3) What are the figures showing the relative use of water for domestic purposes on the one hand and for industrial purposes on the other?
- (4) What population is it estimated that the Metropolitan Water Board will serve for each of the years 1977, 1980, 1983, 1986, 1989, 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001 (or some such suitable time interval)?
- (5) What will be the estimated water requirement in each of those years for the area?
- (6) What allowance has been made in (5) above for possible industrial development, such as a jumbo steel works and/or other such projects?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The answer will be tabled.

**71.****STATE FORESTS***Overcutting*

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

- (1) What is the purpose of the annual report of the Conservator of Forests?
- (2) Why was not the level of overcutting in State forests reported in the years since 1960?
- (3) Is it the policy of the Government that the public should be kept informed of the future and present state of the State forests?
- (4) Was ministerial or other governmental pressure applied to any of those officers who have held the position of Conservator since 1960, to suppress the information that the State's hardwood forests were being depleted as a result of continuous overcutting?
- (5) Has any Conservator of Forests been disciplined because of his failure to inform the Parliament (and consequently the people) that the hardwood forests were being seriously overcut?

- (6) Why did not the woodchip environmental impact statement not indicate the degree of overcutting of any part of the State forest?
- (7) Is this impact statement adequate considering that the question of overcutting was not mentioned?
- (8) Will he table the impact statement referred to above?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Section 42 of the Forests Act, 1918-1969, provides—

- (1) The Conservator shall prepare for the Minister not later than the thirtieth day of September in each year, an annual report to the preceding thirtieth day of June of all proceedings under this Act.
- (2) Such annual report shall contain a statement in detail of the revenue and expenditure of the department, and shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.
- (2) The level of overcutting of sawlogs in State forest did not become apparent until revised inventory information became available during the preparation of general working plan No. 85 of 1972. The previous Minister for Forests, (Hon. H. D. Evans), was fully informed of the position regarding overcutting in memorandum forwarded by the then Conservator, Mr W. R. Wallace, on the 7th December, 1971, and this information was also included in the submission from the Minister to the Premier in Cabinet seeking approval for the general working plan No. 85 embracing hardwood forests. Similar and more recent information is contained in documentation submitted to and subsequently published by the Forwood Conference of April, 1974.

- (3) Yes. Answered by (1) and (2).
- (4) No.
- (5) No, and nor was this necessary because of the circumstances described in the answer to question (2).
- (6) No overcutting is proposed under the terms of the Woodchipping Industry Agreements of 1969 and 1973.
- (7) Yes. See answer to (6).
- (8) This is not deemed necessary as copies of the Woodchipping Environmental Impact Statement have already been supplied to both the Parliamentary and State Libraries.

72.

## RUBBISH DISPOSAL Cost, and Transfer Station

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) What is the estimate of the cost per annum of the collection and disposal of solid waste by local authorities in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Is he or any Government instrumentality preparing the installation of a transfer station for putrescible waste in the City of Stirling?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" how much such waste could be handled per day and what arrangements for funding will be made?
- (4) If (2) is "No" is there a need for such a station, and if so, when will action be taken?
- (5) Has a study been undertaken into the relative merits of transfer stations and baling units for any local government authority; if so, what are the details?

Mr Ridge (for Mr RUSHTON) replied:

- (1) \$4 220 000 in 1973. No later figures available.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The matter is still under consideration.
- (5) It is understood that a study was made by ANI Australia Pty. Ltd. on behalf of the Public Health Department as regards transfer stations and pulverisation but not baling for the north-west coastal area. The details are embodied in appendix 5 to the report on "Community Waste in the Perth Metropolitan Region (1974)" by the Public Health Department.

73.

## WATER SUPPLIES

### Unconfined Ground Sources

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

Considering that the annual throughflow of unconfined ground water north of the Swan River is something like 140 million cubic metres per year and there is no estimate possible of artesian water available, is not the estimated 128 million cubic metres that will be needed from this source by 1991 dangerously high as it leaves no margin for error?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The availability of water from underground sources has yet to be evaluated. Other resources will be available to supplement the underground supplies.

## 74. TOWN PLANNING

*Herdsmen Lake: Report*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Is the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority report on Herdsmen Lake which was to have been finalised early in 1975 yet finalised; if so, will he table it?
- (2) If it is not yet completed, when will it be available to the public?

Mr Ridge (for Mr RUSHTON) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Discussions are still taking place with various authorities but because of the need to determine road design and resolve environmental aspects affecting the locality, a definite date cannot be given for completion of the report.

## 75. RUBBISH DISPOSAL

*Sanitary Landfill: Report*

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

- (1) Was the report "Sanitary Landfill" tabled in reference to question 20 of 27th August, 1974, the same as that prepared by a technical sub-committee of the metropolitan Refuse Disposal Planning Committee of the Public Health Department on the question of the disposal of various wastes and the threat therefrom to public health?
- (2) If "No" will he table the latter report?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

## 76. WATER SUPPLIES

*Capital, Operational, and Piping Costs*

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

- (1) What are the costs at the present time of—
  - (a) capital works;
  - (b) maintenance and operational charges per unit of metropolitan water obtained from—
    - (i) surface water catchments;
    - (ii) underground sources?
- (2) What are the costs per unit, both capital and recurrent, of transporting metropolitan water from the source to the service reservoirs of each of the major sources (both surface and underground)?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) Total cost of capital works for water to the 30th June, 1974 —\$130 760 029.
- (b) Maintenance and operational charges for the 1973-74 year:
  - (i) 0.28c per cubic metre from surface catchments (at headworks).
  - (ii) 4.82c per cubic metre from underground sources including cost of pumping and treatment (from the treatment plant).
- (2) Based on figures to the 30th June, 1974, the costs per cubic metre are—
 

surface catchments—	1.92c
capital, and	
0.42c maintenance and	
operating	
underground sources—	0.11c
capital	
0.19c operating.	

## 77.

## POLICE

*River Rock Cruises: Report*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has he received reports on underage drinking and/or other matters relative to the "river rock cruises of Temeraire I"?
- (2) If "Yes" how many has he received and will he table them?
- (3) If he will not table said reports will he give every reason for this refusal?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

## 78.

## POLICE

*Prostitution: Charges*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Will he give the names and addresses of the persons who have been charged with offences relating to prostitution in the metropolitan area since 1st April, 1974 in each case stating the address of the brothel concerned?
- (2) Of those charged will he indicate which persons were convicted, the description of the offence committed, and the penalty (if any) imposed?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I do not wish to advertise illegal activities and therefore do not propose to answer these questions.

## 79. NUDE BATHING

*Reserve*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it true that he intends to declare a legal nude bathing reserve in this State?
- (2) If "Yes" when and where?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1). I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member.

## 80. CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

*Children at Roebourne*

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

- (1) Is it a fact that a court in Roebourne recently ordered corporal punishment of children?
- (2) If "Yes"—
  - (a) who made the order and when, and upon convictions for what offences;
  - (b) was the order complied with and when, where and in whose presence;
  - (c) if the answer to (b) is "Yes" what were the ages, sex of the said children, and were they white or Aboriginal children?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Roebourne Children's Court recently used section 34 (c) of the Child Welfare Act by adjourning several cases on near relatives undertaking to punish their children in a reasonable or moderate manner as approved by the court, and then dismissing the charges.
- (2) (a) Members of the Children's Court took this action on the 3rd, 5th and 10th February, 1975, in respect of 35 charges of breaking, entering and stealing, 3 of wilful damage, and 3 of interfering with parts of motor vehicles.
- (b) Yes, during court proceedings in the precincts of the court house in the presence of Children's Court members, near relatives of the children, a police officer, and a community welfare officer.
- (c) Aboriginal males aged 10½, 11, 11½, 12, 13, 14 and 15½ years. Aboriginal females aged 12, 14, and 15½ years.

## 81. POLICE

*Laverton Incident: Report of Inquiry*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that there is considerable unrest in the Police Force and elsewhere by reason of his refusal to make Magistrate T. Syddall's report public?
- (2) Will he now table Magistrate Syddall's report relative to the brutality unlawful and unfair conduct which is alleged to have occurred at and about Skull Creek and Laverton on and about 5th January, 1975?
- (3) If "No" will he give each and every reason for his refusal?
- (4) Will he table all or any of the other reports which the Government or any of its servants or agents have received relative to the Skull Creek-Laverton incident?
- (5) If "No" will he give each and every reason for his refusal?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) Confidentiality was a pre-requisite to the effectiveness of Magistrate Syddall's work.
- (4) No.
- (5) Our primary concern is to achieve lasting and practical results through improved community relations.

## 82. KEARNAN COLLEGE

*Manual Arts and Home Science Classes*

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

Will he give approval for classes in manual arts and home science to be conducted at the Manjimup Senior High School for post-primary students of Kearnan College after normal school hours by teachers who have indicated that they are prepared to do so?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The question of the use of the manual arts and home economics centres at Manjimup Senior High School by post primary students from Kearnan College has been the subject of considerable correspondence to the honourable member and the principal of the college. These letters have indicated that students from Kearnan College can use these facilities during the normal school hours provided that the centres are



available, and also on the assumption that a teacher from Manjimup Senior High School is also available to take the classes.

On previous occasions, the suggestion for after hours use was not acceptable because it inevitably causes major difficulties with bus travel by students.

### 83. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

#### *Blackouts*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Was the article headed "Minister acts to stop power chaos" which appeared in the *Weekend News* dated 8th March, 1975, substantially correct?
- (2) If so, and in view of the State's unprecedented long dry summer, what was the reason for the State Electricity Commission's failure to institute an increased preventative insulator washing programme?
- (3) Will he give an assurance that in future when obvious weather conditions could precipitate power blackouts, the interests of the public be given top priority, having regard to all factors, such as available funds, etc.?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There was no failure to institute an increased washing programme. All available plant was used to maximum capacity.  
The plant however was geared to handle problems along the coastal strip which was the only area to suffer severe problems in the past. By March, after the 90-year record dry spell, insulators were affected throughout the metropolitan power system covering an area many times that of the coastal strip.
- (3) Yes. It must be realised however that an unnecessary rise in electricity tariffs would occur if the commission bought a lot of expensive plant to handle a situation occurring once a century.

### 84. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES AND GAS

#### *Charges: Comparison*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

Having regard for the various types of consumers both domestic and commercial, will he provide details of the comparative rates charged for electricity and gas in each State?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The answer is contained in the schedules which, with your permission, Mr Speaker, I shall table.

*The schedules were tabled (see paper No. 80).*

### 85. DENTAL THERAPY TRAINING SCHOOL

#### *Functions*

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

In connection with the dental therapy training school at Mt. Henry, will the Minister advise the functions of the school, especially with respect to—

- (a) school grades of children to be examined;
- (b) location of schools where children will receive attention;
- (c) method of transport to be used to convey children from schools to the dental school;
- (d) anticipated period children will be required to be absent from school?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The functions of the school are to train dental therapists to work in the department's School Dental Service. The answers to the remainder of the question are—

- (a) The School Dental Service arranges for the examination of school children under the age of 15 years.
- (b) Wilson Primary School, Armstrong Road, Wilson.  
Applecross Primary School, Kintail Road, Applecross.  
Mount Pleasant Primary School, Queens Road, Mt. Pleasant.  
Rehoboth Christian Primary School, 22 Dalton Place, Wilson.  
Santa Clara Primary School, Coolgardie Street, Bentley.  
Bentley Senior High School, Marquis Street, Bentley.  
Bentley Primary School, Hedley Street, Bentley.  
Bentley Junior Primary School, Hedley Street, Bentley.  
McKay Street Primary School, McKay Street, Bentley.  
Collier Primary School, Hobbs Avenue, Como.  
Penrhos Methodist Ladies' College, Thelma Street, Como.  
Como Senior High School, Bruce Street, Como.

Como Primary School, Thelma Street, Como. 88.

Koonawarra Primary School, Goss Avenue, Manning.

Aquinas College, Mt. Henry Road, Manning.

Manning Primary School, Ley Street, Manning.

Saint Pius X Primary School, Cloister Avenue, Como.

Holy Family Primary School, Thelma Street, Como.

(c) By school bus.

(d) Up to one hour at any one time.

# 86. FREMANTLE GAS AND COKE CO. LTD.

## *Government Takeover*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

With a view to the need for uniform power charges will the Government give urgent consideration to the taking over of the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co. Ltd., following the reorganisation of the State Electricity Commission and Fuel and Power Commission?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The reorganised commission no doubt will give thought to this and many other matters.

The Honourable Member will know that the State Electricity Commission has negotiated unsuccessfully in the past for acquiring the Fremantle Gas & Coke Co. Ltd. It is not the policy of the Government to attempt any takeover on other than negotiated basis with the consent of both parties.

# 87. BEACHLANDS SCHOOL

## *Classrooms, and Library-resource Centre*

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

What is the proposed timetable for construction of the proposed two new classrooms and library resource centre at Beachlands Primary School?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

A definite timetable cannot be stated until the financial position, as determined by tenders received for other works, has been assessed.

# SCHOOLS

## *Library-resource centres*

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

What criteria or priorities are being used for selection of primary schools to receive the library resource centres being funded by the Australian Government?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Priority is given to those schools with the largest enrolments and also to those with the least facilities. These criteria allow for both the larger and the smaller schools to receive consideration. Naturally, it is necessary to examine individual circumstances to achieve the greatest educational priorities when so many schools are seeking resource centres.

# 89. GERALDTON HIGH SCHOOL

## *Landscaping*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) With reference to Geraldton Senior High School, does his department propose to provide landscaping of the area between the library and the main building?
- (2) If "Yes" will he advise when this work can be anticipated?
- (3) If "No" will he please explain why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) As soon as funds are allocated by the Education Department.

# 90. MEAT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## *Inquiry: Report*

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

- (1) Has the Government received the report of the inquiry of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee into the meat industry?
- (2) If "Yes" will he table the report referred to?
- (3) If "No" to (1), will he advise when the report is expected, and will he table it upon receipt?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

## 91. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRE

*Jarrahdale*

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

- (1) Will the Minister please advise if Jarrahdale is going to be provided with a pre-primary centre this year?
- (2) Is the Minister able to give definite or approximate dates when the construction of this centre will—
  - (a) commence;
  - (b) be completed?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Consideration is being given to the establishment of a pre-primary centre at Jarrahdale. Definite dates cannot be quoted but it is hoped that the centre will be in operation in late 1975.

## 92. ROCKINGHAM HIGH SCHOOL

*Stage 4*

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

- (1) Is it proposed to begin construction of stage 4 of the Rockingham High School in 1975?
- (2) Is the Minister able to give definite or approximate dates when the construction will—
  - (a) commence;
  - (b) be completed?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of the new construction?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Dates are not yet available. It is anticipated the building will be completed for the 1976 school year.
- (3) It is not possible to state such a cost prior to the acceptance of tenders but other works of a similar extent indicate a figure of approximately \$400 000.

## 93. ROADS

*Causeway: Lighting*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

What progress has been made regarding lighting of roadways and bridge at the eastern end of the Causeway?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Lighting of the road and footpaths under the bridge itself is already in operation. There have been difficulties in finalising a design for lighting of other roadways, but tenders for a modified design are about to be invited.

## 94. HEALTH

*Atmospheric Pollution: East Perth Power Station*

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

- (1) Can he supply comparative figures for "air pollution" readings in the vicinity of the East Perth power house over the past few years?
- (2) Is the position being monitored?
- (3) If so, where are readings being taken?
- (4) If not, could this be done in view of the power house apparently being brought back into regular use?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Stack testing at the East Perth power station was conducted on the 20th December, 1974, by the clean air section of the Public Health Department and again on the 18th February, 1975, with the clean air section in attendance. During this period a 40 per cent reduction in emissions had been achieved and further improvements will be monitored.
- (4) Consideration will be given to installing dust gauges in the vicinity of the East Perth power house.

## 95. MEDICAL STUDENTS

*Selection for Admission*

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

- (1) How were the 11 students who completed their first-year medical course in 1973 selected for admission to the second-year course in 1975?
- (2) How many, if any, cannot be accommodated?
- (3) What chance do these have of entering second year at a later stage?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The ten 1973 successful first-year students to fill the 10 extra 1975 places promised to this category of student were selected in strict order of their net scaled aggregate marks in examinations in the subjects of chemistry 13, human biology 10, and zoology 10 which were the compulsory subjects taken by all candidates.

The eleventh was one of those selected by a special committee appointed by the University Senate to fill eight second year vacancies caused by failures or withdrawals from the course or by

students who were successful in first year in 1974 but chose not to proceed directly in 1975 to second year medicine.

Students to fill these vacancies were selected on the basis of their academic record and performance up to the time of their application.

A total of 68 students of all categories applied for these 8 places.

- (2) Of the twenty-two (22) 1973 successful first-year students who applied for second-year medical course places in 1975, 11 were not successful.

- (3) It is likely that each year a small number of places will be available for competition and any remaining first-year students may compete along with other applicants for these places.

The senate selection committee will undoubtedly look again at the academic record of each applicant as it stands at the time of his or her application.

## 96. POLICE

### *Acts of Violence: Kalgoorlie-Boulder*

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

Would the Minister please tabulate for each of the years 1964 to 1974 inclusive, the number of offences (Criminal Code and Police Act) for which convictions were recorded where the offences occurred within the Kalgoorlie-Boulder district, where the offences related to acts of violence whether associated with other offences or not (such as assault, robbery, etc.)?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Records unavailable for the years 1964-65.

1966—27.

1967—40.

1968—36.

1969—87.

1970—95.

1971—118.

1972—78.

1973—98.

1974—101.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Yes. It is expected water from the recent cyclone will reach the trans.-line by Sunday. There is a large wall of water and my officers who have been following its course advise there is no way of halting or effectively spreading it prior to its reaching the trans.-line at Zanthus. My information is that it will cut the trans.-line at Cosack Creek near Zanthus and the depth of water at that point is anticipated to be 12 feet.

Information indicates that the trans.-line could be out of operation for eight to 12 weeks and could be further affected by the current cyclone situated off Geraldton. As from tomorrow the railways will not be accepting any freight for transport to the Eastern States.

The road, approximately 100 miles south of the trans.-line, could be affected, but it is not expected that there will be any protracted hold-up of traffic.

I have been in touch with the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr Jones) to report the seriousness of the position, to offer our co-operation, and to seek his. He has assured me that he will give of this and will keep the matter under constant review.

## 2.

## STATE FORESTS

### *Overcutting*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

As overcutting is occurring in the timber industry as evidenced by answers given to questions asked of the Minister for Forests in 1974, and as the Minister for Labour and Industry wants more migrant timber workers so that the rate of cutting shall not be abated, and as, furthermore, the latter Minister sees no need for consultation between himself and the Minister for Forests as indicated in his answer to question 6 on the 18th March this year, will the Premier—

- (1) Arrange for consultation between the two Ministers concerned so that the rate of labour flow into the timber industry is not such that overcutting will continue and so lead to the denudation of our hardwood forests?

- (2) State his Government's policy with respect to the future of our indigenous hardwood forests?

## QUESTIONS (11): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. RAILWAYS AND ROAD TRANSPORT

#### *Interstate Services: Effect of Flood*

Mr NANOVIK, to the Minister for Transport:

Following Press reports on rain in the north-west and goldfields area, is it felt this will have any effect on interstate travel by either rail or road?

- (3) Ensure that there is co-operation between the different departments of his Government so that more and more timber workers will not arrive and have to be kept in work by a continuation of a policy of overcutting?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) I do not think the member for Morley could reasonably expect a considered answer to a question of that length without any notice. Also he arrives at certain assumptions in the course of the question and these I would query. Therefore I suggest he place his question on the notice paper.

### 3. IMMIGRATION

*Federal Member for Perth: Letter to Press*

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Did he see a letter addressed to *The West Australian* dated the 17th March, 1975, in which Mr J. Berinson, MHR for Perth, stated that references to a letter from a former Minister requiring that he be given precedence were "simply untrue", and that he had no such letter, nor would he flaunt it if he did?
- (2) Has he any comments to make on the matter?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some prior notice of this question the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) and (2) Yes. The Perth City Council received a letter from Mr A. Grassby dated the 24th January, 1973, which reads—  
I write to let you know that following my appointment as Minister of State for Immigration, I have asked my colleague Mr J. Berinson, Member for Perth, to represent me when available at the migrant ceremonies held in your city.

I look forward to my forthcoming visit to Perth next month and to meeting people who have been involved with immigration and I would also look forward very much to a continuing association with your Council.

No matter what arrangements are previously entered into, at such ceremonies, Mr Berinson insists that the letter gives him precedence at such functions even though he is invited only in the capacity of MHR for Perth.

Thus those, and this would apply even to the Premier, who are invited in a senior capacity for the specific purpose of taking part in the ceremonies, find out only at the last moment that all existing speaking arrangements have to be put aside should Mr Berinson arrive because he demands precedence.

I find it remarkable to say the least that Mr Berinson seeks to give the impression that no such letter exists or that it is not used in the manner I have described.

I would just add that I hope the incident at Stirling, which has been given such wide publicity, will effectively put a stop to the blatant manner in which some Labor members have been using citizenship ceremonies as a means of disseminating political propaganda.

### 4. IMMIGRATION

*Naturalisation Ceremony: Bassendean*

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the personnel—that is, parliamentarians—who attended the last Bassendean immigration ceremony, and, if so, would he name them?
- (2) Is it within his knowledge that either or any of those politicians at that ceremony furthered their political interests by making political speeches?
- (3) If so, would he name those members concerned?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

### 5. BEEF PRODUCERS

*Government Loans*

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

Further to my questions of the 30th October and the 13th November, 1974, as to whether the Western Australian State Government intended to assist beef producers of the south-west with special loans and to which he replied that after he had received a report he would discuss the matter with the Premier, will he indicate whether special loans will be made available to these beef producers and the terms under which they will be made?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

The report referred to showed that the majority of producers at that time were in a position to obtain carry-on finance from normal commercial sources but that if prices did not improve by March, 1975, very serious circumstances could arise. It was hoped the Commonwealth's \$20 million proposal would give some relief but on present indications the rate of interest is too high and the conditions too restrictive. The Premier and I are conferring on ways and means of granting some State assistance but State funds are very limited. At the same time we will continue to press the Commonwealth for an early decision on the Agricultural Council's request for at least \$100 million at a low rate of interest on an Australia-wide basis.

## 6. RAILWAYS

### *Interstate Services: Effect of Flood*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Railways:

Arising from his earlier statement relating to the water which is likely to cut the railway line, while we share the concern for the line at Zanthus can he state what action, if any, has been taken to protect the population and railway employees and whether to his knowledge any Aborigines in the area are in danger?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

There is no apparent concern for the population in the area because the waters are diverging into an area known as Cossack Creek and are expected to cut across the line at that point without affecting anybody. Most of the Aborigines should be out of the way because they had their own rain-making ceremony at Wiluna. It is not anticipated that anybody will be in danger.

## 7. STATUTORY AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

### *Loan Programmes*

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

I refer to question 38 on today's notice paper. In part (3) of that question I asked—

(3) Has this improvement been achieved because of measures taken by the Australian Government?

The question related to the improvement that has taken place in order that authorities may be able to borrow capital under the system

which has always prevailed in this country. The Premier did not answer part (3) of my question. I realise that under Standing Orders he can answer a question as he wishes, but in order that the question may be answered by the Premier accurately and, I hope, fairly—

The SPEAKER: Ask your question. You have made your point.

Mr HARMAN: He is probably not anxious to answer the question—

The SPEAKER: Would you ask the question.

Mr HARMAN: My question is—

- (1) Is the Premier aware that since the middle of last year the Australian Government has made a number of decisions and taken some initiatives which have resulted in an improvement in the funds available to authorities which wish to borrow from institutions?
- (2) Is he aware that the measures which were taken by the Australian Government include the withdrawal of the Australian Government from the loan market between July, 1974, and February, 1975?
- (3) Is he aware of the reductions made in Treasury note yields and short-term bond yields?
- (4) Is he aware of the release of funds from statutory reserve deposits by the Reserve Bank and the creation of a special drawing facility?
- (5) Is he aware of the market purchases by the Reserve Bank of Government securities and commercial bills?
- (6) Is he aware of the devaluation of the Australian dollar?
- (7) Is he aware of the suspension of the variable deposit requirements?
- (8) Is he aware of the postponement of the quarterly company tax instalment due in February this year?
- (9) If the Premier is aware of those initiatives taken by the Federal Government, does he consider they may have assisted in the improvement to which I referred?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (9) Mr Speaker, you have been very tolerant with the honourable member and I will be tolerant in giving my answer. One point which is evident from the question is that

the honourable member does not understand the operations of the Loan Council. I will be only too pleased to answer the question in detail, but all he has succeeded in doing in his long, laborious question is to highlight the fact that the Commonwealth Government has been tediously trying to untangle the skein which it caused to become so tangled that it nearly wrecked the economy of this country. I will be pleased to answer the question in more detail if the honourable member so desires.

#### 8. MT. HELENA SCHOOL AND EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Extensions; Official Opening*

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

I appreciate that the Minister in this House may have to confer with the Minister for Education to obtain the answer to my question. I refer to the answer to a question without notice relating to questions 7 and 8 on today's notice paper which states that the total cost of building a resource centre at the Mt. Helena Primary School was \$53 000, and the cost of additions to the Eastern Hills High School, which are at present being carried out, will be \$137 000, both sums being met entirely from Australian Government funding. Will the Minister ensure that in the event of an official opening of either or both of those improvements—

The SPEAKER: Order! If I were a Minister representing a Minister in another place I would find it impossible to answer that question. I suggest the honourable member place the question on the notice paper.

#### 9. MINISTER FOR IMMIGRATION

##### *Naturalisation Ceremony: Apology*

Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the Minister for Immigration has apologised for his behaviour at a recent naturalisation ceremony?
- (2) Does he intend to allow that Minister to continue to represent the Government at these important ceremonies?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) I assume the honourable member listens to the radio and reads the newspapers, and that he will have heard that the Minister for Immigration has in fact written to the City of Stirling regarding the incident referred to.

- (2) I say without any hesitation or reservation that the Minister concerned has my complete confidence and will continue to represent me on all appropriate occasions.

The SPEAKER: I will take two more questions.

#### 10. IMMIGRATION

##### *Federal Member for Perth: Letter to Press*

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

I preface my question by referring to the Minister's remarks—

The SPEAKER: Ask the question, please. Question time has extended for too long now and I will cut it off if members make any lengthy remarks. Be as brief as you possibly can be.

Mr. B. T. BURKE: My question is—

- (1) Will the Minister please clarify for the Chamber whether the letter to which he referred is in the possession of Mr Berinson—who, the Minister says, flaunts it—or whether it was written to the Perth City Council by Mr Grassby?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Deputy Mayor of the City of Stirling was forced to remove the microphone from the grasp of the Minister at the recent naturalisation ceremony?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) On every occasion that he goes to the Perth City Council, Mr Berinson points to the fact that the council has the letter and insists, as I mentioned earlier, that he has precedence.
- (2) I made the mistake of going out to the City of Stirling when several Labor people were present—and only Labor people. We have heard statements about people walking out. As far as I am concerned, two people walked out—a Labor member for the area (Mr Cooley) and his wife.

The SPEAKER: The Minister must be brief in replying.

Mr GRAYDEN: In regard to removing microphones, when I became critical the deputy mayor certainly walked across to the dais but I left at that stage. I say there were no interjections throughout my speech, save from Mr Berinson who said, "I will check that", and I turned to him and said, "You do." The matter has been blown up out of all proportion. Lie after lie has been told in respect of the matter and unfortunately I have not had the opportunity to deny them.

## 11. ELECTORAL

*Senate Casual Vacancy*

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

In the event of a casual Senate vacancy occurring due to the death of a Western Australian Senator or for any other reason, would the Premier adhere to what has been regarded until recently as a convention—

The SPEAKER: This is a hypothetical question and I cannot allow it. That is the end of questions without notice.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

*Statement by the Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, as all members must be aware, I have been very tolerant about questions without notice on a day when we have had quite a number of questions on the notice paper. I think members must show some restraint in the time which is allotted. Normally, Houses of Parliament like to deal with questions in the space of about an hour. We have taken considerably longer than that today. I do not mind that—I believe it is necessary at times—but it will be impossible for the House to function properly if I allow too many questions without notice following on such a long notice paper. I ask members to have regard for that in the future.

## COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

*Council Personnel*

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees elected by that House.

## BILLS (6): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.
2. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.
3. Wespely (Dardanup) Agreement Authorization Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Industrial Development), and read a first time.
4. Education Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and read a first time.
5. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill.

6. Registration of Identity of Persons Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Stephens (Chief Secretary), and read a first time.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr Young, leave of absence for 14 days granted to Mr Thompson (Kalamunda) on the ground of urgent public business.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

*Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 18th March, on the following motion by Mr Old—

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

May it please Your Excellency:

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

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [6.04 p.m.]: If the Governor's Speech is taken as an indication of the criterion of measures of assistance the rural industries can expect, the outlook for those industries is indeed bleak. During the course of that Speech two matters were described as assistance. The first of those is the voluntary minimum price scheme for beef that has been instituted; and the second is the continued representations to the Commonwealth Government for aid.

As the Minister well knows after last Friday when he heard the experiences of a number of responsible and reputable beef producers in my area, the scheme is just not working.

Mr McPharlin: It has worked to a degree, and you know it.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The increase in price to which the Minister referred in replying to a question was a sham; the minimum price just has not been reached.

Mr McPharlin: It has worked, and you know it.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has not worked.

Mr McPharlin: It has, to a degree.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Beyond that, just what has the Government done? I would like to point out that discussions are still being held with the Premier following the receipt of a report on the conditions in the south-west.

Mr McPharlin: A number of producers said they wanted the scheme to continue.



Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes, provided it has some teeth, as we suggested when it was introduced.

Mr McPharlin: They said they preferred to have the scheme than to go without it.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Provided it has some substance. By way of contrast, let me refer to what has happened in Queensland. Even Mr Bjelke-Petersen is not sitting around lamenting. He is not backward when it comes to criticising, but at least he has made available to beef producers \$10 million of State funds at the rate of 2½ per cent. The eligibility factor is refusal of accommodation by the Commonwealth Development Bank. In addition that Government has made available a number of other concessions, amounting to at least a half-dozen in all.

Mr Harman: It is a Country Party Government in Queensland.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes. As a further contrast, let me refer to the actions of the Tonkin Government when it took office and was faced with a situation not unlike the present one.

Mr McPharlin: Is that State or Commonwealth money?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Tonkin Government at least made available State funds, and kept hundreds of farmers on their properties during the course of the drought and the subsequent recession we encountered.

Mr McPharlin: You provided that money under the drought relief scheme.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That scheme and other concessions amounting to a considerable number were made available to the farmers.

Mr McPharlin: That was planned before you got into office.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What utter rubbish! The present Government has provided nothing. Indeed, not only has the present Government not offered any assistance to the producers, but it has worsened their situation by increasing all charges which could possibly be increased. I refer to the abattoir health inspection charges which have been increased by 137.5 to 525 per cent. When the Tonkin Government increased those charges it was greatly criticised, and the increases were withdrawn. But now, when things are at their blackest, the present Government has reimposed the increases but at a much higher level.

State Electricity Commission charges have increased by something like 42 per cent, and water charges have increased at a similar rate. The only action the State Government has taken has been to lament loud and long. It has shown it is not prepared to accept the responsibility that comes with adversity. Indeed, whilst being

"supposedly" sympathetic to the farming community, the present State Government is showing a vast lack of initiative, appreciation, and fortitude.

I would like to draw attention to the events of the past few months in connection with the suggestion of the Lamb Marketing Board that it be allowed to trade in hogget and sheep meats. If one goes through the Press releases on this matter over the past few months, one finds they begin to read like something akin to Gilbert and Sullivan.

Mr McPharlin: Get your facts straight. It was not an application for sheep meats at all.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It was for hogget and young mutton.

Sir Charles Court: Never.

Mr H. D. EVANS: In other words, the suggestion was that Part IV of the Lamb Marketing Act be gazetted. That was the request of the Farmers' Union on behalf of the sheep producers of this State.

Mr McPharlin: The request was specifically to trade in hogget.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That was not the request of the Farmers' Union. The Minister is trying to confuse two issues.

Mr McPharlin: The application came from the board.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The first application in October, 1974 asked for the extension of the powers of the board into hogget and mutton; in other words, the gazetting of part IV of the Act. It is as simple as that. Do not try to confuse the issue. We are talking about the minimum requirement that will satisfy the immediate and urgent crisis. Let us take the two areas and view them separately. Let us get down to what was originally proposed by the Farmers' Union of Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: Let us get this clear, because you are distorting the situation. As I understand it they asked purely for permission to trade in hogget.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Who did?

Sir Charles Court: The Lamb Marketing Board and the Farmers' Union.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Rubbish! The Farmers' Union asked for the extension of trading into hogget and sheep meats.

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Oh, yes it did.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Surely this could be quite easily established.

Sir Charles Court: They asked for permission to trade in hogget.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Farmers' Union reaffirmed this at its general conference. What is the Premier trying to give us?

Sir Charles Court: I know what happened. They saw me on occasions with the Minister.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am telling the Premier what the Farmers' Union was seeking. When the general manager of the board returned from the Middle East in December he reported to the board and the board submitted a report seeking an extension of its powers. That is what occurred.

I would like to refer to some of the Press cuttings. These will enlighten us about the entire proceedings. They include several rather succinct comments that were made during the course of the examination. On the 29th January, 1975, the Acting Premier promised a decision on the morrow, and it was pointed out also that at least two companies were opposed to an extension of the powers of the board. On the 30th January, it was indicated in *The West Australian* that the decision had been deferred for another week, and the same interesting item referred to the conflict between political parties in respect of this matter and also to the involvement in the total issue of sheep meat trading of some further private companies. That is fairly important.

Secondly, on the 5th February, a decision was further deferred on the grounds that the board had not made out a case. The Premier sought a report from the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. No decision was taken in the Premier's absence, because he left specific instructions that a decision was not to be made.

Sir Charles Court: Who told you that?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Upon his return the Premier referred the matter to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee.

#### *Point of Order*

Sir CHARLES COURT: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is the second time within 24 hours that a member has made a statement of that kind and has refused to substantiate his ground.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: That is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order involved here. The member for Warren has made certain statements. The House cannot determine whether or not what he has said is factual; but he is entitled to make statements within the Standing Orders.

Sir Charles Court: He should give some substantiation of his statement.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think subsequent events will substantiate what I have said. What is more, upon receiving the first report from the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, the Government asked that committee to elaborate upon further specific questions. That did not go before the full committee for consideration. The original report was considered by the committee for about 4½ hours. However, the second report was prepared only by the chairman

of the committee. It was that subsequent report which went before the Cabinet and ultimately led to the rejection of the proposition. The Farmers' Union objected to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee putting forward a recommendation on this matter, having regard to the interests represented on that committee.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr H. D. EVANS: Before the tea suspension I was indicating the progress made and the various items and articles that had appeared in the last few months in connection with the lamb marketing issue. I had pointed out that Cabinet had rejected the request of the Lamb Marketing Board and the Farmers' Union for permission to enable the board to trade in hogget and sheep.

The reaction to this was, to say the least, stormy though predictable. The President of the Country Party on the 19th February indicated that he was upset at the hogget decision and was bitterly disappointed at the State Government's rejection. On the 20th February we saw in *The Countryman*, and in other parts of the media, that the Farmers' Union expressed the same sort of opinion and the president of the meat section—Mr John Gardiner—slammed the Government's decision not to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to trade in hogget. He said it was political interference at its worst. I think he has put his finger right on the problem.

The leader of the Country Party went to some pains to express that there was no split in the ranks of the coalition. There would have been had there been more backbone in the Cabinet. On the further considerations which arose, and they appear in the Press, the State Government alternatives were rejected by the Farmers' Union.

These were never clearly identifiable, but it is understood they did involve the utilisation of the facilities at Robb Jetty or Midland Junction Abattoir to allow the board to operate in summer lamb. At this stage may I interpolate and point out that the opinion and the attitude of the Farmers' Union was virtually unchanged throughout, and still is; but the legal position is that summer lamb can be acquired by the Lamb Marketing Board as lamb and having once been acquired it can then be sold as hogget or young mutton, provided there is no conflict with the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture regulations.

It has since transpired, however, that the legal opinion that the Lamb Marketing Board could acquire summer lambs and trade them as hogget or mutton is no longer valid in the light of one of the Department of Agriculture regulations, and once acquired, summer lamb, as such, under the terms of its charter, can be traded only as mutton.

The implications or ramifications are not distinguishable nor will they be until the Lamb Marketing Board has had a chance to assess the position because it is dealing in a relatively new area.

I turn now to the issues really at stake, the first of which is the overall efficiency of the Lamb Marketing Board and the level of efficiency to which it could aspire if it were allowed to venture into an expanded trading operation, which it is not at the moment. There are limitations on the board.

Let us consider the record of the Lamb Marketing Board, firstly to determine whether or not the board is a competent body. To do this we must appreciate that when the Bill was introduced, it was freely mentioned in the spirit of the legislation and in the tenor of debate that the Lamb Marketing Board had indicated it was capable of handling the situation if its activities could be expanded into other fields, and for that very purpose and with a view to this eventually occurring part IV was included in the legislation. This makes provisions for the marketing of hogget and mutton.

This was clearly the intention of the Tonkin Government and it is one from which we have not retreated. The Lamb Marketing Board, having demonstrated the level of its effectiveness, is surely at the stage where it can now be accorded this extension of its operations. I point out that in the period between December, 1972 and October, 1974, the Lamb Marketing Board handled 2.6 million lambs and paid an average of \$9.40 each, and this included rejects. This is a considerable improvement on the record of past years.

There are still some areas that have not been fully resolved, one of which is the late season or off-season lamb, and here again it is a question of the level of incentive which should be given. But it must be borne in mind that this could only be at a level that is sufficient to exclude imports. There have been imports of lamb already and in the same manner that the Potato Board suffers so does the Lamb Marketing Board suffer, and this is one of the decisions that the board has to take.

In addition to that the Lamb Marketing Board achieved a very considerable performance last year when it exported 80 to 85 per cent of its lamb to the Middle East—not to the traditional UK and EEC markets, where it previously gained 7c to 8c below the price obtained in the Middle East.

It broke into some lucrative Middle East markets for the first time and this is an historic event in the marketing of lamb so far as Western Australia is concerned. This means that of the bulk of lamb exports from Australia something like 90 per cent came from Western Australia. This is the level of operation that has been conducted by the Lamb Marketing Board in this period.

The emphasis has changed from the UK to the Middle East and the potential here is very controversial. It is a completely new ball game. It is not the same traditional markets requiring the same traditional standards to which growers and operators have been accustomed; and, in accordance with Middle East thinking, and in this world market which is very competitive—particularly in meat—the requirements of the consumer are paramount. Accordingly, if the Lamb Marketing Board has not the full flexibility to enable it to operate in this market it will be disadvantaged. There can be nothing simpler than this and, indeed, the way in which the Lamb Marketing Board would enter into the field is not one of acquisition but of competition and free enterprise; and surely a Government that flaunts the spirit of free enterprise—that is the cry we hear from it so frequently—cannot have any objection to bringing into the field a competitor to give the producers the best possible opportunity to enable them to export a product that is valuable and one that is so subject to manipulation.

As I have said, the first aspect is the effectiveness of the Lamb Marketing Board as a trading organisation; the second is the right of farmers to determine the sale of their own produce. Here we have a very true principle of the Farmers' Union and the rural producers being pronounced.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The opposition of the member for Vasse to the Lamb Marketing Board has been most outstanding.

Mr Blaikie: It is consistent and on record, and I will stand on that record any time you like.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The farmers should have the right to sell their produce as they wish. Only recently the Leader of the Country Party said in public that he supported this principle. He has the opportunity to take it further and translate this into action. If the farmers want to sell to the Lamb Marketing Board, why cannot they do so? Surely this is something to which they are entitled, particularly with the colour of a Government which claims to be a friend of the farmers. There is no question of compulsion; it is not acquisition; it merely puts another competitor into the field of competition, and if the Lamb Marketing Board can do the better job it will certainly be a vast improvement and a great boon to the growers of this State.

It must surely be a travesty of the democratic process to perpetrate an action like this, and it is the more reprehensible when it is done by a Government that puts forward, when it suits it, the principles it enunciates.

The bulk of the growers desire very strongly that the Lamb Marketing Board be given these powers and that part IV

be gazetted. I will take time to quote an article that expresses the view of the Farmers' Union clearly and unequivocally. It is as follows—

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

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

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

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

The union sees considerable advantages for producers in the board being able to trade in all sheepmeats, particularly in regard to exports.

In respect to lamb the board has amply demonstrated the stability and benefits it can bring to producers.

The Farmers' Union goes on in this vein indicating its desire that the Lamb Marketing Board function in this manner. It has certainly not—as the Premier would suggest—altered its thinking. This was confirmed at the annual general conference of the Farmers' Union and remains its policy.

I would also like to quote a letter which is quite brief; it consists of about six lines. It was written by the President of the Albany Zone Council, Farmers' Union, and is addressed to me. The letter reads—

The Albany Zone Council of the Farmers' Union wishes to thank you for your interest and support in the matter of the W.A. Lamb Board gaining the right to trade in mutton and hogget.

Numerous farmer meetings during the past twelve months have demanded that the Board be given these rights and we hope you will use your best endeavours to see that the spirit of your act is carried out as intended.

There is certainly no misunderstanding in the minds of the farmers in the country areas when the Albany Zone Council can write in that vein.

I think it would be appropriate to examine the reasons for the Government's action; and this action might seem strange, particularly when it runs contrary to free enterprise proposals and policies advanced by the Liberal and Country Parties. If the facts are fully examined, however, we feel a deeper understanding will be revealed.

A decision was deferred while the Premier was overseas, but if we go back to the initiation of the Lamb Marketing Board we find that the hostility of the vested interests in the trade was unrelenting and vicious.

It extended over a period, and for good reason. This is in an area in which vested interests are able to manipulate and, of course, the very existence of the vested interests depends upon it.

Mr Blaikie: You were Minister for Agriculture when I made certain remarks in the Committee stage of the Bill to set up the Lamb Marketing Board. What I said would happen did happen, and all the assurances you gave in respect of producers of premium lamb have been to no avail.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is a separate issue. What is involved is the marketing of meat—a multi-million dollar business. The procrastination in arriving at a decision and the reluctance of the present Government to move are the result of pressure applied by the meat industry. Even before the previous election various statements had been made, and I am sure the campaign fund of the Liberal Party was enhanced considerably by contributions from the trade. The first thing which the present Government did on taking office was to conduct an examination of the lamb marketing trade. From the way in which it was conducted it was practically an inquisition.

The record of the Lamb Marketing Board was such that very little could justifiably be done about it. The extension of the board's operations is anathema to vested interests. This is the sort of situation which has arisen, and the termination of the Lamb Marketing Board is desired in many quarters.

If the operations this year go as well as those in the previous years there will be cries in the Eastern States for the establishment of marketing authorities similar to the one in Western Australia. This is undeniable, particularly in the case of the vested interests which have a fully national flavour. At the present time they can service export markets with a degree of manipulation. It is not in their interests to give a body, like the Lamb Marketing Board, an opportunity to extend on a competitive basis to give producers a better deal. Because the present Government is prepared to support those vested interests, it is sacrificing to that extent the growers of this State.

This is the only country which has such a marketing system. It is rather intriguing to think that we do have a particular vested interest exerting an influence on the Government of this State, to the extent where it is prepared to gainsay the interests of the rural industries. I can understand this from the point of view of the Liberal Party but not from that of the Country Party. This goes somewhat deeper than the stuff with which Watergate was made; this is what the influence from a vested section amounts to. In the case of the Country Party it is something

deeper, and it brings into higher relief the true colours of a party which is supposed to have its base in country areas. It is nothing but hypocrisy and opportunism on which that party depends.

When the President of the Country Party and the Farmers' Union applied pressure the matter came before Cabinet. The Country Party members were told that if they did not like it they could move out of Cabinet. Those members were prepared to sit back and take it.

Sir Charles Court: That is your guess.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It is not a guess. This recalls the adage of the previous Leader of the Opposition, of which I once thought fairly poorly, when he said, "Portfolios before principles." In the present case the same honourable member is getting fairly close to that situation.

It is high time the Government took appropriate action to rectify the situation; and it is still capable of so doing. I have read the lines that applied to the requirements and the requests of the Farmers' Union. It has been identified clearly as policy that this situation should not be perpetuated.

Mr Blaikie: What are those lines?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The situation to which I refer is the gazettal of part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act which should be proceeded with forthwith. For the reasons I have given I wish to move an amendment.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable member copies of the amendment?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes, I did have some prepared. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

; but we regret to have to inform your Excellency that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia by refusing to declare Part VI of the Marketing of Lamb Act 1971 which would allow the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board to extend the scope of its operations to enable it to trade in hogget and mutton and is deserving of censure and no longer possesses the confidence of this House.

Mr HARMAN: I formally second the amendment.

Sir Charles Court: We have not been supplied with copies of the amendment. That is how much the Opposition thinks of it.

Mr H. D. EVANS: When one sits alongside the former Minister for Health, one finds that he does have difficulties with the

contents of his drawer and is unable to extract the copies. However, I now have several copies of the amendment and they are being distributed.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall—Minister for Agriculture) [7.55 p.m.]: The member for Warren opened his contribution by levelling some criticism against the minimum price for beef scheme.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Is the Minister confined to the subject matter of the amendment, or is he allowed to wander and deal with other subjects?

The SPEAKER: The Minister has barely uttered a word.

Sir Charles Court: During the whole period when we on this side did not have copies of the amendment there was silence.

The SPEAKER: In debating an amendment like this one the member for Warren must permit the Minister for Agriculture to begin his speech. I imagine he will be speaking to the amendment, but as yet he has not had time to develop anything.

Mr McPHARLIN: It is quite obvious that the member for Warren is very touchy tonight. In his opening remarks he criticised the Government when he spoke on the minimum price for beef scheme which we as a Government introduced last year to assist the local beef marketing industry. The honourable member said the scheme was not working, and that I attended a meeting at which he heard farmers say that the scheme was not working. I refute that by saying that those very farmers said they would sooner see the scheme continued than discontinued, in an endeavour to assist the scheme to work.

When we introduced the legislation I remember distinctly saying that the success of the scheme depended upon the co-operation of all concerned.

Mr H. D. EVANS: We told you that was impossible.

Mr McPHARLIN: The honourable member did not say that. We were aware that if we did not receive co-operation the scheme would fail in some directions. Its success still relies on the co-operation of all concerned. The assertion of the member for Warren that farmers do not want the scheme to be continued is not correct, because quite a number of farmers have said to me that they would prefer it to be continued rather than discontinued.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Did I say "discontinue" or "not working"?

Mr McPHARLIN: The honourable member said it had failed, and he criticised the Government for procrastination. If ever a Government can be accused of procrastination it is the present Federal Government, because many requests have been made to it to give the industry some help but it has procrastinated.

I know that numerous requests have been made to the Federal Government. In fact, at the last Agricultural Council meeting requests, supported by all State Ministers, were put forward to the Federal Government to make available a large sum of money—the sum mentioned was \$100 million—at a low rate of interest. I suggested the money be channelled through the existing organisation, the Rural Reconstruction Authority, with perhaps some examination being made of the conditions to assist the producers. As yet I have not had any firm reply from the Federal Minister.

The member for Warren also levelled some criticism about the increase in killing and meat inspection charges. Last August when a proposal was put forward to increase the killing charges at abattoirs, I made a request to the Treasury. As a result the Treasury came forward with assistance representing a sum of \$300 000 to each Government abattoir. It is as a result of increased costs in wages, transport, and power that the abattoirs were compelled to consider increasing their charges to meet their commitments. This course of action was forced on them.

I now wish to make reference to a criticism which was levelled at me last night by the member for Balga when he said I was farming at City Beach, and enjoyed no respect in the farming and agricultural communities.

After having spent the greater part of one's life farming—something like 40 years—I think one is entitled to a little comfort and relaxation and perhaps one should be able to enjoy some of the amenities of the city. People such as the member for Balga would not have a clue and would not understand one thing about the trials, the difficulties, or the hard work and endless hours one has to put in while developing a farm.

Mr Moiler: If the Minister represented the farming community better than those people might be able to afford comfortable homes.

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Balga would not know what he is talking about. I might mention that sometimes the way he carries on leaves it open to question whether his conduct is fitting for a Chamber of this sort.

I would also like to remind members that I was criticised last night in another place. The member concerned got up and spoke loud and long.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, surely what was said in another place is not the subject of an amendment moved by my colleague. I think the Minister is stretching the matter wider than we usually go.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order? That the Minister is departing from the amendment?

Mr JAMIESON: He has departed from the matter before the House. The matter before us is the amendment moved by my colleague. The last few words uttered by the Minister were referring to something which occurred in another Chamber last night.

The SPEAKER: I agree that it is important that members and Ministers keep to the subject matter of the debate. However, I must say in this case that the Minister was not developing any argument about what happened in another place. He was making an aside remark. He said that he was even criticised in another place and I am sure his comments would not have taken up any great part of his speech. I would ask the Minister, of course, as I ask all members, to keep to the terms of the amendment.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr McPHARLIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr O'NEIL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr O'NEIL: We, on this side of the House, are in some confusion in that the first copy of the motion which was circulated is different from the second copy. Since you, Mr Speaker, put the motion as presented to us I wonder whether you would care to read to the House the terms of the motion which is, in fact, before the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I now have a correct copy of the amendment. Initially, a member was good enough to hand me a copy of the amendment but it was not complete. Subsequently, when the member concerned discovered the completed amendment, I was given a copy of it. The only difference between the first and second copy is the addition of the censure words.

Perhaps to clarify the situation I should read the amendment as moved by the member for Warren. It is as follows—

That the following words be added to the Address-in-Reply—

: but we regret to have to inform your Excellency that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia by refusing to declare Part VI of the Marketing of Lamb Act 1971 which would allow the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board to

extend the scope of its operations to enable it to trade in hogget and mutton and is deserving of censure and no longer possesses the confidence of this House.

I remind members that the latter part of the amendment, "and is deserving of censure and no longer possesses the confidence of this House" are the words which have been added to the original amendment which was circulated. Will the Minister resume?

*Debate (on amendment to motion)  
Resumed*

Mr McPHARLIN: Just briefly, the criticism levelled at me came from the same member who, during the fiasco at Forrest Place, described the farmers as scum from the scrub and no better than the pigs they feed. That same member launched himself last night as being a champion of those same people. I would like those remarks placed on record in *Hansard*.

May I mention that the amendment which has been moved refers to part VI of the Marketing of Lamb Act. However, the part to be gazetted was not part VI, but part IV. So, again, the amendment is incorrect, and I would like your ruling, Mr Speaker, on that point.

Mr O'Neill: That is the motion before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: At this juncture I believe I should ask the member for Warren whether or not he wishes to alter the wording of his amendment.

Mr H. D. EVANS: If you recall, Mr Speaker, when I read out the amendment I mentioned part IV. That is what was intended.

Mr O'Neill: Two amendments have been distributed.

The SPEAKER: The member for Warren had better seek leave of the House to alter the printed wording of his amendment.

*Amendment on the Amendment to Motion*

Mr H. D. EVANS: I seek leave of the House to alter the printed wording of my amendment to read "part IV".

The SPEAKER: The member for Warren seeks leave of the House to alter the wording of his amendment in regard to part VI. He wants the reference altered to read "part IV". Is the House in agreement?

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr O'Neill: No.

Mr Mensaros: No.

Sir Charles Court: We have had enough shambles already.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to members that the Speaker is on his feet. I will put the question again. The member for Warren seeks leave of the House to make the necessary alteration to his amendment. If there is a dissentient voice it will not mean the end of the motion before us, but it will mean the amendment will have to be voted on, for all intents and purposes, as part VI. Is leave granted?

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr May: Democracy!

Mr O'Neill: Shambles.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice leave not granted. The Minister.

Sir Charles Court: The member for Warren still has his motion.

*Debate (on amendment to  
motion) Resumed*

Mr McPHARLIN: The particular part of the Marketing of Lamb Act to which we are referring is part IV.

Mr Moiler: Get on with the issue; don't dodge about.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Toodyay should have patience. The debate has centred around part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act. Regarding the matter of the gazettal of the part, of course, members will recall the request came to me from the Lamb Marketing Board and the Premier asked that I bring the matter forward to Cabinet for consideration, which I did. Members are well aware there was considerable debate and discussion on the matter and the decision of the Cabinet was to defer it.

*Point of Order*

Mr H. D. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am quite happy to hear the Minister going ahead and debating the amendment as stated. However, there is some difficulty because there is no part VI in the Act.

Mr O'Neill: Then the amendment is out of order.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I think this does call for a ruling.

*Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am happy to give a ruling. It would have been more fortunate had the member for Warren ensured that the wording of his amendment was correct. However, the terms of the amendment are as described by the wish of the House. Whilst it would be foolish of me to try to ensure that the Minister, or anybody else, spoke about the gazettal of part VI of the Act *per se*, it falls to the lot of

members of the House to make the most of what has happened and discuss the merits of the motion as outlined by the member for Warren in his introductory speech and his presentation of the amendment.

Whether or not members wish to do that is their own business. They may or may not be critical of what has happened; that is their business. But as the servant of the House in this regard, I suggest that, as far as possible, for all practical purposes members devote themselves to believing it was meant to be part IV.

*Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr McPHARLIN: Prior to the interruption, I said that at the request of the Premier the matter had been referred to Cabinet for consideration and had been discussed and deferred. Further examination was made and the matter was brought forward again; and again it was deferred. Cabinet made the decision; I make that point clear. As the member for Kalgoorlie will know, when one is a member of a Cabinet one abides by the Cabinet decision until the Cabinet changes its decision.

Mr T. D. Evans: Was the Premier present at the Cabinet meeting at which the matter was discussed?

Mr McPHARLIN: The Premier was present at a number of Cabinet meetings at which it was discussed. I do not need to tell those members of this House who have been members of a Cabinet that once a Cabinet decision is made one abides by the decision until such time as the Cabinet makes a different decision. Once that decision was made I had no option but to abide by it. As a responsible Minister, it was my duty to abide by it.

Inquiries were made in an endeavour to find a way in which the board could meet its requirements and fulfil its orders by including a percentage of meat other than lamb. Alternatively, this could have been achieved through full co-operation between the Government abattoirs and other abattoirs.

One of the problems experienced by the board related to summer lamb trading. This problem gave rise to the first move, and the advice given to me was that it was the main problem confronting the board. It wanted the gazettal which would allow it to trade summer lamb in a category other than lamb. I was informed this was the principal reason for the board's submission. The board therefore graded the meat as summer lamb.

At the time we had information that the Australian Meat Board was making a submission to the Australian Department of Agriculture that consideration be given to the categorisation of young sheep up to four-tooth, which would meet the requirements of the Lamb Marketing Board.

After some time this submission was put to the Australian Department of Agriculture which agreed to the inclusion in the young sheep category of young sheep up to four-tooth, which would cover the Lamb Marketing Board's requirements.

I have a copy of the proposed amendment to the Exports (Meat) Regulations relating to young sheep. The proposal was sent to me by the Australian Department of Agriculture and I would like to read the paragraphs relating to permission to trade in sheep which are older than lamb—

Extensive market investigations have demonstrated a definite need for the separate and distinctive identification of premium quality mutton carcasses exported from Australia and have led the Department to accept a recommendation from the Australian Meat Board that the Exports (Meat) Regulations be amended to provide for this need by the establishment of three categories of "Young Sheep" derived from ovine carcasses shown to possess no more than four permanent incisor teeth.

Accordingly exporters, operators and inspection staff are advised that formal amendment of the Exports (Meat) Regulations may be anticipated and that as from the receipt of this circular, and provided other existing Departmental requirements such as label approvals are met, carcasses conforming with the following proposed addition to the Third Schedule of the Exports (Meat) Regulations and Special Requirements may be prepared for export to any destination:—

**A. Proposed Addition to Third Schedule of Exports (Meat) Regulations.**

First Column	Second Column
43B. Young Sheep— First Quality Carcasses.	1. A carcass shall be the carcass of a castrated male sheep (other than a stag), or of a female which had not cut more than four permanent incisor teeth.

That information from the Australian Department of Agriculture was forwarded to me with a letter advising that the proposal met the board's requirements.

We have not disregarded the interests of the board or the farmers; this proposal meets the wishes of the board and it can now extend its scope. The amendment moved by the member for Warren says the Government has refused to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to extend the scope of its operations to enable it to trade in hogget and mutton. The board did not mention mutton. The request to me was that it be allowed to trade in hogget, not



mutton. The proposal therefore meets the board's request to be able to trade in young sheep, and the amendment moved by the member for Warren falls down on this very point.

It is claimed in the amendment that we have "disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers". I say we have not disregarded them. I worked very hard indeed to find a method whereby we could allow the board to trade in the categories of meat in which it wanted to trade. I think it could have been achieved through co-operation between the Government abattoirs and the other abattoirs. However, regulation 43B now states clearly and concisely that the board can do what it wanted to do, and the board has told me that is the case. Far from disregarding the interests of farmers, I worked very hard for weeks to try to find a solution. I knew the submission from the Australian Meat Board was coming forward, and it did so recently. Because of the efforts I have made to have the board's requirements met, it cannot be said the Government has disregarded the interests of farmers.

Mr H. D. Evans: What prevents the gazettal of part IV, which would give greater opportunity?

Mr McPHARLIN: I was bound by a Cabinet decision, as the honourable member well knows. I have to abide by a Cabinet decision, unless I show irresponsibility. I hope I do not show irresponsibility as a Minister of the Government. So one is faced with a position that one must abide by the decision of the Government. If one does not do that, one does not remain a member of a Cabinet.

Mr Carr: And that is more important than principles!

Mr McPHARLIN: I wonder whether members on the other side of the House will give consideration to the aspects of the whole issue. Members opposite have not had an opportunity, as I have had, to consider all the details. I have had a long period of time in which to consider this, to work on it, and to try to meet the board's requirements and satisfy all the people who are so vitally interested in this matter. The board has now come forward and said it is satisfied. Surely the board is vitally concerned in this issue.

Mr T. D. Evans: What about the consumer?

Mr McPHARLIN: Had the board said it was not satisfied and it wanted nothing to do with the proposal, it would have been a different matter. However, the board said it was satisfied with the decision.

Mr T. D. Evans: But are the consumers satisfied?

Mr McPHARLIN: The board forwarded the request for the gazettal and said it is satisfied.

Mr H. D. Evans: The board is not fully satisfied.

Mr McPHARLIN: The board said that the decision will meet its requirements and the gazettal is no longer necessary.

Mr H. D. Evans: It does not go far enough.

Mr McPHARLIN: According to the board the problem has been resolved. It is now prepared to go on with the scheme as it exists. However, the Government will watch the situation closely. We will see how it works out. It is not correct to say that the Government has disregarded the problem altogether. After a trial period we may discover that it is necessary to review the situation.

I have worked very hard to try to meet all the requirements. What else can I do when the board says it is completely satisfied? Where do we go from here? We cannot say to the board, "You are not satisfied", when it has already said it is.

Mr H. D. Evans: It is not satisfied with it.

Mr McPHARLIN: The board wants to trade in summer lambs in the young sheep category. It is now open for the board to grade summer lambs as hogget or young sheep.

Mr H. D. Evans: If the board receives an order for something beyond summer lamb, as it will do, what happens?

Mr McPHARLIN: The board did not ask for anything else but to trade in hogget, because it wanted to fill these orders. The Middle East has great potential for the marketing of meat, and an importer could ask for a percentage of older sheep in his order. People in the Middle East do not really understand what the term "hogget" refers to, and when they place an order they understand that they will receive a percentage of hogget or young sheep. This is the reason the board made the application—to fill these orders for hogget or young sheep.

I discussed this matter with representatives of the board, and I was told that it was not known if there would be a great percentage of hogget requested, and as yet the board does not have a great number of young sheep. However, it can obtain these sheep if necessary. I was told that the provision may not be used and that no great volume of business was expected. The problem has been resolved by the board's acceptance and approval of our proposal.

The number of summer lambs varies, but I believe the total number in the State for one period was about 80 000. This is not a great percentage when compared with the total volume of meat. That

was the figure given to me. So when we give the board permission to trade in young lamb or hogget, we are not considering a large volume of business. The main interest of the Lamb Marketing Board is lamb—not young sheep. The board says that its problem has been resolved. I was told that the gazettal of part IV of the Act was now insignificant.

The board is prepared to give the proposal a trial run. The Government will keep an eye on proceedings to see whether anything needs improvement. I have made the position quite clear—the board is satisfied.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You are prepared to sell Country Party principles in order to stay in the Cabinet.

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not think we have done that because we have given the board what it wanted.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: What about Country Party policy?

Mr McPHARLIN: We have given the board what it wanted.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: So the board runs the Government!

Mr McPHARLIN: I am saying that the board got what it wanted.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: What about the consumer?

Mr McPHARLIN: It would have been quite easy in the first place to say, "You will get nothing." We did not do that; we worked very hard to try to meet the board's wishes. Let the board get on with its trading in these young sheep. We are meeting the board's requirement.

Mr H. D. Evans: And the policy of the Farmers' Union?

Mr McPHARLIN: This matter could have been thrown out when it was first raised, but that was not the attitude I adopted. I believe we could meet their requirements, and we have done so.

It is incorrect to say that the Government has disregarded the wishes of the board. We have been tenacious, or at least I have been tenacious, in order to have this situation resolved. The board now has this avenue to meet its orders. The board is prepared to see how the plan works. We should proceed in a way that will help the board in its trading methods. It is not correct to say we have disregarded the wishes of interested people. As the Minister I have not disregarded their interests. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

MR McIVER (Avon) [8.28 p.m.]: I rise to make a contribution to the debate. I most certainly support the amendment moved by the former Minister for Agriculture, the present member for Warren.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: And a very good Minister.

Mr McIVER: Members will appreciate my remarks when I say that the Lamb Marketing Board is the baby of the member for Warren. He was responsible for bringing to this Parliament the legislation to establish the board. Naturally he must be concerned with its activities and its role so far as the primary producers of Western Australia are concerned, now and in the future. I commend the member for Warren for moving such a censure motion in this House.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr McIVER: We on this side of the House must accept full responsibility for the manner in which the amendment was moved in this House tonight. The Premier was quite correct when he said that the amendment was a shambles.

It would be ridiculous to say otherwise. I do not know how this came to pass; but, in any case, I am getting away from the crux and the essence of the censure motion before this Chamber.

The objective of the amendment is quite plain, because thousands of lamb producers in Western Australia are most concerned about the decision of the Government not to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to expand its area of operation. I feel I can speak with authority in this debate because when one considers the geographic location of the Avon electorate one finds it is possibly the largest lamb producing area in Western Australia. Therefore, I am not speaking simply for the sake of wasting time.

Following the decision of the Government not to allow the lamb board to extend its operations into the area of the marketing of hogget, I say without hesitation that the phones in my electoral office and my home did not stop ringing. Farmers phoned me constantly to register their disapproval and disgust at their Country Party representatives. The farmers clearly indicated to me their disgust at the failure of their representatives to apply pressure to the Government and to have the decision changed. I am speaking of people who in the election in 1974 were handing out how-to-vote cards against me at the polling booths. These are not men of my political colour. However, they came to me sincerely and earnestly to register their disapproval of the decision of the Government.

They gave me some information. I do not know whether or not it is authentic; no doubt the Premier will deny it. I was told that before the Premier left Western Australia on his overseas trip he left instructions that the matter was not to be brought before Cabinet until he returned.

Sir Charles Court: That is not correct. It is a straightout lie. Whoever told you that?

Mr McIVER: That may be so, but it is the information which was supplied to me.

Sir Charles Court: Then you tell whoever told you it is wrong.

Mr Bateman: Make him withdraw; he is calling people liars.

Sir Charles Court: I am not accusing the member for Avon; I am telling him that the people who told him that told him a lie.

Mr McIVER: I prefaced my statement with the remark that I do not know whether or not the information is authentic, but that it is the information which was supplied to me. If the Premier says it is a lie, then I accept his statement. However, that information was supplied to me by prominent farmers in Western Australia. They also informed me—and I support the member for Warren in this—that the Premier told the Deputy Premier and those who sit with him in coalition that they could either accept his decision on the matter or leave the Cabinet. Again, I do not know whether or not that is authentic, because I was not present.

Sir Charles Court: Who told you that fib?

Mr McIVER: Here again, this is a matter which should be cleared up.

Sir Charles Court: Who are the people who are saying these things?

Mr McIVER: When statements such as that are made to me it is my responsibility to check them out and to report back. Surely the Premier would do the same if he represented one of the largest lamb producing areas in Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: We operate as a Government and a team, not as a dictatorship or a shambles.

Mr Moiler: A one-man band.

Mr McIVER: The statement of the Minister for Agriculture regarding his submissions to the Australian Government and the procrastination of that Government must be challenged. It is unfortunate that members opposite have very short memories. I vividly recall that following the Meckering earthquake in 1968 the water table in the area changed completely, and a drought occurred in 1969-70. The farmers in the area of the member for Roe—particularly at Jerramungup—were shooting sheep daily.

They sent urgent telegrams to the then Prime Minister (the Rt. Hon. John Gorton). Telegram after telegram was sent to the Prime Minister by the various branches of the Farmers' Union in Western Australia. It was three weeks before an answer was received. Yet we had the Minister for Agriculture on his feet tonight

once again criticising the Australian Government and accusing it of procrastination. I do not know what members opposite will do if there is a change of Government in Canberra.

Mr McPharlin: They know the problems of the beef industry, but they are doing nothing about them.

Mr H. D. Evans: Bjelke-Petersen is.

Sir Charles Court: Haven't you been one of his greatest critics?

Mr McIVER: I am not talking about beef; that is not mentioned in the amendment before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Avon has the floor.

Mr McIVER: It is quite plain to the producers that the Liberal Party certainly wholeheartedly supports the vested meat interests and those who stand behind them and make profits of thousands of dollars, and did so for years before some positive action was taken at the request of the farmers, which resulted in the establishment of the Lamb Marketing Board.

I very well remember that prior to the State election in 1974 a large meeting of Liberals was held in Moora. Many of those present at the meeting were anti-lamb board, and an assurance was given to the meeting that if there was a change of Government the first instrumentality to be removed would be the lamb board. It is quite clear the opposition of the Government to the Lamb Marketing Board is spearheaded by the Premier, who cannot in any way deny that statement because it is supported by Press comments. He is definitely against the lamb board; and no wonder when the vested interests in the meat industry have given handsomely to the Liberal Party with no strings attached.

Sir Charles Court: How do you know?

Mr McIVER: I happen to know.

Mr H. D. Evans: Table the receipt book.

Mr McIVER: Good luck to the Liberal Party. But why should this be done at the expense of the farmers of this State? I feel the time has arrived when members of the Country Party, who are led by a Minister who is no doubt sincere in his attitude to the rural industries, must make a stand. Surely Country Party members do not need a bright neon sign to tell them what is being done to them. They will have the support of thousands of farmers in Western Australia if they take a stand; and the time is ripe for them to take a stand by supporting the amendment moved by the member for Warren.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: They are not game.

Mr McIVER: Let us consider what has occurred in the 12 months since the present Government came to office. Water rates, electricity charges, and all other charges affecting country people have been increased.

Mr Blaikie: What has that to do with the price of chops?

Mr McIVER: Be quiet. The member for Vasse can have his say in a moment. We had to listen to a load of rubbish from him in respect of the motion he put forward last year. He did not even finish it off; he simply wasted the time of the House.

Every day we see instances of the Country Party being further dominated by the Liberal Party in this State. I appeal to the Deputy Premier and to those who sit behind him to make a stand. They will have the support of the farmers, who certainly do not support the Labor Party. We hear from those people only on occasions like this when they appeal to us, as the major political party in Australia, to help them. History has proved this. If one considers the entire history of the rural industries in Western Australia one finds that when the position is at its lowest ebb the Labor Party has always been elected to come to the rescue.

Unfortunately there are many young people in these areas. The Deputy Premier did not refer to them as scum from the scrub, and I must agree with him that they are not scum. However, farms which belonged to their fathers and grandfathers have been handed over to them and they have never known what it is to struggle.

Mr McPharlin: I never referred to them as scum from the scrub.

Mr McIVER: I know; I said I agree with the Deputy Premier in that respect. The situation which arose at an electoral meeting last year was scandalous, and the people of Western Australia were disgusted. The farmers did not win any friends in respect of that incident.

We have now even reached the point—if I may digress a little—where Country Party members of Parliament in this State have no chance of having a trip abroad, because the Liberals are the major coalition party and they have dominated the committee concerned so that their own members will be given preference. It is inevitable that Governments change, and naturally the Labor Party could possibly adopt the same attitude—although I do not think it would because it is a party of principle—and then the members of the minority party in this Parliament would have no chance at all to take a trip abroad. I would be the last member to deny Country Party members that opportunity.

However, the time has come when members of that party must do something on their own behalf. It is time they stood up to the State Government and had their say. I say to members of the Country Party: stand on your principles; the producers of this State expect you to do so.

Sir Charles Court: Listen to Mr Principle over there!

Mr McIVER: Is it not marvellous that we have such members in this place? They are in the Chamber only five minutes and are full bottles on the debate. Members opposite continually interject yet never make a speech; they are always full of knowledge when someone is trying to make a contribution to help the people of this State.

Sir Charles Court: Are you talking about some of your back-bench members?

Mr Sodeman: Are you saying that age brings wisdom?

Mr McIVER: It is fair comment to say that unless this amendment is passed, dozens of producers will be affected. Every day we read letters in the newspapers about how the policies of the Australian Government are affecting farmers; in many cases, they say they are on the bread line. I do not know the financial situation of every farmer in Western Australia but, because I am in company with many of those farmers, I do know that a good number of them say these claims in many cases are exaggerated. Many are happy with the present situation.

It would not matter what one said to people who strongly followed the party line. It would not matter if we put a gold sovereign in every sheaf of wheat; it would not have any effect on their political affiliations. They are Country Party, Liberal Party, or Labor Party voters and will continue to vote in that way because that was how their fathers voted and their fathers' fathers voted before them. That is the situation which applies throughout this State.

I appeal to the Country Party members of this Chamber. If they have any backbone at all, and if they truly represent their electors and the people who stand behind them, they should have the courage to support those people, but not only in their electorates or their little towns; that is not the only place to do it. They have the opportunity right here in this House, in this democratic Chamber, the Legislative Assembly, where they are supposed to be the voice of the people who stand behind them, irrespective of their political beliefs.

So, Mr Speaker, that is my contribution. I fully support the amendment moved by the member for Warren and the genuine concern he displayed towards country people during his three years as Minister for Agriculture. I repeat what I said during the debate on last year's Address-in-Reply: The member for Warren gave back some respect to farmers who had been reduced to beggars by the previous coalition Government. He retrieved for them a position in the community which they now enjoy and which they will continue to enjoy when a Labor Government is returned to office. I fully support the amendment.

**MR COWAN** (Merredin-Yilgarn) [8.45 p.m.] : The member for Avon has just made a rather emotional plea to members of the Country Party to support this amendment. If I may digress a little from the amendment, Mr Speaker, he also stated that people in the country areas looked to the Labor Party to support them during their lowest ebb. I know of one particular Labor Government—the Federal Labor Government—which could make a great contribution to safeguarding the rural industry during one of its lowest ebbs for quite some time. However, it is not prepared to do so.

Mr May: Since when was the rural industry at its lowest ebb?

Mr COWAN: To return to the amendment, several points could be made. The request to extend the operations of the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board to permit it to trade in hogget and mutton was first made by the Farmers' Union and that was followed up by the Lamb Marketing Board itself. The request was made late in 1974.

At that time, there was a market for young sheep meat in the Middle East. The Lamb Marketing Board felt it could secure fairly substantial contracts for Western Australian produce in the Middle East. I might add that the reason it felt confident was that two parties—one a private enterprise body and the other a State Government instrumentality—had visited the area and laid the foundations for the signing of two very large contracts for the sale of young sheep meat, which they passed on to the Lamb Marketing Board.

It was this fact which prompted the Lamb Marketing Board to send representatives to the Middle East in an endeavour to secure contracts for Western Australian products. In December and January, there was no other way the Lamb Marketing Board was able to negotiate a deal with respect to young sheep in the form of hogget. However, since that time the board has been able to categorise summer lamb as hogget. When an order for young sheep comes from these Middle East countries, the board is able to classify summer lamb as hogget and thus fill part of the order.

I believe that point is worthy of a lot of thought. One amendment states, in part—

... that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia by refusing to declare Part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act 1971...

At the time it was hoped that part IV would be proclaimed; this may have been the case. But since the Australian Department of Agriculture has reclassified meat grading, I believe the gazettal of part IV is no longer the way in which the lamb board could operate, and I think that should be remembered. As far as I am concerned, the lamb board has expressed

its satisfaction with the current Cabinet decision, and the Farmers' Union has expressed its satisfaction, subject to review.

Therefore, I would say that the policy of the Country Party has been satisfied inasmuch as we support orderly marketing when it has been requested. It has been requested but there has been a change in the request, and I would say that we could not support this amendment.

Currently, the lamb board is satisfied and the Farmers' Union is satisfied, subject to review. Let us face it—we must have continuing review of marketing circumstances. I could not possibly support this amendment for the very reason that we have satisfied the issues which producers have raised.

**MR MOILER** (Mundaring) [8.50 p.m.] : I support the amendment moved by the former excellent Minister for Agriculture in this State, Mr Dave Evans. The most important facet of the amendment is that the Government has disregarded the wishes of, and the responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia by refusing to proclaim part IV—the part mentioned by the honourable member whilst making his speech, but in the copy of the amendment that was distributed among members part VI is mentioned—of the Marketing of Lamb Act, 1971.

We have just heard the Minister for Agriculture and Deputy Premier of this coalition Government stating that the Australian lamb marketing authority has carried out some reclassification which will now enable farmers, through the Lamb Marketing Board, to deal in summer lamb and, as a result, the Australian agricultural authority, as a representative of the Commonwealth, has enabled the farmers in this State to dodge around the Premier. If the department had not done this, the influence of the Meat and Allied Trades Federation and those who financed the Premier and his party during the last election would have been able to prevent farmers trading in summer lambs.

Sir Charles Court: What nonsense!

Mr MOILER: That is the issue which we are arguing tonight. The very fact that an Australian Government department has enabled farmers in this State to dodge around the obstacle placed in their path by the Western Australian Premier should bring forth some consideration from those country members who sit on the Government side of the House.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: They are trembling!

Mr MOILER: Part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act if adopted, and following a proposal put forward by the Farmers' Union, would enable the Lamb Marketing Board to trade in hogget and mutton, and members should realise that there is no

compulsion whatsoever on farmers to trade solely with that board. It is a completely voluntary decision on the part of the farmers. That is the point we should bear in mind tonight. It is the farmers who state that they wish to use this facility.

In a free enterprise State, surely it is the prerogative of farmers, if they so desire, to use the facilities of the Lamb Marketing Board to dispose of their mutton and hogget. It is up to the farmers to make the decision as to whether or not they will use this method to dispose of their mutton and hogget. To me it is reasonable that farmers should be able to do this under a voluntary scheme. No member on the Government side of the Chamber has refuted that this is the right of the farmer.

The Premier has stated that no adequate case has been put forward to support the wishes of the farmers to trade in mutton and hogget. The actual words of the Premier, as reported in the Press, were—

The Premier (Sir Charles Court) said the board had not made out an adequate case for an extension of its powers.

I ask this question: Have those people who are opposed to the board dealing in hogget, made out an adequate case?

Sir Charles Court: The MIAC which comprises representatives drawn from a wide cross-section of industry said that no case had been made out for the extension of powers to the board. That document was tabled today.

Mr MOILER: The MIAC produced a comprehensive report in which it said it was not opposed to the extension of the board's powers.

Sir Charles Court: If you read the questions and answers tabled by the Minister today the MIAC sets out the reasons it said that a case had not been made out.

Mr MOILER: The Premier is apparently of the opinion that that outweighs the wishes of farmers who, voluntarily, wish to trade in hogget and mutton.

Sir Charles Court: You have changed your ground. The matter in question is trading in hogget.

Mr MOILER: I have not changed my ground at all. The Premier is the one who repeatedly shifts his ground. I repeat that the Premier was reported as having said—

The Premier (Sir Charles Court) said the board had not made out an adequate case for an extension of its powers.

I am claiming the Premier has not made out any case on which he should refuse—

Sir Charles Court: I accept the judgment of the MIAC against your judgment and mine.

Mr MOILER: I would not, because it is not merely a question of judgment. It is a question of what is right and what is wrong. If farmers choose to dispose of their stock in a particular manner, the Premier, because of the attitude adopted by the Meat and Allied Trades Federation and a small group of influential people within our community, can exert influence on the Government to decide that this practice should not be permitted. In this case it is not a question of the Premier's or my judgment; it is merely a question of whether farmers can sell their product in a particular manner.

Particular mention was made of this in an article published in *The West Australian* of the 5th February, 1975. In the same article the State President of the Country Party (Mr David Reid) and the Farmers' Union supported the proposed extension of the board's export powers. Therefore, in view of this, I say to members of the Cabinet, including the Deputy Premier, that if the report from the Meat Industry Advisory Committee on the second occasion was in favour of an extension of the board's powers, and this was contrary to what the Premier wanted, would it still have been approved? This merely gives point to the fact that whatever the Premier approves goes through at the drop of a hat.

Those Cabinet members who sit idly by and allow this injustice to continue, and those Government members who sit behind the Cabinet Ministers who condone this attitude, emphasise the treacherous record of the Country Party as a whole in this State.

Mr Sodeman: I did not realise you were so naïve.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr McPHARLIN: I object to the remark of the member for Mundaring, "treacherous record". I would ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Agriculture has asked the member for Mundaring to withdraw his remark about treacherous record. I would be pleased if the honourable member would withdraw.

Mr MOILER: I am not inclined to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member either withdraws or does not withdraw the remark. I leave that decision to him.

Mr MAY: The reference made by the member for Mundaring had nothing to do with the Leader of the Country Party personally.

Sir Charles Court: Yes it did. He is the Leader of the Country Party, and that makes the position worse.

The SPEAKER: I see offence in the words uttered by the member for Mundaring. I say from the Chair that I think

the words "treacherous record of the Country Party" were offensive. Any member who said that about any of the parties represented by members in this Chamber should know that those members could take exception to the remark. I would ask the member for Mundaring to withdraw the words used.

Mr MOILER: With deference to you, Mr Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

*Debate (on amendment to motion)  
Resumed*

Mr MOILER: I would like to devote some time to speaking on the Country Party. It has been elected to Government in this State and in the Federal sphere because of the name it has used. Country people have supported Country Party members because of the name of that party. Because of their apathy the people of the country have voted them in. However, on every occasion when those parliamentary members had an opportunity to do something for the people they represented they chose not to do it.

Mr Mensaros: You should not forget that during the last election the name was not "Country Party".

Mr MOILER: As the previous Leader of the Opposition once said, it is a case of portfolios before principles.

Mr Sodeman: Different logic should be applied to different situations.

Mr McIver: When will you get up and make a speech?

Mr Sodeman: I shall surprise the honourable member.

Mr MOILER: I suggest that members of the Country Party, from Mr Anthony down, have continually—if members opposite do not like the word "treacherous" I shall use another—let down the people they are supposed to represent. Regardless of the fact that on occasions members of the Country Party were placed in an advantageous position in a coalition Government, and were in a position to reverse Government decisions, they did not take advantage of the situation on behalf of the people they represented.

They are not prepared to bring the Government down on this occasion. It was the Farmers' Union and country people who elected the Country Party members to this Chamber who wanted the Government to bring about something they had requested.

Mr Cowan: They requested that in December last, but now it is March and circumstances have changed.

Mr MOILER: It is going through on the action of an Australian Government department which has negated what the Premier has been trying to do. Members of the Country Party still make some pretence

in an endeavour to retain their seats, by continuing to support the Premier. I have put forward my thought on how I believe the people of the country have been fooled by the name "Country Party". Fortunately for Australian politics, I think those members are being sorted out.

Dr Dadour: By whom?

Mr MOILER: What I have said applies not only to those members in the present Government, but also to those in many previous Governments. The only occasion I can recall of any threat to bring down a Liberal-Country Party coalition Government was the time when the seats of some Country Party members were threatened. That was about eight or nine years ago.

The fact that the people those members represent are threatened matters little. To them the most important thing is to maintain the coalition and retain their seats in Parliament.

When the Lamb Marketing Board was being established in this State I was fortunate enough to attend a seminar in the Eastern States. Because of my interest over a period of time in abattoirs and their development, I took the opportunity to visit some of the more modern abattoirs in the east, and they included the major abattoirs and some privately-owned ones. I shall not mention them by name, but they were major concerns.

At every privately-owned abattoir I visited I was told that the Lamb Marketing Board would not be able to function and would cost Western Australia a lot of money; and the sooner we got rid of it the better. The fact is that today it is working very well, despite an inquiry instituted by the present Government in the hope of disbanding the board. However, the report of the inquiry was such that the Premier was not game to disband it, although he might wish to nullify its operations. Because the board is working so well in this State, the other States are seriously considering setting up similar boards.

At the time the board was set up in Western Australia the people in the east were scoffing, and were doubtful of its success. Its success is one of the reasons the Meat and Allied Trades Federation and other influential groups in Western Australia are not prepared to allow it to extend its operations; they want to prevent the board from becoming more powerful than it is. It will be then a case of a small select group within the community suffering financially, and of farmers and others engaged in the industry benefiting, if the operations of the board are extended.

At this stage it is just as well for me to read three lines from the report of the Consumer Protection Bureau dealing with the Lamb Marketing Board. This is to be

found in chapter VII(A) under the heading, "Need for Marketing Improvements" and reads—

The Meat and Allied Trades Federation representing retail butchers and wholesalers—

Primarily it represents the wholesalers—the big wheels who wield a big influence with the Premier. To continue —

—has been strongly opposed to the establishment and operation of the Board.

That is, the Lamb Marketing Board.

It is also worth mentioning that the same report suggests in its recommendation No. 7 that hogget be immediately brought under the control of the board.

I am trying to point out to members opposite—and particularly the Country Party members and those other members who represent country areas—that the board is of considerable benefit to farmers, and all those members who represent country electorates should be supporting it and its expansion. The fact that they do not will be recorded against them and used at an appropriate time; I can assure them of that.

During his speech the Deputy Premier ranged far and wide and you, Mr Speaker, allowed him to do so as you have allowed other members so to range. Initially the Deputy Premier referred to the minimum price for beef scheme and did not touch on the amendment. Incidentally, on today's notice paper I had a question asking the Minister whether he considered that the scheme was operating efficiently.

Mr Blaikie: What has that to do with the amendment?

Mr MOILER: I wondered that when the Minister replied to the amendment.

Mr Sodeman: The amendment had not been moved then.

Mr MOILER: Of course it had; otherwise why would the Minister have been on his feet, you dill?

Mr O'Conner: That is a nice comment!

Sir Charles Court: Very nice!

Mr MOILER: The Minister mentioned the beef scheme and the impression I gained from what he said was that he believed it was not working completely satisfactorily, but that it should be allowed to continue to improve. I believe that was what he was trying to convey.

Mr McPharlin: The producers want it to continue.

Mr MOILER: Yes; and the producers want the authority of the Lamb Marketing Board extended, too. On the one hand, the Minister states that a scheme should be allowed to continue because the producers are in favour of it, but on the other

hand he denies them the opportunity to expand in another area when they want to. He is not reasonable.

Mr McPharlin: I told you half a dozen times that the board is satisfied.

Mr H. D. Evans: Are the farmers?

Mr MOILER: While speaking the Minister went to great lengths to explain why he should not accede to the farmers' wishes, and the overriding reason he gave for his not agreeing with or supporting the farmers was the Cabinet decision. He gave no reason why the Cabinet could not agree to the farmers' request or why Cabinet could not accede to his request.

Did the Minister ask Cabinet to permit the board to trade in hogget and mutton? Apparently the Minister did. Why could the other members of Cabinet not support the Minister? No reason has been given. The Minister did not say that he put the request to Cabinet for support and that because of certain good reasons he could not convince its members. He gave us no such reasons for his not being able to convince the other members of Cabinet. That would have been a simple explanation.

I have been accused of trying to simplify matters, but to me my argument is logical. If we are honestly to represent the people who elected us it is quite easy for us to develop our case in a very simple manner. I put it to the Minister that if he were honest—I beg his pardon. I withdraw that remark.

Mr Jamieson: You are withdrawing it because you are sincere.

Mr MOILER: Yes. I put it to the Minister that if he expected us to accept his submission, it would have been reasonable for him to tell us the reasons Cabinet would not agree to his request which was supported by the other two Country Party members of Cabinet.

I do not wish to be critical of individual members of the Country Party. I merely point out to them that parliamentary members of the Country Party—not members of the Country Party outside Parliament—are continually selling out the country people. History has proved this and, if what has transpired in the debate on the amendment is any gauge, history will continue to prove this. Country Party members have time and time again sold out the country people.

In the *Daily News* of the 19th February the spokesman for the Farmers' Union Council said—

... action by the union was under consideration today.

In the interim, the union was not prepared to accept Cabinet's decision.

"This matter has gone far beyond the issue of hogget. What is involved is a principle that farmers have the



undeniable right to say how their produce, whatever it might be, is marketed," the spokesman said.

In conclusion I emphasise the fact that farmers have an undeniable right to sell their product, whatever it might be, in the manner they choose under proper marketing arrangements. They have requested an opportunity to sell one of their products through the board, but the Premier and his deputy, as I have already stated, have not indicated one reason why the farmers should not be afforded this undeniable right. We have been told merely that because of actions of the Australian Government it is possible to get around the situation. Because it already markets lamb, the board has developed the machinery by which it could, with very little additional expense, cater for the marketing of hogget and mutton of those farmers who desire such a system.

Mr Cowan: Farmers can sell hogget on a weight and grade basis to the Midland Junction Abattoir Board.

Mr MOILER: Has the member for Merredin-Yilgarn tried to export hogget and mutton?

Mr Cowan: The member for Toodyay was referring to the ability of the producers to sell their product.

Mr MOILER: I cannot follow the honourable member.

Mr Blaikie: That figures.

Mr MOILER: I am saying that the machinery is available through the Lamb Marketing Board. The machinery is already operating whereby the board can absorb hogget and mutton which the farmers choose to sell through this arrangement. There would be little additional cost.

Mr Old: Is hogget readily available now?

Mr MOILER: The last point I make is the influence which the Meat and Allied Trades Federation obviously has on the present Government. I have made that statement to the Deputy Premier recently, and I repeat it.

Prior to the Tonkin Government going out of office in March of last year meat inspection fees were raised to a reasonable figure. That increase took place after an investigation carried out over a period of between 18 months and two years.

Mr McPharlin: We did not have the high inflation rate then which forced costs up to such a high degree.

Mr MOILER: So prices were increased further during a more critical period. The point that I am making is that just prior to the last State election the Tonkin Labor

Government had to increase meat inspection fees. The fact that the increase occurred just prior to the election shows the sincerity of the former Government. However, within two or three weeks of the Liberal Government taking office a group representation from the Meat and Allied Trades Federation approached the Minister for Health, and possibly others, and in a matter of days the decision of the previous Government was reversed and meat inspection fees were reduced.

The previous Government had carried out an investigation before it increased inspection fees but the present Government, because of the influence of the Meat and Allied Trades Federation—through its obvious contributions to the election fund of the Liberal Party—was able to reduce meat inspection fees. The move was so blatant that the Treasury was required to carry out an investigation into the reduction.

I now have a copy of the report which I asked to be tabled, and it shows clearly that meat inspection fees should have been maintained at the level imposed by the previous Government. The present Government eventually had to increase the fees at a time when the farmers were even worse off than previously. The point is that the present Government lowered the fees without carrying out any investigation, and as a result of the pressure applied by the Meat and Allied Trades Federation. That federation wields much influence over the Premier.

I can see the member for Moore is anxious to take part in the debate. I wholeheartedly support the censure motion on those people who are prepared to support the Premier on this occasion.

MR CRANE (Moore) [9.24 p.m.]: I note the implied challenge from the member for Mundaring; I hope I can hold my seat.

Mr Jamieson: And the challenge from the member for Vasse.

Mr CRANE: I do not know that he was challenging my seat. First of all, I advise the member for Geraldton that I am not shaking at the knees. I speak here tonight in support of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn who very competently put the case for Country Party members. I have before me the amendment which is the subject of this debate, but it seems that the debate has not been on the amendment, but rather has been a vicious attack on Country Party members in this House.

I believe the meat of the motion lies in the words—

... that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia . . .

One could almost read into those words anything one liked, and even refer them to the discontinuance of the superphosphate bounty, but that would be talking about another Government.

People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I am here in this House because I represent a rural community and country people. When I speak during this debate I do so with some knowledge of the industry, even though my knowledge may be limited. I consider myself to be part of the industry. I have bred lambs and in the first instance I supported the institution of the Lamb Marketing Board. I would like those remarks to go on record. I believed at that time, as I still do, that the majority of farmers supported the idea. There was evidence, at the time, that the board could be a useful competitor in the marketing of meat. I do not mind those remarks going on record in *Hansard* because they happen to be true.

It seems that tonight we are debating another issue which has developed into an emotional argument. My leader, the Deputy Premier and Minister for Agriculture, put the case very clearly regarding the position which exists today. He described how we arrived at that situation. Whilst many people try to stir up emotions, it does hurt me to see my fellow farmers in the country being used like pawns in a game of political chess.

My concern is really for the farmers and those people who live in the country. When we carry the argument to its logical conclusion, after going through the sequence which occurred, we find that the Lamb Marketing Board did request extended powers so that it could trade in hogget. That has not been denied by anyone. We are aware that the Premier requested the Minister for Agriculture to take the matter to Cabinet. Cabinet rejected the proposal at the time, but it must be remembered that that was not the end of the matter. Otherwise, we would not still be debating it.

Due to the persistency of my leader negotiations were protracted and we finally ended up with something which entirely satisfied the Lamb Marketing Board. Is that not what the game is all about? The board wanted to be able to handle the summer lambs. It is on record that the president of the meat section of the Farmers' Union said that the position would be watched closely.

The board is satisfied at the moment and, of course, we will all watch the position closely. No-one will watch more closely than I and my Country Party colleagues. If at some future time there is a need for some additional powers I am sure pressure will be applied in the right place.

As I said earlier, many people get emotional when speaking about hogget. How many members really know how much hogget will be available? A member of the

Lamb Marketing Board told me the board desired to have these additional powers for the benefit of the growers. The reference is to summer lambs, but what is in a name? It is quite obvious that the Government has acted and has provided a solution to the problem.

What are we really arguing about, except party politics? As I said, we are using the farmer in this game of political chess, and I regard it as a very serious matter that the farmer is used in that manner.

I can assure members there will not immediately be much hogget for marketing in the Middle East. It must be remembered that mutton is the by-product of the wool industry, and if a farmer can sell a lamb for \$7 or \$8 it is not likely that he will keep it for a few more months and sell it as hogget for \$5. He is not such an idiot as that.

I hope mutton will continue to be the by-product of the wool industry and that we will see more action in the other part of Australia in support of what farmers in the wool industry have been requesting for a long time. I hope members opposite can bring their guns to bear to end the procrastination in that area. Until then, I believe mutton will remain a by-product of the wool industry and that not a great deal of hogget will need to be marketed as such. So we are probably wasting a lot of time talking about something which will not eventuate for a long time.

Apart from the amendment, I would like to mention that at the present time everybody is trying to ride the same donkey or court the same girl in the Middle East, as in the gold rush many years ago. It has suddenly become very important to look to the Middle East for our mutton market and as the panacea for all our sheep problems; but I do not believe that will be the case entirely. Is it very "trendy" to say, "We must do something to market in the Middle East."

I went to the Middle East for the first time two years ago and I mentioned these markets when I came back, long before it became the trend to do so. I know what is going on in the area because I have been back there since. Perhaps I speak with limited knowledge but I must know more about the sheep marketing problems in that area than one or two members of this House. It is as well to bear in mind that we should be more concerned with the industry than with the party-political game.

The member for Warren said that the situation relating to the Lamb Marketing Board was tantamount to a Gilbert and Sullivan opera. I would have thought the manner in which the amendment was handled here tonight was tantamount to a pantomime along those lines. As I said, we should not throw stones when we live in glass houses.

As the member for Merredin-Yilgarn and the Minister for Agriculture said earlier, the Lamb Marketing Board is satisfied with the result that has been achieved at the present time.

Mr H. D. Evans: Is the Farmers' Union happy?

Mr CRANE: The Farmers' Union has said it will watch the situation closely.

Mr H. D. Evans: Are the producers happy?

Mr CRANE: I remember that not long ago one political party was quite sure that what the people in this State wanted was daylight saving and there was no need for a referendum on it, but a referendum subsequently proved that some of us are not so woolly behind the ears as others make us out to be, and some of us supported what the people said they wanted. So one should be careful when speaking about what the majority of people want.

I will be honest and say I have received one telegram asking me to support vigorously the move for the gazettal of part IV. The member for Avon says he represents the biggest lamb producing area. Perhaps he does—I do not know—but I suggest that statement may be open to challenge.

Mr McIver: I said I represented one of the biggest fat lamb producing areas.

Mr CRANE: There are many producers in the Midlands.

Mr McIver: More than in Beverley, York, and Northam?

Mr CRANE: There are many producers of lambs in that area.

Mr McIver: And they are very concerned about the actions of your Government.

Mr CRANE: If that is so, they have not indicated that to me.

Mr McIver: It does not make any difference; they will still vote for you.

Mr CRANE: I do not know whether or not they will. I am not fighting an election tonight; I am speaking about the best interests of the producers. I believe at the present time I cannot do anything other than support my leader, because the Lamb Marketing Board has the powers it wanted—there is no dispute about that—and the Farmers' Union has said it will go along with it and watch the position closely. As I have already said, I will also watch the position closely.

I do not think there is any need for me to speak any longer. Some members think they should use up all of their 45 minutes but I do not believe it is important to keep repeating oneself. I hope I have said what it was necessary to say. I have supported my party on the grounds I have stated, and I will stand up to any of my electors and say what I have said tonight without any fear of being cut down to size by more than a small minority of them. I thank members for the time they have afforded me.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [9.36 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment on quite a number of grounds, and I bear in mind the last speaker's remark that many of us just use up our 45 minutes for the sake of speaking. I hope I will not do that in presenting my arguments in support of the amendment before the Chamber.

Many speakers on the Government side, particularly those in the Country Party, have said the Farmers' Union and the farming community in general made approaches last year and early this year for the inclusion of hogget and mutton in the functions of the Lamb Marketing Board. Since the announcement was made, many speakers have put forward reasons why the Farmers' Union, the board, the Country Party, and the Government are satisfied. But there happens to be at least one member of this House who is far from satisfied, and I wish to show it is not true to say the Farmers' Union is satisfied or that the consumers are satisfied to pay the ransom at the time the carcase is hanging on the hook or sitting in the butcher's tray.

It behoves me, as a member of this side of the House, to uphold the dignity of the Chamber at all times, and I will continue to do so; but I think it would be remiss of me if I did not take the opportunity presented to me—as I believe I have the right to do—to show that the Country Party by its actions has deserted the very people it claims to represent. I say that without rancour or hatred but because that is the position as I see it.

Early in his speech tonight the Minister said the Beef Industry Committee was experiencing some difficulties in operating its minimum price scheme. I understood that the member for Warren pointed out some of the discrepancies which have arisen in the scheme, and I think *Hansard* will reveal that some of the issues I mentioned in regard to price fixing are now becoming apparent, and there is now a problem in the beef industry.

Mr McPharlin: At the time you said there had to be co-operation by all concerned.

Mr SKIDMORE: That is the point I am trying to make. I would like to read from an article appearing in the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 15th February. The heading of the article is, "New bid to prop up price scheme", and under the sub-heading, "Understanding", we read—

There have been below surface mumblings about agents deliberately underestimating cattle so they are not subject to the floor price—and some producers "starving" their animals to keep them out of the scheme and guaranteeing a price for them.

One would think that is a rather challenging statement to appear in a publication accepted by the farming community. The article was written by a reporter of some standing on farming interests. I would like to quote another section of the article appearing under the subheading, "Blame denied". It reads—

Farmers' Union meat section president John Gardiner denied farmers are to blame.

He said the percentage of cattle going under the scheme has been steadily dropping because operators have neglected the prime cattle and have opted for the trade variety.

"And some of them have paid ridiculously low prices," he said.

I said that the producer may be protected at any time by the minimum price scheme, but it would certainly act to the detriment of the consumer. This has happened. I am not going to deal with the question of prices, because that is not the issue raised by the Minister. I suggest that someone should look at the question of whether or not beef prices have come down over the last few months while the scheme has been in operation, because quite obviously the consumer is paying first-grade prices for second-grade beef. I will leave it at that because I believe some of the inherent dangers in the scheme can now be seen.

I would like to say that I hope the farmers themselves will act responsibly, and that all those concerned—right through to the consumer—will act responsibly.

In February the Farmers' Union commenced a campaign for relaxation of control on the board so that it could market certain meat. I would like to quote from an article written by the same author in the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of February. It reads—

Farmers Union executive director Tom Sullivan told *Western Farmer* the Government is denying farmers the right to market their produce by refusing to allow the Lamb Board to handle hogget and mutton.

He then went on to say—

"We are not asking that the board be given compulsory or acquisitive powers for hogget and mutton. We are simply asking that it be allowed to operate a voluntary pool in these meats as provided for in the Marketing of Lamb Act."

So it appears that early in February the Farmers' Union had made up its mind to ask the Government to permit the Lamb Marketing Board to market two classes of meat. This is apparent from the statement made by its executive director. Until that time, the Lamb Marketing Board was not permitted to do this,

although the power is contained in part IV of the Act. Once this part is gazetted, the board will have complete autonomy. Having established its requirements, there seems to be some doubt as to whether or not the Farmers' Union continued with its attitude over a period of time.

I would now like to refer to an article appearing in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, the 25th February. It is headed, "Hogget: Farmers 'not convinced'". The article reads—

The president, Mr Don Eckersley, said it was difficult to understand alternatives which would allow the Lamb Board to trade in hogget in "a roundabout way."

The Government's alternative plans have not been made public.

This is an instance where the President of the Farmers' Union is looking merely at the question of one class of meat as hogget, and so it appears that there has been a lessening of the demand of the Farmers' Union, according to the reporter and according to the farmers.

Another article appeared in the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 27th February, written by the meat roundsman, Barry Pestana. He had this to say—

The board has refused to be drawn into the controversy although it believes some lambs do not entirely meet orders for hogget.

I am quoting only statements which I feel are germane to the argument I am putting forward. We must come to the logical conclusion that all is not well. The Government might say that the board is satisfied, but it would not be very hard to satisfy the board which had before it a recommendation from the Farmers' Union. I understand the board would have discussed the recommendation and arrived at a decision satisfactory to it. Of course the Government has accepted the board's determination, but I doubt very much whether this determination would meet the 20-page proposition—as I understand it to be—put forward by the Farmers' Union. I may be wrong, and perhaps someone more knowledgeable than I am can say whether or not that is so.

We then come to the question whether or not we should be concerned about the attitude of the Farmers' Union. I would like to read from an article appearing in the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 20th February. It commences—

The Farmers' Union and State Government are heading for a bitter clash over this week's Cabinet decision to reject the Lamb Board's application to trade in hogget.

It goes on further to say—

Meanwhile, the Country Party—partner in the State Government—is critical of the decision.

Party president David Reid says he is at a loss as to why the application has been rejected.

"It's one of the craziest decisions made," he said.

"We are bitterly disappointed. There was to be no compulsion for producers to sell a single hogget to the board. And besides, it was to be temporary."

We then come to a different attitude expressed by another body, and I will come back to that later. I do not wish to denigrate the efforts made by the Country Party, through its leader, the Deputy Premier, in regard to the actions he took to secure some sort of healing of the breach that had developed because of the disputation between the Country Party and the Liberal Party.

I can well understand the concern of both parties, and the difficulties they must have had in welding their thoughts together in the interests of the producer. That would be bad enough, but again, the poor old consumer, at the far end of the line, did not even get a mention. The fact is that allowing the board to deal in these types of meat would have eliminated the middle man—the one who takes the greatest amount of profit. These people are unaware of their obligations to anybody but themselves in the pursuit of their profit margin. I do not suppose we can quarrel with that because it is what the coalition Government stands for, and it is entitled to have its point of view respected. However, I did not expect the coalition Government to accept the proposition of allowing the board to trade in hogget, which will cut out the wholesaler in the middle and allow the producer to receive a higher market price for his carcass without costing the consumer another cent.

That was knocked back; it was not accepted by the Government, which could not see beyond the producer and the split which had developed between the coalition parties. I would be remiss if I, too, did not draw the attention of the House to the fact that I believe the Country Party has failed, and in failing it has joined the Liberal Party which has also failed to accept its responsibilities. Therefore the censure motion is a deserving one, and the Government no longer possesses the confidence of this House because of its disregard of the interests of the farming community at large.

I would proceed further along the line of the question of whether or not the Country Party is honest in its endeavours to undertake the formation of a board which, I believe, is fundamental to its own platform. I find it incredible that a party which stands for the interests of the farmer and for sections of the

rural industries which should be supported by marketing schemes to give the producers the best possible returns, should make such a decision.

I would like to refer to the "Constitution, Rules, Objectives and Platform" of the Country Party of Western Australia (Inc.) as amended to the 13th September, 1973. At page 17 of that document under the heading of "Rehabilitation and Development of Rural Industry", we find the following—

(e) Legislation to enable any primary producing industry, with consent of the majority engaged in that industry, to establish a marketing scheme for its product.

That is a clear statement of the policy of the Country Party; that is, to have a marketing scheme which would be in the best interests of the producers.

Earlier this evening I made a note that the first demand made on the coalition Government in this matter was for the lamb board to have the right to handle hogget and mutton. The Farmers' Union, by virtue of the methods used to heal the political breach, has been drawn into a political fight. I agree with previous speakers. I, too, am concerned that the farmers have become a political football. Do not tell me that we are not making a political football out of the farmers when the State Government, in the first instance when the Farmers' Union demanded that the lamb board should handle hogget and mutton, suddenly decided the board should not handle those meats. As a result of some coercion within the Government and because of the methods most magnificently stated by the Minister for Agriculture, the Government suddenly decided against the suggestion.

Firstly the suggestion was challenged on the basis that it would not be right for the board to handle hogget and mutton because part IV of the Act did not provide an answer to the problem. Many reasons were put forward to confuse the issue. However, the ultimate reason was nothing more nor less than a sell-out of the farming interests of this State by the coalition Government. There is no question of that. If one analyses the cold, hard facts of the issues before us—and of which the farming community should be made well aware—one finds there was a sell-out, and the Farmers' Union did not get what it wanted. I say that is far from satisfying. When we consider that the manifesto of the Country Party states that the party will legislate along the lines of the wishes of the majority engaged in a primary industry to establish marketing schemes, then I say that party is giving no more than lip service to its platform and policies and for that it should stand condemned.

Mr P. V. Jones: On that date did they say they did not want it accepted?

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not too sure. I would say the document I now have in my hand will be made public within a short time as the Farmers' Union policy on this issue. I wish to quote from the document as follows—

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

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

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

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

The union sees considerable advantages for producers in the board being able to trade in all sheepmeats, particularly in regard to exports.

In respect to lamb the board has amply demonstrated the stability and benefits it can bring to producers.

The union can see no reason why these benefits should not also apply with other sheepmeats, and why farmers should not be able to take advantage of such benefits.

At no time has the union requested compulsory acquisition of sheepmeats other than lamb.

I would like to pause there if I may and to bring to your notice, Sir, an article which begs the industry not to destroy itself. It states, "Don't wreck the Lamb Board". It is an appeal by the producer representative of that board to ensure that the farmers do not by their own actions destroy the board which has served the farmers well since its inception. He appeals to farmers to be careful to ensure that they are not used as a political football. The article states—

As the hogget issue unfolded and became "a serious political issue" . . .

The Farmers' Union recognised that fact, and the producers' representative on the board also recognised it. To whom did the latter appeal? I quote the article again as follows—

Fred Hamilton also hinted to Farmers Union meat section conference delegates short-term alternatives to formally extending the board's powers into hogget could be desirable.

He spoke to the very people who attended the conference to determine the attitude of the Farmers' Union. So we should be careful to point out that the board has amply demonstrated its ability to look after the requirements of the industry.

A scheme has been requested by the union whereby a producer could sell to the board if he wanted to. There would be no element of compulsion on anyone; but the Government has seen fit to deny the board and the producer this right.

I am not saying this; as I say, this will be made public in the very near future. The document continues—

The Farmers' Union has been given no reason by the government why it has taken this stance.

The government attitude is bewildering when it is realised that it is the Liberal side of the coalition, the proponents of free enterprise, that has decided to refuse farmers the freedom to market their produce as they think best.

I pause there for a moment to say that surely it would be in the best interests of all to challenge the coalition Government on the question of its sincerity on this issue. It has refused the farmer his freedom to market and has denied him the opportunity of freedom of choice for the disposal of his product. On top of that, the Government has denied the consumer the benefits of the Lamb Marketing Board in the form of cheaper prices or at least a prevention of price increases. The document continues—

We make no apology for condemning the stance adopted by the Liberal Party members in total defiance of the wish of producers.

The last paragraph clearly sets out the attitude of the Farmers' Union. Even at this stage, it does not blame its Country Party representatives in the coalition Government. The Farmers' Union has not named members of the Country Party as being responsible for the breach; it lays the blame for the breach in unity between the coalition parties at the door of the Liberal Party.

What has the Liberal Party offered its coalition partner in turn for its willingness to go along with the Liberal Party's wheeling and leading? Has it said, "You cannot have all the cake now, but you can have half the cake, and later if you are not satisfied we can have a look at it and see whether we can give you a little more"? The wheeling and dealing has been aimed at satisfying those members of the Farmers' Union who wanted a complete control of those meats by the Lamb Marketing Board.

I challenge members of the Country Party, and, in particular, the Deputy Premier, to show a little more intestinal fortitude. If they had stood up to the demands of their coalition partners they would have been doing themselves and the Western Australian farming community a service; they would have been doing what the Farmers' Union asked them as its representatives to do. Surely it behoves members of the Country Party to take note of important matters raised by farmers who, no doubt, form part and parcel of the Farmers' Union.

Is it considered that the Farmers' Union does not represent the great majority of farmers? If that is so, one might question their representation on many of the boards apropos of the industry. Whether or not we

examine that question, we know that surely the Farmers' Union represents the majority attitude of farmers. Every union, whether it be the Transport Workers' Union, the Farmers' Union, the Building Workers' Industrial Union or—I must get this one in—the Millers' Union, accepts responsibility for its total membership.

We find ourselves in the position of having to criticise the coalition Government and of having to say to the Government "You have failed in your responsibility. You have been completely unable to accept the fact that in the production of a commodity there is an end result; namely, a purchase, but you have ignored that market. Your attitude is to look after the producer." As I mentioned earlier, the Government's main concern is the producer; it does not worry about the consumer. I instance the question of the beef marketing minimum price scheme. I believe that the consumer has expressed his dissatisfaction with the price he is asked to pay for some of this meat. The consumer has changed his attitude from one commodity to the other, depending upon the meat and the price he is asked to pay.

Mr McPharlin: Consumers' interests are considered.

Mr SKIDMORE: If the Deputy Premier feels that to be the case, I did not hear him give credence to such an argument anywhere in his speech tonight. However, when I raise the issue, he then says, "The consumers' interests are being considered."

Mr McPharlin: You notice that in the variation of prices.

Mr SKIDMORE: The variation of prices which would have been introduced as a result of the beef minimum price scheme would have represented a price increase. Perhaps the Minister could explain to me how that reflects a consideration for the consumer. Perhaps those philanthropic people who sit fair and square in the middle of the money markets of the meat industry—namely, the rapacious wholesalers of meat—will not bother to pass on the increased cost to the consumer. What a laugh, Mr Minister! I hope to be in this Chamber for many years to come, but the Minister will be a long time convincing me that this is the case.

The coalition parties forming the Government now find themselves in the position of being challenged by the Farmers' Union which says, "You have not agreed to our request. You have not given us what we want, and we are not satisfied."

I refer now to those members of the Country Party who have taken part in this debate tonight. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn stated that the Farmers' Union first made its request, I think, early in the year, and the attempted censure of the Government was not deserved because the farmers were now satisfied.

Mr Cowan: I said the Farmers' Union is now satisfied, subject to review.

Mr SKIDMORE: The other Country Party member who spoke on the question of satisfaction in the farming community seemed to express some doubts in his mind as to whether or not the farmers actually were satisfied. Of course, he mentioned that one delegate approached him with a request that the board be allowed to trade in hogget. That in itself is an indication of a desire for a step forward in the operations of the Lamb Marketing Board.

It has been suggested that the Government has gone some of the way towards meeting the objections of the farmers to the proposition that is before the House by reclassifying meat. I am not sure what it is all about, but the Deputy Premier read from a document which said, "We will now say these are no longer lambs. You can now call it hogget for the purpose of sale". I understand that to be the general sense of the document.

Mr McPharlin: Young sheep.

Mr SKIDMORE: A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I cannot subscribe to the view that that represents an honest attempt by Government to overcome the problem. I should like to refer to part IV, section 23, of the Marketing of Lamb Act. Surely the way an honest Government would have undertaken to fulfil the requirements of the farming community would have been by gazettal of this section.

Section 23 states—

"sheep" does not include a lamb or lambs;

It goes on to enumerate sheep products which would be handled by the board. Section 24 (1) states—

The Minister may from time to time, on the recommendation of the board, by notice published in the *Government Gazette*, declare that during such period or periods as are specified in the notice, the board is authorised to accept the delivery of sheep...

I draw the attention of members to the official opinion expressed by the Farmers' Union that the board should be able to deal in all sheep meats. This certainly would have been the correct step for a responsible Government to take, instead of changing the classification of a lamb so that it may be sold as hogget. To me, that seems to be rather a backward step.

Mr McPharlin: In case you do not know, hogget is a young sheep.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would imagine that hogget is a young sheep because I understand the Deputy Premier changed the classification. I do not profess to know how we ascertain how sheep are graded, how

their wool is classed or even how lambs are classed as this type of lamb or any other type of lamb. What I am saying is that, because of the pressure placed upon the Leader of the Country Party, he has seen fit to capitulate to the Liberal line; there is no shadow of doubt about that.

Otherwise the Minister would not be occupying the seat he occupies at present, but could be sitting in a seat on the cross benches of the Chamber.

I conclude on the note that I regret the farming community has become a political football. The Farmers' Union regrets that the farming community has become a political football. Let us be honest about the situation. It cannot be challenged that the Country Party has failed to accept its responsibility towards the farming community in Western Australia. History will reveal that this so-called Country Party has always failed to meet its responsibility based upon the conception that it has a very difficult role to play and the fact that it is part of a coalition Government which is dominated by the Liberal Party.

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier) [10.11 p.m.]: I want to make some comment in support of the stand taken by the Deputy Premier and Minister for Agriculture. First of all, one has to state quite categorically that this amendment moved by the member for Warren is no more than a straightout political stunt; a political stunt which I believe has backfired. It has certainly misfired, and apart from the fact that it has been badly organised, I think the Opposition has completely under-estimated the situation and the calibre, integrity, and good sense of those who sit on the Government side of the Chamber.

It is very important that members have full regard for the wording of the motion. It reads as follows—

...but we regret to have to inform Your Excellency that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of, and responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia...

No-one could have worked harder and more intelligently than the Minister for Agriculture to find a solution to the problem. Members on the front bench opposite know full well from their experience when they were in Government that one has to be more than just a representative of a particular section. There has to be a time when the Government of the day sits as a Cabinet and looks at its total responsibility in accordance with its oath of office. Whether one is a Country Party member, a Liberal Party member, or a Labor Party member, at various times—as the member for Warren must know if he was a good Minister—one has to look at the total question.

It is not easy, especially when one represents a party such as the Country Party. However, it is to the credit of members concerned that they had a look at this question as a total responsibility and with full regard for the rural interests. Otherwise this problem could have been resolved in a matter of 10 seconds at a Cabinet meeting. Perhaps there would have been less trouble if we had done that. However, because we, as a Government, wanted to do the right thing, a tremendous amount of time has been spent on this problem.

This is not a question that affects only members of the Farmers' Union. There are nearly as many farmers who are not members of the Farmers' Union and many of them have very strong views in opposition to the board itself. Then, when we look at this question as a Government, we have to look at it as a total question. We believe that the original request of the Lamb Marketing Board was the one that had to be faced. The Opposition has introduced a new side to this subject. The Opposition is setting itself up as the spokesman of the Farmer's Union. What an incongruous combination! The Opposition is standing up, shedding crocodile tears all over the Chamber and acting as spokesman for the Farmers' Union but it is not talking about the marketing of hogget at all; it is talking about the marketing of mutton and all sheep meats. That was never at issue.

**Mr H. D. Evans:** This was put forward at the request of the Farmers' Union.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** I do not care what the honourable member claims was put forward. I want to tell the member for Warren what was put before the Government. It was requested by the Lamb Marketing Board to permit the board to trade in hogget under certain conditions. One request the Minister had to consider, and on which he sought legal advice, was the proclamation of part IV of the Act on a restricted basis so that the board could deal in hogget. It was clearly laid down in the advice from Crown Law that this was a dangerous exercise because it could be immediately challenged, and how silly would we all be if suddenly the Government were challenged on that type of proclamation? I invite the attention of the member for Warren to part IV of the Act. Apart from the heading it does not refer to hogget at all. In the operative clauses of part IV it does not mention hogget as a specific class of meat.

There was a way around this, but the issue became extremely emotive quite unnecessarily because certain people were anxious to create mischief and they made the life of the Minister almost intolerable. The people who were not prepared to give him their support in what he was trying to do jumped on the bandwagon



and said that this was a good time to embarrass the Government by driving a wedge between the Country Party and the Liberal Party. However, they will not have any success because we govern as a Government and that is how we should govern.

Mr Bryce: Just puppets on a string!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to emphasise the point that the request put before the Government had nothing to do with mutton. This is a new issue introduced in recent times. I want to tell members opposite that the arguments of the president and vice-president of the Farmers' Union when they saw us revolved around the question of hogget. The simple fact is that they wanted an opportunity for the board to deal in hogget. In my mind it was never in doubt that that was their objective, and after all is said and done it has been made very clear by the member for Moore that we are dealing with only a tiny fraction of the trade.

However, there was no impediment to the proposal. The Farmers' Union desires to keep this matter under review. The Government has already said, weeks ago, that it wants to keep the matter under review. The Lamb Marketing Board went through a rather traumatic period, because it had misunderstandings with the producers; misunderstanding in the slaughtering section and in the general trade itself. I was hopeful that after the board got over the worst of its establishment period it would settle down to a sensible trading operation and fulfil its original role of watchdog for the producers and that in time—I think a further 12 months would have been sufficient—it would have developed a total industry approach to the matter.

Let us face it—and this is a point that has been argued at great length in various sections of an industry that is inclined to get into compartments—the success of the producer in this exercise is tied up with the efficiency and smooth operation of the total industry.

Let us look at the components of the industry. There are people such as Wesfarmers. That is a co-operative. Not only is Wesfarmers very heavily committed in the merchandising and export side of the industry, but also it is very heavily involved in the shipping side. It has an international reputation in the shipping business, particularly in the shipment of primary products.

Today this is a very vital aspect. It is not everyone who can command ships and call on ships out of world trade. One has to know his way around to be able to do that. Wesfarmers has built up a tremendous reputation in this respect, and this is vital in the exercise of getting shipping.

Against that we have Claussen Steamship Company, a private undertaking, engaged in the shipping business. It is not a

co-operative; but it is very efficient and experienced in this type of shipment. So, we have these two forces working for us, and not against us. Furthermore, we have other interests, private and Government, involved. There are the two very big Government works, in which a tremendous amount of the money of the taxpayers has been invested to keep them in operation, which are also involved in the same business.

I only mention this to point out there is already a very strong element in the industry today which knows the business and has various interest in it. There is a difference between Wesfarmers and Claussen Steamship Company, and a difference between the former and Elders. That is the way we want it to be.

I sincerely hope the Lamb Marketing Board will be able to settle down to a good period of operations and to develop goodwill, because it has been doing fairly well in respect of the marketing of lamb.

Much play has been made by members of the Opposition on the interests of the consumer, and all of a sudden the consumer has been intruded into the debate, whereas the amendment started off as being a producer benefit. The tears shed by the Opposition were not on behalf of the consumers but the producers initially.

I would invite the attention of the member for Swan to the report on lamb marketing in Western Australia by the Consumer Protection Bureau. That report has now been made public. If we read the reason for the board to control the marketing of hogget it is not to benefit the producer at all; it is to benefit the consumer in making cheaper hogget available.

The honourable member who raised this issue apparently completely overlooked this fact, because the Consumer Protection Bureau was looking at the matter from the consumers' point of view. If the honourable member says the Government has no interest in the consumer, I can tell him that our predecessors in Government as well as the present Government used the Consumer Protection Bureau as the medium to undertake the inquiry into lamb marketing. Not only does it have competence within its own organisation, but it is also oriented towards the consumer.

Mr Skidmore: Would the Premier read the Consumer Protection Bureau report dealing with the industry as such?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The honourable member can quote from the report as long as he likes, but I shall not do so. I am now dealing with a matter put forward by the member for Warren, and it relates specifically to the alleged disregard by the Government of the interests of the rural community; this was particularly directed at the Country Party Ministers within the Government.

Mr H. D. Evans: Is the Farmers' Union satisfied with the present set-up?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I can assure the honourable member that the Farmers' Union is quite prepared to go along with the present arrangement, and to keep it under review, just as the Government is prepared to do.

Mr Carr: For the benefit of the middle-man.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The member for Geraldton is ill-informed on this matter. This has nothing to do with the middle-man at all; he will find that out if he stops to think. He seems to have a warped idea of this matter.

I invite the attention of members opposite to another issue which has been overlooked both by the instigators of the amendment and others who have spoken in the debate. The study that was undertaken of the Lamb Marketing Board by the Consumer Protection Bureau is only one facet; the inquiries that were carried out by the Government, following the request from the Lamb Marketing Board about hogget, is another facet. Overriding all this is the inquiry undertaken by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee into all types of meat. The report is now in the hands of the Minister, and I understand it will be tabled next week. That deals with the total question.

Mr Skidmore: The Minister for Agriculture was so concerned that he indicated he would look at the report when he had the time.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the honourable member reads the documents that have been tabled he will find that the Meat Industry Advisory Committee was somewhat concerned about giving an opinion on lamb marketing and the sale of hogget. The comprehensive report will be made public next week. We will then have another aspect of meat marketing, meat production, and meat handling which has to be considered not only by the Government, but by all the interests within the industry and by Parliament.

I summarise my remarks in this way: the amendment, as I read it, is nothing but a political stunt which has misfired. The amendment refers to the Government as having disregarded the interests and wishes of, and the responsibility to, the farmers of Western Australia. In fact, the Government has had full regard for all those interests. It has had full regard for the total interests of the community, right through to those of the consumer.

Mr H. D. Evans: Particularly the trade.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Least of all the trade, because our objective is to get the maximum sales in as many diversified markets as possible with the maximum net

return to the producer. That does not necessarily mean we have to have the highest selling price. I have pointed out the objective of the Government is to get the highest net return to the producer. If the member for Warren disagrees with that objective he should say so. That is the objective of this Government in respect of primary products; that objective is written into our policy and it will be adhered to.

I reject completely the proposition put forward by the Opposition alleging that the Government has disregarded the interests and wishes of the rural community. I also want to remind members opposite, who tonight have had some fun and games and have been on a hunting expedition attacking the Country Party, that in this Parliament there are 28 country members who owe their allegiance to the Liberal Party; there are 11 Labor members who have constituencies outside the metropolitan area; and there are nine Country Party members. In all there are 20 members representing country electorates in the Country Party and the Labor Party, and there are 28 country members who owe their allegiance to the Liberal Party.

Surely those members have an interest in the rural areas. Have they not heard their electors expressing their sentiments? Have they not made valid judgments as to what is in the best interests of the producer and the community? It is in that light that a balanced decision has been made. I believe we have arrived at a very practical solution.

The Minister for Agriculture is to be commended for the attitude he has adopted. He did not take a parochial and narrow view of the position as he could have done so easily. He has taken the view that any responsible and sensible Minister should have taken. I oppose the amendment.

MR. JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.29 p.m.]: There is not much to which I wish to apply myself in this debate. Other than liking both hogget and lamb chops, I do not claim to be an expert on the subject matter at all. However, I would like to make some comments, because a student in the future might go through our *Hansard* reports in undertaking a study of what took place tonight.

I have had the unfortunate experience of doing that very thing and finding that a section of an Act had been left out inadvertently in a reprint, and that confused me completely. When one tries to follow the reason that a section has been deleted, and one cannot find the section in the *Hansard* report, one becomes confused. If in the future a student undertaking a research into debates on agriculture comes across the record of the

present debate he will regard this as a peculiar House, because the debate on an amendment which could not be acted upon took up three hours.

This is stupid and I very much resent the petulance of the Premier in refusing to allow the honourable member to amend his amendment by merely altering part VI to part IV. Obviously a typographical error is involved.

Mr May: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: The honourable member was embarrassed enough as it was. The honourable member who sits next to him had tidied up his things on the desk and shifted to another place to give the member for Warren more room. In tidying up in this way the honourable member placed in his own drawer the notice of motion which had been put next to the member for Warren for ready reference. No-one can become more confused than when he reaches for something—and I have seen the Premier do this—from which to quote and finds it is not there.

Sir Charles Court: I'll say.

Mr JAMIESON: This is what occurred and it is not to the credit of the Premier that he refused to give permission for the amendment to be altered to enable it to make sense in the annals of Parliament.

Sir Charles Court: The one which had the error is the one the Minister took out of the drawer.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it was, but obviously it was a typographical error. Let me give the Premier a warning. He often wants a unanimous vote to make statements to the House. In future we will look very closely at such requests.

Sir Charles Court: What about the motion you moved against me while I was in Brazil and then you refused me the right to make a personal explanation on my return? What about the situation involving the member for Boulder-Eyre?

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier has refused a member the right to alter an amendment and we will look closely at any similar request the Premier might make in the future.

Sir Charles Court: That is your right.

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier has taken this action with us and he will have to cop similar action himself. It was a silly move on the part of the Premier. He could have easily allowed the amendment to be made, but he was petulant and stupid and took an action to stand over someone who was already humiliated. This is typical of the Premier. When a person is down he puts the heel in and turns it as hard as he can. He does not do himself or the Parliament any good

and he certainly will do no good for history and will make it very difficult for anyone in the future trying to study the debate. The Premier makes stupid statements. He never does anything else.

Mr Sodeman: You have said you have done the same thing yourself, so why not sit down?

Mr JAMIESON: I am telling the Premier that we will have to look very closely in future at any similar requests he might make—

Sir Charles Court: Fair enough.

Mr JAMIESON: —before we make a decision. As a matter of fact I personally have refused to give him permission as from the 14th September several years ago and that is why I invariably leave the Chamber rather than humiliate my leader by objecting to the request. I will continue to do this.

By his action the Premier has used the privilege of the House in a manner not envisaged. On this occasion he refused to give an honourable member, who was already in a humiliated situation, permission to amend his amendment. How petulant, silly, and stupid can one get? It was a childish action and does not deserve any further comment.

Sir Charles Court: I would remind you that you have a leader who is the greatest taker of points of order on Standing Orders this place has ever had.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course he is, but has the Premier ever known him to refuse a member the right to change—

Several members interjected.

Mr JAMIESON: I appeal to you, Mr Speaker, because you are more reasonable than the Premier. Have you ever known him to refuse a member the right to make an alteration in similar circumstances; that is, when an obvious typographical error has been made?

Sir Charles Court: He refused me the right to make a personal explanation.

Mr JAMIESON: Obviously the board made representations to the Government. If our situations had been reversed and the boot had been on the other foot, and the Premier and his cohorts from the Country Party were on this side of the House and we had not agreed to the proposition as originally outlined by the Farmers' Union, the Premier and his cohorts would have moved a similar amendment. It is a lot of hypocrisy for the Premier to say that we are doing something which is not in accord with usual parliamentary practice. We are entitled to raise this matter. As a matter of fact, in tomorrow's *The West Australian* which we are privileged to have a little early, the political notes of the day happen to excuse the situation in which the Country Party members find themselves in connection with

this very matter. Undoubtedly the article was written earlier. The Government would not have known the amendment was to be moved. If members read it they will find that the article follows the lines of tonight's debate.

There is nothing wrong with the action taken by the member for Warren; in fact, it was laudable. He piloted the legislation through the House and he has had a personal interest in it. No doubt people from the farming community have requested him to take some action.

The only point on which I would agree with the Premier concerns the wording of the part. It is certainly a bit obscure, but in any case mostly lamb and hogget are marketed. Not much mutton is marketed. If the part had been proclaimed it would have done no harm. I suppose some people might have tried to get a few scraggy sheep through and this might have been responsible for some other body having a say in the activities, too. They are the ones who put most pressure on the Premier.

The motion is quite justified even though it does not make sense as it reads and even though we will conclude this comedy of errors by calling for a division, if necessary, to put over our point of view. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—17

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

(Teller)

## Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr Mensaros
Mr Clarko	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Gibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Young
Mr Laurence	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Taylor	Mr Rushton
Mr Bryce	Mr Thompson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Stephens
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Coyne
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Nanovich

Amendment thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

*House adjourned at 10.42 p.m.*

# Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th March, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS (9): ON NOTICE

### 1. LAMB MARKETING BOARD

*Accounts, Report, and Throughput*

The Hon. G. W. Berry for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Have the annual financial statements and accounts of the Lamb Marketing Board been certified by the Auditor General?
- (2) When is it expected that the annual report will be tabled in Parliament?
- (3) What weight and numbers of lambs have been handled for each of the past 18 months?
- (4) What has been the monthly cost of running the Board for each of the last 18 months?
- (5) What increase in staff and running costs have occurred since the inception of the Board?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The W.A. Lamb Marketing Board has advised as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In approximately two weeks.
- (3)

	No	Weight (tonnes)
July 1973	87 673	1 157
August	112 233	1 586
September	158 172	2 319
October	274 685	4 203
November	163 308	2 474
December	59 639	928
January 1974	54 367	834
February	40 713	614
March	40 157	609
April	58 327	846
May	58 444	870
June	55 540	847
July	90 419	1 361
August	140 688	2 086
September	226 783	3 334
October	280 003	4 021
November	200 884	2 866
December	63 569	893

- (4) The published report of the Board for the period 2nd December, 1972 to 30th June, 1973 showed overheads to be 0.895 cents per pound. The cost to the Board of its representatives was 0.82 cents per pound.

For the year 1st July, 1973 to 30th June, 1974 the equivalent figures were 0.918 cents per pound and 0.617 cents per pound.