

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and passed.

## CONTRACEPTIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it did not insist on its amendments to which the Council had disagreed.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.03 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Friday, the 24th November, at 11.00 a.m.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You have a conference at 10.45 a.m.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: That is right. I am advised it will be cleared quickly.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.04 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 23rd November, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. Harman, leave of absence for six weeks granted to Mr. May (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) on the ground of urgent public business.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 22nd November.

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [11.03 a.m.]: A little over two years ago I had the opportunity provided to me by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to visit Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide. By

coincidence I happened to witness in Sydney a moratorium demonstration on a Friday afternoon. The demonstration started at 2.00 p.m. and was staged initially at Wynyard Park. A considerable number of people gradually came together and were addressed by a number of speakers. Not by coincidence but by planning, I feel, the march was organised to go from Wynyard Park into central Sydney along George Street at approximately 4.45 p.m. I was able to see a demonstration of some 20,000 people marching along George Street outside the Wynyard station at approximately 5.00 p.m. At this time I imagine a great number of people would be endeavouring to obtain transport to their homes in the various suburbs of Sydney. However, this is not the primary point I wish to make by illustrating this particular occasion.

One of the points I am making is that a number of people from various walks of life joined in the march. It is true the great majority of them were young but, among the marchers, were a considerable number of older people and ministers of religion; further, there were women of all ages. This, too, is a secondary point.

The real point I am making is that the demonstrators continually chanted, "We want peace; peace now."

Mr. Williams: Hitler said "I want peace" and pointed to a map of the world and said "That piece".

Mr. HARMAN: Some members on the opposite side of the House may not be interested in peace but I certainly am; in fact I am sure most members in this House are interested in peace.

Sir David Brand: Do you not think that we all are?

Mr. HARMAN: Of course, but I was worried about the attitude of the member for Bunbury.

Mr. Williams: Hitler said he wanted peace, but we know what he did to try to achieve his kind of "piece."

Mr. HARMAN: The history of the world shows that in every age man has been associated with war and peace. Due to tremendous changes which have occurred in our technology and a less authoritative approach to people on the part of various Governments, during the last 30 years the so-called permissive society has come into being. Now there seems to be developing the attitude that we ought to be thinking more about peace and less about war.

The mind boggles at the technological changes which have occurred in the last 30 years and it boggles more when we think that, in the year 2000, our whole way of life will be changed tremendously because of the rapid progress and developments which have occurred in recent years, and will continue to occur.

For this reason, it is not a matter of coincidence that, during the last few years, a number of eminent people throughout the world have stressed the need to develop research into peace. In referring to the various people who see the need for peace research I would like to quote an extract from an address given by Norman Z. Alcock, President of the Canadian Peace Research Institute, Oakville, Ontario. He says—

The reason for peace research is simple: the rules of survival have changed drastically in the past 30 years, but we don't yet know what the new rules are. All we know really is that we cannot use war for settling disputes between nations as we once did.

In the years since the conclusion of World War II, we have seen a tremendous armament race by the two major countries of the world; namely, America and Russia. No less an authority than Robin Clarke, the founder editor of *Science Journal*, in a discussion on the Australian Broadcasting Commission programme called "Science Unit" stated—

In 1961 it was authoritatively estimated that the world had stockpiled nuclear weapons equivalent to 30,000 million tons of TNT—that's roughly 10 tons for every man, woman and child alive at the time. As it takes less than one pound of TNT to kill a man, the human race had even then accumulated enough nuclear explosive to eliminate itself 20,000 times over.

Mr. Hartrey: Super kill!

Mr. HARMAN: To continue—

—Who could possibly ask for anything more?

That was the situation in 1961, and presumably the stockpile has increased since then.

Mr. Speaker, you may well wonder why a member of the State Parliament should talk about research into peace and the need for this new discipline, if we may call it that, in the State of Western Australia. The reason is that I would like to give my support to an organisation set up in Australia which is undertaking an appeal for a course in peace studies at an Australian tertiary institution. This particular group is endeavouring to set up a chair of peace, or a chair of irenology, as it is sometimes referred to, at the new Murdoch University. I feel it would be appropriate for Western Australia to have such a chair at this university which is now being planned. The aim of the appeal is as follows:—

It is essential that competent people should be appointed to concentrate, study and research on the solution of basic problems related to peace. A tertiary institution, with supportive courses in the behavioural sciences, is the best place for such studies.

The prime purpose of this appeal is to create a chair in the Science of Peace (Irenology) at an Australian tertiary institution. It would be the first such chair in Australia. A likely location for such a chair is the Murdoch University, Western Australia.

Why has the appeal chosen Murdoch University? It states its reasons as follows:—

The Murdoch University is at the stage where it can incorporate peace studies into its initial planning.

The Chairman and members of the planning board have demonstrated their interest in the proposal and have gathered information on the subject from around the world.

They have sought and been granted permission from the Australian Universities Commission to establish such a chair.

The University is named after a well known and loved Australian, the late Professor Sir Walter Murdoch, who himself espoused the cause of peace.

I believe the members of this House will support the appeal by this organisation to have a chair of irenology established at the new Murdoch University. I ask the Government and the planning board to give very close consideration to the proposition put forward by it.

If we set up a chair of irenology at the Murdoch University, research will be undertaken along the lines suggested by these very eminent people. This would be an excellent focal point to research some of the other problems in our community today, and I refer to problems in the fields of industrial relations, urban development, and the racial situation in Australia. A great deal of work is already being done by various professional people and organisations in regard to these problems, but I feel the results of such research are never properly put before the people. By doing this, people may be willing to change their attitudes, or at least they would start to question them.

It seems to me that it may even become necessary in the future to establish an organisation to research such a subject and disseminate the results to the people, particularly to those who are in a position to make decisions which affect the rest of us. I refer, of course, to people in our bureaucracy, leaders of private enterprise and members of Parliament. If we had this avenue open to us to make known to the people the results of such research, I am sure the community would be less apathetic. People would question their own attitudes and possibly become a little more involved in the affairs of society.

I referred earlier to the question of urban development. In this party, of which I was a member, there was a senator from the United States. He visited Sydney,

Melbourne, Adelaide, and Perth, in company with the group. On his return to Canberra, we discussed the subject of urban development, and particularly the rapid development in high rise and high density accommodation. We now have in Perth a big concrete jungle with many people living in a small area.

The senator drew me aside after the discussion and said, "We ceased this type of accommodation in the United States about 25 years ago." This was an important message to me, because we are still developing high rise living in our State, and I wonder whether, considering all the aspects, this is the correct approach to the problem.

I realise that high density accommodation solves some problems—it houses a great many people very quickly, and perhaps quite cheaply in some cases. However, in the long run, we must question whether it is a wise move.

I would hope that in this whole range of research we would have the opportunity to study such problems so that the results may be passed on to the community. By this means we may enlighten the people and get them more interested in the affairs of society. I hope some other members of the House will discuss this subject.

In conclusion I would just like to quote a passage written by Cicero which has already been mentioned in this House by the member for Boulder-Dundas. He says—

Discussion and force are the main ways of settling quarrels, the former of which are peculiar to man, the latter to brute beasts.

**MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [11.19 a.m.]**: Approximately 12 months ago we debated a similar measure in this House. Even in that Budget we referred to a number of increases in charges, and also to a number of promises which had not been kept by the Government at that time.

On the surface, the Budget before us does not appear to be one to create a great deal of discontent or criticism, because it does not show any significant increases in taxation. However, this has been offset during the year by the number of increased charges applied in many directions, and of course, these are not shown as taxes in the Budget. I will refer to these increases later in my speech.

At this point I draw the attention of Government members particularly to a promise made in the Premier's policy speech which I think is of some significance. On page 28 of that speech, the following paragraph appears:—

I pledge my party to face up to all farmers' problems, especially debt problems. We propose to endeavour to

institute a form of payment from the Treasury to the farmer to bring his nett income to a stated minimum. In this way farmers with no real alternative would not be forced to leave their farms or endure income-shrinking poverty.

We must not forget the situation in which the primary industries found themselves. There had been a drought, a falling away of wool prices, and the application of quotas in the wheat industry. All these created a difficult situation for those engaged in the farming industry.

At that time the present Premier saw a way to influence people towards thinking that a change of Government could offer a solution to all their problems. On the 11th September, 1970, this headline appeared on the front page of the Press: "3,000 W.A. farmers may be forced off land." That was in September and the policy speech was delivered in the following February, and at that time farmers in trouble thought it offered some solution to their problems.

It appears that an income plan for farmers was presented to a meeting of the A.L.P. held at Katanning in June, of the same year. As I understand it, it was put forward by a farmer who is now a candidate for the electorate of Moore in the Commonwealth general elections. I would like to hear from the Premier or the Minister for Agriculture information on how many farms the Government has bought, or how many farmers it has assisted by ensuring that they have received this payment to give them a set income minimum. I would also like to know from the Premier whether any farmers have been assisted in this way, whether any farmers have offered their farms to the Government, and if so whether the Government has purchased them.

Not only I, but many other people would be interested to know if this happened to induce these people that a change of Government would present a solution to their problems. So I repeat: I would like to hear from the Premier or the Minister for Agriculture as to whether these steps were taken.

**Mr. Jamieson**: It gave us about five more country seats, did it not?

**Mr. McPHARLIN**: I did not say it gave the Government five more country seats, but to offer that sort of deceptive inducement to farmers is not playing the game.

**Mr. Jamieson**: It was not deceptive.

**Mr. McPHARLIN**: It was so. Not long after the change of Government we in Opposition criticised the Government for being a bit slow in applying the rural reconstruction policy, which was drawn up before the present Government came into office. We were criticised by the present Minister for Agriculture and in one of

the statements that was published in the Press on Friday, the 9th April, 1971, he was reported as saying—

It was a shameful indictment that a party that was supposed to represent farmers should perpetuate political humbug.

Mr. H. D. Evans: How perfectly true.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I expected that comment. If ever there was a charge of political humbug to be levelled, it should be levelled fairly and squarely against the present Government because of the promises in the Premier's speech. That represented political humbug of the first degree, because he made promises that the Government does not keep. We see many statements such as I have quoted being published in the Press. I also have here the annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Authority, together with some answers that were given to a question asked by my leader recently as to how many applications for assistance were made under the Rural Reconstruction Scheme. Instead of a total of 3,000, which was the figure at that time, the total given in this answer to the question was 1,511; approximately half. What a glorious situation! Apparently the Premier was so impressed at the time that he offered these deceptive inducements to farmers by saying that the present Government would find a solution to all their problems. This statement is also reflected in the current statements being made by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the A.L.P., but I noticed that in his policy speech there were no more than a few lines that had reference to the rural industries.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What does the D.L.P. say?

Mr. McPHARLIN: I now come to all these increased charges that have been made by the present Government over the previous 12 months. These have not been shown in the Budget, but many increased charges have been imposed by various departments. I realise that some of them have been mentioned before and that some charges have been increased by as much as 150 per cent. Mention has been made of increases in electricity charges, water rates for domestic use, and an increase in the transport surcharge from \$2 to \$5. The cost of obtaining a duplicate of a driver's license was increased from 50c to \$1. The transfer fee for a motorcycle or a trailer was increased from \$1 to \$2. Boat licenses were increased from \$1 to \$4 or to \$7 or \$8, depending on the size of the boat. Pilotage fees for the Port of Wyndham have been increased from \$300 to \$600. State Shipping Service freight rates rose by \$10 per ton to Darwin from the 1st July, 1971, and a flat rate of \$5 per ton on goods shipped to north-west ports was made on the 1st October last year, only a year ago.

The Fremantle Port Authority cargo handling charges were increased in March, 1971, by 65c a ton outwards, and 50c a ton inwards. The fee for an extract of birth certificate has risen from 30c to \$1, and similar charges and increases have been applied to marriage and birth certificates. Fire brigade charges have risen, and rents on dredging and mineral claims have increased from 25c to 50c an acre a year. Rents on mineral leases other than coal leases, rose from 50c to \$2 an acre. With the exception of only some, temporary reserve holders are now faced with fees for occupancy rights of \$1,000 a year, plus \$26 a year for every square mile. The old rate ranged from \$20 to \$400 a year. To submit an application to the Town Planning Board to subdivide land now costs \$5 instead of \$2, and fees for the approval of a diagram went from \$4 to \$10, and for plans from \$10 to \$20. The cost of every lot shown on a diagram or plan rose from 50c to \$1. Factory and shop owners employing 50 people now have to pay a registration fee of \$45 instead of \$30. Stamp duty on marketable securities increased from 20c for every \$100 of the consideration to 30c, and so it goes on.

Mr. O'Connor: This is the Government that does not believe in taxation increases!

Mr. McPHARLIN: These imposts are not shown in the Budget as actual taxes, but the income derived from them is reflected in the Budget. The Treasurer did not have very much left on which to work so he decided he would take some action to increase the betting tax, but we know what eventually occurred in that regard because it is history now. The trotting and racing clubs were most upset and the Treasurer revised his ideas and did not proceed with the proposal.

It is very interesting to note the increased revenue obtained from the payroll tax, which was not available to the previous Government. The actual amount received in 1971-72 was \$28,096,975, and the estimate for the coming year is \$40,460,000. This has given the Government an increased amount which will help in the expenditure required.

The liquor license tax is another very handy source of revenue, and the estimate for the coming year is \$5,000,000, while the estimate for royalties is almost the same as it was last year.

In addition, of course, the State receives grants from the Commonwealth and these are a very substantial feature of the Budget. These grants are as follows:—

Financial Assistance Grant	189,300,000
Additional Assistance Grant	6,500,000
Special Revenue Assistance	3,500,000
Debt Charges Assistance	3,317,000
Interest Contributions	947,000

Total Commonwealth \$203,564,000

That is more than the total State income. Therefore I do not consider much criticism can be levelled at the Federal Government in connection with the assistance it extends to the State.

We must admit that the recent Federal Budget provided tremendous concessions and assistance to many industries and this is of great benefit to the State Government. The State Treasurer must be grateful for the generous Commonwealth Budget. Under the Federal Budget rural industries throughout Australia were assisted to the tune of \$230,000,000. A great deal is to be given for wool research and promotion, and \$4,000,000 is being provided for the eradication of TB and brucellosis in cattle herds.

The reduction of income tax was a generous move on the part of the Federal Government and a further 600,000 taxpayers are now exempt from tax liability. It was reduced by 2½ per cent. last April and a further 10 per cent. under the recent Budget. Statutory exemptions from estate duty have been doubled. All this assistance must reflect in the State Treasurer's Budget, enabling him to present a Budget which does not call for a great deal of uproar or opposition from the citizens of this State.

The Commonwealth has also offered assistance to home buyers. The value of a home which can be purchased has been increased from \$17,500 to \$22,500 and the grant has been increased to \$500 for a saving of \$1,500 and to \$750 for a saving of \$2,250. This assistance also would help the State Treasurer in his compilation of the financial statements.

The Federal Government has also been generous in its substantial assistance towards education. We know that a great deal of criticism has been levelled at the education system, but I do not think it can be said that the Federal Government has not faced up to its responsibilities in this respect, because it has offered many millions of dollars not only in cash assistance, but also in scholarships and in other directions. The Federal Budget has certainly been of great help.

Last night the member for Mt. Lawley referred to road maintenance tax which has been creating dissension for some time. At present some who can pay are forced to pay while those who cannot are released from the obligation. This is creating a great deal of confusion and difficulty for the Road and Air Transport Commission. I am sure that some who are liable to pay will be arguing that they cannot pay when, in reality, they can; and the officers of the commission find it very difficult to work out who can pay and who cannot. The situation is certainly not as it should be and some action must be taken to try to iron out the difficulties for all concerned.

The member for Mt. Lawley suggested that we could have a "cut-off period" to enable the problems to be sorted out and a system to be devised under which the imposition would be equitable.

Earlier in the year a Bill was presented to us offering an alternative, but it did not go as far as members of the Labor Party had advocated when the taxing Bill was introduced into the House in 1966.

At that time the Labor Party advocated that an extra tax should be added to all license fees; but when the Bill was introduced earlier this year, it included a provision to add it to the license fees of commercial vehicles only. So no consistency exists within the ranks of the party itself, because it did not adhere to the principle it originally advocated.

The road maintenance tax is certainly creating difficulties at the moment, and the Government should be investigating ways and means by which those difficulties might be overcome, thus relieving the pressure on the commission in its administration of the Act.

The previous Government appointed a committee which undertook investigations into a proposal that fuel outlets should be licensed in the same way that liquor outlets are licensed. This was the alternative system suggested.

The advice received from the committee after it had made an investigation was that this would be contravening the Commonwealth field of taxation, and would not be allowed. The claim was that it could be challenged in court and that the findings of the court would be against this type of tax if it were applied. I wonder why the Government has not given more consideration to this type of alternative.

If there is some doubt then the matter should be tested to see what sort of reaction there is and what decision the court makes. There appears to be some doubt as to whether or not a court would agree or disagree with such a proposal. The only real solution is to test the position by placing provision for the tax on the Statute book. However, the Government has not seen fit to do that or to take any other action.

I understand that the Premier of Tasmania has imposed a tax on cigarettes but up to this time no action has been taken by the Commonwealth Government. This is a similar situation and I think it requires further consideration. My proposal may not be acceptable, and it may not work, but it is worth trying.

I will now refer to a matter which is of interest to most of us: the situation of the wheat industry at the present time. We heard criticism in this House to the effect that because the Federal Government had not recognised Red China we would not be able to sell wheat to China. In contradiction of that criticism wheat

sales have been made to China. The Federal Labor spokesman for primary industry (Dr. Patterson) claimed that there could be some sales to China as a result of Labor Party moves.

Dr. Patterson was criticised by the Leader of the Country Party in the Federal Parliament (Mr. Anthony) and the wheat sales which have taken place since then certainly make false the claim by Dr. Patterson, and I think it also reflects the disadvantages which a Labor Government would present. That attitude also indicates that there could not be any great sincerity engendered in the primary industry if a person such as Dr. Patterson—who claims to be the Labor Party spokesman on primary industry—makes such statements.

An article which appeared in the Press was to the effect that Dr. Patterson claimed that wheat sales to China would resume. Five weeks ago Mr. Anthony pointed out that Dr. Patterson claimed there would be no sales of wheat to China while Australia maintained a hostile attitude towards that country. What sort of a representative is a man such as that who tries to get out of what he said previously? He tried to make all sorts of excuses for his utterances.

Mr. Hartrey: Does the honourable member not think that his visit to China had something to do with the wheat sales?

Mr. McPHARLIN: We have made wheat sales to that country without the recognition which members from the other side of the House have been advocating for so long. The policies of the Government have been vindicated, and they have proved to be right. The criticism which has been levelled and the suggestions which have been made are not founded on truth.

Going a little further, the statements and actions on the part of Dr. Patterson reflect just how little reliance can be placed on the Labor Party. I am referring now to the Wool Commission and the wool industry. Just how much confidence and reliance can the primary producers have in any scheme which is continually attacked by Labor spokesmen?

We all know that ever since the Wool Commission was appointed there has been tremendous criticism. The commission was appointed to purchase wool and the Labor spokesmen set out to rubbish that commission from the day it was formed. The same Labor spokesman, on the 28th October, 1970, is recorded in *Federal Hansard* at page 2879 as having said—

It is one of the worst pieces of legislation I have seen in the Parliament.

If there is a change of Government in December that is the type of person who would probably become Minister for Primary Industry. God help us; I certainly hope there is not a change of Government.

Another statement from a so-called responsible member of the Labor Party was, "It is a sickly abortion that has little chance of thriving." That statement shows how little he knew of the situation. What a statement to make!

Sir David Brand: Who said that?

Mr. McPHARLIN: The speaker's name was Grassby.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McPHARLIN: If members opposite do not like what I am saying, I have more statements for them to listen to. Once again, from Mr. Grassby, "The Australian Wool Commission is a very pallid organisation." I would suggest that the member himself is very pallid.

Mr. O'Connor: He is very colourful.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Another statement made by Dr. Patterson, on the 17th March, 1971, which appears at page 980 of the *Federal Hansard*, is as follows:—

The Australian Wool Commission has panicked because of its failure to bludgeon the wool market into accepting higher prices. Grave fears are now arising that the Commission's activities could wreck the entire economic foundation of the wool industry.

That statement was made by the man who, if there is a change of Government, will probably be the Minister for Primary Industry. Another statement from the same person is as follows:—

The Government once again is guilty of gross complacency. It is obviously backing the stockpiling activities of the Wool Commission.

I believe that the present policy of the Wool Commission of deliberately acquiring mounting stockpiles of wool is a dangerous gamble which has all the earmarks of backfiring.

As I have said, these remarks were made by Dr. Patterson, the Labor Party spokesman on primary industry. I hate to think of the situation we will be in if there is the misfortune of a change of Government.

Sir Charles Court: The honourable member should also tell the Government what Dr. Patterson said at the Hobart conference.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McPHARLIN: I have some notes on that one, too. I will go a little further because I think members on the Government side of the House may like to hear my comments. The following was said by Senator Poke on the 24th November, 1971, and it appears at page 2039 of the *Federal Hansard*. It reads as follows:—

How much longer will the Government continue to pour money down the drain by an open-ended deficiency

scheme which means that the taxpayers are subsidising these wealthy people in large companies.

The wool industry was in a desperate situation and the Government took the responsible action of setting up the Wool Commission. The commission came under severe criticism, but it lifted the wool industry out of its troubles. Yet we have a senator representing the Labor Party making comments of that nature.

Let us return to Dr. Patterson. When speaking about a means test in conjunction with rural support measures he said—

The Opposition will support only a proposition which distributes Government or public moneys to those producers who genuinely need help.

There are no comments on that.

Mr. O'Connor: He will give some to the member for Ascot.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I have not heard any comments from the Government side. Would that apply to the first payment on wheat? No. Dr. Patterson has made no comment on that one, of course. *The Sydney Morning Herald* picked it up and published an item on the 23rd May which said—

Backbenchers from city electorates today forced postponement of an A.L.P. move for a floor price scheme for wool.

So there was a division within the A.L.P. The city boys did not want to help the country people. I will not continue to read these extracts because I think I have embarrassed the Government.

Mr. Jamieson: You are not embarrassing the Government.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I will give the House more. Here is this fellow Grassby speaking about the Australian wool industry conference—

A clumsy amalgam of interests sponsored by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Bryce: How true!

Mr. McPHARLIN: What a statement! Dr. Patterson has to come in again—he cannot keep out of it. He says—

A body which is known to be a Country Party front, I refer to the Australian Wool Industry Conference.

What sort of a statement is that? God help us if he becomes Minister for Primary Industry. Grassby will not be there after the election, so we need not worry about him.

Several members interjected.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I have here other statements about the Launceston conference, at which a motion was moved which was different from the one submitted by

Dr. Patterson. The people who proposed the motion did not know anything at all about primary industries.

Sir Charles Court: He is bad enough but the rest of them are worse.

Mr. McPHARLIN: These people profess to assist the primary industries but do nothing at all about them. I will not delay the House.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPHARLIN: I want to refer now to another matter. I term it the abuse of alcohol, which is different from the use of alcohol. The State Government derives income from liquor licenses. The estimate for this year is almost \$5,000,000. That is useful revenue and no Government would like to see it done away with. However, I think Governments should give more recognition to the abuse of alcohol and take steps to assist people who are afflicted as a result of it. This can be done in various ways.

I have here a leaflet which states that recent surveys of large medical institutions reveal that about one in five of male medical admissions is a patient suffering from alcohol abuse. It also states—

In any large Australian metropolitan hospital alcoholics could account for at least 5,500 bed-days annually. At \$35 per bed-day this adds up to almost \$200,000 per year for one hospital alone.

Mr. Brady: From what document is the honourable member quoting?

Mr. McPHARLIN: I am quoting from an advertisement published by the Alcoholism Foundation of Victoria, 289 Flinders Lane, Melbourne.

There are several ways in which we could assist in the problem of the abuse of alcohol. Of course, this is not the only country which experiences the problem. We could take action by way of legislation.

I understand Sweden tried to control this problem through licensing laws. In 1955 the licensing laws were relaxed and as a result the consumption of spirits increased by something like 30 per cent. and the sales of wine decreased. An increasing number of people afflicted with alcoholism presented themselves for treatment and a great number of convictions for drunkenness were recorded.

The Government of the day took action to try to decrease the consumption of alcohol. It increased by 20 per cent. the price of the most common spirits. A diminishing demand for the spirits followed but the consumption of wine increased. The Government went further and listed persons who were known to be excessive drinkers. Those persons were forbidden to purchase liquor. That is an outline of the action taken by one country which experienced problems in connection with the abuse of alcohol.

Action can be taken in the matter of education. The whole community should be made more aware of what can happen. Health and welfare services, research, and so on are other avenues through which the problem can be tackled, and the Government should give consideration to them.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes more.

**Mr. McPHARLIN:** Alcohol plays a part in a great percentage of road accidents. We are all deeply concerned about the increasing road toll, and I suggest the Government could take action to increase the price of certain spirits as was done in Sweden. This may contribute to a reduction in the road toll.

**Mr. Hartrey:** We cannot impose excise duties, can we?

**Mr. McPHARLIN:** No. It would be a very unpopular measure to increase liquor license fees, but it might have an effect.

**Mr. Hartrey:** It would have the effect of defeating the members who voted for it.

**Mr. McPHARLIN:** This comes down to politics. The abuse of alcohol is a serious matter which every Government must face up to, particularly in an endeavour to reduce the road toll. Perhaps the Premier will see fit to increase his revenue by doubling the liquor license fees, or something of that nature.

I know the political reaction to such an increase would be in our favour because probably the Premier would be put out of office and that is exactly what we want. I suggest to the Premier that he face up to the challenge and do something about the matter. He would have added revenue, although I do not know how much, and the move would perhaps contribute in some small way to reducing the road toll.

**Mr. Speaker,** as you advised me that I had only a few minutes left, I will conclude on that note before you sit me down.

**MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [12.01 p.m.]:** We have heard a fair amount up to date about the Treasurer's Budget speech, about what he had to say and what he did not have to say, and about how uninteresting it was. Probably whether or not it was interesting depends on how one looks at it. However, the Treasurer had already taken the opportunity prior to that—and he has done so since—to increase many charges upon the community, rather than make such announcements in his Budget speech.

**Mr. O'Connor:** Not many; nearly all!

**Mr. WILLIAMS:** That is so. Any increase under 100 per cent. is more or less chicken feed, because most of the increases have been considerably higher. Last night the member for Mt. Marshall and the member for Floreat enumerated these increases, and I do not think I need repeat them. I am sure the public are aware of the fact that the charges have been increased

and that they will produce something like an extra \$30,500,000 for the Treasury in a full year.

When introducing the Budget the Treasurer said the total revenue expected to be available to the Government this financial year falls well short of the funds sought by departments. I do not suppose the Treasurer is an orphan in that respect. Other Treasurers have faced the same problem. No doubt each Minister tries to get the greatest amount possible for his department. Of course, there is never enough to go around and all Treasurers have been faced with a shortage of money over the years. However, with the increased charges I suppose some Ministers are now more satisfied than would otherwise have been the case.

I wish to raise a matter concerning the Ministers of the Government and their appearance in various electorates since the Government came to office. The situation I am about to outline may also concern some members of the Government. I must say that some Ministers have notified me of their intention to come to the Bunbury electorate or surrounding areas; but a number of other Ministers have not—and not just on one occasion, but on several occasions.

The Minister for Police, the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Tourism, the Minister for Education, and the Minister for Development and Decentralisation have all been to my electorate without notifying me. I must say that on the last occasion in the middle of October the Minister for Tourism had the decency to apologise to me. I do not want to get onto my high horse about this matter, but one feels a little foolish when one is balled up in the street and the person says, "I saw so-and-so here yesterday" and one did not even know the Minister had been in the electorate.

No matter whether one is a member of the Opposition or of the Government, one is entitled to know the movement of Ministers throughout one's electorate because on many occasions one could ask the Minister concerned to look at something if he had a few minutes to spare. I have often done this in the case of Ministers who have advised me of their intention to visit my electorate.

**Mr. Harman:** The same thing happened under the last Government.

**Mr. WILLIAMS:** If it did, I did not hear any members of the then Opposition making a noise about it, so they had no-one but themselves to blame.

**Mr. H. D. Evans:** We were starting to become accustomed to that treatment, particularly by the present Leader of the Opposition.



Mr. WILLIAMS: I suppose one does become accustomed to it. However, I think Ministers should continually remind their secretaries—as may be necessary in some cases—that the local member should be notified when the Minister is about to visit his electorate. I think the Minister for Agriculture understands the position. Incidentally, he is not one of the Ministers concerned; he has always notified me.

I would like to mention another matter of courtesy which was mentioned by a member of the Labor Party in another place some few years ago. I refer to the fact that when Ministers address an audience—I suppose we all do this from time to time, but we would hope it is unintentional—they often refer specifically to a Federal member of Parliament who is present, but not specifically to State members who are also present.

On a specific occasion in Bunbury earlier this year a Minister had reason to address a group, including three State members and a Federal member. The Minister named the Federal member, and then referred to the State members merely as State members of Parliament. It is my belief—and I always practise this—that if one names one member, one must name the lot; otherwise one merely refers to them as State and Federal members. I take exception to this; I will not name the Minister concerned because I think he knows to whom I am referring. I take exception to his referring to a Federal member and then lumping the State members together. If he wishes to name one member I believe he has a duty to recognise the others; or if too many members are present he should refer to them broadly as Federal and State members.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I can recall a Minister in your Government who ignored State members completely.

Mr. O'Connor: I hope you are not looking at me.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Maybe the Minister can; but it was up to him to bring the matter to the attention of Parliament or the Premier of the then Government, and perhaps something would have been done about it. I agree such things can result from an oversight on some occasions. I notice the Minister for Education has been bitten, so nothing remains to be said.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is not the Minister for Education to whom you are referring?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, it is.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Identify the occasion.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It was the opening of the library at the Bunbury Senior High School. The Minister stood up and referred to a Federal member and lumped together as State members The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, the member for Wellington, and myself. The Minister remembers that

occasion. I believe he did it for a specific purpose. Be that as it may, the occasion is past now; but do not let it happen again in front of me.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Who do you think you are, with your messianic attitude?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I think the action of the Minister on that occasion showed his ignorance.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The messiah from Bunbury passing a heavenly edict!

Mr. WILLIAMS: It is out now and the Minister knows exactly what I am referring to.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What a heavenly edict to say, "Don't you ever let that happen again" and to shake your finger at me!

Mr. WILLIAMS: Let us hope the Minister has learnt a lesson and that his etiquette will be of a higher standard on the next occasion.

During his policy speech prior to the last election the Premier had a deal to say about the proposed industrial arbitration legislation. When Parliament sits again next year the Government will have been in office a little over two years, but so far we have seen nothing of the proposed legislation. In *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 22nd February, 1972, it was stated that many penal provisions in the State industrial legislation will be wiped out if Parliament accepts proposed Government amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act. We believed that legislation would be presented this session; but it is a bit late now and no doubt we will see it next session. I am wondering whether the Government—and of course I will have to wait and see—intends to remove all of the penal provisions of the Act, or whether it merely intends to remove some of them.

Mr. Hartrey: You had better wait and see.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, I will have to do that. However, if one refers to the ninth annual report of the Western Australian Industrial Commission tabled by the Minister for Labour within the last few days it is rather interesting to see the statistics provided on page 9 in relation to the penal provisions of the Act. When compiling the report the commissioners made it easy for one to tally up the numbers, because in the first column they have listed the number of proceedings dealt with from the 1st February, 1964, to the 30th June, 1971, which was the date of the last report.

The figures relate to cases since the inception of the Industrial Commission in 1964. The second column of the table on page 9 of the report gives the number of proceedings which resulted in the application of penalties for the period from the 1st July, 1971, to the 30th June, 1972.

When one reads this report one wonders what penal provisions will be taken out of the Act.

I will now refer to the headings and to the figures shown. The following information is revealed in the table:—

Details of proceedings which resulted in the application of penalties are—

	1/2/64 to 30/6/71	1/7/71 to 30/6/72	Total
By industrial union of workers against employers ....	602	82	684
By industrial union of workers against workers ....	392	51	443
By employers against workers	14	2	16
By industrial inspectors against employers ....	Nil	8	8

Because of the cry which we often hear from the opposite side of the House that the employers use the penal provisions of the Act against the unions or the workers, I wonder which penal provisions will be deleted. I would hazard a guess that the penal provisions which will be retained are those which are used to the greatest degree; that is, those relating to proceedings by industrial unions of workers against employers, and by industrial unions of workers against workers. Perhaps the other penal provisions will be taken out, but it remains to be seen. I am quite sure that many words will be spoken on this score, if my guess is correct.

Very early in the term of office of the present Government we heard the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Mines in particular, and maybe on one or two occasions the Premier, convincing the people of Western Australia—and hoping their message would be conveyed overseas—that because of the change of Government in Western Australia, industrial unrest would be far less than it had been in the previous years. This is not a bad story at all, but we should examine the figures to determine whether or not that is the position.

Let me give some figures relating to the man-days lost through strikes. Up to 1967-68 the number of man-days lost through strikes was very low, but for some reason from 1968-69 onwards the number increased. I believe the cause was that a State election was looming and this might have aggravated the situation, or that the previous Government was able

to get the State on the move and thereby increased the work force and thus created more problems.

I shall give the figures for each year from 1966-67, and I chose this starting point at random. I could have gone back to the very first report of the Industrial Commission for part of 1964. This is about the only source from which this information may be obtained. I believe the figures to be correct, as long as the operator did not push the wrong button when he was using the computer to compile the figures. The following are the figures:—

Year	Man-days lost through strikes
1966-67	2,702
1967-68	5,233
1968-69	77,042
1969-70	79,549
1970-71	178,478

Then we come to the first full year in the term of office of the present Government which declared that there would be complete industrial harmony and peace in the State. It is rather interesting to note that the number of man-days lost through strikes for the year 1971-72 totalled 433,065. That is about 2½ times as many as in the previous year, and about 160 times as many compared with 1966-67. So much for this Government's contention that it would have co-operation of industry as well as peace in industry.

Until such time as the present Government is able to reach the stage of restraining the militants and giving them a shaking I do not think industrial stoppages will be reduced. The Government should be prepared to give individual unionists the right to decide whether or not they should go on strike. I am sure such a right will have to be extended to the workers one day whether or not we like it, and the sooner it is granted the better.

Mr. Hartrey: You are the rising hope of the unbending Tories!

Mr. Bryce: Is there any significance about the year 1966-67?

Mr. WILLIAMS: None at all. One could commence with any of the reports of the Industrial Commission since 1964; however, the first year I chose was 1966-67. The 1964 report did not cover a full year, but the 1965-66 report would be for a full year and from memory the number of man-days lost in that year was about 3,000.

I wish to mention one item briefly before I deal with some major ones. If the Premier has not had an approach on this matter he will in the next few days. I refer to a grant under the heading of "Miscellaneous Services" to the Youth Hostels Association. Let us not confuse this with any other youth organisation.

The Youth Hostels Association has set up hostels throughout Australia. It is represented in each State and in most countries of the world. Each country has its own association, but they are all affiliated through a world organisation. The prime purpose of the Youth Hostels Association is to enable young people to travel very cheaply.

I had an experience with a young member of my family who returned from an overseas trip in the last few weeks. He was able to live very cheaply in the course of his travels by staying at the youth hostels, and he saw a great part of Western Europe. For a youth to avail himself of the facilities of these hostels all he has to do is to join the association before he leaves Australia.

In some countries, such as West Germany, there are over 200 youth hostels. I believe the number in West Germany is around 230. Sweden and Norway which are small countries in terms of area have, respectively, in the order of about 100 and 300 hostels established. The young people, both males and females, are able to hitchhike across the Continent. A youth is able to use a vehicle in his travels, but he has to park it around the corner from the youth hostel; however, he is able to use the facilities of the hostel. The young people are well looked after, and there is always someone on hand in the hostels to make sure that the fittings and other appurtenances are cared for. Every person who stays in a youth hostel is allocated a duty on the morning before he leaves. It may be to make up the beds, to sweep up, or to wash up.

In Western Australia there are some eight youth hostels, but the Youth Hostels Association of Western Australia is keen to establish more. With cheaper air transport being made available, more and more young people are coming to Australia to look at the country.

In the years to come—and there is little point in our waiting for this to happen—air fares and concession fares will become cheaper and we will have a greater number of young people from other countries—perhaps from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and the European countries—coming to see Australia and hitchhiking their way around, as many of our young people do at the present time when they visit countries overseas.

I believe that at the moment it is possible to obtain a student concession fare for \$83 on a Boeing 747 from New York to London. This of course means that at present there are as many as three or four Boeing 747s coming into Heathrow Airport with no other passengers but young students who go over for long weekends, or who visit the country during their school

or university vacation. In this manner they are able to see the other countries of the world.

I believe that we, in this State, should support the Youth Hostels Association. I understand the figure that would be required to upgrade the buildings to a standard which would reasonably meet the health and other accommodation requirements is about \$14,000.

In the past the Governments of the day have been helpful to a degree in providing the Youth Hostels Association with a building here and another there, or perhaps an old school building or a house which may have belonged to the Government. Such buildings generally require a certain amount of renovation. Apart from this type of Government assistance there are also people who donate their time on a voluntary basis to look after the buildings in question—it could be a person who lives over the road. A young person who is hitchhiking would thus find he is able to cook himself a meal and obtain breakfast before going on the following day.

These youth hostels are big business in Europe and I believe they will also become big business in this country in years to come. Youth hostels make no profit because everything they receive goes back into the organisation. They are generally run on a shoestring budget. The member for Karrinyup knows as much about this as I do. I think he will bear me out when I say that the Youth Hostels Association generally has three people on its permanent staff.

The main source of funds, at the moment, is derived from young people who belong to the association as members and the occasional donation from those who feel well disposed towards the association.

If the Premier has not already received an approach from the Youth Hostels Association, I do hope when he does receive such an approach he will give the matter sympathetic consideration, because this will help young people to see countries other than their own.

The other States are tending towards assisting the Youth Hostels Association, and I hope Western Australia will do its bit by helping to make available reasonable accommodation for the young people who will be travelling around and seeing the country. It is not possible for them to obtain this type of education in a formal way. It is the kind of education which lasts, because it makes it possible for them to get to know the young people of other countries; and it helps them appreciate their habits and customs.

Another matter with which I wish to deal at some length—at least in the time available to me—is that of regional development or decentralisation. When the

present Government came into office it created the portfolio of decentralisation. The Department of Development and Decentralisation, however, is only a name, because no matter what one might call it its purpose is the same, or it should be.

As things are, the Minister for Development and Decentralisation is the only person responsible for this aspect, but it is my belief that every Minister in Cabinet should be made well aware of decentralisation and appreciate what it involves.

Only last evening we heard the member for Vasse make an urgent plea to the Government for the establishment of a new hospital in Busselton. Such a request, of course, is forwarded to the Minister for Health, for sure; but I say here and now that we will not get people to live in decentralised or regional areas unless we make available to them such facilities as hospitals, schools, police stations, and the other amenities that are necessary to community living.

Unfortunately the Minister for Development and Decentralisation is away on Government business at the moment but I have no doubt that the Minister acting for him will take heed of what I am about to say. I point out that the Minister for Development and Decentralisation has made several statements over the last year which I have found to be rather conflicting. On the 9th February, 1972, the Minister made a Press statement, a copy of which was supplied to me by the department. His statement referred to the sweeping changes in the decentralisation policy that have been approved by the Western Australian Government. His Press statement reads as follows:—

The main new measures are:

Financial assistance for land and buildings be extended from 50 per cent. to 75 per cent. for country industry generally and to 100 per cent. for selected country industry.

Interest on loans for capital expenditure be subsidised up to 5 per cent. per annum for selected country industries, the subsidy phasing out over five years.

New, more effective rail freight concessions be introduced on a selective basis to replace existing concessions.

The Industrial Lands Development Authority acquire and develop land in the main country centres to attract new industry.

That was the general tenor of his announcement at the time. He also announced, however, that a committee was

being formed to advise him and the Government on matters of decentralisation. On page 2 of the statement the Minister said—

That was why the committee had recommended, and Cabinet had approved greater incentives than normal for selected industries.

The phrase that intrigues me is his reference to selected industries. I wonder how these will be selected. On the 27th May, 1972, the Minister issued a further Press statement which referred particularly to freight concessions in Western Australia. He said—

The new measures include introduction for new rail freight concessions of up to 30 per cent. of the gazetted freight rate. These will be made available on a selective basis and will replace the existing 10 per cent. concessions for regional industry.

When the Minister said "will replace the existing 10 per cent. concessions for regional industry" he meant that five years ago the previous Government had agreed to certain types of industry being granted a 10 per cent. concession which would be reviewed at the end of five years, provided on their making application for a freight concession it was established, after investigation by the officer of the department, that the industry was a manufacturing industry and the materials brought in by rail were to be used within that particular industry.

The five-year period referred to has come to an end for a number of the businesses that were involved. I will not weary the House by reading the questions and answers I have with me, because they are to be found in *Hansard*. I will content myself by summarising them.

I asked the Minister since he made his statement on the 5th February of this year how many of these regional industries which were receiving freight concessions have had those concessions discontinued. The Minister replied that 32 such industries were involved. I then asked the Minister: Of the number of industries which had a freight concession discontinued how many have had the freight concession reinstated? The answer was "Nil."

The intriguing part of the Government's decentralisation policy is that the basis upon which industry is selected to receive these concessions is far too selective.

From the questions I asked and the answers I received it appears to me that the only people who are qualified to receive these concessions—or concessions of any sort—will be those in new industries. I believe the Minister is completely overlooking the established industries. His main criterion for giving assistance to regional industry is that it must be in keeping with an expansion or a diversification

programme. If we are to build up industry in the country areas, however, we must provide some foundation on which such industry can build. Generally speaking, business is not generated from the particular area itself; it must come from somewhere else.

In the main, this means that a manufacturer, at this stage, must be able to compete with manufacturers in the metropolitan area. I am thinking mainly of the engineering line but, of course, there are many other fields of manufacture. Few regional areas in this State would have sufficient business generated within their own areas to meet the qualifications of "diversification or expansion."

To encourage industry to country areas it will be necessary to subsidise or to give concessions in some way. These should be of a far more permanent nature than those which are available at the present time.

It has been my experience in recent times to see people tender for work in Perth—some win the tenders and some do not. A firm at Harvey in the electorate of the member for Wellington found itself in the position of having a 10 per cent. freight concession discontinued. This firm had had that concession for five years; was manufacturing an article in Harvey; sending it to Perth to be galvanised; and the galvanised product was returned to Harvey. For five years, as I have said, the firm had received a freight concession of 10 per cent.

Sir Charles Court: And it was also competing in South Africa.

Mr. WILLIAMS: As the Leader of the Opposition says, it was also competing in South Africa. However, the freight concession was stopped because the firm did not qualify under the terms "diversification or expansion" which the Minister has set down.

Mr. McIver: Do you not feel those terms are fair? They induce an industry to expand in some way.

Mr. WILLIAMS: How can industries expand if there is nothing to expand? They must go somewhere else and compete with manufacturers in the metropolitan area in many cases. I know that one or two new industries in the electorate of the member for Northam, who has interjected, have qualified for such concessions. This is fair enough. I make the point that only new industries will qualify and, in the main, existing industries will not.

Through question and answer in this House, the Minister has informed me that, if a new industry comes into an area and intends to compete with an existing industry, the new industry will be given the concessions available whereas the existing industry will not, if it cannot meet the

qualifications of "diversification or expansion." Theoretically, the Minister intends to subsidise and give concessions to new industries at the expense of established industries.

Sir Charles Court: He is throwing away the substance for the shadow.

Mr. I. W. Manning: He does it to trick the industrialists.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I believe that when the next State election approaches—in 1974 or whenever it may be—the Minister for Development and Decentralisation will stand up and say, "We the Government—or I, The Hon. H. E. Graham—have established X number of industries in the country." He will conveniently forget that the industries have possibly been established at the expense of existing industries.

Irrespective of the promises being made in connection with the forthcoming Federal election, I do not think any political party has sat down and studied regional development as it should be studied. The same applies with State Governments. On a political basis, it has been kicked around in an effort to win a few votes, because it is the "in thing" to talk about regional development or decentralisation. I have spoken on this subject for seven or eight years now. I know a little about this subject and I know also that all we ever hear in this connection is, if I may use the expression, a heap of gimmicks.

It is time people sat down and studied how permanent assistance could best be given to an industry to enable it to be established, and continue to operate, in country areas. Assistance must be given at least until the time the industry becomes self-generating.

Mr. McIver: What about an industry which has been operating in a country town for 60 or 70 years? That industry should not be subsidised or given concessions in freight rates, because it should be on its own feet.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Which comes first, "the chicken or the egg"? Suppose a firm has been established in a regional area for 50 or 60 years and then faces a competitor in the metropolitan area. The firm in the regional area does not have the money to keep up with technological advances. What happens? The competing industry in the metropolitan area starts to cut its prices. Where do people buy? Whether or not an individual likes the idea of regional development, he will buy wherever he can save a buck.

Mr. McIver: It is the type of industry which is the question. There are many factors.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I agree there are many factors, but I say that regional development has been kicked about and has not been studied in depth. It will take some

time to arrive at something which really works unless either the Federal or the State Government really throws itself into this.

There are various ways by which industries can be helped, and they should be helped on an indefinite basis until such time as the area in which the industry is operating becomes self-generating and there is sufficient work for the industry to carry on without the subsidy. The firms about which I am speaking should not have to compete with manufacturers in the metropolitan area or with the north-west. I know many difficulties are involved. I shall now suggest the various ways in which regional development could be assisted.

In the first place there could be a higher exemption—than that of approximately \$20,000 at the present time—in respect of pay-roll tax. There could be long-term freight concessions. I am not talking of freight concessions for five years but for longer periods than this. There could be land tax concessions and a reduction on stamp duty on cheques. The Government could say that, if an industry is located 100 miles from the metropolitan area, concession A will apply and, if it is located 200 miles away, concession B, which is a greater concession, will apply.

I admit there are problems in what I am suggesting, but I do not think the problems are insuperable. I also suggest that the Government could subsidise the local authority by an amount equivalent to the rates to be paid by that industry. The Treasurer—or the Minister for Education who is Assistant to the Treasurer—will tell me in a moment that these suggestions are difficult to put into practice and I agree that many problems can be encountered.

I further suggest that concessions could be given to any firm in the metropolitan area which operated the whole of its bank account in a country area. Banking is big business and will bring people into country towns. A carrot could be dangled in front of businesses in the metropolitan area to encourage them to operate their bank accounts from country areas. Further, there could be cheaper rates for power and for water when the Government controls the water. This would not affect Bunbury, because the Government does not subsidise the Bunbury Water Board.

To follow through with my suggestions, concessions could be given to industries in the metropolitan area which are prepared to buy from manufacturers or suppliers in country areas. I know difficulties could arise. Let us take the example of axe handles. Suppose a country manufacturer were to supply 40 outlets in the metropolitan area. It would be difficult to ascertain from those 40 outlets what percentage of their purchases came from the country. However, in some fields a definite line can be drawn. The Government could say,

"Because a percentage of your requirements is purchased from the country, we will give you a reduction or a grant."

All of the points I have mentioned—such as exemptions from pay-roll tax, long-term freight concessions, land tax concessions, reduction in stamp duty, etc.—could create problems. When we talk about regional development in Western Australia we are talking about all of the area outside of Perth. Generally speaking, the whole of Western Australia comes under the classification of "country areas." I know the Government will say that if it starts to give pay-roll tax concessions, what will be the position with respect to the iron ore companies in the north which contribute a large part of the Government's revenue? The position becomes difficult indeed and this is where I believe people have not done their homework.

Although I may create a howl in saying this, I believe that industries which should be subsidised should receive straightout cash grants from the Government. This straightout cash grant could be equated to the concessions I have mentioned, such as pay-roll tax, stamp duty, and the like. The Government could equate what it would like to give in the form of a pay-roll tax concession and, instead, give it in the form of a straightout cash grant. Then it would be in the hands of the Government to manoeuvre it up or down, as the case may be. The Government may feel the grant should be reduced once the area has grown; but it knows full well that once it starts to give concessions and then takes them away, screams follow from the people who have lost those concessions.

Earlier on I spoke about freight concessions on behalf of 32 people whom I mentioned. The Government could decide the basis of equation, and then give a straightout cash grant. In this way the Government of the day could say, "Yes, we will give you more because more is justified." Alternatively it could say, "We will give you less, because you are now doing fairly well and are reaching the stage where you could compete with the metropolitan area."

I believe that a full study in depth should be undertaken on this subject, and we should not simply sling concessions around, right, left, and centre, as Governments have done in the past. The Minister for Industrial Development in the previous Government, who is the present Leader of the Opposition, had some thoughts along these lines which he was prepared to implement.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**Mr. WILLIAMS:** No doubt one day such ideas will be implemented.

**Mr. J. T. Tonkin:** What about being generous and letting us have those five minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will do that Mr. Speaker. The Treasurer does not make such requests very often. I hope he will consider the matters I have brought up, particularly in relation to regional development. We will look forward to some smart action in the future.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Moiler.

*(Continued on page 5730)*

## APPLE AND PEAR INDUSTRY BILL

*Returned*

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

## ALUMINA REFINERY (MUCHEA) AGREEMENT BILL

*Returned*

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

### *Council's Amendments: In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows:—

No. 1.

The schedule, clause 9.

Page 17, line 5 of the clause—Insert after the word "may" the words "if agreement is reached with such persons".

No. 2.

The schedule, clause 9.

Page 17, lines 8 and 9 of the clause—Delete all words in the clause after the word "State" in line 8.

No. 3.

The schedule, clause 38.

Page 35, lines 1 to 7 of the clause—Delete subclause (1) and substitute the following:—

- (1) The State will in accordance with the proposals as finally approved or determined under Clause 6 cause the Fremantle Port Authority to construct a wharf in the Fremantle Outer Harbour other than by way of an extension of the Fremantle Port Authority's proposed bulk grain jetty and in such suitable location as may be agreed.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The Legislative Council has amended the schedule to the Bill before us in three respects. Two of the amendments affect clause 9, and one

affects clause 38. I understand that members of both Opposition parties have been apprised of the contents of the amendments, and the subject matter is well known because the issues were fully discussed in this Chamber. I move—

That amendments Nos. 1 to 3 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr. GAYFER: On behalf of the Country Party, I would like to indicate our support of the motion. I would also like to thank everybody concerned for their co-operation, with special reference to amendment No. 3.

Mr. Jamieson: Stop beaming!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would have thought the Minister would move the amendments in two parts, but it really does not matter. In regard to the first two amendments, the objective is to ensure the owners of private land containing bauxite are in agreement with any proposals. I cannot imagine the situation will arise where such an agreement would not be a prerequisite to State approval, but the matter is now set out in the agreement to remove any doubt. Also the words "which approval will not arbitrarily or unreasonably be withheld" are deleted and the decision left to the State. We are happy about that.

In regard to the other amendment, I believe a plan has been tabled in another place. Can the Minister indicate whether the site has been arbitrarily decided on at that point, or is it an indicated site subject to further investigation? We support the amendment, and I am sure the Government in this House has a very good idea of our feelings in this matter.

Mr. T. D. Evans: By way of interjection, I understand the site is not arbitrarily fixed. It is still subject to agreement between the parties.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want an assurance from the Minister that the question of contamination will be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have a question on the notice paper dealing with a very important matter involved with this agreement which has caused a great deal of concern in my area. I have a personal objection to the proposed site, and I have had many phone calls, quite a few as late as this morning, requesting some alternative decision.

I have looked at the plan presented in another place, and whilst the new site will be of benefit to the grain to be loaded, no regard has been paid to the people of the area. There are 200 homes at Kwinana beach, and I think the Government should give us definite information in regard to these properties. I believe that the future of the Fremantle Port Authority is in jeopardy.

This proposition has been inadequately planned, and no thought has been given to the people in the area. We have had no comment or submission regarding the effect on the people in the 200 homes located down-wind from the loading port for the alumina.

The member for Cockburn, who is now the Minister for Labour, was always very attentive in matters such as this.

Mr. Taylor: He still is.

Mr. RUSHTON: He now has a portfolio, and this must make a difference.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Surely there is no occasion for a second reading speech!

Mr. RUSHTON: I am going to record my objection.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are just going to waste time.

Sir Charles Court: It is fair comment.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is not. It is a second reading speech.

Sir Charles Court: He is speaking to the matter before the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I have a question on today's notice paper to which I could not obtain an answer yesterday.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you think we ought to accept the amendments or not?

Mr. RUSHTON: I think much more could be done.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Tell your colleagues in the Legislative Council about it!

Mr. RUSHTON: I am very anxious about this, because the proposed site is virtually within my electorate. The Bill allows some flexibility, but it compromises the future of the Fremantle Port Authority.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the time.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to make a statement. I did not realise the member for Dale intended to speak at length, otherwise I would have adjourned at 12.45 p.m. I had hoped the debate on the message would have been completed by now. If the honourable member indicates he wishes to talk for the full 15 minutes, I will adjourn the Committee.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is my intention.

*Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.15 p.m.  
Committee Resumed*

Mr. RUSHTON: Before the luncheon suspension the Premier was using intimidatory tactics to stop me from speaking on this matter.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You were out of order for the whole of your speech.

Sir Charles Court: He was not. He was talking about the subject of the amendments.

Mr. RUSHTON: This item deals with the location of the jetty, and all I said related to this subject. The Government could not obtain a report from the Environmental Protection Authority to support the siting of the jetty. This is obvious, because misleading misrepresentations have been made by the Minister for Environmental Protection in that firstly he said there was a report and then he said there was not a report.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: These are amendments made by the Legislative Council. Will you accept them or not?

Mr. RUSHTON: Personally I am giving a warning to the Government, because it is shoving its responsibilities over to C.B.H.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The Legislative Council has done that.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is trying to be co-operative, and we on this side are doing the same. The amendments contain provisions which may be agreed to, but that has to be determined. Only this morning I received a phone call from a lady in the area affected, and this shows how strong is the objection of the people down there to the siting of the jetty.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What was the nature of that phone call?

Mr. RUSHTON: Some people applied to establish a printing business in the Kwinana beach area. They received approval from the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority on the 1st November, and the premises have been built. Now they find it is hopeless to attempt to carry on printing with all the alumina dust that will be flying around. They have been told that their premises will not be resumed before 15 years. I have placed a question on the notice paper asking when the Pacminex installation will be established. I think it is somewhere around three years.

When in Opposition the present Premier used to deplore the action of the previous Government regarding issues such as this, yet the jetty is to be built in the location indicated when it should be built to the north. The same lady rang me previously to tell me that when the wind changes it takes the dust over her premises, but during another part of the day the wind might carry it to Governor Road and the C.B.H. terminal. It seems that C.B.H. will be responsible for the jetty installations and for protecting the people.

I am raising this issue because of its tremendous importance. As a result of the siting of the jetty the Fremantle Port Authority extensions will spread to the east. In answer to certain questions the



Minister indicated that he would not permit the use of the land at Rockingham for light industry which would have provided employment progressively in labour-intensive undertakings. The Government will reserve the land for the Fremantle Port Authority. This is another big change, and it is a move totally against the interests of Rockingham and the shire. In fact, the shire has lodged an objection, which I support fully.

One should read the report of the Environmental Protection Authority to see what is happening in Cockburn Sound.

The CHAIRMAN: Has this anything to do with clause 38 of the schedule?

Mr. RUSHTON: It has to do with the jetty. I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to go down to the area and see for yourself. If you did you would realise the relevance of what I am saying.

Mr. Jamieson: It took you a long while to get down there.

Mr. RUSHTON: We know about the stupid interjections from the Minister.

Mr. Jamieson: It took you a long while to get down there.

Mr. RUSHTON: If you, Mr. Chairman, were to go down there you would realise how vital is this installation. It seems the Government is saving an area for the future development of the Fremantle Port Authority. The previous Government agreed to the C.B.H. installation on the southern side for obvious reasons. It wanted a clean area for a food, bulk-handling industry at one end, and the industries likely to cause pollution at the northern end. That is not the case with the present Government, despite all its great talk about environmental protection.

The Government has not made any statement to the people who are living down there. They have been told nothing except that there is an option open to C.B.H. to remain there. Reports have been tabled in this House which support what I am saying. This is my personal submission, because I realise that the amendments made by the Council contain certain options and the position is flexible. However, the Government should indicate what will and what will not be the possibilities, and that aspect should be made clear to the people who are living in the 200 homes in the area.

I have placed some questions on the notice paper which, if answered frankly, will disclose some of these facts.

People will need to know what is in store for them in the future. The phone call I received this morning was from a person who stated that she was told there would be no resumptions for 15 years, and she remained in the area with confidence. Everyone knows it is an industrial area but the residents want a clear understanding of where they stand.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must keep to the clause as to whether or not there is to be a jetty.

Mr. RUSHTON: What I am saying is relevant to the siting of the jetty. It will be constructed 2,000 feet north of the grain terminal jetty and that demonstrates just what a fiasco the whole situation is.

I think the Premier intended to bulldoze his way through but sufficient evidence has been placed before him to save the situation. The planning has now been changed, but it is on a very flimsy pretext. The new jetty will extend from the present storage site.

The Rockingham Shire had not been consulted, but we have been told by the Minister for Development and Decentralisation that all these matters will be taken care of. I would be lacking in my duty if I did not bring this question to the attention of the Committee. If the Minister for Labour were present he, too, would be having something to say. He has attended public meetings and spoken on this issue.

The reports I have concerning the Naval Base subdivision show just how unacceptable that proposition is. Nobody wants to stop the Pacminex project from proceeding, but we do need some decisions regarding the future of the Fremantle Port Authority area.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. MENSAROS: I have listened to the comments of the member for Dale and I would hate to think that he would not have an opportunity to complete his remarks.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Thanks for your help!

Mr. Williams: The Premier took similar action on many occasions.

Mr. RUSHTON: The tactics of the Premier are noted.

Mr. Jamieson: So are the tactics of the member for Dale.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: It is obvious that it is not acceptable that the responsibilities should be placed on the shoulders of C.B.H. regarding the site for the jetty as it relates to the Fremantle Port Authority area. I ask the Government to consider the matter deeply and assume its responsibility. It should obtain a report from the E.P.A.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Is the member for Dale prepared to answer a question?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have to.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What should the Government do; accept or reject the Legislative Council's amendments?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have already said that the issue involves the whole question.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is the only question before the Committee.

Sir Charles Court: The member for Dale is asking for some assurance before he accepts the amendments. That is fair enough. The Minister has not replied to my request.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The Minister did reply.

Mr. T. D. Evans: To the best of my knowledge, I answered the query.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister answered one query, but not the vital question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I represent the area concerned, and apart from the members in the Legislative Council, and the Minister for Labour, there is no-one else in this Parliament who is vitally concerned. If the Premier is to accept the responsibility for this measure, I want him to give me some assurance relating to the factors I have mentioned.

The jetty will be adjacent to the C.B.H. jetty. Where will further food storage facilities be located? What will happen to the people who remain in the area?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I can assure the Premier that I have no intention of holding up this matter. I asked the Minister two questions. The Minister indicated, by way of interjection, that a plan had been tabled in another place. He indicated that it was not necessarily the final situation, but I do not quarrel with his reply because obviously the plan was produced in a hurry to allay the fears of the people who have been concerned about the wharves being located alongside C.B.H.

We now have the situation where we know there will be two wharves, and not just one jetty with a projection one way for Pacminex wharf and a projection the other way for C.B.H. wharf. Many considerations will have to be taken into account by technical experts, and we are sufficiently grown up to understand that situation.

The question which the Minister did not answer was that we want an assurance that in making a final decision the question of potential contamination will be the vital factor. That is all we want by way of assurance.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Real and proper regard will be given to that matter.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

### *Report*

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## APPLE AND PEAR INDUSTRY BILL

### *Council's Amendments*

Amendments made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. A. R. Tonkin) in the Chair; Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows:—

#### No. 1.

Clause 2, page 2, line 3—Add after the word "proclamation" the following proviso:—

Provided that no proclamation may be made until the Minister has caused to be conducted a referendum of growers who own or occupy orchards from which not less than 500 bushels of apples or pears were exported in each of at least two of the three years preceding the taking of the poll asking whether the Act shall be brought into operation and a majority of those growers has voted in favour of bringing the Act into operation.

#### No. 2.

Clause 7, page 4, line 1—Delete the word "five" and substitute the word "four".

#### No. 3.

Clause 7, page 4, lines 3 to 7 inclusive—Delete paragraph (a).

#### No. 4.

Clause 7, page 4, lines 15 to 18 inclusive—Delete subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (b) and substitute the following:—

(ii) one shall be a person selected from a panel of names submitted by a recognised body of licensed apple and pear exporters and who is considered by the Minister to have commercial expertise and experience in fruit shipping;

#### No. 5.

Clause 7, page 4, line 19—Add after the word "person" the words "with commercial experience".

#### No. 6.

Clause 7, page 4, line 21—Add after the word "Board" the words "and who has no financial interest in any part of the Apple and Pear Industry".

## No. 7.

Clause 16, page 11, line 6—Insert after the word "may" the following passage "after consultation with the Apple Sales Advisory Committee".

## No. 8.

Clause 23, page 15, line 13—Add after the word "dollars" the words "and a monthly penalty of one dollar per tree".

## No. 9.

New Clause—Insert the following new clause to stand as clause 26:—

Appeals. 26. A grower may appeal in writing to the Minister against any decision made by the Board or the Committee affecting that Grower, and the Minister's decision shall be final.

## No. 10.

Title—Delete the words "to regulate the receipt of apples into cold storage" in lines 4 and 5, of the Title.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Ten amendments have been submitted by the Legislative Council, of which Nos. 7, 8, and 10 are acceptable, and the remainder—Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9—are not acceptable.

In regard to amendment No. 1, I will not go through the detailed reasons I gave during the second reading debate, but this legislation was introduced at the request of the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association and was the subject of two conference motions in 1971 and 1972. The only additional information I have is that yesterday I received, unsolicited, copies of nine telegrams reaffirming the conference decisions from the presidents at Mt. Barker, Donnybrook, Perth, taking in the eastern hills district, Upper Kalgan, Kendenup, Manjimup, Greenbushes, and Bridgetown. I move—

That amendment No. 1 made by the Council be not agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON: I presume the telegrams to which the Minister referred are from the presidents or executive officers in the various areas.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what he said.

Mr. THOMPSON: This is the peculiar situation that has developed. It is true the Executive of the Fruit Growers' Association was given the power by the conference to negotiate, on behalf of the industry, a Bill to set up an apple and pear board. However, since the Bill has become available and known to the individual growers in the industry there has been widespread reaction. The Minister has received telegrams from the presidents of certain branches expressing their personal

opinions, but the individual growers have clearly expressed their concern and have called for a referendum of growers. Nothing could be clearer than that.

A meeting of growers was held at Donnybrook, and although it was not sponsored by the association it was truly representative of the apple and pear growers in that area. They called for a referendum. The growers at Donnybrook and in the hills areas produce the majority of the export apples and pears in this State.

If the Government pursues the line of denying the individual growers a right to have a say in the future of their industry, I believe it will be committing a grave political blunder. I appeal to the Minister at this late hour to reconsider his attitude and give the growers the right to conduct a referendum on this vital subject which will have an impact on their lives from here on.

Mr. RUSHTON: Except for a couple of words, the amendment is similar to the one I moved in this Chamber which had the support of all the members on this side. The Minister claims a mandate to proceed with this legislation and deny the growers the right to a referendum. The Minister is not accurate in making that claim because the growers indicated to him that they would not have a bar of legislation which involved the local market, and the Minister introduced legislation which did involve the local market.

The Minister makes great play of the Executive of the Fruit Growers' Association. That executive moved a certain motion which is recorded in the *Western Australian Fruit Grower* of September, 1972. It sets out certain things to which the executive agreed and which are not in line with what the Minister has brought forward. We cannot even obtain a copy of appendix 12 which would clearly show what it is all about. The legislation is a mess.

At the time the Bill was being drafted, the President of the Fruit Growers' Association said the growers would have the right to consider the report and accept or reject the recommendation. This is already recorded in *Hansard*. What faith can the growers have in their executive or in the Minister when they disregard printed reports in the *Western Australian Fruit Grower* which state that certain things will take place?

The member for Collie dropped a little bomb when he disclosed that a member of the Fruit Growers' Association had told him certain facts about a branch meeting. Nothing could more upset the growers than an intimation that their association was attempting to sell them out. The member for Collie's report was inaccurate and was simply intended to bedevil the

whole issue. He has done more harm to the industry than anyone else could have done in three months.

The association should think of the whole industry, not sections of it. It has before it a petition asking for a referendum which has been signed by something like 400 growers, who represent a large section of the industry.

Those 400 growers come from Donnybrook, the hills, Jarrahdale, and Dwellingup. Some were not home when the people called, otherwise there would be many more signatures. How can the Minister represent an industry when he does not recognise the wishes of the growers? Accurate figures have been presented in this place in the past relating to the various interests of the different areas. I do not intend to give more figures showing certain areas to be stronger than others.

I want the Minister to encourage the Fruit Growers' Association and to think about the matters it has projected. I want the Minister to get on side with the growers, rather than cause chaos. I want him to create confidence in the industry by allowing it to have a say. He has before him a statement by the president of the association to the effect that growers should have a say. Great play was made of the fact that an inquiry would be held into the industry. The committee concerned presented its report after the measure was prepared. Certain important aspects of the report are still not available to us, so we do not know whether or not the Minister is carrying out the recommendations. Certainly he is not carrying out all of them because he is including the export and the local markets.

The executive of the association clearly indicated to him that he was not to involve the local market, but purely the export market. I believe the two markets cannot be entirely separated, and certainly they will not be under this Bill. The Minister has violated the trust of the growers. Surely, no matter what our political ideologies, we all accept that the people concerned should have some say in the matter.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would like to ask the Minister: Is it a fact that the executive of the association, which was empowered by the association to act on its behalf, did accept all the provisions of the Bill as originally drafted? Did it accept the vital part—as far as the Minister is concerned—that was withdrawn; that is, the part relating to cool stores? It appears that the Minister is not prepared to indicate that to the Committee.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Why did you say, "vital"?

Mr. THOMPSON: I said it appeared to be vital from the Minister's point of view.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I think I used the term "most desirable."

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, that was accepted by the executive of the association; but after the Bill was circulated amongst the growers and considerable controversy was generated as a result of its contents, I believe the Minister agreed to a request from the association that the part be removed. Is that right?

Mr. H. D. Evans: I took it out after discussion with certain groups, including the executive.

Mr. THOMPSON: So the Minister accepts it was unpalatable to many growers?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Yes, because it could have been taken as being able to influence the local market. We made this point clear in the Committee stage; that there was to be no suggestion of a local market. That is why it was withdrawn.

Mr. THOMPSON: The point I want to make is that the executive, which was empowered by the association to approve the matters to be encompassed in the Bill, accepted the measure as it was presented to this Chamber; and when the industry found that many matters in the Bill were unpalatable to the Minister, in conjunction—I would imagine—with the Fruit Growers' Association, agreed to withdraw that part of the legislation. I think it is reasonable to assume that the action taken is not sufficient to meet the demands of a majority of growers.

I believe it is imperative that a referendum of growers be held, and I would urge the Minister to allow it to take place. We must bear in mind that the legislation will have no effect on the 1973 crop. My leader has indicated to the Chamber that the Opposition is prepared to co-operate with the Government to enable legislation to be introduced in the first days of the autumn session.

Surely the Minister should accept our co-operation and get on side with the industry. If he has his way regarding the Bill and the board is established many growers will be hostile towards it. I suggest if the board is to have any chance of working it must commence operations with the wholehearted support of the industry.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I belong to a party which in the past has always supported grower representation on statutory marketing authorities. In fact, we have always asked the growers to indicate their preference in connection with such legislation. As a rule referendums have been held prior to the drafting of measures.

Unfortunately, although the Bill before us was drawn up at the request of the Executive of the Fruit Growers' Association, the time available was limited and the growers could not be made aware of its contents.

We support the amendment. I think the Minister will agree that the necessary machinery for the taking of a referendum

could be set in operation and the referendum held in late January or early February, thus enabling the Bill to be proclaimed early next year. I am afraid we are on a collision course with the other place regarding the amendment and we could lose the entire Bill. I am certain the Fruit Growers' Association and its executive do not want that. The Knox report took 12 months to compile, and I think, rather than leave the position as it is at the moment, the Minister should consider the possibility of holding a referendum within the next couple of months so that the growers may make a decision in time for the board, if approved, to operate in the 1973 export season.

So for my part I indicate my support of this measure, because I cannot see how the board can divorce from the Apple Sales Advisory Committee any control of the local market. When the Bill was before us earlier in this Chamber we sought to amend the clause to provide for some agreement between the proposed authority and the Apple Sales Advisory Committee, but this was refused. At the moment we have consultation, but not agreement. Therefore I agree with the Council's amendment.

Sir CHARLES COURT: As the Minister well knows, we sought to have the Bill deferred. We thought it was best for all concerned, especially those engaged in the industry that, having seen the contents of the Bill, they should be given a chance to study it more closely. In view of the fact that the Government is determined to get the Bill through this session, for my part I have to take notice of the industry as a whole, and I am not impressed with the explanations that have been given about the two conferences that have been held. These things happen in any organisation when people find themselves confronted with the small type in the form of a Bill. One has to assess it in the light of one's livelihood, savings, and the industry one has developed with sweat and effort, and therefore I am not surprised that the growers have reacted as they have.

As far as I am concerned, the majority of the growers have reacted in this way to ensure that they are on the right track with this legislation. Time will not interfere with the objectives of the Government. I understand the motion before the Chair is to disagree with the Council's amendment, and therefore I am opposing the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

## Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Stephens
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman
Mr. Hartrey	

(Teller)

## Noes—18

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. O'Neill
Sir David Brand	Mr. Ridge
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Graham	Mr. Lewis
Mr. May	Dr. Dadour
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Brown	Mr. Gayfer

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 2 made by the Council be not agreed to.

This amendment is similar to those that appeared in the Committee stage during the debate on the Bill in this Chamber previously, and for the same reason I gave then I consider the Committee should disagree with the Council's amendment.

Mr. RUSHTON: This amendment relates to the industry being departmentalised or commercialised. The Leader of the Country Party tried to move an amendment similar to this one when the Bill was previously before this Chamber. Whilst to me the Council's amendment is not perfect, it illustrates the unacceptability of the Bill. Although we might disagree with the amendment, the whole purport of it is to prevent the Director of Agriculture from becoming a member of the board. If the board is to be a success it should be a commercial board and not a departmental one.

As the Minister has refused to answer the other questions we have put to him, I ask him this: Would he not agree that this should be a commercial board? Would it not be preferable for the board to call upon the Director of Agriculture or other officers of the department to obtain scientific knowledge, thus leaving the board to concentrate on its proper duties? I think the whole legislation needs to be re-examined, but as the amendment is all we have at the moment, I ask the Minister to change his views in regard to it.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I support the comments made by the previous speaker. My leader raised this matter when the Bill was in Committee in this Chamber previously. He pointed out it was not necessary to have the Director of Agriculture, or an officer of the department, on the board, and drew attention to subclause (5) of clause 14 to support his argument.

If any advice is required it can be obtained from anyone in the department. Therefore it is not necessary to have a departmental officer on the board. He has enough to do without attending meetings. I am therefore opposed to the motion.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 3 made by the Council be not agreed to.

This amendment seeks to delete the section which appoints the Director of Agriculture or one of his officers as a member of the board. The whole merit of the provision has been missed by members opposite. It was inserted at the specific request of the association, probably because it recognised the value of the marketing research undertaken by the department in the last 1½ years and the value of having an objective professional man with no vested interest in the industry, but who is in close contact with many aspects of it.

Mr. McPHARLIN: This is the same provision we were discussing a moment ago.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Except that it is different.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I oppose the motion. If I say very much I will be merely repeating what I said a few moments ago. I think the Minister admitted in earlier debate that this was a departure from the usual procedure, and we believe that an officer should not be on the board.

Mr. RUSHTON: I oppose the motion also. If we are to adopt the principle, and appoint the director concerned to various boards to be established in the future and those which have been established in the past, we will find that the directors will do nothing else but attend board meetings. A director has far more important duties to perform than attend board meetings.

Mr. Hartrey: He would get bored.

Mr. RUSHTON: Surely we should be able to get this point over to the Minister.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

#### Ayes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

#### Noes—20

Mr. Blakie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Rushton
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nalder
Mr. May	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Brown	Mr. Mensaros

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 4 made by the Council be not agreed to.

The usual practice, as far as I am concerned, anyhow, is to request a panel of names in connection with certain appointments. However this is a situation which does not lend itself readily to that particular procedure and it would be preferable for no restriction to be imposed.

Mr. O'Neill: Why does it not lend itself in this particular case?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Because there is a certain transitory situation which does arise within this particular field and a flexibility of appointment is preferred.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I must admit I am amazed the Minister has disagreed to this amendment because it is one he could accept with good sense. In the case of the previous definition there is no doubt that the matter has been spelt out, but in this case there was some difficulty because there was no body which could be named, as in the case of the growers' association which has been defined in the Bill. I think the Legislative Council has adopted a very sensible approach in its amendment. If it had not included any qualifications, then the Minister would have some valid objections; he is not pinned down at all, but is given tremendous discretion which we assume he would use within the guidelines laid down.

I hope the Minister will reconsider the matter and agree to the amendment. It does not make sense to refuse to lay down some guidelines for this particular appointment.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. The amendment proposed by the Legislative Council would give the Minister flexibility. A panel of names would be submitted by a recognised body and the Minister could choose a person from this panel. I cannot see any reason for disagreeing to the amendment. If accepted, it would give the Minister the opportunity to be selective. At the moment the Bill states that the person to be considered by the Minister shall have commercial expertise and experience in fruit shipping. If the amendment is agreed to, the Minister could select such a person from a panel of names. In all probability all the people on the panel would be experts in the handling and shipping of fruit. I therefore suggest the Minister should give further consideration to this matter. No harm would be done by accepting the amendment, which is almost in line with the Bill, as printed, except that it gives a wider application of selection

and gives the Minister more flexibility. I suggest the Minister should reconsider the position.

**Mr. BLAIKIE:** I support the amendment made by the Legislative Council and I express my opposition to the Minister's statement. The amendment would give the Minister flexibility. It would allow him to select a person with satisfactory qualifications from a panel of names submitted by a recognised body of licensed apple and pear exporters.

I am concerned because, apparently, the Minister does not want flexibility. It also seems to be apparent that the Minister wants the prior right to decide, without reference to any other organisation, who shall be appointed to the board. The Bill, as printed, states—

- (ii) one shall be a person considered by the Minister to have commercial expertise and experience in fruit shipping;

Instead, the Legislative Council has suggested that the person should be selected from a panel of names. Surely this is a reasonable request. It would give the Minister ample opportunity to select the very best. I support the amendment made by the Legislative Council and I ask the Minister urgently to reconsider this matter.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

#### Ayes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

#### Noes—20

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nalder
Mr. May	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Blackerton	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Brown	Dr. Dadour

The **DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

**Mr. H. D. EVANS:** I move—

That amendment No. 5 made by the Council be not agreed to.

Obviously, in normal circumstances, it would be preferable to have somebody with commercial experience and business ex-

pertise, together with the qualifications necessary to participate in a complex marketing operation. However, to spell it out in such terms as are proposed by the Legislative Council would be unwise. It would be restrictive. Just what does "commercial experience" mean? There are certainly shades of gray in this area. Many difficulties would be encountered. Western Australia is not so large as to make the choice unrestrictive. A person of outstanding qualities could be precluded from being appointed because of the inclusion of these words. I think this would be most unwise.

Naturally, any Minister making an appointment would have full regard for the overall complexity of the marketing operation this represents. I cannot agree to the amendment because of this restriction.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** I shall be brief, but I wish to comment so that there may be some record of the debate. I cannot follow the Minister's reasoning. He says he will follow the principle anyhow, but the fact that he is resisting something which he says he will follow is indicative that he could change his mind. I would rather see the provision in the legislation.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

**Mr. H. D. EVANS:** I move—

That amendment No. 6 made by the Council be not agreed to.

In principle, virtually the same comments apply. The suggestion is that there should be a requirement that the person shall in no way have any financial interest in the industry. Nevertheless, there could be such a person with outstanding abilities. The position could arise whereby this person could not be appointed because of a financial association, however remote, with the industry. I oppose the amendment, because it would make the provision too restrictive.

**Mr. RUSHTON:** Obviously this Chamber should agree to the amendment made by the Legislative Council. If we want an effective board, this is the sort of person we want. The Minister acknowledges that fact, but will not have it written into the legislation. Therefore, we wonder what his intention really is. The matter needs to be spelt out. The Minister has given us no clear indication and, therefore, we should agree to the amendment made by the Legislative Council.

**Mr. McPHARLIN:** I cannot agree with the Minister's view in connection with this amendment. There could well be a man with wide experience in agricultural industries but who no longer has any financial interest whatsoever in any agricultural industry. This type of person could be a suitable man to appoint to a position on the board.

I think the Minister should reconsider his decision because such people are available and, by virtue of their own experience,

they would be of great value to the board and of benefit to the industry. I ask the Minister to look at this question once again and reconsider his decision in the light of the comments which have been made. I cannot support his motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

**Ayes—20**

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamleson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

*(Teller)***Noes—20**

Mr. Blakie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. E. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

*(Teller)***Pairs****Ayes**

Mr. Graham  
Mr. May  
Mr. Bickerton  
Mr. Brown

**Noes**

Mr. Nalder  
Mr. Lewis  
Mr. Runciman  
Dr. Dadour

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I assume that the words "and agreement" have been deleted from the amendment. I move—

That amendment No. 7 made by the Council be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 8 made by the Council be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 9 made by the Council be not agreed to.

When the Bill was in this Chamber, the Leader of the Country Party moved to insert a special clause dealing with appeals. At that stage I stated the avenue through which appeals should be made. The Minister will have more control over the administration of this legislation than in many other cases. As an interim measure, I have undertaken to ensure that the legislation will come within the compass of the Parliamentary Commissioner. It is not usual to include specific appeal clauses, and I refer to the Wheat Quotas Committee, and similar bodies.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: During the second reading debate we indicated that we felt such an amendment was necessary, and we still hold this view. In my earlier remarks I said that some growers may be able to deliver fruit to the board and some may not. The board could discriminate between certain growers, and an appeal clause would remove the doubt that growers will not get a fair proportion of the export market.

Under the provisions of the Bill, it is not mandatory for the board to accept fruit which has met the standards and criteria laid down. The board may reject fruit without explanation. I maintain that the Minister should at least be prepared to hear an appeal from a disgruntled grower.

Mr. RUSHTON: The refusal of the Minister to accept this fairly reasonable amendment is somewhat ironical when one recalls the pressures brought by the then Opposition on the previous Government for much greater redress than we are now seeking. Mr. Deputy Chairman (Mr. A. R. Tonkin), you would acknowledge that in town planning and other matters certain issues must be referred to courts.

In view of the board's discretionary powers in regard to a fruit grower's production, I feel the amendment does not go far enough. I would like to see an additional reference to an appeal to the court. For the time being it is reasonable that a grower, with everything at stake, should at least have the right to refer an issue to the Minister when he finds himself out of step with the board. After all, we are imposing a restriction on the grower's livelihood.

The present legislation is contrary to the views previously expressed by the Government. It is not correct to deny growers the right of appeal because it may be embarrassing. Therefore, I very strongly support the Council's amendment.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

**Ayes—20**

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamleson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

*(Teller)***Noes—20**

Mr. Blakie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. E. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

*(Teller)*



Ayes	Pairs	Noes
Mr. Graham		Mr. Nalder
Mr. May		Mr. Lewis
Mr. Bickerton		Dr. Dadour
Mr. Brown		Mr. Ridge

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I move—

That amendment No. 10 made by the Council be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

### Report

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

### Committee of Reasons

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [3.31 p.m.]: I move—

That the member for Collie (Mr. Jones), the member for Mt. Marshall (Mr. McPharlin)—

in deference to the fact that it was his leader who took the adjournment of the debate on this Bill—

—and the mover be appointed as a Committee to draw up reasons for not agreeing to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 made by the Council.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [3.32 p.m.]: I have no objection to the names that have been put forward, but I do suggest to the Premier and request that in future when nominations are to be made for such committees it would be a matter of courtesy to mention this to the Leader of the Opposition.

As it happens I was going to suggest that the member for Mt. Marshall deputise for the Opposition on this committee. I ask the Premier to give the matter some consideration because it is the third time this has happened in the past few days.

Question put and passed.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

### INDECENT PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

#### Council's Amendments: In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bate-man) in the Chair; Mr. Taylor (Minister for Labour) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 3, page 2, line 7—Delete the interpretation "book".

No. 2.

Clause 3, page 2, line 8—Insert after the word "book" the passage "magazine, periodical,".

No. 3.

Clause 6, page 4, line 36—Insert after the word "horror" the words "or for any other reason".

No. 4.

Clause 10, page 11, line 5—Delete the word "book" and substitute the word "publication".

Mr. TAYLOR: I move—

That amendments Nos. 1 to 4 made by the Council be agreed to.

The first amendment merely deletes the interpretation of "book." The second amendment inserts the passage "magazine, periodical." In other words, this is to broaden the definition in clause 3.

The third amendment inserts in clause 6 the words "or for any other reason." Members will recall that this matter was debated at some length in this Chamber, and the Government insisted that these words be not included. The last amendment of the Council deletes the word "book" and substitutes the word "publication." The Government has no objection to the amendments made by the Council.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for agreeing to the amendments made by the Council. The deletion of the interpretation of "book" was not debated in this Chamber. All references to the term were removed in this Chamber or in another place, and that is the reason for the first amendment.

The Bill will be better off with the inclusion of the words "or for any other reason" for the reasons I gave in the second reading debate. It is good to see there is no repetition of obstinacy in this instance.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

### Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.*

### QUESTIONS (24): ON NOTICE

#### 1. WARNBRO AND SAFETY BAY SCHOOLS

##### Choice of Enrolment

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) What grades will be established at the Warnbro primary school next year?

- (2) Is there to be a choice for senior students to attend either Safety Bay or Warnbro school with the advantage of a straight class against a broken class in the final years of primary education?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Grades 1-7.
- (2) Yes, grade 7 students in 1973 may elect to continue at Safety Bay.

## 2. CONSUMER PROTECTION

### *Uni-credit Charge System*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

- (1) What aspects of uni-credit charge system used by retail traders are being examined?
- (2) Will he explain to the House any aspects of the examination related to interest charges and the findings to date by the department?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) I have been given to understand that the matter of fair consumer credit laws including provisions by retailers is under consideration by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.
- (2) No examination of interest charges is currently being made by the Consumer Protection Bureau. Should sufficient complaints warrant it, the matter will be placed before the incoming Consumer Affairs Council. No complaint on the matter of interest charges in regard to uni-credit charge systems has been received to date by the Consumer Protection Bureau.

## 3. TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING

### *International Transport Workers Federation*

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is he aware of the existence of an organisation known as the International Transport Workers Federation?
- (2) Does he know the aims of this organisation?
- (3) What nations and what organisations with those nations belong to this organisation?
- (4) Is the International Transport Workers Federation represented in Australia, and if so, by whom?
- (5) Has any pressure been used, within Australia, to achieve the aims of the organisation?
- (6) Has this had any effect on freight rates and/or trade with overseas countries?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I understand that this organisation is affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and has its head office in London. Its aims as advised to my office are the exchange and co-ordination of information on matters of mutual concern between unions connected with international transport.
- (3) My department has no record.
- (4) I understand that the federation is represented by Mr. Fitzgibbon, a member of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Fair Practices Committee, who is authorised to sign all agreements concluded in Australia.
- (5) and (6) Unknown.

## 4. DEPARTMENTAL HEADS

### *Libellous Statements*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Does he know of a precedent in the past where a head of a Government department has been sued for libellous statements which were allegedly contained in his report submitted in the course of his duties?
  - (2) If so, can he give details?
- Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:
- (1) and (2) No.

## 5. NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

### *Commonwealth and State Subsidies*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Considering the Press report about the statement of the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science regarding the State's calculation of the direct aid to non-Government schools, can he state in connection with the proposed 20%-20% aid to private school children's education—

- (a) the items of aid and to what amount they have been calculated;
- (b) if the amount of per capita cost to educate pupils and students in Government primary and secondary schools has already been arrived at;
- (c) if "Yes" to (b), what are these amounts?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

As a result of the announcement made this week by the Minister for Education and Science concerning assistance to non-government schools, all aspects of the State's contribution are being examined. I expect to be in a position to make a statement at an early date.

## 6. STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

### Net Profit

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Electricity:

For what purposes is the accrued net profit of the State Electricity Commission going to be used?

Mr. Jamieson (for Mr. MAY) replied: The accrued net profit of the State Electricity Commission is retained and used in the undertaking for capital works.

## 7. IRON ORE

### Exports: 1967 to 1971

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Mines:

How many tons of iron ore were exported to—

(a) Japan;

(b) other destinations, in each of the last five years from 1967 to 1971 inclusive from Western Australia?

Mr. H. D. Evans (for Mr. MAY) replied:

The number of tons of iron ore exported in each of the last five years from 1967 to 1971 inclusive, from Western Australia, was:—

(a) To Japan—		Tons
1967	....	8,061,029
1968	....	11,695,340
1969	....	18,958,728
1970	....	30,390,929
1971	....	40,660,033
(b) To other destinations (including the Eastern States of Australia)—		
1967	....	3,407,878
1968	....	5,788,614
1969	....	5,807,851
1970	....	7,585,228
1971	....	9,638,497

## 8. EDUCATION

### Student Teachers' and Book Allowances

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

(1) Has the Government reviewed the student teachers' allowances and book allowances?

(2) If so, what are the details?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) and (2) As from the 1st January, 1973 student allowances will be as follows, with the old allowances in brackets:—

Students under 21 years of age—

	\$	\$
1st and 2nd year	963	(943)
3rd year	1,140	(1,110)
4th year	1,285	(1,255)

Students over 21 years of age—

	\$	\$
1st, 2nd and 3rd	1,242	(1,212)
4th year	1,285	(1,255)
Married man	1,770	(1,720)
Married man with a child	2,160	(2,110)

All book allowances will be increased by \$15 per annum so that the allowance for students in the final year of a primary school course will receive \$35 (\$20) while all other students will receive \$55 (\$40).

All other allowances remain unchanged.

## 9. EDUCATION

### Teachers: Bonding System

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

(1) As he is no doubt aware, the bonding of trainee teachers has proved to be irksome to many teachers college students: In view of this, has the Government given any consideration to offering an alternative to the bonding system?

(2) If (1) is "Yes" what are the details?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Applicants for teacher training will be offered two alternatives:—

(a) to receive the full student allowances in return for which they will enter into an agreement to serve in Education Department schools for a fixed period; or

(b) to enter as unbonded students, in which case they will receive a basic allowance of \$140 which will not be subject to repayment and will be eligible to apply for a loan which becomes repayable without interest from the day of graduation from a teachers' college.

10. This question was postponed.

## 11. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

### Dandalup Reservoir

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

(1) What is the cost of installing fluoride equipment at the Dandalup reservoir?

(2) When will this equipment be fully installed?

(3) Does his Government intend to cease the fluoridation of our water supplies?

- (4) If "Yes" to (3), when is this action expected and what administrative process is necessary?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) The estimated cost of installing fluoridation equipment at the North Dandalup pipehead (the only source operating at present) is \$29,000.
- (2) The permanent installation at North Dandalup is expected to be completed by the end of January 1973 (a temporary fluoridating facility has been in operation since December 1970).
- (3) This matter is kept constantly under review.
- (4) Not applicable.

12. **ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT  
DISTRICT MEMORIAL  
HOSPITAL**

*Swimming Pool*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he as promised discussed with the auxiliary president the siting and installing of the swimming pool at the Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), what are the results of the discussion?
- (3) If "No" to (1), why has he not kept his promise?
- (4) What additions of buildings and plans and maintenance are scheduled for this hospital before 30th June, 1973?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The promise was when I next was in Armadale. I have not yet been able to afford myself that luxury.
- (4) (i) As indicated in my answer to the Member's question 38 of 13th September, 1972, the new operating theatre suite will be commenced this financial year. Items of equipment to be installed on completion of building in 1973-74 have yet to be determined.
- (ii) Planning for the conversion of the existing operating theatre suite to outpatient facilities will commence before 30th June, 1973.
- (iii) The hospital now employs maintenance staff and there is a continuing programme of maintenance in force.

13. **POWER BOATS**

*Areas of Operation*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) If there have been further decisions as to the siting of power boats, will he advise the House the details?
- (2) Has Lake Jandakot, Forrestdale, been found unsuitable for power boats?
- (3) Does he or his department intend to initiate moves towards using Lake Jandakot for any purposes?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), what are the proposed plans?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) There has been no other decision than to temporarily allocate a site north of Heirisson Island.
- (2) No.
- (3) No decision has been made at this stage.
- (4) Answered by (3).

14. **BEACH EROSION**

*Mandurah*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the department's role in curbing the serious erosion problem north of Hensman Street in Mandurah?
- (2) Does he consider the situation to be serious?
- (3) What action will his department take to contain the problem?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department has carried out surveys and acted as engineering adviser to the Shire of Mandurah, which is responsible for the protection of the foreshore reserves. Since 1st July, 1970, the department has contributed \$15,767 to the cost of beach erosion works on a 50/50 basis with the Shire of Mandurah.
- (2) No. At the present time there is no immediate danger to private property, and with the advent of the normal summer weather pattern it is not expected that the erosion front will progress.
- (3) The department has provided \$30,000 for beach restoration work in the Henson Street—Priam Road area on the basis of a contribution of \$15,000 by the shire. Work is expected to commence in the near future and to be completed well before the onset of winter.

## 15. BUSHFIRE CONTROL

*Campbell Report*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What are the reasons for not making the Campbell report on bush-fire control available to the shires concerned?
- (2) Has he or his department received any letters protesting at his decision not to release the report?
- (3) Does he not think that this action will jeopardise the essential co-operation between the Bushfire Control Board and local authorities?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Reasons include—

It is a public service report not a public document.

Shires have six representatives (out of 13 members) on the Bush Fires Board, which is dealing with the report.

The tendering of evidence does not entitle shires to the report. Through the report, 138 shires were canvassed for their views (which vary widely) and these are being considered, with a view to advising the Government.

- (2) Three letters have been received on this subject only one of which was a protest.
- (3) No.

## 16. MURRAY RIVER AND PEEL INLET

*Pollution*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Is he aware of the very serious pollution problem in the Murray River and Peel Inlet?
- (2) Is he also aware that the pollution is due mainly to large areas of rotting algae?
- (3) What plans has his department to contain this menace?
- (4) Has he received any communication on this matter from the Peel Inlet Conservation Committee?
- (5) In view of the possible danger to the fishing industry, to the crabbing and prawning potential of the area, will he have an investigation or survey made of the area with a view to taking the necessary remedial measures?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) The Department of Environmental Protection is co-operating with the Department of Fisheries and Fauna and the Peel Inlet Con-

servation Committee in an investigation of the problems in the area. The rotting vegetation has led to an unpleasant black slime being formed on the bottom of the inlet. Recent low tides exposing large areas of flats, and the warm water, have results in noisome conditions in these areas.

It is to be noted that planning to overcome the situation is a very involved and long term exercise.

- (4) Yes.

- (5) Answered by (3).

17.

## PEEL INLET

*Sand Bar*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he received any complaints from the fishermen's association regarding the danger of negotiating the Mandurah Sand Bar entrance to Peel Inlet?
- (2) If so, from whom?
- (3) What action does he recommend to improve the situation?
- (4) What immediate action does his department intend to take to improve this hazardous situation?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The W.A. Fishing Fleet Masters' Association in September, 1972.
- (3) Permanent depth improvement could be achieved by continuous dredging at the entrance.
- (4) The heavy expenditure involved is not warranted at present.

18.

## PEEL INLET

*Weed Growth*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Has he received any communication from the Licensed Fishermen's Association of Mandurah complaining of the increasing weed growth in the Peel Inlet?
- (2) Is he aware that this growth is developing so rapidly that it could endanger the fishing potential of the area?
- (3) Would he discuss this serious problem with the Minister for Environmental Protection with a view to having a survey made of the problem, and would he then give his support to the necessary remedial measures on behalf of professional and amateur fishermen?

Mr. Taylor (for Mr. BICKERTON) replied:

- (1) Not as I recall.

- (2) Departmental advice indicates that there has been an increasing weed problem in the Mandurah estuary.
- (3) Discussions are proceeding between the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, the Department of Environmental Protection and the Peel Inlet Conservation Committee in relation to possible means of managing the Peel inlet.

# 19. MEAT BRANDING REGULATIONS

## *Adoption by Shires*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

Would he advise the list of shires that have not adopted meat branding regulations?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Shires of—

Beverley.  
Boddington.  
Brookton.  
Broome.  
Broomehill.  
Bruce Rock.  
Carnamah.  
Chapman Valley.  
Chittering.  
Coolgardie.  
Coorow.  
Corrigin.  
Cranbrook.  
Cuballing.  
Cue.  
Cunderdin.  
Daiwallinu.  
Donnybrook-Balingup.  
Dowerin.  
Dumbleyung.  
Dundas.  
East Pilbara.  
Exmouth.  
Gingin.  
Gnowangerup.  
Goomalling.  
Hall's Creek.  
Irwin.  
Kalamunda.  
Kellerberrin.  
Kondinin.  
Koorda.  
Kulin.  
Lake Grace.  
Laverton.  
Leonora.  
Meekatharra.  
Menzies.  
Mingenew.  
Morawa.  
Mount Magnet.  
Mt. Marshall.  
Mukinbudin.  
Mullewa.  
Murchison.  
Nannup.  
Narembreen.  
Northampton.

Nungarin.  
Nyabing-Pingrup.  
Perenjori.  
Pingelly.  
Quairading.  
Ravensthorpe.  
Roebourne.  
Sandstone.  
Serpentine-Jarrahdale.  
Shark Bay.  
Tambellup.  
Three Springs.  
Trayning.  
Upper Gascoyne.  
Victoria Plains.  
Wandering.  
West Arthur.  
West Kimberley.  
Westonia.  
West Pilbara.  
Wiluna.  
Williams.  
Wyalkatchem.  
Wyndham-East Kimberley.  
Yalgoo.  
Yilgarn.

# 20. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

## *Compensation to Property Owners*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) How does the commission intend to finance the very large increased compensation costs incurred because of his and the commission's insistence on installing the 330kV powerline through long-developed and subdivided properties at Kelmscott south of the alignment of Allen Road instead of through rural land north of Allen Road?
- (2) Is the zoning of the land north of the Allen Road alignment between Ranford Road and the south still rural?
- (3) If he is aware of any proposals for the rezoning to urban and development of the land north of Allen Road, will he please give the details?
- (4) Is he adamant that he and the commission will not agree to the realignment of the two powerlines along or north of the Allen Road alignment so saving large costs and removing the disruption to many developed properties?
- (5) Will he advise the present route proposals for the powerline from the South West Railway to the Gosnells and Kalamunda shire boundaries?

Mr. Jamieson (for Mr. MAY) replied:

- (1) It is not accepted that the selected route will result in compensation costs which would be greater than those resulting from alternative routes.

- (2) and (3) The areas need more precise definition for useful reply, and it is considered the questions should be directed to the Minister in Charge of region planning.
- (4) The present alignment was decided and agreed to by the affected shires after discussion before the Minister at which the Member for Dale was present. There are no circumstances known which would warrant a change.  
As to costs, see (1) above.
- (5) The invitation to the Member for Dale to inspect the route proposals at the commission's office is still open.

## 21. PACMINEX ALUMINA LOADING FACILITIES

### *Kwinana*

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

(1) Will he—

- (a) table a wind pattern showing the direction of prevailing winds passing the proposed new Pacminex loading jetty;
- (b) describe the direction of the prevailing winds?
- (2) What is the distance between the proposed Pacminex alumina loading position and—
  - (a) Kwinana beach "A"-class reserve;
  - (b) the nearest residential area of Kwinana beach;
  - (c) the corner of Office and Rockingham Roads?
- (3) How many homes are there now at Kwinana beach?
- (4) How many homes at Kwinana beach were purchased by the Government in 1970 and 1971?
- (5) When is Pacminex expected to load alumina at Kwinana?
- (6) What are the Government's plans for removing the residents at Kwinana beach before this new alumina loading takes place?
- (7) Why will the Government not insist on the Pacminex alumina storage and loading being sited at the northern end of the Fremantle Port Authority's zoned Kwinana area?
- (8) Does the storage of alumina adjacent to Co-operative Bulk Handling confirm bulk export of goods compatible with the grain will not be sited at Kwinana?
- (9) What intentions has the Government for the utilisation of the land between Western Mining Corporation and Dixon Road, Rockingham?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. GRAHAM) replied:

- (1) (a) Yes; a series of charts giving the direction of winds and the percentage of days in the month on which they blow in that particular direction (from the centre of each chart) are laid on the table herewith. The charts have been copied from originals produced by the Bureau of Meteorology and give data for 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. for the twelve months of the year at Kwinana.
- (b) The charts indicate south-westerly afternoon sea breezes.
- (2) Alumina will be loaded at Kwinana at a new separate jetty, the details of which are not yet available. Assuming the berth provides 45 feet of water and the berth is 1,500-2,000 feet offshore the appropriate distances would be approximately:
  - (a) 1,700 to 2,200 feet.
  - (b) 2,000 to 2,400 feet.
  - (c) 2,400 to 2,700 feet.
- (3) One hundred and sixty five houses, four duplexes and six flats.
- (4) Fourteen in 1970 and ten in 1971.
- (5) It is unlikely that the joint venturers would load alumina before the first half of 1977.
- (6) The Government will continue its policy of progressive purchase, by negotiation, of properties in the Kwinana beach area.
- (7) The Government has accepted the recommendations of the committee for the development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana which provide for development of proposed port operations from the south and has no reason to depart from these recommendations.
- (8) The Government desires to keep its options open on exports of goods compatible with grain to be exported through Kwinana, but has no immediate plans in this regard.
- (9) The land located between Western Mining Corporation and Dixon Road, Rockingham, is classified for industrial use in the Metropolitan Region Scheme and also zoned for such use in the Rockingham Shire Town Planning Scheme. The Government has no intention of utilising this land for any use which is inconsistent with these schemes.

*The charts were tabled (see paper No. 541).*

## 22. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

*Conversion of Vessels*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of having the two new State shipping service vessels converted in Hong Kong?
- (2) What is the time factor for the delivery of the first and then the second converted vessel if both vessels were converted in Hong Kong?
- (3) What is the cost of conversion for each vessel now that a decision has been taken to have one vessel converted in Hong Kong and the other converted in Western Australia?
- (4) What is the time factor for return to service of—
  - (a) the vessel to be converted in Hong Kong; and
  - (b) the vessel to be converted in Fremantle?
- (5) (a) Is the estimate for conversion of the vessel in Hong Kong on a fixed price contract, or is it subject to cost escalation;
  - (b) if it is subject to cost escalation, what is the nature of the escalation arrangements;
  - (c) what penalties are there for late completion and delivery?
- (6) (a) Is the cost of conversion of the vessel in Western Australia based on a fixed price contract, or is it subject to cost escalation;
  - (b) if it is subject to cost escalation, what is the nature of the escalation arrangements;
  - (c) what penalties are there for late completion and delivery?
- (7) What will be the all up costs of each vessel by the time it is placed in service—
  - (a) without a charge for financial charges such as interest etc. involved in the financial outlay during the full period from original acquisition and leading up to the time when it goes into service; and
  - (b) the financial charges such as interest etc. during the same period up until the vessel actually goes into service?
- (8) Who are the contractors for conversion—
  - (a) in the case of the vessel to be converted in Hong Kong; and
  - (b) the vessel to be converted in Western Australia?

- (9) Is he satisfied that the all up costs of the two vessels when converted will be lower than would have been—

- (a) the cost of having new construction undertaken for vessels especially adapted for our coast;
- (b) the provision of alternative vessels that were on offer and could have been adapted to our needs on our coast?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) \$A1,808,318 (Fixed price).
- (2) Re-delivery at Hong Kong, 70 days after receipt of vessel—both vessels to be done simultaneously.
- (3) Hong Kong \$A951,175—Fremantle \$A2,108,743.
- (4) (a) Approximately 15th March, 1973.
- (b) Approximately 6th July, 1973.
- (5) (a) Fixed price.
- (b) Answered by (5) (a).
- (c) \$A1,000 per day late delivery, and \$500 per day bonus payment for early delivery.
- (6) (a) Substantially fixed price.
- (b) Some details of the tender require clarification and are subject to negotiation. Some prime cost items may vary.
- (c) No penalties. Evans Deakin will not accept any penalty.
- (7) (a) Hong Kong Vessel—estimated \$A2,627,000.
- Fremantle Vessel—estimated \$A3,757,000.
- (b) This will depend on Treasury requirements.
- (8) (a) The Taikoo Dockyard and Engineering Company of Hong Kong Ltd.
- (b) Evans Deakin Industries Limited—Brisbane.
- (9) (a) Yes (substantially less).
- (b) Yes. Also these were the most suitable vessels offered.

## 23.

## TRANSPORT

*Commonwealth Assistance: Report*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) When did the Government receive copy of a Commonwealth report or proposals in respect of Commonwealth assistance for urban transport of which the Leader of the Federal Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) claims to have a copy?
- (2) How many copies were received?
- (3) What distribution was made of these copies (both initially and subsequently) and where are they currently located?



(4) (a) Did he or any of his colleagues make a copy available to the Federal Leader of the Opposition or anyone acting for the Leader of the Federal Opposition;

(b) if a copy was not made available, did he or any of his colleagues make the contents known to the Federal Leader of the Opposition or anyone acting for the Federal Leader of the Opposition?

(5) Will he table a copy of the document?

(6) What is the State Government's reaction to the proposals in the Commonwealth's proposition for substantial financial assistance?

(7) Is the document classified confidential or any other way qualified as to its distribution?

(8) Does he approve of Mr. Whitlam's action in making public the contents of the report or proposals?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) to (3) The Government has not received any copies of this report which, I understand, was tabled at a meeting held on 7th July of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Four copies were subsequently made available, at confidential level, to the Western Australian members of the Standing Committee of Advisers of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, i.e. the Minister for Transport, the Director-General of Transport, the Commissioner of Transport, and the Commissioner of Railways.

(4) (a) and (b) No.

(5) No—in view of the confidential nature of the report.

(6) Since the report has not been studied by the State Government, I am unable to comment on any reaction thereto.

(7) Yes—not for publication.

(8) I am unaware of the circumstances and, in consequence, am not prepared to comment.

## 24. HEALTH

### *Geriatrics Facilities: Country Areas*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Has his department made any survey of the need for geriatrics facilities in country areas of the State and, if so, what areas have been subjected to survey?

(2) What are his department's criteria to investigate any area of the State?

(3) Would he advise the number of geriatrics patients in geriatrics care units in country areas to 30th June, 1972?

(4) What is the anticipated number of patients in year ending June 1975?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1) The Member is referred to the answer to part (3) of his question 13 given on 22nd November, 1972.

(2) A request by local people.

(3) This information is not available in the department.

(4) An increase of between 1 and 2%.

## QUESTIONS (10): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. INDECENT PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Tabling of Document*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

Has he an answer to the matter I raised by way of a question without notice recently?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

The Leader of the Opposition asked me earlier this week to contact the Chief Secretary in regard to two matters. I indicated yesterday that the Chief Secretary was writing to him. Apparently he has not yet received the letters. I have obtained copies and will now read them. The first one was in relation to the Indecent Publications Act Amendment Bill, and reads as follows:—

Dear Sir Charles,

Reference is made to a request to the Hon. A. D. Taylor during the debate on the Obscene Publications Act Bill, that I make available a copy of a submission presented to me by a deputation. I have given the matter careful consideration, but regret that I cannot accede to the request as I feel the submission was made purely for my attention and I do not wish to make it available without reference to those who waited on me.

I suggest however that you approach the Fellowship of Australian Writers and ask them if they would be prepared to make available a copy of the document. You may advise them that I would have no objection to them doing so.

Yours faithfully,

R. H. C. STUBBS,  
Chief Secretary.

November 22, 1972.

2. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
BOUNDARIES COMMISSION**

*Report*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Has he a further answer to the question I asked?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

The Minister for Local Government has written the following minute to me:—

Referring to the question by the Hon. Sir Charles Court which you answered on 21st November, 1972, I wish to elaborate concerning my intentions with regard to the implementation of any recommendations for municipal district boundary alterations which may be recommended by the Boundaries Commission.

The proposal contained in the Bill to amend the Local Government Act and which was defeated during the current Session of Legislative Council, was designed to enable the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission without having first to receive a petition from any of the Councils involved.

At present the Act enables this procedure to apply only when the recommendation is for full union of adjoining municipal districts.

It was intended in any case to give all interested parties the opportunity to be heard in respect of the recommendations in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 (6) (j) of the Act.

In view of Parliament's rejection of the proposed amendment, any implementation of a recommendation involving changes other than complete amalgamation will require a petition to be presented before any action may be taken. Such petitions will be referred to the Boundaries Commission.

Any proposals by the Commission will be published and circulated to affected Councils inviting comment before any action to implement the recommendations or to conduct hearings is initiated.

R. H. C. STUBBS, M.L.C.  
Minister for Local Government.

3. **WATER SUPPLIES**

*Wongong Brook*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware that fish and bird life are dying along the Wongong Brook through a shortage of water?
- (2) Is the board intending to implement some relief in terms of normal policy by releasing a limited quantity of water into the stream at selected points from time to time?
- (3) If the board is not intending to carry out normal policy, what action does it intend to take towards the provision of stock water through the coming summer?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Release of water commenced on the 22nd November, 1972 when 300,000 gallons were released, and further quantities will be released as required.
- (3) Not applicable.

4. **EDUCATION**

*Teacher Bursary Scheme*

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

- (1) Is it a fact that the teacher bursary scheme which applied to children in fourth and fifth-year high school has been abandoned?
- (2) Is it also a fact that although he made a decision in this matter in May, 1972, the schools were not advised until about the 23rd October that no bursaries would be offered to third-year children who are planning to proceed?
- (3) Can the Minister give the reasons for abandoning the scheme and the reasons for the delay in the announcement?
- (4) Has any public announcement been made as to the abandonment of the scheme?
- (5) Could he advise to what purpose funds previously used for the bursary scheme will be applied by the Education Department?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (5) To enable me to devote as much time to preparing the answer as the honourable member devoted to preparing his question—

Mr. O'Neil: That is about two minutes.

Mr. T. D. EVANS:—I would ask him, if the opportunity exists, to place it on the notice paper; if not, I will supply the answer to him in writing.

## 5. ROAD TRANSPORT SYSTEM

*Inquiry by Royal Commission*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is there any likelihood of Order of the Day No. 13, referring to the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into road transport, being debated during this session?
- (2) If not, does the Government intend to do anything to relieve the pressure on a number of people in the industry who find themselves in tremendous difficulty?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).

## 6. PRICE CONTROL

*Promises of Prime Minister*

Mr. BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Did he see the article in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* referring to promises by the Prime Minister to take action to control prices if his Government is returned on the 2nd December?

Mr. Williams: And wages.

Mr. BRYCE: To continue—

- (2) Does he see the advocacy of this measure as yet another example of political plagiarism on the part of the Prime Minister and his colleagues?
- (3) Bearing in mind the violent opposition of Liberal Party members in this House to the Western Australian Government's Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill, does he see this move by the Prime Minister as a realisation on his part that the public, generally, are very much in favour of such a policy?

Mr. O'Neil: That question is inadmissible.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'Connor: No wonder the Premier has gone hoarse.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It would appear the Prime Minister is not averse to the adoption of those items of Labor Policy which seem to him to have a popular appeal.
- (3) Yes.

Sir Charles Court: What about the wages?

## 7. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

*Report of Magistrate Nott*

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister any closer to making a determination on the Nott report on pre-school education?
- (2) More importantly, approximately how many members of the public have added any information to the information already gained during the course of the committee's investigation?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) I am closer to making a decision inasmuch as it looks as though this session of Parliament might conclude soon, and I will be able to devote more time to the matter. As indicated earlier, in the meanwhile the provisions of the report are being examined at Education Department and Treasury level. When I have time to devote myself to the matter a committee composed of Education Department and Treasury officials, together with myself, will be appointed to examine the report to see which parts of it can be implemented and to determine the best and most expeditious means of doing so.
- (2) Whilst the report is being examined at both department levels the public have been enabled to respond to it. The response has been most worth while. I cannot indicate the number of responses we have had, but the response in the newspapers is indicative of the interest which has been generated by the report. I have also received a great many personal responses, some for and some against the report, and some for the report in part and some against the report in part.

## 8.

## LAND

*Reserve No. 29935*

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Lands:

Will the Minister table the file dealing with Reserve No. 29935?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the member for Avon for adequate notice of the question. As a consequence of that notice I have been able to have a summary of the correspondence prepared. A copy of that summary is contained on the file I submit for tabling, and I will ask the Clerk to hand a copy to the member.

The file was tabled (see paper No. 542).

9. MIDLAND JUNCTION  
ABATTOIR

*Cold Storage*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When did the Midland Junction Abattoir Board join the Cold Storage Association?
- (2) What is the monthly cold storage charge levied per 100 lb. weight for meat stored at Midland?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The 6th August, 1971.
- (2) Freezing and first 28 days storage—  
Carcase meat—\$1.60 per 100 lb.  
Carton meat—\$1.95 per 100 lb.  
Second 28 days storage—  
46c per 100 lb. for both carcase and carton meats.  
Subsequent periods of 28 days storage—  
35c per 100 lb. for both carcase and carton meats.

10. PRICE CONTROL

*Promises of Prime Minister*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:  
Arising out of the Premier's answer to the question of the member for Ascot—

- (1) Was the Premier answering the question on the basis of a wages and prices freeze, or was he answering it only on the basis of a prices freeze?
- (2) Is it Labor policy to have a prices and wages freeze, as was in force in the United States, and is currently in gress in Britain?

Mr. Hartrey: Nobody said anything about a freeze.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) It has been long established that wages are related to prices. When the Industrial Commission from time to time fixes wages it has before it the price index as a guide. It is therefore considered that the first requirement is that some action be taken to control prices, and if that is done wages will be controlled automatically.

Mr. O'Connor: In other words, you would leave in wages control?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If the Opposition wishes to ask a question and answer it itself, that is all right with me.

Sir Charles Court: We want an answer to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If I am permitted to give my answer, I will continue to do so. I would say the Prime Minister's statement represents a very great change of heart.

Mr. O'Connor: That was not part of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This represents a great change of heart because at a recent Premiers' Conference the Prime Minister emphasised—and he referred to this in his recent statement—that it was necessary for the Commonwealth and the States to get together with a view to controlling wages. At no time did he refer to the possibility of controlling prices, although I took advantage of that meeting to inform the Prime Minister that surely he would not contemplate controlling wages if at the same time he did not contemplate taking action in regard to prices. I welcome this change of heart on the part of the Prime Minister.

Sir Charles Court: How about answering my question?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I think I have.

Sir Charles Court: Do you favour a wage and price freeze such as that in the U.S.A.?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: My answer to that is: There is no necessity for a wages freeze if prices are controlled because wages are fixed on prices.

Sir Charles Court: Our whole problem is due to wages.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

*Aid: Ministerial Statement*

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [4.40 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, I seek your indulgence and that of the House to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education seeks leave to make a statement. It is necessary to have an absolute majority, with no dissentient voice. The question is that leave be granted. As there is no dissentient voice the Minister may continue.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I thank the House for giving me the opportunity to make the statement I foreshadowed when answering a question of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday evening.

I think it desirable, in view of statements made by the Federal Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Fraser) this week, that I inform the House of developments in the matter of the Commonwealth Government's proposals to increase financial assistance to non-Government schools.

It is a fact that State Governments were the first to provide assistance to non-Government schools, and the Government of Western Australia—and I refer to the Government irrespective of its political colour—has been among the leaders in this field. I think I am right in recalling that the first move was made in this State in 1953 when the Education Department school paper was made available free by the Hawke Government to children attending non-Government schools.

Our predecessors responded to requests for aid to non-Government schools by providing assistance in several forms. Subsidies were provided to parents' associations for the provision of equipment and library books; school stocks and a wide range of supplies were provided free; interest on loans raised to construct boarding accommodation was subsidised to a substantial degree; and in more recent times a *per capita* grant was introduced for both primary and secondary pupils.

In addition, free or concessional transport has always been available equally to children attending non-Government schools, and boarding allowances are paid to parents of children attending these schools who are required to live away from home.

It was a fairly well settled policy of the previous Government to extend equally to non-Government schools any increased subsidy payments to Government schools or free issues of books and other school stocks.

The greater part of assistance provided by the previous Government was therefore related to needs supplemented by across-the-board *per capita* payments. The present Government had no fundamental quarrel with this approach and in fact moved early in its period in office to extend the existing and well established forms of aid.

In our first year in office, recognising the extent to which inflation had increased the costs incurred by non-Government schools, we increased the *per capita* grant for primary students by 50 per cent. from \$20 to \$30. For secondary students, the grant was increased from \$30 in the first three years and \$36 in years four and five to \$40 in all years. In other words, the existing State *per capita* grant at the secondary level has been levelled out at \$40 a child.

In this year's Budget, the book allowance for all fourth and fifth-year students, regardless of the type of school attended, was increased by 50 per cent.

The progressive introduction of free textbooks applies equally to children of non-Government primary schools and by 1974 all Western Australian primary pupils will receive free textbooks and learning materials.

Recognition of the need to assist non-Government schools in this way has been accorded by both sides of this Parliament

and it has been to the credit of all members that the progressive development of the present forms of assistance has not been the subject of political acrimony.

By comparison with the record of State Governments, the Commonwealth Government is a relative newcomer to this field. The Commonwealth made the first tentative moves in 1964-65 when grants for the construction of science laboratories, and subsequently libraries, in secondary schools were applied also to non-Government schools.

The first move to assist in meeting the recurrent costs of non-Government schools was not until 1970 when the Commonwealth introduced *per capita* grants at the rate of \$35 per primary pupil and \$50 per secondary pupil. These grants were increased to \$50 and \$68 respectively from the beginning of this year.

In May of this year, the Prime Minister unilaterally announced a move to link expanded Commonwealth payments to the cost of educating a child in Government schools and proposed that State Governments would pay an equal amount. In other words, the State Governments were invited to join with the Commonwealth in paying an equal amount.

There was no prior consultation with this, or, as far as I am aware, with any other State Government before the 11th May and the terms of the announcement showed either ignorance of, or a total disregard for, long-established assistance already provided by the States.

This attitude of the Commonwealth in announcing measures which sought to commit expenditure by the States, or to ride roughshod over established State policies has become a most unfortunate feature of Commonwealth-States relations—or lack of relations—in recent years.

At the very least, one could have expected that the States would have been asked to express views on the proposals before an announcement was made by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister's published statement actually showed figures of what the States were expected to find—that is, if they join with the Commonwealth—by way of additional payments to non-Government schools under the proposed arrangements.

Notwithstanding the fact that in this State at least, and probably in most States, State Government assistance by way of direct and indirect payments was already fully comparable to that provided by the Commonwealth, the figures showed that the States were expected to find an additional \$18,000,000 against \$13,500,000 by the Commonwealth. In our case we were put down for \$2,000,000 as against \$1,000,000 by the Commonwealth.

Of course the explanation for these most peculiar figures was that the Commonwealth had taken full account of its own recurrent aid to non-Government schools and left out of account very substantial expenditures being incurred by the States on other forms of assistance. It had had regard only for that part of State assistance paid by way of *per capita* grants.

Subsequently, discussions were held between Commonwealth and State officers over a period of some months to thrash out details of the scheme and to determine what elements of State Government expenditure on State schools would be taken into account in arriving at the national average cost of educating a child in Government schools at primary and secondary level. Not unnaturally there was some divergence of opinion between the States and the Commonwealth.

One particular aspect of these discussions has been given prominence by Mr. Fraser and has been made a contentious issue by a number of people without a full understanding of our position in the matter. I refer to the question of expenditure on transport of school children.

In general it may be said that we would agree broadly with the concept that if the national average cost of educating a Government school pupil includes expenditures of a type that are also incurred in existing aid to non-Government schools, the corresponding payments to non-Government schools should be regarded as part of the State's "quota" of assistance.

An example is the issue of free school stocks or textbooks. Expenditure on this activity in Government schools forms part of the overall costs used in arriving at the national average cost. In turn it determines, in part, the level of grants to non-Government schools under the "20%-20% formula."

If the cost of providing this service to a Government school pupil is reflected in the assessed quota of assistance to a non-Government school child, surely the actual expenditure incurred in providing free stocks and textbooks to the non-Government school must be reckoned as part of the agreed level of assistance. To do otherwise would be giving an advantage to the non-Government school.

Equally we would agree, in general, with the proposition that if the cost of a service, such as transport of children, provided equally to Government and non-Government pupils alike, was not taken into account in determining the base average cost, then expenditure on that service to children of non-Government schools would not be reckoned as part of the State's quota of assistance to non-Government schools.

However, our position, and that of some other States, put forward at the conference of officers held on the 9th August this year, was that the cost of transport of Government school pupils should be included in arriving at the national average cost per pupil.

#### *Point of Order*

Sir CHARLES COURT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister making a personal explanation, or a speech on a new subject?

The SPEAKER: I understood that this was to have been a ministerial statement, but having listened to it I think it should have been included in the introduction to the Minister's Estimates.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Does that mean I will not be permitted to continue making this statement, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Will your statement take much longer?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I have only about two pages of this statement to read, plus a telegram which I wish to read to the House.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister should stick to the rules.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I can recall that the Leader of the Opposition on many occasions has not stuck to the rules when reading a statement.

Sir Charles Court: I am not objecting to your reading of the statement, but to the subject matter of it.

The SPEAKER: I think the Minister may as well be permitted to conclude the statement now that he has gone this far.

#### *Ministerial Statement Resumed*

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out that at the meeting held on the 9th August, it was contended that the cost of transport of Government school pupils should be included in arriving at the national average cost per pupil. However we are now advised that that was not the Commonwealth view. We have been advised of the attitude observed by other States and the Commonwealth; that is, the transport costs would not be included, and so they will not be included as part of the assistance that we render to non-Government schools.

I conclude by saying that last Friday, the 17th November, I received advice from the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Fraser) as to the national average costs to be used in determining the level of Commonwealth assistance to non-Government schools in 1973. The figures are \$308 per primary pupil and \$519 per secondary pupil.

The advice did not disclose the components of the cost factor that had finally been accepted by the Commonwealth and all the States.

Earlier today, further to a telegram I received yesterday, I received another telegram at my office. This was actually in reply to a telegram I sent yesterday. As an answer to the Leader of the Opposition I explained that my telegram had been received by a person whom I believed to be the secretary to Mr. Fraser, which indicated that his Minister was not present yesterday. He was campaigning in Victoria and my telegram was referred to him. I received his reply telegram today, and it sets out the information I desired. The telegram concludes as follows:—

I have now written to each State Minister setting down the *per capita* figures for expenditure on Government schools in each State and the two territories which resulted in the national average figures given in my telegram of 17th November.

Malcolm Fraser.

I conclude by pointing out, as I did in my answer to the question asked by the member for Wembley this afternoon, that now the Government is finally aware of the cost factors that are to be excluded, it will give close attention to these matters, and it is expected a decision will be made on the additional assistance that will be given to non-Government schools next session.

Mr. Mensaros: Could you table that telegram from the Commonwealth Minister?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes, certainly. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I herewith table the telegram.

*The telegram was tabled (see paper No. 543).*

## RESERVES AND ROAD CLOSURE BILL

### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [4.57 p.m.]: I do not know whether it is possible for members at this stage of a weary week and a weary session to use their imagination, but I ask them to do that and to think of a whole town, with a fairly large population, being wiped out by a disaster such as that caused by a cyclone or an earthquake. I am sure members can imagine that if this happened people throughout the country would be alerted. Emergency services would be called upon and members of

the Press would be running around everywhere trying to obtain news items, so that reports of the disaster could be published, not only in Australia but throughout the rest of the world.

This happened following the earthquake at Meckering; the disaster was announced in news items everywhere. Fortunately, on that occasion there were no deaths, although there was some destruction. I now wish to refer to a tragedy that is comparable; one which occurs continuously every year and, in fact, grows greater in intensity. I am referring to the tragedy that occurs in Australia every year; namely, the number of road deaths, which now exceeds 3,500. But in addition to this, 85,000 people each year are maimed as a result of being involved in road accidents.

I instanced the population of a whole town being wiped out so that members could realise what a tragic situation it would be, but I think all of us would agree that the comparable tragedy, in terms of numbers, that is occurring on our roads every year is much worse. It is almost beyond comprehension that this should continue every year throughout Australia, and therefore it seems to me that we should take more notice of this appalling loss of life—in addition to the many thousands who are maimed—that occurs on our roads, than we have done in the past.

I was very impressed with the stories I heard a couple of weeks ago about the difficulties and long struggle of men and women in their fight against alcoholism. The Attorney-General was with me at the time and I have no doubt he also was impressed. I wish to refer to one or two Press reports because it must be remembered that many of the accidents and deaths on the road are the result of alcohol.

Only a couple of days ago it was reported in the Press that 49 per cent. of drivers killed in accidents had a blood alcohol level of more than .05 per cent. and that most of the drivers were incapable of driving. It was also reported that of 48 pedestrians killed, 36 per cent. had a blood alcohol content of above .05 per cent.

Another news item advises us that there has been a sharp increase in drinking. The *Medical Journal of Australia* reports that in 1938 the beer consumption was 11.7 gallons per head, but that a year ago it had risen to 27 gallons a year per head—and possibly more by now. The rise in the *per capita* alcohol consumption would indicate a proportionate rise in the number of excessive drinkers.

Alcoholism is recognised as the fourth major health problem in Australia, surpassed only by degenerative disorders of the blood, psychiatric disorders, and cancer. So I am not talking about something

which has no impact on the community. As I have said, the effect of traffic accidents is the equivalent of the wiping out of a whole town plus many maimed people every year.

I have another cutting here which reports the proceedings of a case which was held a short time ago. A driver, killed in a double fatality, had a blood alcohol content of .212, and the other victim, an innocent passenger in the other car, had her head impaled on a gear change lever.

Alcohol is involved in tragedies not only on the road but also off the road. I have here a newspaper report of another court case in which the person involved was likened to a Chicago gangster. He had shot a policeman. In court he said he was sorry for what he had done, but that he had been drunk at the time.

This aspect alarms me. Often court cases reveal that those involved did not know what they were doing because they were drunk. I wonder how much notice is taken of such evidence. Does it exonerate the persons charged? The statement is certainly made in evidence so therefore it must be considered to contain some merit. Are they absolved from responsibility merely because they were drunk?

Another newspaper cutting reports a person as having said, "I was too drunk to remember." That particular person had been unemployed for about three weeks before the alleged incident took place, but despite this fact he said he had been drinking heavily from noon onwards.

Mr. Hartrey: He would certainly have the time.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Either he has many friends with a great deal of money or the unemployment relief is rather lavish in this country. It was reported that he was very drunk when he left the flat where he was staying.

These newspaper reports give an indication of the present situation and I just wonder what we can do about it. Some people say we should not interfere with personal liberties. It is said we should not stop a person to ascertain whether his blood alcohol content exceeds the maximum allowed.

Mr. Hartrey: Would you like to be stopped and searched in case you might have stolen something?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am making a speech at the moment. We inspect vehicles and premises; we stop people to see if they have brought their potatoes from the board; we stop cars to ascertain whether fruit is being transported to a nonfruit-fly area; we stop trucks to ascertain whether they are overweight; and we take all sorts of other similar action. These matters are major enough, but they bear no comparison with the tragedies created

by drunken drivers. Over 3,500 deaths have occurred and 85,000 people have been maimed, and yet we make no real attempt to solve the problem.

I believe that the few court cases to which I have referred reveal that liquor must be served on many occasions contrary to the provisions of section 126 (1) (d) of the Liquor Act which reads—

(1) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, a licensee and the servant or agent of a licensee who— . . .

(d) supplies liquor, or causes or permits the supply of liquor, to a person who is, at the time, in a state of intoxication or is visibly affected by liquor to the extent that any further consumption of liquor by him is liable to induce a state of intoxication; .

That provision should be invoked when a person is in a state of intoxication to the extent that further consumption by him would be liable to involve him in a dangerous situation. The penalty is \$200.

I do not know how often a charge is made under that provision, but it appears it is very seldom despite the fact that the provision should have been invoked on many occasions. It is obvious that those who have a blood alcohol content in excess of the maximum allowed have obtained their liquor from licensed premises of some kind. Who served the liquor? How do the people serving it continue to do so without any charge being laid against them? Who is responsible for the implementation of that provision? Why do they not do their job? I think it is time—

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: —we spoke on this matter. It ill-behoves the member for Boulder-Dundas to make such critical remarks. One Labor member used to refer to "inane" remarks; but I would not use that word. What do we do about this problem? Do we merely throw our hands up in despair and say, "Look at the dreadful road toll. Someone should be doing something about it."? We have done this for years, but no-one takes any notice of us. We make laws to provide for licenses to be issued for the sale of liquor and then we make laws to stipulate that people must not drink too much. We are a crazy lot of people, but this is what we do. It is time someone took a stand to ensure that liquor is not drunk to excess.

Not only are car drivers being affected, but also pedestrians. In addition the lives and families of those involved in the tragedies are often seriously affected. I am sure all members in this House have had to deal with problems of the families of men and women who have drunk to excess.



Actually alcohol represents one of the greatest tragedies in our community and all members will admit this if they are honest.

Over the years I have hesitated to speak about this subject because I do not drink alcohol myself and I do not like the thought of action being taken against those who do. People should have an opportunity to decide matters for themselves, and they do have this opportunity with which I do not like interfering. However, it seems that many people are taking advantage of the situation and it is time we did something about it. I suggest that one of the easiest ways to overcome some of the problems without the necessity to introduce any further legislation, is to implement section 126 (1) (b) of the Liquor Act. In all sincerity I say that at the moment someone is not doing his job and therefore the Minister concerned should ensure that that provision in the Act is implemented. If this were done some improvement might be made.

I wish to refer very briefly to one or two other subjects. I am sorry the Minister for Education is still not in his seat because I intend to refer to something concerning him. Firstly, however, I wish to say that I was disappointed with the action of the Minister this afternoon.

After having been given permission to make a statement—it must be remembered that when members are asked to give permission for a Minister or member to make a statement, the contents of that statement are not known—which all members assumed would be either a ministerial or personal statement, the Minister rose to make a political speech thus breaching the confidence of the House.

Mr. Jamieson: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am expressing my opinion.

Mr. Jamieson: And you are entitled to do that, but it is only an opinion.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If that same Minister rises to request permission to make a statement in the future mine will be a dissentient voice because I would not have sufficient confidence in him to give him permission to make another statement.

Mr. Jamieson: This will happen with others I am afraid.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I have never before experienced such a breach of faith and confidence.

Mr. Jamieson: You had a go at the Premier when he wasn't sitting in his seat the other night.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is quite right too.

Mr. Jamieson: It was quite unjust, but it was in keeping.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You were not as cruel as that, surely!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: When the Bill to amend the Country High School Hostels Authority legislation was before the House a short time ago the Minister referred to a "greater form of equity in educational opportunities." He was, of course, dealing with the accommodation provided by the authority, and I agree with him. However, it is all very well to use beautiful words, but the Minister should practise what he preaches.

Because the country high school hostel at Narrogin has insufficient accommodation, 40 students who desire to attend the Narrogin Senior High School next year will be unable to do so. I have raised this matter with the Minister several times, but he has done nothing and, furthermore, he does not care.

In the first place he suggested that the students could go to four other hostels—Esperance, Port Hedland, Carnarvon, or Bunbury. Yet the Minister refers to equal opportunities. He does not know what it means. Fancy suggesting that these students be sent away. The Minister's latest suggestion is that they be sent to Bunbury. On the 24th October I asked the following question:—

- (1) As in reply to my question on 1st June he advised that no additional accommodation at the Narrogin high school hostel was planned before the 1973 school year, has the position changed?

This was five months later, and his answer was, "No." I then asked—

- (2) If not, what proposals has he to offer the 40 students who are unable to book accommodation?

I thought he might have set to work to arrange for the erection of a transportable dormitory. Two years ago the previous Government did not waste any time in a similar situation. Between November of one year and the beginning of the following school year the previous Minister supplied a new dormitory; but not this Minister, who replied—

- (2) The 40 students could be booked into Bunbury hostel where there are 75 vacancies at present.

With all due respect to my friend from Bunbury, the students do not want to go to Bunbury.

Mr. Williams: Shame!

Mr. Bryce: It's a beautiful place!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It might be assumed that the students come from Narrogin which is 120 miles away. However, it is not the Narrogin students who require the accommodation, but the students who are 130 miles east of Narrogin making their

homes 250 miles from Bunbury. The students might just as well go to Carnarvon or Port Hedland as to Bunbury.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What does the honourable member propose as a solution?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The erection of a new dormitory quick and lively.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Where do we get the capital from?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will tell the Minister one possible source of capital. Recently I asked the Minister how much money had been spent on building up the printing works so that the Government could supply books to the schools instead of having them supplied by existing companies.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The member for Narrogin shows a lack of knowledge of the contents of the Statute governing the authority.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I ask the Minister not to get off the track.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The honourable member is off the track.

Mr. Gayfer: It should be at Corrigin, not at Narrogin.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister replied that the cost was \$200,000. He could erect quite a few dormitories with this amount of money. Instead, he is prepared to waste money on items which are totally unnecessary and to leave students high and dry.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Thousands of young married persons would not agree with you.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not concerned about that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I know you are not concerned.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister is trying to get me off the track. I know that students and parents are concerned. If the Minister feels he has done a good job in this connection, I do not. I shall make another suggestion, because the Minister has asked me for suggestions. Recently, I asked that a bus service be provided from Brookton through Pingelly to pick up students in that area. I suggested that this should be a daily service as the distance is only 42 miles. Many very young students travel longer distances than that. It is a direct route on a good highway and, consequently, there are no problems. The Minister, in his reply, displayed perfect ignorance of the situation, because he said—

A bus service as proposed is not practicable as it involves nearly 100 miles of running per day—

Actually the distance is 84 miles. To continue—

—exclusive of distance travelled from farms to pick up points. Existing services to Brookton and Pingelly

would arrive too late to enable the through bus to arrive at Narrogin for the school opening.

A detailed survey would need to be undertaken and this is not warranted as vacancies exist in other hostels.

I made a simple request and a simple answer could have been given. We had ascertained that many parents from the Brookton and Pingelly areas who board their children in the town would take advantage of a daily bus service. They offered to do this to relieve the hostel accommodation so that the position would be easier for students who live too far away to make use of the bus service. Surely this is the simplest solution in the world, but the Minister said it was not warranted. This is the Minister for Education who has stood up and made statements trying to tell us how good he is on education.

#### *Withdrawal of Remarks*

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. The honourable member said I had made a statement saying how good I was on education. I have never made any such statement.

Mr. W. A. Manning: I will not withdraw the remark.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I demand that the remark be withdrawn. I have never made any such statement at all.

Mr. W. A. Manning: What did the Minister tell us?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I have asked for the remarks to be withdrawn.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I refuse to withdraw them; they are the perfect truth.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I ask for those remarks to be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the member for Narrogin to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will not withdraw them and action can be taken against me. It is the perfect truth and there is no personal reflection in my words.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is my painful duty to ask you to give the honourable member a further opportunity to withdraw his remarks. If he fails to acquiesce and to agree to your request, then I suggest, Sir, you have no option but to do your duty.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I give the member for Narrogin one further opportunity to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I will not withdraw the remarks I made, because

I made no personal reflection on the Minister. He is not justified in asking me to withdraw my remarks because I only spoke the truth.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr. HUTCHINSON: What is the statement to which the Minister for Education objects?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The member for Narrogin said I had stood up and said how good I was on education. I have never made any such statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I again ask the member for Narrogin to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will not withdraw my remarks. What I said was perfectly true according to what the Minister has told us. If he wants to tell us he is not doing a good job he can do that.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I hesitate to do this, but I have no option. Standing Orders require obedience on the part of members. The fact remains the Deputy Speaker has asked the member for Narrogin to withdraw his remarks and the member for Narrogin has defied the Chair.

Mr. MENSAROS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you please tell the House under what Standing Order you ask the member for Narrogin to withdraw his remarks?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Narrogin to withdraw his remarks under Standing Order 128 which reads—

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I did not use offensive or unbecoming words at all and I refuse to withdraw what I said.

Sir CHARLES COURT: May we know the words which are considered to be offensive?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I have already stated them twice.

Mr. O'Connor: The Leader of the Opposition was not in the Chamber at the time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I most certainly do not like to do this, but I am left with no alternative but to name the honourable member.

#### *Suspension of Member*

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The honourable member having been named as being in defiance of the Chair, I direct that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, take the action necessary for his suspension. I move—

That the member for Narrogin be suspended from the service of the House.

#### *Point of Order*

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this matter debatable or must it be taken to a vote without debate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is not open to debate.

Mr. RUSHTON: Under what Standing Order is that stated?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 165 which reads, in part—

The following matters are not open to debate, shall be moved without argument or opinion offered, and shall be forthwith put from the Chair without amendment:—

#### 71. Suspension of Member.

Motion put and a division called for. Bells rung and the House divided.

#### *Remarks During Division*

Mr. Nalder: For how long?

The SPEAKER: It is laid down under Standing Orders. It is 24 hours for a first offence.

Sir Charles Court: I understand that the Standing Order which stated that a member must cover his head if he wished to speak during a division has now been repealed. I wish to know whether this motion calls for a seconder and if, in fact, it was seconded?

Mr. Jamieson: At least we admit the motion was moved, which was more than you did.

Sir Charles Court: I checked *Hansard*; it was not moved.

Mr. Jamieson interjected.

Sir Charles Court: The Speaker was right; I had not moved a motion and I have had the *Hansards* checked.

Mr. Jamieson: Have another look.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the question shall be put forthwith so that it does not require a seconder.

Sir Charles Court: I raise another point so that I will not be ruled out of order later on. I understood the Minister for Works to say across the House that I had lied to the Parliament. If he did say that, I want those words withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The Leader of the Opposition will have to wait until the appropriate time.

#### *Result of Division*

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman
Mr. Hartrey	

(Teller)

## Noes—23

Mr. Nalder	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushtoa
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. Lewis	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mensaros	(Teller)

Motion thus negatived.

## Points of Order

Sir CHARLES COURT: Is now the correct time to raise my other point before some further business intervenes?

The SPEAKER: What point is this?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The interjection which was made during the division. I did not hear it fully—I simply heard that I had lied to the House. If those words were used, I want them withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: No debate was taking place.

Sir CHARLES COURT: On a further point of order, can I be assured that the words will not appear in *Hansard*?

The SPEAKER: I can assure the Leader of the Opposition they will not appear in *Hansard* because no debate was taking place for *Hansard* to report.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It has recorded remarks during divisions before.

## Debate Resumed

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If I may continue my speech—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How often are you going to defy the Chair? That is what is being done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Narrogin.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Pairs declared off in order that you may defy the Chair.

Sir Charles Court: This is the business of the House.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is what happened.

The SPEAKER: Members will keep order! The member for Narrogin will continue his speech.

Mr. Jamieson: They never do that even in the Federal House, and you know it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will have something to say on this in a moment. I think I had finished with the subject I was discussing—I do not know where I was up to.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is a fine performance from a former Chairman of Committees—

Mr. Williams: A fine performance for a Minister.

Mr. Hutchinson: Too trivial altogether.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: —to use this means to defeat the ruling of the Chair!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: On the 6th September I asked the Treasurer a question whether pay-roll tax is paid by high school hostels. The Treasurer replied that this depended on the law, and that no exemption is provided by law. I asked him to indicate whether he thought the tax should be imposed, but he rather avoided the question. He replied—

As the honourable member knows, it is necessary to amend the Act before exemption can be given. The matter will receive consideration.

I ask the Treasurer: When will it receive consideration? That answer was given over two months ago and no legislation has been brought to the House and no further information given. The matter should be given further consideration so that it may be dealt with on an equitable basis.

A number of departments are required to pay pay-roll tax, and I feel this is unjust. For instance, the losses sustained by the Railways Department are boosted because of the large sums of money the department pays to the Treasury by way of pay-roll tax. The Treasurer then wonders why the Railways Department is losing money. This applies to many other departments, but I do not intend to go into detail at this stage. However, we must take this matter into account when considering the Estimates. The collection of pay-roll tax from Government departments must involve a tremendous amount of work and the net result is nil. Why do we do it?

My last question is directed to the Minister for Works and Water Supplies. Money is to be spent this year on extensions to the comprehensive water scheme, and the Minister knows the problem we have north and west of Wickepin. I will not enlarge on it, because the Minister is well aware of the position. However, I do ask him what is happening to stage 3 of the comprehensive water scheme? Can the Minister advise the House, or me, what is happening so that co-ordinated action can be taken?

Mr. Jamieson: By way of interjection, the matter is well in hand, but until the Commonwealth comes along and says it is prepared to meet the same conditions as before, it is impossible to do anything more.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I realise that.

Mr. Jamieson: It is designed and well ahead in planning.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is the point I am raising: I would like to see what

has been designed and what the proposal is. It would be most helpful if we were aware of the plan being put to the Commonwealth. If the Minister tells us that, I will be quite happy.

Mr. Jamieson: It is a bit late in the session, but if you see me I will arrange for you to discuss it with the officer concerned.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is all I have to say. I thank the House for its indulgence.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [5.35 p.m.]: I do not wish to delay the House, but something has arisen during the last few days which I would like to draw to its attention. I am disappointed that the Minister for Agriculture has disappeared; he was in the House a moment ago.

A statement appeared in *The West Australian* of the 22nd November regarding the delivery of wheat into the system this year. It is headed, "Non-quota men also benefit." I have contacted the Wheat Quotas Committee and I find there is only a small proportion of nonquota wheat. We will set a very dangerous precedent if we condone the practice of growing wheat outside the quota system. Quotas have applied for four years, and it is now fairly well established that no wheat is to be grown outside a regulated system. We now find that nonquota wheat will be accepted.

The State, and indeed the Commonwealth, is faced with a drastic shortage of wheat at present. The estimated quota for Australia for the next year is 513,000,000 bushels, and the growers will need a very good season to produce this amount of wheat. I am afraid we will find a team of speculative growers taking advantage of the situation. Unless the season is particularly good, the wheat quota holders of Australia will face a big task next year, and I am afraid the speculative growers will set up in the industry on the strength of the announcement that non-quota wheat will be accepted. They will take their chance next year, knowing Western Australia will receive a large quota.

If the situation continues for another two or three years, we will have set up a new group of wheatgrowers who will demand big quotas when the situation does settle down. I presume we will again face a situation similar to that prevailing in 1968. I would like to say this will not happen, but I am afraid it will—we will find ourselves growing more wheat than we can sell. The silos will be filled up and the speculative growers will say, "We have been growing wheat for the last two or three years and we are therefore entitled to a quota." This will mean that the present quota holders will find a greater number of growers in the industry and a general reduction in base quotas.

Once we know accurately the amount of nonquota wheat, we should allow it into the system this year, but make a very definite announcement that future plantings of nonquota wheat will be taken on an annual basis and that nonquota wheat will not be accepted next year. This will keep the speculative growers out. At the present time many quota holders are drastically restricted. I have been arguing the wheatgrowers' case since quotas were introduced, but they are still not able to grow wheat to a reasonable capacity. It is not fair to allow people who have relinquished their right to an "old land" quota because of non-delivery to come in and take advantage of the situation.

I have spoken to the Vice-Chairman of the Wheat Quotas Committee and I understand that only a small amount of wheat will come from this source. If we throw the system wide open, we will create a very dangerous precedent. When we look at the situation fairly and honestly, we realise the first consideration must be the quota holders. I can see the necessity this year to let all quota holders have an open go, because if we set a percentage of the quota, it will work in favour of the holders of large quotas. A 100 per cent. increase on a 40,000 bushel quota will mean a lot more than the same increase on a 4,000 bushel quota.

We should say to the quota holders of Western Australia, "You may grow all the wheat you can because we will be able to take it into the system next year, but wheat grown by nonquota holders will not be received into the system."

I agree that overquota wheat should be paid for because the farmers and the State need the money. I hope the people who have grown over their quota for a number of years and whose wheat is stored as overquota wheat, will be paid. I hope this wheat is still registered as a delivery against the farm, because otherwise people could say, "The quota system only works occasionally. We will go on growing the wheat and putting it into storage."

If we proceed on this basis, in a few years we will find that the storage is all choked up, and the people who have grown the overquota wheat on the understanding it will be paid for will be keeping the genuine growers from their normal entitlement. I hope an announcement will be made that nonquota wheat will only be accepted on an annual basis and there is no chance of nonquota wheat being accepted next year. If the Minister makes the announcement now, he can then look at the situation in 12 months' time. The quota system has taken a great deal of time and trouble to set up, and it will be destroyed if nonquota wheat floods the market.

I would like to ask the Minister for Agriculture what progress has been made in regard to rye-grass poisoning. The

member for Katanning asked him a question about this last week. For the last three years we have known that a toxicity is present in the seed of rye grass and is obviously spreading. Three properties had this problem originally, but it has now spread to nine. In the past only sheep were affected, but it is now killing cattle. Perhaps cattle have died from this disease previously and their death has not been attributed to the toxicity in the rye grass, or perhaps the toxicity had not spread sufficiently to affect cattle herds.

A farmer in the Gnowangerup shire has lost 45 cattle from a herd of 99. I am afraid the indications are that it will become another serious problem in the areas where rye-grass pastures are dominant. From the answers to questions asked by my leader on Wednesday, the 15th November, it would appear that the disease is understood. Part (4) of the question reads—

Has any progress been made in the control of the disease?

The Minister replied—

Research and field studies to date have led to a clearer understanding of the disease.

I suggest that far more effort should be put into this investigation. Members who are familiar with stock raising in Western Australia will recall that years ago we had a pregnancy toxemia problem from clover dominant pasture. The problem was researched, but I feel the efforts made were not made soon enough. When Dwalganup clover was grown in wetter areas, this disease was very difficult to control.

The SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: We find that rye grass is now having the same effect on sheep, because in areas similar to those I have mentioned earlier we find that out of a flock of 300 ewes 40—which constitutes 14 or 15 per cent.—were aborted owing to rye grass toxicity.

It is evident, therefore, that now is the time to look into this problem and nip it in the bud before it spreads to other areas where rye grass is established. Rye grass is a vigorous grower and in some pastures it becomes dominant. As I have said I hope the department will look into this aspect in an endeavour to sort it out before the problem spreads and becomes even more serious than the one we experienced concerning pregnancy toxemia; particularly now when the State is endeavouring to rebuild its flocks of sheep after the ravages of the serious droughts which led many farmers to slaughter and reduce the numbers of their flocks.

Accordingly I hope we have a very firm and definite approach from the Department of Agriculture to ensure that the

problem is tackled with great urgency and a solution readily found. I say this because in only a couple of years this condition has spread from three pastures to nine, so who is to say how far it will spread in the next few years?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I did hope somebody was listening to me. I had hoped that the Minister would be listening.

I would now like to refer to school hostels. I deliberately left this matter to the last in order to give the Minister a chance to settle down after what happened a few minutes ago!

I support my colleague, the member for Narrogin, because I feel school hostels outside the metropolitan area are becoming a most difficult problem. I asked the Minister a question regarding the possibility of zoning pupils into areas with particular hostels. I understand this is done in the metropolitan area where pupils are zoned into schools not necessarily of their own choice.

We find that pupils in the country areas who desire to get away to a country hostel are being denied this opportunity, because the school hostels which are readily accessible are filled with pupils from outside their zone.

In particular I would like to cite the case of the Esperance hostel where there are some 35 vacancies for children. Quite a few of the children from that area are accommodated in hostels in the metropolitan area. This of course restricts and prevents the other districts from sending children who are much closer to the metropolitan area to a hostel in the metropolitan area.

This is something to which we will have to give consideration, to help arrange the allocation of hostel accommodation in an equitable manner to enable the children in the country districts to get to the hostel nearest their homes.

As the member for Narrogin has pointed out, and as has been mentioned to me, children from the Wickepin-Pingelly-Brookton area have to go to Bunbury. This of course means they are driving right away from their particular sphere of influence which is their local town, and for no good reason they must head for Bunbury. This constitutes an added burden to those living in the south-west corner of the State. The pupils from the Bunbury or Collie zone are in fact going to hostels in the Narrogin area. The pupils in areas west of Narrogin should be directed to the Bunbury area.

I am also disturbed by the agitation for the earlier age groups—children of five years old—to be included in the education system, on a compulsory basis. If this

happens, far greater sums of money will have to be spent. I am not against the introduction of the five-year-old into the system—I think it is a good thing. We should, however, consider first things first. With the curtailment of school buses the children who have to be catered for at the moment cannot get to the school of their choice. They will find, because of the shortage of numbers, they are missing out on their education and having to undertake correspondence courses.

If we include more children in this scheme money will have to be spent over a far greater area; it will have to be spent on a different age group and this will reduce the chances of being able to maintain school buses or schools in the country districts. It will be very nice for the children in the metropolitan area—and I do not say that this is a reason for not taking them into the schools a year earlier—but we must look at the situation in an equitable manner and ensure that equity is achieved and inequity reduced.

We will find that five-year-olds will be attending school in the metropolitan area and, because of the increased cost involved as a result of this extra year's education, the children in the country areas will be further neglected.

I do not know how the inclusion of the five-year-olds can be achieved on a compulsory basis, because we will have children of five and six years of age having to undertake the round trip of 90-odd miles. Some of them will have to travel 48 miles in the morning and cover the same distance in the evening. I cannot see what benefit would be derived by compulsorily putting the five-year-olds on a bus at 7.15 a.m. when they will not return home until 5.15 p.m. I certainly would not like to be the teacher who may be trying to educate these children because they are virtually only babies. They will have to travel about 50 miles in the morning and then wait at school all day for the bus to bring them home in the afternoon.

The child will have no other means of returning home apart from the school bus, and this will mean his having to be away from home all day. It will not be long before such children will stop attending school.

Before we introduce a compulsory scheme for five-year-olds to attend school we should ensure that some measure of equity is achieved and begin considering another bracket of youngsters. Those are the few points I wished to make.

**MR. RUSHTON** (Dale) [5.53 p.m.]: I would like to make a few brief comments. In the first place I would like to refer to the Government's greatest success, the withholding of information so that the public do not know what is going on. One aspect about which I would like to speak is the proposal to refund the receipts tax.

This is only a small item which, as I see it, amounts to \$29,000, which is to go to a fund for charitable purposes, while a sum of \$110,000 is to be returned to the people.

The people, however, are now considering this to be a huge joke. They all understood they were to get their money back; indeed we understood from statements on the hustings that this money was to be returned by the Tonkin Government.

The present Government's tenure of office has only another year to run and, as a result, very little of this money will be refunded as promised. We will find that an amount of \$5,000,000 will be spread over 10 years and this, of course, will commit future Governments—no matter what their political colour might be—to refunding the money in question. It is a strange way of financing and of fulfilling a promise, by committing Governments 10 years ahead to refunding a large sum of money.

**THE SPEAKER:** There is too much talking in the Chamber and behind me.

**MR. RUSHTON:** The refunds will be paid to companies or individuals, but they will not be able to pass on the money to the rightful owners—the people who paid the tax. It is difficult to obtain any information on this question from the Government. The Treasurer should be mindful that Parliament should be supplied with all the facts. In denying the people this information the Government is condemning itself.

The Government should show what percentage of the \$5,000,000 or thereabouts will be returned to the companies or individuals, and what percentage will be paid back to the rightful owners. I am sure the Commonwealth will receive a large proportion of it in the form of taxation.

The present Government has made a firm promise to refund the receipts tax, but up to date only a very small portion of it has been refunded. This Government has a little over a year to complete its term of office, and it will be interesting to see whether next year an amount of \$500,000 will be included in the Estimates for refund of the receipts tax. Repayment is to be spread over 10 years, and it is most likely that this Government will be committing Governments of the future—in all probability Governments of my political persuasion.

**MR. T. D. EVANS:** You need not worry about that happening.

**MR. RUSHTON:** The people of the State are concerned about this. They do not think that money should be refunded to companies or individuals who basically are not entitled to it. This is totally unacceptable.

I hope that when Parliament meets again in the next session the actual figures relating to refund of the receipts tax will be presented. If they are we will know what percentage has been returned to the rightful owners.

Another question I wish to deal with is unemployment, and in this regard the Government owes us an explanation of what has happened in the State. Some of the relief measures applied by this Government in June came too late. When the previous Government was in office and took similar measures to bring about relief they were introduced in February. The previous Government anticipated a decline in the economy and was able to take steps to cushion the effects. However, the present Government took action in June, and it provided next to nothing in finance.

As has been mentioned in the news media, one project which the Premier claimed would bring about some relief in the unemployment situation was the Naval Base housing project, but that has now been put into cold storage. It is not being proceeded with, because of the likelihood of pollution.

In recent times we saw the case of a person from another country who wished to establish a lingerie factory. Whatever might be the merits of this enterprise the Government has not given it any encouragement. Surely a person who is prepared to establish a factory at Rockingham to produce lingerie should be encouraged, especially as it is to be established at a centre where there is a pool of skilled labour available.

That case was bad enough, but worse was that of a manufacturer who previously employed 35 to 40 people in his factory. Because of the difficult winter season he had to reduce the work force to 20 on a part-time basis. This business was placed in jeopardy for the sake of a few thousand dollars of risk capital. I made a plea to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and also to the Premier, but it was rejected. By providing \$5,000, this person would have been able to increase his work force from 20 on a part-time basis to 40 on a full-time basis. This is the sort of example we see as being the Government's effort to relieve unemployment.

This Government owes it to the people to give an explanation of the efforts it has made to relieve unemployment. Its contribution by way of finance to relieving unemployment is so confused that we cannot see the true picture. The answers to some questions asked in this House have indicated that little has been done by the Government.

The best method to relieve unemployment would be to start some works at a reasonably early date. This would relieve the hardship which is being experienced

by the young and the old. I am sure they prefer constant work to receiving hand-outs.

Relating to the establishment of industry it will be seen from the answers to questions that the Government has done nothing in the Armadale area. In the list of industries which the Government supplied mention was made of the influence on Rockingham of the Co-operative Bulk Handling installation at Kwinana. This was not a Government effort. The extension is due to the good work done by the management of C.B.H.

Another matter I wish to bring up is the provision of houses for the naval personnel who will be stationed at H.M.A.S. *Stirling*. I suppose one can regard this as one of the misfortunes of the Tonkin Administration. In this instance there is need for a bold display of confidence in an area like Rockingham or Safety Bay. The Government should encourage projects so as to provide work for the people engaged in the building trades.

The Government has made a decision to deny the people, who are and will be working in this area, the opportunity to live in proximity to their place of employment. The Government is insisting that they travel an extra 14 miles each day.

The strange thinking of the Government is highlighted by the fact that there are 2,600 vacant blocks at Rockingham. Yet the Government had the effrontery to tell us and the people that it will insist on its decision to build the Navy houses at Kwinana. This is one of the strange decisions that have been made by this Government. It is certainly a blot on its administration. Firstly, the decision cannot be deemed to be satisfactory. If any member were to approach any resident in the Rockingham-Safety Bay area he would be told that it is a wrong decision and that the people there cannot understand the reason for it especially when the Government attempted to establish a suburb at Naval Base. It is considered that the argument for the Government's decision does not hold water.

The Government's decision, of course, means that the Navy personnel at H.M.A.S. *Stirling*, in travelling to and from their place of residence, will cover an extra 14 miles a day. This just does not add up. Such a decision also tends to lessen the confidence of the people in the area and undermines the confidence of those engaged in the building industry. There is no doubt that this confidence needs to be restored.

When I read the answers given to the questions I asked yesterday and today relating to the Government's intention in regard to industry at Rockingham, I had high hopes that the Brand Government's desire to establish light industries extending from Dixon Road to less attractive



industries near the Western Mining Corporation area would be fulfilled, but now that planning has been disregarded by Government preference for a proposition that this area be tied up for development by the Fremantle Port Authority, which is also linked with Pacminex and all the other projects to be established there. I object to this move.

Further, this action by the Government has been taken without any clear announcement of its intentions. Therefore the Government must face the charge that it is not telling the people what is really going on. The only information we have been able to gain has been drawn out from the Government by chance, but we want a clear understanding of what is taking place. It would appear that the people at Kwinana beach have been sold down the drain.

I now wish to speak about school books. In answer to a question of mine, the Minister said he had no intention of initiating a cost system in regard to the printing or publication of books for school children. We believe in freedom of choice, but the Government is going about this matter in another way and controlling the supply of school books that are issued to the various Government schools. This is an issue that will be raised at the next election.

What I really object to is the Minister making the statement that he is aware of what it costs to produce the books that are supplied by the Education Department, and he is not prepared to introduce a practical cost system so that this information may be accurate. Further, the Minister made a statement to the Press implying that those in the private sector are profiteers. He said that to obtain the supply of school books from the private sector would cost much more than having them printed by the Government or the department. Yet, when he is asked, he does not know what the cost is. This is how our economy is running down; by the Government making decisions that are unacceptable not only to members of Parliament, but also to the public in general. The Government's priorities are obviously wrong. If the Government could see the true picture, it would realise it would obtain far better results by having school books printed outside the department.

It therefore behoves the Government, certainly in the autumn session, to put before us a clear picture of the cost of printing school books. Another factor is that the officers of the department who have been employed in preparing the material for publication in these school books no doubt have been withdrawn from other duties which they are supposed to perform.

Mr. Bryce: Are you objecting to experts being withdrawn from schools to assist in the publication of textbooks?

Mr. RUSHTON: No, I am merely saying that officers—I understand it could be members of the inspectorial staff—should be visiting schools and paying attention to more important matters instead of being employed on preparing material for the publication of these books. In other words, I am only asking for a clear-cut explanation from the Government as to what is actually happening in regard to the publication of these textbooks. We accept the fact that the honourable member places some importance on the regimented system, but we believe in free choice, with a supplement. However, as I have said, this is a matter we can argue on the hustings at the next general election. At the moment all we are asking is that the Government give a clear picture of the existing position.

I would point out to the member for Ascot that I do not hold myself up as a "know-all."

Mr. Jamieson: That is the laugh of the year! You could have fooled us! You have even made the Press laugh.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why does not the Government disclose all the facts about the printing of school books by the Education Department?

Mr. Bryce: You have stated that it is a regimented system, but I could prove that the opposite is the case.

Mr. RUSHTON: The honourable member has a right to do so. I say it is a regimented system in view of the literature that is presented to the schools. It tends to reduce the effectiveness of certain people in regard to the carrying out of various duties in the schools.

I would point out that primary schools in particular are becoming involved with recordings and other day-to-day menial duties because of this system. These are special matters that should be studied factually and truthfully and not for political gain. Officers should be employed to ascertain the cost and the advantages and disadvantages involved. This is the information that should be compiled so that we can assess the real situation in regard to this new system. For example, if we are told that the cost to print school books by the Education Department will be \$6, and eventually the figure is \$9, this is not acceptable and we should know the actual position.

At this point of time I believe schools should be provided with their basic requirements—that is, they should be provided with facilities such as libraries and canteens—before free school books.

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

Mr. RUSHTON: Prior to the tea suspension I was saying that I would prefer to see the Government provide the basic necessities in the schools, as is the case in high schools. If the Government

provided playing fields, canteens, and libraries for primary schools it would reduce considerably the embarrassment faced by parents and citizens' associations. It would be preferable if parents were called upon to make some contribution towards textbooks so that the teachers would have a freer choice. Unnecessary administrative work involved in the handling of free school books would be eliminated. I realise this is something on which we do not all agree and it is a subject which we will probably debate at length within a year or so.

I would like the Minister to undertake to supply detailed figures regarding school supplies, and not just a total figure to be included in the Estimates. I feel the cost involved in supplying free school books is considerably more than would be the case if those books were supplied by the private sector. The supply of school books by the Government has a restrictive effect. Obviously, the export of school books will be affected, as employment will be.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The books are being produced in Western Australia by Western Australians.

Mr. RUSHTON: It seems to me that we are slumming.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We are not slumming at all. The member for Dale is being particularly unfair and not objective.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not want to arouse the Minister. I simply wanted to make that statement and I will now move on to the subject of housing and what is being done under the administration of this Government.

I will refer, particularly, to the State Housing Commission and its activities. It really does not matter whether one lives in a modest or a luxurious home; it is the planning, the compatibility of the community, and the diversification of the residences which are important.

Replies I have received to questions asked indicate that there is an acknowledgment that the diversification of communities in housing areas is advantageous. A housing area does not have to be of one strata or another.

The member for Cockburn, when in Opposition, stressed this point and I supported him at the time. We witnessed what occurred at Orelia and Calista, and the principle adopted in those suburbs should be continued. In the period of 20 months since this Government has been in office I have received replies to questions on this subject. On the 7th November I obtained some statistics relating to the ratio of persons per acre in housing areas.

The density in Orelia was 12 per gross acre; in Balga it was 11; in Manning, a development of a few years ago, it was 10; in Medina, 11; and in Coolbellup, 12. They

were all about the same. However, under this Government the density in Southwell is 15 and in Koonawarra it is 18. I am sure that the situation at Koonawarra has been created for political reasons and the people are expected to live under conditions which are not acceptable.

By maintaining these high densities people of the one strata are being congregated in the one area and similarly the children are all going to the one school. In this way they do not get an opportunity to lift themselves from the environment. This is not good.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That must have been your experience.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have seen it because it is occurring at Kelmscott at the moment. The M.R.P.A. presented a plan of an area based on minimums. The previous Government was not happy about it because it was one of the poorest planning developments proposed. However, since the change of Government the State Housing Commission has bought up extensive numbers of blocks and is placing people in the area. There is no diversification and the people gain no advantages by living there. The way the commission is acting at the moment is causing it to go downhill.

Mr. Taylor: No.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is not looking after the people's needs.

Mr. Taylor: It is acting in the same way it has acted for a long time.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am glad the Minister for Labour has returned to the Chamber.

Mr. Taylor: The Orelia subdivision was possible only because the Government of the day had a large tract of land on which to work. Until the system changes, no matter which Government is in office, you will find pockets of State Housing Commission ownership; and this cannot be changed unless you get big developments. You could not, and we could not.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is not totally right.

Mr. Taylor: I am sure it is.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister for Labour had good intentions.

Mr. Taylor: I was the Minister for Housing.

Mr. RUSHTON: But not for long enough. Does the Minister consider that what is being done at Koonawarra is in the best interests of the people there?

Mr. Taylor: No; nor were any of the other developments.

Mr. RUSHTON: But many things can be done to improve the situation. The present densities are unacceptable. I want to emphasise at this point that the Government is not learning by past experience.

Mr. Taylor: We are learning. You and I both agree, but what is possible is another thing.

Mr. RUSHTON: We have no evidence that the lessons have been learnt. Let me give an example. Private development was commenced to the west of Armadale and people had built on the firm understanding that the area would be privately developed. However, overnight the State Housing Commission bought in excess of 100 blocks and erected the standard commission homes. To me this is totally unacceptable. When only five or six commission homes are built in a private area this is all right because they can be absorbed, but to the west of Armadale the private sector is surrounded by commission homes. I am not in any way reflecting on those living in them, but I am objecting to this policy.

This is why confidence has been lost and it is a factor which is contributing to the high prices being obtained in other areas; but we will have more to say about that later. People are prepared to pay a high price because they are certain that others will not intrude.

This is not class consciousness. It is a matter of organising compatible communities in which people can live without being subjected to problems they had not envisaged. I am receiving phone calls and letters from people in areas like Balga asking for details on how they can transfer to Armadale or Kelmscott. Why is this?

Mr. Bryce: It must be because of the tremendous member representing the district!

Mr. RUSHTON: That might be too much praise altogether! All I am saying is that we must establish communities in which people desire to live and the only way to achieve this is to pay more attention to diversification. I had high hopes when the Minister for Labour was Minister for Housing because I thought that with his influence on the Government greater consideration would be given to this aspect; but the situation has worsened. We were going uphill with the Brand Government, but we are now going downhill very quickly, and I can visualise all the social problems which will result. As I said earlier, we have densities now which are almost 50 per cent. higher than the densities at places like Coolbellup and Balga. This is what the Government has done at Koonawarra and it does not represent forward thinking. As I understand the situation it was done against the wishes of the local authorities at that point of time.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Which point of time?

Mr. RUSHTON: In the earlier stages the South Perth City Council objected to it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You referred to "that point of time." I just wished to know which point.

Mr. RUSHTON: We might define that another time.

I want to refer to the conflict that is arising with one of the shires I represent. I refer to the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott. The shire had a deputation to the Minister for Housing and said, "Let us have something better than you are now giving us. We have enjoyed a compatible, integrated community over the years. We are losing that because of some of the actions of the commission. Let us look at it in depth and see what we can do to improve it."

Mr. Bickerton: What a great help you would be to any Minister for Housing if you knew what you were talking about!

Mr. RUSHTON: I am prepared to learn. The Minister received the deputation and rejected the submissions.

Mr. Bickerton: Whose submissions?

Mr. RUSHTON: The submissions of the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire.

Mr. Bickerton: You know what goes on up there. Why don't you ask them before you blow your top?

Mr. RUSHTON: It was in the paper.

Mr. Bickerton: Do you take notice of the paper?

Mr. RUSHTON: The shire has spoken to me about its concern.

Mr. Bickerton: Attend one of the meetings and ask them.

Mr. RUSHTON: Everyone in this House hopes that these densities will not continue. In conclusion, I hope the Minister and the commission will make a New Year resolution to rethink the practices they are perpetrating on the people by way of increased densities. I hope they will make an earnest endeavour to produce far more compatible communities which do not depend upon the Police Force and so on to keep them under control. We want people to enjoy their lives and share in the good things of life. We do not want them to be inflicted with social hardships which are purely man-made.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [7.47 p.m.]: I wanted to touch on a number of matters in this debate but I understand it is desired to adjourn it as soon as possible after eight o'clock in order to deal with some other items. Therefore, at this stage I will confine my speech to one matter and deal with the other items when speaking to the departmental Estimates.

I want to refer to the organisation in Perth which is known as the Aboriginal Advancement Council. I refer to it because everyone in Western Australia seems to have the idea that it is a big, strong organisation which, of all the organisations dealing with Aborigines, is the most representative of the Aborigines. The

news media—the papers and radio and television stations—invariably go to the leaders of that organisation if they want an expression of the views of the Aborigines in Western Australia.

I think most people in the State would be astonished to know how few financial members this organisation has. It issues a balance sheet each year, and for last year subscriptions of members are listed at \$133. That is misleading because 40 organisations are supposed to be members of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. Those organisations seldom send a representative to attend meetings of the council but they pay a subscription of \$3 a year. Therefore, of the \$133, \$120 represents subscriptions from the affiliated organisations.

That leaves \$13. The subscription to this organisation for an ordinary member is \$1, which indicates that last year the council had 13 financial members. A few days ago I said the council had 20 members but today the president of the council contradicted some of the things I said. He said, "Our membership is about 25 to 30. Everybody realises \$22,000 does not go far today." He was speaking about some money made available to the organisation by the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, the president puts the membership of the Aboriginal Advancement Council at 25 to 30 Aborigines.

Apart from the fact that the news media always go to this organisation as being the one which is most representative of the Aborigines in Western Australia, the Commonwealth Government and other authorities make very large sums of money available to the organisation each year, being no doubt under the impression that it is a relatively large organisation. In 1970 the Commonwealth Government made available \$15,000; last year it made available \$17,000; this year it made available \$22,000. In the 1971 balance sheet we see a grant to this organisation from the W.A. Lotteries Commission to the extent of \$7,500. So both the Commonwealth Government and the State Government are involved as well as many other organisations. The council receives donations from churches and other authorities.

In the last financial year the total receipts of the organisation were \$49,958.49, which is almost \$50,000; yet according to the president of the organisation it has 25 to 30 members. On the statement of assets we find the assets comprise land, buildings, and that sort of thing to the value of \$160,579. I repeat: the assets are \$160,000-odd, the council receives \$50,000 a year, and it has a membership of 25 to 30.

Mr. O'Connor: What does the Surf Life Saving Association receive?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Narrogin raised a matter today. He was looking for some money. I suggest as far as this council is concerned some money could be saved.

Mr. Bertram: Does the Commonwealth or the State give it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Commonwealth has given the Aboriginal Advancement Council money under the impression that it is a large organisation. The Lotteries Commission has also given substantial amounts. Church organisations, too, have given substantially.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Is not the responsibility on the Commonwealth Government and the Lotteries Commission to ensure that the right thing is being done?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is administered, under the Charitable Collections Act, by the Chief Secretary's Department in Western Australia. The responsibility lies with that department. I have checked with the Commonwealth Audit Office and the State Auditor-General's Department, but neither office has anything to do with the administration of that Act.

Mr. O'Neill: That may be one of the charities the Minister is looking into.

Mr. Bertram: What about the auditors' report?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I ask members to look at the auditors' report for last year in respect of this organisation. Whenever the subject is raised, the secretary or president of the Aboriginal Advancement Council says that the books are open to the public—which is absolute nonsense—and that there is nothing wrong anywhere along the line.

I refer to the report on the audit conducted by Duncan McPhail & Co. It reads, in part—

Audit for the year ended 31st December, 1971.

The above audit has been completed and the records found to be maintained in not a completely satisfactory manner, but we would comment as follows:—

Under the heading of "Wages" the report continues—

Owing to the nature of the recipients it is practically impossible in some cases to obtain the normal receipt from the person who is entitled to the wages. In many cases where other people have signed on behalf of the authorised earner no authority has been received. In other words, no signature has been recorded not even a mark which is acceptable provided it is witnessed. There are numerous incidences of irregular receipts.

The auditors give the impression that, owing to the nature of the recipients, it is practically impossible in some cases to obtain a normal receipt. This organisation

has only a handful of individuals working for it and all of them are capable of signing their names.

It is not a question of this organisation handing out money to anyone, as we can see from its financial statement for last year. Of an amount of \$50,000 allocated to the organisation, only \$87 was spent on actual welfare. This is what the auditors say. Under the heading "Receipts" the report continues—

We have accepted the actual amount of deposits representing income, but have been unable in many incidences to verify the analysis of the income . . .

This is the kind of auditors' report which the Chief Secretary's Department received from that organisation last year. However the position goes much further than that.

Under the Charitable Collections Act, it is necessary for any organisation collecting money for charity to provide an audited annual financial statement to the Chief Secretary's office at the conclusion of the year. Let us see what happened last year in respect of that proviso in the legislation. Months after the end of the annual financial year, on the 3rd May, the secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department wrote to the Aboriginal Advancement Council as follows:—

Under the provisions of the above Act, Registered Charitable Organisations are required to supply an annual audited statement of receipts and expenditure.

A certified statement for the twelve months following the date of the last statement submitted by your organisations is now outstanding and I shall be pleased if this could be forwarded at your earliest convenience.

Again, on the 13th July, the secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department wrote another letter, as follows:—

I recently addressed a communication to you requesting the supply of an up to date statement of receipts and expenditure as required by the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

The statement has not yet been received and is considerably overdue. Will you, therefore, give the matter your further attention.

He wrote again on the 16th August, but still no reply was received, notwithstanding that the financial year in question had ended in the previous December. Another letter was written from the Chief Secretary's Department as follows:—

I recently addressed a communication to you requesting the supply of an up to date statement of receipts and expenditure as required by the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

The statement has not yet been received and is considerably overdue. Will you, therefore, give the matter your further attention.

There was still no reply from the Aboriginal Advancement Council. On the 1st October, 1971, the Chief Secretary's Department wrote yet another letter to the council as follows:—

I recently addressed a communication to you requesting the supply of an up to date statement of receipts and expenditure as required by the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

The statement has not yet been received and is considerably overdue. Will you, therefore, give the matter your further attention.

Then, on the 2nd November, another letter was written by Mr. Campbell of the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. O'Connor: To whom is it addressed?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is addressed to Mr. Winder, Secretary of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. The letter is as follows:—

Charitable Collections Act, 1946.

I recently addressed a communication to you requesting the supply of an up to date statement of receipts and expenditure as required by the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

The statement has not yet been received and is considerably overdue. Will you, therefore, give the matter your further attention.

That was on the 2nd November, 1971. Then, on the 3rd December, 1971, the Under-Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department began to get fed up because he had already written about seven letters.

Mr. O'Neil: He has been a very patient fellow up to date.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Indeed, he has. This time he wrote as follows:—

On September 3, a letter requesting your organisations financial statement for the year ending February 28, 1971 was forwarded to you and you replied on May 20 to the effect that this matter was in the hands of your Treasurer.

Again on July 13, August 16, October 1 and November 2, 1971 similar requests were made and it is now noted that this statement is not yet to hand.

I draw your attention to the Provisions of Section 15 of the Charitable Collections Act, 1946 under which your Organisation is registered, which reads as follows:—

He then indicated the provisions of the Charitable Collections Act, and mentioned the penalties, etc. He finished on this note—

I would be most reluctant to recommend action as provided therein to obtain the return sought after and seek your co-operation and prompt attention to this matter.

Then, almost 12 months after the original letter we find him writing again on the 13th January, 1972, still trying to obtain the financial statement for the year ended the 31st December, 1970. He wrote as follows:—

Ref: Charitable Collections Act,  
1946-1949.

I refer you to my letter of December 3, 1971 concerning the lodging with this office of the audited financial statement of Receipts and Payments and Balance Sheet of your Council for the year ending February 28, 1971, which has now been outstanding for almost twelve (12) months.

It is again noted that you have neglected to comply with my repeated requests and unless the papers are received within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of this letter by you or your explanation and reasons for the undue delay is to hand action as previously advised will be taken forthwith and the matter brought to the Hon. Minister's attention with a recommendation that your accounts be investigated with a view to cancelling your registration as a charity and transference of any funds to some other worthy or similar charitable purpose.

To avoid such action your urgent attention is again requested.

So the situation is that the Under-Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department had to write seven letters, extending well over 12 months, to try to get the accounts.

Mr. Hartrey: They should have replied, "This correspondence has now ceased."

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the under-secretary of the department might have got to that point.

We find the provisions in the Act are very strict in this respect. Section 15 of the Act states—

(1) Every person, society, body or association who or which collects or receives or before the passing of this Act collected or received any money or goods for any charitable purpose shall at the time or times when required by the Minister, submit to the Minister an audited account setting out the money and goods so collected or received and a statement of particulars of the manner in which the same have been dealt with.

(2) The accounts of all persons, societies, bodies or associations referred to in the next preceding subsection shall be audited by a person approved by the Minister.

(3) Every person, society, body or association who or which contravenes or fails to comply with the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds.

(4) When any society, body, or association is liable to any such penalty every member of the committee or governing body thereof or (if there is no committee or governing body thereof) every member of the society, body or association shall be severally liable to the penalty unless he proves that the offence was committed without his knowledge or without his consent.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member has not much more to read.

Mr. O'Connor: Only another seven letters!

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, Mr. Speaker. However, the letters I have read out indicate the sloppy manner in which the organisation keeps its books. Exactly the same pattern occurred this year. I could read a sheaf of letters along exactly the same lines, all addressed to the Secretary of the Aboriginal Advancement Council by the Chief Secretary's Department—but the department was left lamenting.

Mr. O'Neil: It must have had to put on a second correspondence clerk to deal with the correspondence.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I agree. As the honourable member mentioned earlier, the department was extraordinarily patient with the organisation. The serious aspect is that which I mentioned earlier; that the organisation is dealing with \$50,000 a year and has assets to the extent of about \$160,000 a year.

Mr. Bertram: Assets to the extent of \$160,000 a year?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am sorry, I meant it has assets to the extent of about \$160,000. The receipts of the organisation amount to about \$50,000 a year and yet, according to the president, it has only 25 to 30 members.

Mr. Hartrey: I would like to have a share in that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is an extraordinary state of affairs. There is no doubt that the money is being squandered. One of the items included in the balance sheet is an amount of \$5,162 for furniture and equipment in the hostel known as Kul-lark in Beaufort Street. The council bought a building there and runs a hostel, although it is now without a superintendent.

It is rather interesting to see what happened to that \$5,000-odd worth of furniture. I am informed it is teak furniture, although that may be wrong.

Mr. Coyne: Was teak furniture!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes. Three months after the furniture was provided a member who represents an organisation affiliated with the Aboriginal Advancement Council, and two or three other members of the council, virtually forced their way into the

hostel. They were met at the door by the person in charge and told that under no circumstances could they enter. Notwithstanding the fact that they were members of the council, the person in charge had instructions from the secretary (Mr. Winder) that they were not to be admitted.

They entered, anyway, and afterwards they listed the damage. The following is the letter one of the persons wrote to another member of the council:—

The following is a summary of the notes I made yesterday in the course of our tour. They are a bit scrappy but no doubt you will have in your mind a very clear picture as to the complete setting.

There appeared to be no suite of furniture intact in the bedrooms. Some however were in better condition than others. Broken mirrors were the most common form of vandalism. Also, every wardrobe had damaged doors and some bedrooms had wardrobes where the panels had been removed completely. There was a pile of broken furniture from several rooms against the wall of the third bedroom we inspected, the mirror was missing from the dressing table and there were no curtains on the window.

The fourth bedroom had a broken mirror and a smashed panel removed from the wardrobe. The next one had no doors on the wardrobe and broken drawers in the dressing table. There were empty beer bottles in a carton of dirty clothes and further damage in the following one.

In room eight there were smashed drawers in the dressing table. In room nine only one door was left on the wardrobe. Room ten was locked and the front doorbell was fixed to the door. In room eleven knobs had been torn from the wardrobe and woodwork was damaged.

The laundry had a broken window and piles of dirty washing littered the floor. The toilet seat was unhinged and the bowl was filthy. The toilet in the manager's bathroom was also in a dirty condition. There were two piles of empty beer and wine bottles in the yard. The whole aspect of the place indicates lack of supervision.

It is difficult to see the value of more than five thousand dollars claimed to have been spent in furniture and equipment. One thing is certain: a valuer would probably assess the total at no more than a few hundred dollars in view of the amount of repair that needs to be done.

One of the members of the inspection party is an extremely responsible woman who has been the head of various schools for delinquent girls.

Mr. O'Connor: Had they just cleaned it up before she got there?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know about that. The point I am making is that the Aboriginal Advancement Council spent over \$5,000 on that furniture, and within three months the damage to it was estimated at approximately \$4,500. That is an indication of how money is spent by the council.

Another aspect regarding that hostel which disturbs me greatly is that at present it has no supervisor. I understand about 19 youths, all aged between about 18 and 19, live at the hostel. As far as I am aware they all receive social service benefits. I have been told by members of the council—who are prepared to testify at any inquiry—that these youths undertake nightly car-stealing forays. They do not merely go out and steal one car a night; they steal a number of them. According to the people who made the allegation the cars are used for the purpose of theft in the suburbs. Those are serious allegations made in good faith by people who know the situation.

The people who made the allegations are also concerned at the incidence of venereal disease amongst those boys. Indeed, the Aborigines who erected the tent in the grounds of Parliament House were horrified at the thought of the boys from the hostel coming to the tent. They did not want them sitting on the blankets, etc., because of the incidence of venereal disease amongst them. That is a serious allegation made by Aborigines in respect of other Aboriginal boys at the hostel.

Those boys, about 19 or 20 of them, all receive social service benefits and live virtually without supervision at the hostel. They do not even clean up their rooms because a woman comes in and does that for them. What sort of organisation is this? The only supervision the boys receive is from Mr. Jack Davis, the President of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, and from Mr. Winder, the secretary of the council. Neither of those men should be in charge of a youth hostel; there is no doubt about that.

For instance, Mr. Winder was recently overseas in Peking. I do not want to criticise him, but I think I should mention that whilst he was in Peking he was still on probation for a rather serious offence he committed in this State. He was convicted on the 21st April, 1971, and placed on probation for two years. Yet recently he was in Peking representing Australia.

Mr. Hartrey: He would not be on probation there.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I take it he obtained authority to leave the country, because had he not done so he would have breached the terms of his probation. I mention that

to indicate he is not the type of person—and this is only one offence; there are others—to be in charge of a youth hostel. The only supervision of the boys at the hostel is provided by Mr. Winder and Mr. Davis.

The Aboriginal Advancement Council has an executive, but it is composed mainly of Aborigines who take little part in its affairs. The executive does what it likes and never conveys what it has done to the council meetings, which are attended by delegates of the various affiliated organisations. The executive runs the whole show.

When Mr. Winder was in China recently he and his party made a number of statements. For instance, I have one here from an Eastern States newspaper. The following article appeared in *The Sun* under the heading of "‘Envoys’ to China—Red carpet for our blacks in Peking":—

PEKING, Sun.—A film showing police breaking up the aboriginal tent "embassy" in Canberra was shown in Peking this weekend.

The film was brought to China by nine aborigines led by Mr. "Chika" Dixon, of the Black Caucus.

The screening was at the Institute of Nationalities, where guests at a reception for the Aboriginal delegation disapproved of the action of the Canberra police and the Australian Government.

"We used this film to illustrate what is going on in Australia and to point out how we are being discriminated against by a racist Government," Mr. Dixon said.

The aborigines, who are on a month's visit to China, are being treated like state visitors in Peking.

A red carpet was rolled out for them when they arrived last Wednesday. Representatives of China's national groups in traditional costumes welcomed them at the airport.

Mr. Dixon is staying in a large suite at the most luxurious hotel in Peking, the Peking Hotel.

All bills, including air fares, are being paid by China's People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries.

The visit is likely to cost \$12,000.

The aborigines have been entertained at two banquets and have visited Chinese at work and cultural centres.

Mr. Dixon has taken to wearing a Chairman Mao blue boiler suit with a "land rights now" badge pinned to his lapel.

He would not be quoted directly about the aims of the delegation, but agreed to make a statement which, he said, represented the views of the delegation.

The statement said: "We are just a group of aborigines who have been invited to China. This is historical—we are the first group of blacks out of racist Australia.

"Australia is an apathetic, racist country."

These are the sorts of statements which were made by this delegation to Peking.

In the *Daily News* we see a photograph of the delegation including Mr. Winder of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. Many of the delegates in that picture are shown as giving the "Black Power" salute. The badge which some of them are wearing seems to be the same as those that can be seen around Perth. They are very large ones worn on the arm. They are red, black and green in colour, with the red symbolising blood, the black the colour of their skin, and green representing land rights.

These individuals are making statements about Australia being a racist country. One of the members of this delegation and a party to the statement that racism exists in Australia is the Secretary of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. Here is an organisation which has never had it so good, and none of the staff of that organisation has ever had it so good. Here it is with 25 to 30 members having an annual income of about \$50,000, with assets in excess of \$160,000. Yet, an individual who has a police record, and who is out on probation, can leave Australia and go to Peking together with the other members of the delegation where they make statements of the kind I have mentioned—that Australia is a racist country. These are treacherous statements.

If the Chinese realised the conditions under which these people lived in Australia they would have done something about the statements they made. I imagine that in China every individual would be required to pull his weight in the community. I imagine that they would be horrified at the thought of the existence of any organisation of the kind to which I referred. Here we have the organisation spending in the last financial year the sum of \$46,154, but the interesting aspect is the item in respect of welfare payments.

As it is a Perth-based organisation we can imagine many Aborigines who are down and out in the Perth area making approaches to it. I know this from experience; they go along to seek assistance but invariably they are knocked back. This is why the great majority of Aborigines in the metropolitan area are not



members of the organisation, and they would not be members under any circumstances. Many of them are members of the other organisations—the New Era Aboriginal Fellowship and the Aboriginal Rights League.

Over and over again Aborigines have said to me that under no circumstances would they be prepared to belong to the Aboriginal Advancement Council, and yet this is the body which is being supplied with funds by the Government. I have before me an item showing welfare payments amounting to \$87.30 for last year. If anyone wants to find out whether criticism of this organisation exists all he has to do is meet some of the Aborigines and ask them what they think of it.

Mr. Bertram: How long have they been receiving grants?

Mr. GRAYDEN: For some considerable time. It is deplorable that money is being channelled into this organisation when the money could be put into much more worthwhile organisations which look after the welfare of the Aborigines.

There are many more points I could bring up in respect of this subject, but I know there is some anxiety to conclude this item on the notice paper, in order that other items might be dealt with. With those remarks I conclude my contribution to the debate.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Bateman.

*(Continued on page 5771)*

## ROAD TRANSPORT SYSTEM

### *Inquiry by Royal Commission: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 18th October, on the following motion by Mr. O'Connor:—

This House is of the opinion that a full scale inquiry—in the form of a Royal Commission—should be undertaken by people with the required experience and capability into the road transport system of this State with special reference to the owner/driver section of the industry in view of the current instability of this section of the industry, and the complaints about discrimination in the administration of the permit system and collection of the road maintenance tax.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [8.22 p.m.]: I have been asked by the Premier to reply to the debate, and in doing so I shall use the notes which the Premier has prepared. These notes naturally refer to the Premier.

In introducing the motion to the House the member for Mt. Lawley made various statements regarding inconsistencies in administration of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. He referred to dis-

crimination between operators and contradictions in answers to questions and in correspondence. This is surprising when it is noted that many of his own remarks, when examined, are inconsistent and contradictory.

Earlier this year the Government was criticised for its alleged failure to enforce the payment of road maintenance tax. It was criticised even to the extent of having failed to send people to prison for not paying this tax. Now the Government is being charged with being unduly harsh on those who are unable to pay the tax. The member for Mt. Lawley went so far as to suggest, to quote his own words, that the road maintenance tax be frozen at a certain point at which the Government should declare that back taxes from that point need not be paid forthwith.

What does he suggest should be done about those who have already paid? Or does he suggest that in terms of those the Government should discriminate? I seem to be asking a question now that is very close to the question which the member for Mt. Lawley himself asked earlier.

Mr. O'Connor: I will answer that at the appropriate time.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: If we compare our answers they may be the same. I also pose the question: How does all this line up with his later statement when he expressed concern about some operators having to pay, while others do not? He follows this up by saying that the State and the hauliers will be affected by the resultant huge loss of moneys, because that much less will be spent on the maintenance of our roads.

Mr. O'Connor: You are taking my remarks out of context. I will put them into the right order when I am able to.

Mr. Thompson: The Minister is not able to do that.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The honourable member is a good judge of that, so I will take notice of what he says in that regard!

### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr. THOMPSON: I would ask the Minister to withdraw the derogatory statement he made.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we have had enough of that this afternoon. I do not think frivolous remarks will be accepted. My ruling is that it is a frivolous statement.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I have no objection to withdrawing the statement of accusing the honourable member of being a good judge, or of being a bad judge, depending on the circumstances.

### *Debate Resumed*

Mr. T. D. EVANS: There is the reference to an amount of over \$500,000 owing for road maintenance tax. I would like to point out that something like half that

amount was allowed to accrue before this Government took office. If something had been done to correct the drift at that time the position would have been much better than we find it now.

As for people neglecting to keep records because they thought the road maintenance tax was to be abolished, there could be no exemption from complying with the law until it was abolished.

I think the member for Mt. Lawley is one who upholds law and order, and I am sure he will be the first to agree with this. Until the law is abolished all persons bound by that law are expected to adhere to it.

Mr. Thompson: The Premier made emphatic statements at the last election that this law would be abolished. Is it not reasonable to assume that would be the case?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Until the law is abolished no-one can presume that he will be exempt from that law.

Mr. Thompson: Many road transport operators will find it difficult to understand that.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The honourable member would also. The member for Mt. Lawley has stated that the reply to his question on the 4th October was incorrect when he was advised that there had been no refusals of permits on the score of financial stability of the applicant.

Mr. O'Connor: I did say that and it is incorrect.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: In support of this he referred to the case of Mr. B. Polinelli who, he intimated, had been refused a permit five days earlier. In regard to this point the Premier has intimated as follows:—

I have made inquiries about this and I am assured that there is no record of an application from Mr. Polinelli in the week before the 4th October. On the 29th September a letter was sent to him. This was a standard letter which is being sent to all operators who have failed to meet their commitments to give them an opportunity of bringing their payments up to date or making some arrangements with the Transport Commission to liquidate them within a reasonable period.

I am unaware whether there was some conversation between the member for Mt. Lawley and the Premier but the Premier states—

As you have been told—

I presume he is referring to the member for Mt. Lawley—

—Mr. Polinelli had the money to pay his road tax but neglected to do so. He has since paid the outstanding amount and there is no further problem as far as he is concerned.

Mr. O'Connor: What was the amount involved?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I am unable to say. What we are trying to do now is to distinguish between those who can pay but will not, and those who cannot pay, often through no fault of their own. Those persons who form the assessment committee are the same personnel who loyally served the Government in which the member for Mt. Lawley was the Minister for Transport.

Mr. O'Connor: Yes, but not under the same conditions.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: No; but these people are, in fact, the same officers and they are assisting these people on that basis to determine those who will not pay and those who cannot pay.

Mr. O'Connor: But we have never tampered with their work in this way. We let them operate in the normal manner.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I make the statement that before this assessment committee all operators are being given an equal opportunity, and I could give the honourable member my assurance that as far as I am involved—and I do become involved to a limited degree in these matters, because I see the files—I do not believe there is any discrimination in this regard.

This brings me to the statement regarding the operator's financial position which the member for Mt. Lawley chooses to refer to as a means test. This is not a means test in the sense that it is designed to determine whether or not an operator should be liable for road maintenance tax because the Act itself determines whether an operator is liable to pay. So to that extent the means test is not being applied in that sense.

Mr. O'Connor: The Premier advised it was.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: But not in that sense. It is the Act itself which assesses whether a person is liable to pay. The means test is being applied to try to distinguish between—of those who have been assessed as liable to pay—those who can pay and will not, and those who cannot, in many cases through no fault of their own. I cannot imagine that the member for Mt. Lawley would suggest we write off arrears of payments or defer payment in all cases, even when those concerned are able to pay.

Mr. O'Connor: I have never suggested that.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I know the honourable member would not agree to that. This is why operators who are in financial difficulty are being given the opportunity to set out their position and the form prepared by the commission is designed for that purpose, and no other.

It is not intended to be a close and pressing interrogation, but it does give the person an opportunity to be assessed under that test to ascertain whether he can pay.

Mr. Thompson: This is section 36 of the Act is it?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: If a person makes a reasonable offer of progressive payments consistent with his financial position, the commission will go along with him—

Mr. O'Connor: Sometimes.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: —and permits will not be refused. This is the practice which was adopted by the previous Government.

Mr. O'Connor: I have documentary evidence here to—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The member for Mt. Lawley would not disagree with that proposition?

Mr. O'Connor: No, provided the person could pay and provided he was treated fairly and equally.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The commission is prepared to continue to issue permits in this instance on condition that the operator makes all future payments as he goes, in accordance with the remarks of the honourable member when he said—

Some operators are not paying road maintenance tax, and they have stated that they will not pay it. Such operators have a trading advantage over the operators who are operating legally. Something should be done about this, because the legal operator is trying to do the right thing by paying the road maintenance tax, but he suffers a disadvantage as compared with the operator who does not pay the tax.

What has been referred to as anomalies are no more than differences in the circumstances of individual operators. Each case is considered on its merits, but the principle remains the same, the principle being an attempt to distinguish between those who, having been assessed as liable to pay, have the capacity to pay, but are not willing to pay, and those who just do not have the capacity to pay.

No change has been made in policy, as has been suggested. Operators must pay the charges for which they are liable, but if an operator produces satisfactory evidence that it is impossible for him to meet the arrears wholly or in part, he is dealt with accordingly, provided he makes an effort to pay as far as his circumstances will allow.

What would the honourable member prefer—that he be given the opportunity or that he be imprisoned? I am sure the honourable member would not choose the latter course, knowing him to be the fair and just person he is.

Mr. McPharlin: If they cannot pay, do they lose their license?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: This would depend on the circumstances. If a person cannot pay at a particular time, but the commit-

tee assesses that, given the opportunity by retaining his license, he would have a chance to do so, I am sure the committee would be influenced and would grant him a permit.

As the honourable member has stated many times, numerous operators need help, but others cannot be helped because they are beyond it. He also suggested that a Royal Commission be established to enable the doubts and views of the operators to be aired. Surely this could not justify the establishment of a Royal Commission. We do not need a Royal Commission to tell us what we already know; that is, that the basic cause of the present problem is a great lack of work in the transport industry. Nothing a Royal Commission could do would increase the volume of work available.

Mr. Rushton: Did your Premier not promise a Royal Commission—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: This is determined day by day by the law of supply and demand, and a Royal Commission would have no effect whatever.

The fault does not lie in the fact that there is too little work as much as in the fact that there are too many vehicles competing to share in the work available. The volume of work is something we cannot regulate so the answer is to adjust the transport capacity commensurate with or appropriate to the demand.

Mr. Rushton: Before you sit down—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I am not sitting down yet. A further point to which the member for Mt. Lawley drew attention is that operators who encounter financial difficulties, whether through lack of work or otherwise, resort to price-cutting which tends to flow on through the whole industry and reacts adversely against the good operator as well as the bad. This is well acknowledged and is well known. It has also been brought to the notice of the Road Transport Association, and the present policy of requiring applicants for permits—and this is important—to give evidence of their financial stability is designed to correct this very situation.

So the Government advises that it does not favour or see any need for a Royal Commission involving considerable expenditure to the community to find out things of which the Government and the community are already aware.

Mr. O'Connor: The community is not aware, and neither are we, because you will not disclose the facts.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The situations are being dealt with in the manner laid down in the Act. Individual cases are a matter for administration—and I make this final point to the honourable member: any person who feels he is not being fairly treated can approach the Premier, the

Minister for Transport, or even myself because any one of us would always be prepared to look into the case. These are the types of problems for which the State has established the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner; but I do not regard them as justifying the establishment of a Royal Commission.

**MR. McPHARLIN** (Mt. Marshall) [8.42 p.m.]: I support the motion. The Minister has indicated that he does not see the need for the establishment of a Royal Commission because it would be costly to the taxpayers. However, in his speech the member for Mt. Lawley indicated that even a Select Committee could investigate the problems outlined in the motion. I support a request for an investigation into this matter. The Minister said that arrangements were being made with the commission for these people who are in financial difficulties to meet their commitments, and the officers of the commission are trying to work out who can meet their commitments and who cannot. What a difficult problem this must be for those officers who are no doubt endeavouring to be as fair as possible.

All types of persons would submit their cases to the commission. Many are apparently trying to dodge the issue by not meeting their commitments while others are being honest. I can just imagine how difficult and confusing a time is being experienced in an endeavour to come to some arrangement between the individual operators and the commission.

As we all know, the road maintenance tax has been regarded as a cumbersome tax to administer and since its introduction a great deal of dissension has occurred and many suggestions have been made that some other easier method should be adopted to collect the finance which is at present being raised under the tax.

If an investigation or inquiry were carried out, I think a great deal of information could be obtained from the owner-driver section of the industry. The people concerned could tell the inquiry of the problems with which they are faced. Not being in the industry, we could not possibly understand the problems as well as they do. Also, they could make suggestions which could be of benefit to the industry and, I think, to the Government. In consequence, some arrangement could be made which would be far more satisfactory than that which exists at the present time.

Officers of the Transport Commission now have to interview drivers and decide whether or not they are able to pay. I imagine a great deal of the time of the officers of the Transport Commission at the moment is being taken up in working out these matters. I feel an inquiry or Select Committee would be beneficial.

The member for Mt. Lawley has quoted many figures and he says that he has more to quote in support of his motion.

I am sure a great deal of benefit would result from an inquiry into this industry. I do not suggest it must be a Royal Commission but perhaps a Select Committee could achieve the same result. Members of the Select Committee would gain knowledge of the industry from those engaged therein.

From time to time we hear reports about big operators subletting contracts and of the various charges which are being made. Many consider that these actions are not fair to those who do not actually obtain the contracts. We have also heard in previous discussions in this House of people becoming bankrupt. The Premier himself made reference to this at one stage.

**Mr. T. D. Evans:** We do not need an inquiry to determine who these people are.

**Mr. McPHARLIN:** No, but we could certainly learn the reasons for it happening in this way. A great deal of information would be gained and this would help in an endeavour to reorganise the whole industry. Perhaps this tax could be applied in some other way or an alternative could be suggested. I am sure an inquiry would be advantageous to the industry and to the Government.

The Minister says each case is considered on its merits. I do not think there is ground for arguing that point, because each case should be considered on its merits. However, the time taken by the officers is one aspect which could be sorted out by a Select Committee. I support the motion moved by the member for Mt. Lawley.

**MR. O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley) [8.48 p.m.]: To say the least, I am disappointed at the Government's attitude on this issue. I felt sorry for the Attorney-General when he spoke to the motion, because he was handling a matter which falls within the portfolio of another Minister, and of course, the acting Minister does not know a great deal about the subject. However, I do not feel half as sorry for him as I do for the people in the industry who, if I may say so, have been taken for a ride.

The Government has disregarded them and has cast them aside. Many of the people supported the Government at the last election, but they were misled by the Government and it is most unfortunate for them. The chaos which presently exists in this industry has been brought about by the present Government. I moved a motion in an endeavour to let the Government off the hook; to help the Government and an industry which badly needs help now.

I believe that what has happened is quite callous. I think initially the issue of road maintenance tax was a calculated one in an effort to win an election. I am referring to the promises made prior to the election in connection with road maintenance tax. The present Premier said unequivocally that he would abolish road maintenance tax and people believed that this would happen. The Premier made a promise he did not, and was not able to, keep. He should not have made it.

Mr. Jamieson: He could have kept it had the Legislative Council passed the Bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Pigs might fly.

Mr. Jamieson: They might!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Premier did not keep his promise and, in fact, he could not. He should not have said unequivocally that he would abolish road maintenance tax when he was unable to do so. This is what has caused so many of these people to get into trouble.

Mr. Jamieson: I represented numbers of cases to you when you were Minister.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If our positions were reversed, the Minister would not be bringing many to me now, because they would not see him.

Mr. Jamieson: I brought very many cases to your attention.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Government is responsible for the chaos which exists in the industry and for sending many in the industry near-broke and bankrupt. The Government does not want to help these people out of the mess which it has created. I am trying to help those who, in my opinion, have got into trouble through no fault of their own.

Instead of coming out and trying to help a crippled industry, what is the Government doing? It is pushing those in the industry into a pool and instead of throwing them a life jacket, it is putting a foot on their heads and pushing them under. This is what the Government does continually. It is a great pity the industry has been pushed around in this way by the present Government.

I moved the motion to try to help the people in the industry and I know how many are beyond the point of no return. They will not be able to recover from the difficulties they are in.

The Government has had the opportunity to clear up many matters, including many statements and accusations which have been made. The Government is hiding many facts. Why does it continue to hide them? Why shroud these matters in secrecy instead of bringing them into the open? Members on this side of the House and members of the public are entitled to have this information. It is a pity the Government has gone into secret session as far as the details of the Transport Commission are concerned. The Government will not permit an inquiry of any sort into this field.

The Minister referred to a number of statements which I made during my speech and I do not deny I made them. He quoted them correctly, but out of context. The Minister said, first of all, that I criticised the Government for not forcing people to pay road maintenance tax. I did criticise the Government for this.

The Minister also said I criticised the Government for making others pay. What I said was that the Government was at fault, because it had misled the people into believing that road maintenance tax would be abolished. Many people thought the position would be the same as that which applies in respect of receipt duty; namely, those who had paid would receive refunds over a period of time and those who had not paid would not be forced to pay.

I do not blame the transport people for not paying road maintenance tax after the present Government took office, because they were advised that this tax would be abolished. Some may have put the money aside to pay the tax but may have spent it subsequently, and they cannot be blamed entirely in the light of what the Government had said. The Government is to blame in this matter.

Instead of hitting these people on the head while they are down, the Government should be trying to assist them and should be man enough to admit that it was at fault. The Government should have asked what it could do to try to help. The Opposition is trying to do this now.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The committee that has been set up is doing this.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will read letters to contradict the Minister's statement. The Minister is in a difficult position, I acknowledge, because he is handling a portfolio which is foreign to him.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We know the number of people who are grateful.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is all right, but it is no good making flesh of one and fish of another.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They are all treated on their merits.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Who decides what their merits are?

Mr. T. D. Evans: The committee of officers who served under your Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Unless they are advised otherwise.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They are not advised otherwise.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Is the Minister telling me that the Premier, or the Minister concerned, has never advised these officers to take certain action in connection with a file?

Mr. T. D. Evans: I am not in a position to indicate that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Premier, if he were present, could not even deny that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I have never administered this portfolio.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I realise this, but the point I am making is that these facts should be brought into the open if the Government has nothing to hide. If it has something to hide I can understand it not wanting to agree to this motion.

I believe the best course of action is to draw down the curtain at a certain point of time. Let us give these people some consideration. The Government told them they would not have to pay road maintenance tax. Let us draw down a curtain and say, "From this point of time you must pay road maintenance tax and permit fees."

Mr. T. D. Evans: What happens to the person who cannot pay?

Mr. O'CONNOR: He would not be able to continue. I am suggesting that the people should be given a point at which they can make a fresh start. Many of them are thousands of dollars in arrears. I am suggesting we should draw down the curtain at a certain point and say, "From now on you must pay everything." Otherwise, the Government should take their vehicles off the road.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That would have the effect of discriminating against people who pay.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am suggesting that all charges should be paid from a certain point and during the following six months the Government could make arrangements for the back payments. By doing this the Government would permit people to operate and receive an income. In this way, a person would be able to get himself and his family out of a mess. If the Government says that certain people cannot operate, people with trucks will be unable to meet the payments, because the Government will not allow them to move out.

The result is these people go broke or actually become bankrupt. They and their families are in trouble. I am trying to help them and I think the Government ought to try to do the same thing.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We feel we are helping them.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not see why this cannot be done, because the Government would not be losing any money by adopting this course of action. In fact, it would be embarking on a course which would assist it to obtain some money back. If certain people cannot continue to pay from a certain point, the Government should take the necessary action to keep them off the road. This must be done one way or the other.

Mr. Thompson: The State will lose, because by precluding these people from operating they will become bankrupt, and will not be able to pay back taxes anyway.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister made reference to what I call a means test but he says it is not.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is not even close to being one.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The application of the Government's policy is a means test. Those with the money pay and those who do not have the money do not pay.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is a capacity-to-pay assessment test.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is a means test. I asked the Premier why the form was drawn up in that way and why people were requested to fill it in. I am not sure whether my first question was asked of the Premier or the Minister for Works.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The people are invited to fill in a form.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Under threat of what? If they do not fill it in they have had the kibosh.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They are invited to fill in the form and to allow the Government to make a capacity assessment.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If they do not fill in the form what is the position?

Mr. T. D. Evans: They are invited to fill it in.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If they do not fill in the form they will not be permitted to operate. Therefore, they are compelled to fill it in. The form requests particulars of a personal nature and they must state the amount of finance they possess.

When I asked the Premier why this form was required, he said that it is necessary in order to ascertain a person's ability to pay. I then asked what was meant by this. Apparently if a person does not have the money, the Government will not send that person to gaol; but if a person does not have money but has assets, that person is forced to sell those assets in order to pay. This is a means test. It is completely unfair.

Many of these people have battled for years to save enough money to buy a home for their family. Many of them have encountered severe financial difficulties. Some have sold their homes and, now, the State Housing commission will be forced to provide accommodation for them. This is the sort of thing I am trying to avoid.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you have knowledge of any such case?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will give examples of a few cases shortly.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Where a person's house has been sold?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I know of people who have gone broke and have borrowed on their houses to clear their debts.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What would be the position with these people had your Government stayed in office?

Mr. O'CONNOR: They would have known the position and would have continued to pay road maintenance tax as they had done in the past.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Notwithstanding the downturn in the industry?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I admit there has been a downturn in the industry. When the present Government came into office many of these people thought it would be equivalent to the answer to a maiden's prayer. They thought that road maintenance tax would no longer be imposed. This was the reason for so many of them getting into so much trouble.

I cannot understand why the Government is not prepared to assist these people. The other night I quoted the case of a truck going from Guildford to Port Hedland. This truck owner received a summons for \$1.61 for one trip from Spearwood to Port Hedland instead of from Guildford. Unbeknown to the owner, when the truck went to Bell Bros. to pick up the load, the driver was told to get it from Spearwood. He was therefore required to pay \$1.61.

I would like to quote from some of the letters I have received. The first letter reads—

This letter is being written in regard to an application for a permit at the Transport Commission on Friday 13th October, 1972.

At the time we were owing the Board \$28 from two previous permits obtained in July of this year. For this reason we were refused. At my request . . .

And it goes on to give details. A permit was refused because of an account for \$28.

If the Minister wishes to see the letters I will make them available to him.

Mr. Bertram: He could pay the \$28.

Mr. O'CONNOR: He did not have it at that point of time. Another man wrote to me about an outstanding amount of tax. The next letter read in part—

. . . (repayments in my case is only \$296) to help you in questions which I believe you are currently asking.

If I have to comply to their demands and pay Road Tax and Permit Fees before departing the Commission is forcing me into bankruptcy as my vehicles will come to a complete standstill, as this also applies to a vehicle which is not even liable for Road Tax.

This person advises me that he also owns a vehicle of under eight-ton capacity and because the road maintenance tax was not

up to date, he was unable to operate either vehicle. He says—

. . . and deprives me of the seven days grace which I have had in the past.

The letter goes on to thank me for certain information. The next letter is from Bindoon and it reads in part—

The amount owing to the 30th June 1972, has since been paid and that was the amount owing, namely \$1,025.13—

And the letter is dated the 23rd October, To continue—

—plus omissions, that I mentioned to . . .

And he mentions the man to whom he talked as well as the man with whom he had an interview. It continues—

. . . and have since made an offer to pay the balance at \$200.00 month.

This is quite relevant. It continues—

We are reputable people and have been established at Bindoon for 7 years and have always met our commitments in due course. We have 4 Trucks and 3 Semi-Trailers and our sons are part of this business and drive the semis.

Since I have been to see the Transport Commission, we have had to pay Road Tax, both ways, before we could start on 3 journeys . . .

I believe this is contrary to the law because the Act states that road maintenance tax must be paid within seven to 14 days of completion of the journey. However, in this case, payment was requested before the journey. The letter continues—

We believe that the Road and Air Act does not require that Road Tax be paid prior to undertaking a journey, and in fact, we feel that the Transport Commission are breaking this Act by making us do so. We are well aware there are many other people in the transport industry who are making no attempt to pay their Road Tax and we further believe that in some cases concessions have been made.

I have agreed to keep my comments brief tonight for certain reasons. However, I must state that I believe the Government has acted very badly over this matter. Many people who are attempting to make a living in this industry have been crippled, and many others do not know where they are headed. The Government is not prepared to do anything to help many of these operators.

There could be reasons for the Government's asking for payment in advance of journeys, but I believe it is illegal. The Government misled the truck owners. They were led to believe that road maintenance tax would be abolished and then the truck drivers who had not filled in returns for some time were denied permits. If the Government had been prepared to go along with our suggestion, it would have been let off the hook. Such a course

would have helped to straighten out the mess within the industry which has been brought about by the actions of the Government. If the Government agrees to our motion, it will show it has nothing to hide. However, it is not prepared to let us go through the files to determine the details. We wish to know whether the accusations in regard to the Government's giving preference to certain truck owners are correct. Why should the Government hide the facts? The information should be made public.

A Royal Commission would help to stabilise the industry and we could gain assistance by way of additional income. I do not think we should refuse applications of people who are attempting to pay.

I realise that some truck drivers are in a hopeless position through their own fault, and my remarks are not directed to them. Some owners have purchased trucks on a jacked-up system without a deposit. The repayments are very high, and when the truck owners run into trouble the trucks are repossessed and are then taken over by someone else.

The Government has created chaos in the industry and I am extremely disappointed that it is not prepared to attempt to get some of these people out of the trouble it has put them into.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

**Ayes—20**

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

**Noes—21**

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Harman
Mr. Fletcher	

(Teller)

**Pairs**

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Williams	Mr. Brown
Mr. Runciman	Mr. Graham
Mr. R. L. Young	Mr. May
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. A. R. Tonkin

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

**BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Metric Conversion Bill.
2. Reserve (Concert Hall) Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

**LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL****Council's Message**

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

**In Committee**

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. Taylor (Minister for Labour) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Assembly, to which amendments the Council has disagreed, were as follows:—

**No. 1.**

Clause 2, page 2, line 5—Insert after the word "organisation" the following words "or to any other body or organisation not established for the purpose of trading or for securing pecuniary profit to its individual members".

**No. 2.**

Clause 2, page 2, lines 7 and 8—Delete the words "on specified premises for such length of time and".

**No. 3.**

Clause 2, page 2, lines 11 to 15—Delete the whole of the proviso.

The Council's reasons for disagreeing to the Assembly's amendments are as follows:—

The Legislative Council considers that permits to play bingo should be limited to a religious body or charitable organisation and further gambling on licensed premises is already forbidden under the Liquor Act, 1970.

Mr. TAYLOR: In my opinion the Committee should agree to disagree with the reasons given by the Council and should insist on its amendments.

I would like to make two points. The first reason is that the Legislative Council considers permits to play bingo should be limited to religious bodies or charitable organisations. This point has been argued twice now in this Chamber and it was felt the definition should be strengthened and extended to allow other organisations to participate as long as such organisations were not profit-making bodies.

The Council also states that gambling is forbidden on licensed premises under the Liquor Act. The Act does not provide that one cannot play a game such as bingo or conduct raffles on premises where alcohol is being sold or distributed in the case of a permit issued for one evening only. I move—

That the amendments made by the Assembly be insisted on.

Accordingly, I believe the Committee should insist on its amendments.

I wish to bring one other point before the Committee. In normal circumstances, if we did agree to disagree with the



Legislative Council we would then advise the Legislative Council accordingly and if it wished to insist on disagreeing with us it would be entitled to ask for a conference of managers. I intend to circumvent that and save time, in that if the Committee in this Chamber agrees with my motion to insist on our amendments, or in other words to disagree with the proposal put forward by the Legislative Council, I will subsequently move that this Committee appoint a conference of managers to plead our case to the Legislative Council.

Mr. O'NEIL: I intend to oppose the motion that has been moved by the Minister and ask the Committee to agree with the proposal put forward by the Legislative Council. It cannot be denied that when the first approaches were made to legalise bingo they came from some charitable organisations, but principally from parents and citizens' associations and parents and friends' associations in areas which contained a considerable number of British migrants, because these people have been accustomed to playing this game in their own country where it is legalised to a large extent and is, I might add, causing some concern to that country.

It was determined that for the purpose of raising funds for those organisations the game could be regarded as being reasonably harmless if played under permit and controls imposed by the Lotteries Commission. Permits could be granted for particular occasions on which the game would be played. It was not intended to give an open ticket to establish bingo parlours, as I think they are called in the United Kingdom, and therefore we were quite prepared to agree with the original concept.

A Bill of this type was discussed in the first session of this Parliament, and I do not think it can be denied that that Bill would have passed through Parliament if it had not been for the attitude of one member on the Government side who happened to return at what I consider an inappropriate time. He considered that the premises upon which this game might be played could be extended to include licensed clubs. It is still our belief that this game is relatively harmless, provided it is played subject to the controls imposed by the Lotteries Commission, and if it were played mainly for the purpose of raising funds for charitable and other organisations that assist in community affairs.

We consider that this is as far as we should go at this stage. We should see how the system works, subject to the conditions imposed. We have heard exaggerated statements as to what could happen if the Bill were passed. It has been suggested that a massive bingo game could be played on the Perth oval assisted with electronic devices to cater for the great crowds that would congregate at such a venue. However, I think this is stretching the long bow a little. However if Parliament desires to legalise the game we should

confine it to the provisions contained in the message from the Legislative Council. For that reason we shall continue to insist that the Bill be agreed to in the form presented by the Council. Therefore I disagree with the proposal put forward by the Minister that we should insist on the amendments made by the Assembly.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments insisted on.

### *Report*

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

### *Assembly's Request for Conference*

Mr. TAYLOR: I move—

That the Council be requested to grant a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Assembly and that the managers for the Assembly be the Attorney-General (Mr. T. D. Evans), the member for East Melville (Mr. O'Neill), and the mover.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

### **FISHERIES ACT**

#### *Amendment of Regulations: Council's Resolution*

Debate resumed, from the 18th October, on the message from the Council requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—

That the Regulations made pursuant to the Fisheries Act, 1905-1969, as published in the *Government Gazette* on the 21st September, 1971, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 5th October, 1971, be amended as follows—

To insert after paragraph (a) of subregulation (2B) of regulation 3AA, a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (aa) as follows:

(aa) is in receipt of a pension under the provisions of the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act, 1943-1971;

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [9.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Order be discharged.

Motion put and passed.

Order discharged.

### **LAND: BUILDING BLOCKS**

#### *Availability and Price: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 18th October, on the following motion by Mr. O'Neill (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):—

This House views with concern the deterioration of the position relative to the availability of reasonably priced residential lots in the metropolitan region, which has resulted in:—

(a) an escalation of land prices, and

- (b) public concern as to future availability and cost.

The House also expresses concern at the conflict between statements made by the Government and those made by real estate developers as to the real position and calls upon the Government to give a clear and precise statement of the position showing:—

- (a) location and numbers of useable residential allotments in the region, and
- (b) details of action being taken and proposed to be taken to maintain stability in the supply and price of residential land.

**MR. RUSHTON** (Dale) [9.23 p.m.]: I think it reasonable that I should commence by making it clear to the House what the Government undertook to do when it came to office in regard to the availability and price of land, and also what it announced to the public concerning its intentions. A statement appears on page 2 of the Labor Party's dossier outlining its promises, and in regard to land prices the following appears:—

Although land prices have receded in Western Australia they are still artificially high and an inadequate supply of serviced building blocks would again give rise to an increase in prices.

Australia is one of the few countries in which public participation in land development is almost unknown and the Leader of the Federal Opposition has undertaken to make grants to the States, when a Labor Government comes to power, to enable them to acquire substantial areas of residential land on just terms and subdivide, service and sell it at cost.

We shall, on becoming the Government, put this policy into operation and expand it if funds become available from the Commonwealth.

In retrospect, in looking at those promises now, and even the promises that have been made by the Federal Labor representatives it can be said that through an accumulation of unfortunate events we have not seen the results that were promised by the Premier when he made his policy speech.

The first comment I make to illustrate that the Government has not recognised the steps that have been taken in the past to retrieve a position that was not acceptable to the people of this State, is that the Premier or the Minister for Town Planning do not appear to have learnt the lessons that were learnt after so much effort by the previous Government.

In recent times we have heard the Premier making the statement that 40,000 blocks of land were available in the metropolitan area, and the Minister for Town Planning followed that up by announcing

with a view to rectifying the Premier's figure, that 33,600 blocks were available. I think that clearly illustrates to the people, and certainly to the members of this House, that the Government is completely devoid of any understanding of this subject.

Firstly, the Minister for Town Planning, in an effort to defend himself, attacked a lecturer at W.A.I.T. because of the statement he had made to the Press. I suppose he was following the principle that attack is the best form of defence. However, so far as the Minister's attack on Mr. Worthington of W.A.I.T. is concerned, I think he owes that gentleman an apology.

I will now show how wrong the Minister was with his remarks. On the question of land prices, the Minister had this to say, and these comments are recorded on page 3963 of current *Hansard* No. 18—

- (1) There has been a remarkable stability in East Hamersley prices over the last four years and this price averages out at about \$4,500.

I believe this is the first factor to take into consideration. This is the salient point to remember. We do not want people to attend the next auction thinking that they will be expected to pay \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000 for a block, because the average price has been maintained around the \$4,500 figure.

We have now reached an unusual situation, because that statement was made on the 11th October and in *The West Australian* on the 11th November appears an announcement that the Government had changed its direction and, as a magnificent arrester of all these inflationary trends, it was going to conduct a ballot for 50 blocks of land and the lowest price was to be \$4,330, and the highest price was to be \$5,730, making the average price \$5,244. This was on the 11th November.

That is a far cry from what the Minister said on the 11th October. Therefore this must be very worrying to individuals who wish to buy a block of land on which to build a home; that is, to see such a change in the Government's attitude in its approach to this subject. What illustrates more than anything else how we have slipped in regard to land prices since the present Government has taken office is the fact that the Minister, on his own announcement, has said that we have 33,600 building blocks available in this year of 1972, when we have a population of approximately 750,000 in the metropolitan area. Back in 1966 we had a population of about 550,000 in the metropolitan area. It was then said, under the same system of assessment, that we had available blocks to the tune of 50,000.

We have had this vast increase in population in the metropolitan region over the past few years and we have experienced some difficult times, but the then Government of the day attended to this problem

in a workmanlike manner. Now, after 20 months of the present Government being in office we are back to a figure of 33,600 available blocks for home building. What is happening? Nothing is being done. It is worth reciting what has taken place in the period since the Tonkin Government took office.

Firstly, I would briefly like to present to the House what was done by the previous Government to solve the problems that arose in a difficult situation. When one looks at the recommendations that were presented to the previous Government to solve the high price of land they would have panicked most people and most Governments with less stability, and a disastrous situation could have resulted.

However the Government at that time took certain steps which proved to be very effective; and by the time the election was held, reasonable stability had been achieved. We hoped that the incoming Government would continue to follow the policy we adopted; but this has not occurred. The situation has deteriorated, and all the improvements which were made are now being lost. The previous Government, by marshalling the forces available, achieved tremendous success and it is worth while to recall what was done.

Negotiations were carried out for the land development at Mullaloo and Hamersley and I think it is generally recognised that this was a creditable and an effective performance. The Brand Government also introduced the Rural and Industries Bank development of Crown land and shortly a portion of that land will be allocated by ballot.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSHTON: On that one item alone it is evident that the present Government is latching on to portion of the previous Government's effort—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking.

Mr. RUSHTON: —but it has presented nothing new. Part of the exercise of the previous Government involved the development of State Housing Commission land. Now the commission is buying land which has been developed by the private sector. This is having a direct effect on the availability of land because every block it buys it takes away from the public. This is a very direct attack upon the previous hard-won satisfactory position.

I think I mentioned earlier that a recommendation concerning the M.R.P.A. scheme No. 4 at Kelmscott was made by the Housing Advisory Association. I have not many kind thoughts about that scheme. I was not very happy about it when it was proposed and now the Housing Commission has moved in and made the scheme even less workable than it was before. The situ-

ation is completely unsatisfactory. This is only one reason a change of Government is necessary in order that we might rectify this kind of situation and try to retain compatible living conditions for the people of the area thus ensuring no further slump occurs in that scheme.

Under the previous Government Sir Keith Watson conducted an investigation in order to speed up administrative processes. We were worried about the various bottlenecks which occurred in the processing of land, and Sir Keith submitted some good recommendations which were adopted. A complete team effort is necessary from the highest officer to the most junior to achieve a satisfactory standard. No one effort on its own will achieve the desired results.

Members will recall that a Cabinet sub-committee was established. It comprised Mr. Logan, the then Minister for Town Planning, the present Leader of the Opposition, and his deputy leader. That committee achieved good results.

The Liberal-Country Party Government continued to improve its policies on this issue, and I am looking forward to the day when a change of Government occurs and the Liberal and Country Parties are able to proceed to build upon the very satisfactory foundation they established previously. This is necessary because if the present Government continues as it is at present, I am fearful some extreme measures will be introduced from time to time which will have an effect opposite to that which we desire.

It is worth while examining in brief what the present Government has done on this issue. I think it can be conceded that the Deputy Premier, when Minister for Town Planning, had definite ideas. We must also concede that some of them were very forthright while others were quite acceptable because they removed certain blockages which had occurred. However, his methods also scared some people to death. I think it is generally agreed that his administration, which commenced with such high hopes, had, because of a lack of confidence, the opposite effect to that which he desired. I am sure he faced many frustrating problems.

The then Minister for Town Planning ordered an investigation into the corridor plan and this had a delaying effect. Before the election, something like 20 months ago, we had won the immediate battle and a stability of land prices had been achieved and a considerable amount of land was available. All that was necessary was sound thinking and administration and the present unsatisfactory situation would not have been reached.

The Naval Base housing project was responsible for a reduction in confidence. We did not know what would happen next, and when from time to time the Government does reveal its plans, we find no

consistency and certainly no encouragement to the private sector to get on with the job of making blocks available.

It is well known that the position has deteriorated. Fewer blocks are available even on the doubtful figures supplied to us, and I will deal with them later. However, even using them as a basis it is evident how far we have slipped back. I also mentioned earlier that the purchase of urban blocks by the State Housing Commission is a contributing factor to the declining situation. By purchasing blocks in the scheme at Kelmscott, the commission is reducing the number available for the private sector, and thus contributing to this disastrous position.

It is imperative that the Government examine very carefully and quickly the reasons for the lack of a reasonable flow of blocks onto the market. Positive signs indicate that blocks are not available and the Government must rectify the situation.

In 1966 a special survey was undertaken and it would be worth while to examine how it was implemented, why, and the results of the deliberations. At that time it was stated that 50,000 blocks were available in the metropolitan area and those same people are saying that 33,600 blocks are available now.

These figures are misleading and do not reflect the actual position. The survey was conducted south of the river in 1966 because it was believed that the greatest pressure existed in that area. Because of the sharp increases in the prices of land it was felt a survey was warranted. However, I contend that such a survey should be a continuing process, not a spasmodic one. If it were a continuing process it would reveal the weaknesses as they occurred. I believe that the intention of the legislation passed in 1963 was that a continuing assessment be made. However, the survey in 1966 was restricted to urban and urban-deferred land south of the river because it was considered that the acute shortage would show up more clearly in that area. It was stated in the findings of the survey that "there are reserves of urban and urban-deferred land that will be adequate for a long time." We are always hearing such statements. We are told that ample land is available.

I well remember serving as a representative of the shire on a group associated with the M.R.P.A. I have a great faith in town planning and I gave the organisation a considerable amount of my time. I still believe we have a tremendous basis on which to work, but we must be practical and realistic in our assessment.

The finding of the survey was that adequate land was available for a long time, but it has since been proved that this was not so. The second item reads—

2. The relationship between the number of undeveloped blocks and

land values is only one of many factors that influence the price of land.

That is fair enough, but in this day and age it is true that the supply and demand has a very strong influence on the price of land. To continue—

3. There is a need for further research into all the inflationary factors; but the immediate conclusion is that any move prematurely to increase, by rezoning alone, the supply of residential land would be wrong.

This was the effect of putting more land on the market and enabling speculators to operate freely. The fourth item reads—

4. Land values have levelled off. They may rise again. The report discusses a number of possible controls, stressing that further thought will have to be given to them.

That was being said in 1966. To continue—

5. The nub of the problem is that although sufficient land for development has been zoned under the Scheme it is, because of factors outside the control of town planning, apparently not freely available to the public for home building at a reasonable price.

It is interesting to reflect on those times. I think it was the intention of the planning authorities to have something in the nature of a ring around the metropolitan region within which people could buy, subdivide, and develop blocks for building homes. But this quickly proved to be wrong because, being a declared area it could be readily exploited. Every block that was purchased reduced the supply and it became very obvious that the planners had not allowed sufficient flexibility in their thinking and planning to accommodate all the needs of a free community, with people being able to buy blocks in various sectors and parts of the metropolitan region.

The survey showed that there were approximately 6,600-odd acres which would provide building blocks for in the vicinity of 25,000 new homes. The survey showed that the acreage stated had not been built upon. The survey revealed that about 2,000 blocks are developed yearly. The contention was that the supply would cover the needs for something like 12 years, which proved to be totally wrong.

According to the surveyors, one of the factors that must be considered is an increase in the rate of development, and the blocks may be unsuitable for development. They were looking at the overall area and considering what should be done and what was available. Consideration was given to what should be done with deferred urban areas.

The assessment was made by looking at the acreages to see how many blocks were on made roads and to see what the other features were. The detailed survey discloses how inaccurate the assessment was. The land is not developed land which is ready for building on. It comprises blocks which need a considerable amount of servicing, and it is acknowledged that it takes many months to service them.

We need to reflect again on the figure the Minister has disclosed because in the original survey—and I think the same strategy has been used on this occasion—it was calculated from a map how many building blocks were in the urban or urban-deferred area, and a certain conclusion was reached. Not much of that land could have been bought for building homes.

As a result of the survey I believe it was stated that a large number of blocks were readily available at Roleystone, but those blocks are not readily available for building on at the present time. It was said there were 2,600 blocks at Rockingham ready for building on at the present time. I suggest those blocks are not available, and any common-sense survey would disclose that. They are bulk acreages which would take many months to process and put on the market.

I think it is up to the Minister for Town Planning to study the findings of the survey in 1966. He will find the methods used then were not in fact practical methods. They do not produce an accurate assessment of the number of blocks that are readily available for home building. It is more a theory or a projection of what will be available when the services are supplied and the blocks are ready for development.

I think the Minister would readily acknowledge that the 33,600 blocks he has projected as being ready are not in fact ready at this point of time. Many experienced people could explain to him just how far from the mark he is. When the matter is investigated in detail it is found the number of blocks available has diminished very quickly. It has been assessed that we need something like 12,000 building blocks a year, and we are in trouble at the present time. The matter needs close attention in order to restore a reasonable situation.

It took many months of devoted service by many people to retrieve the situation which had developed. Methods were developed which were proved to be right and which gave a guideline for the present Government.

If the Minister looks at the 1966 survey he will find that the projections proved to be unsatisfactory and unrealistic when it came to trying to contain the price of land. The recommendations following that survey indicate how people who look at

matters in a theoretical way make recommendations which create trouble when they are put into effect.

One of the recommendations emanating from the 1966 survey was that because there were reserves of undeveloped urban land sufficient for a number of years it was not necessary to release urban-deferred land except in special circumstances. That was quickly proved to be wrong. The second recommendation was that it was necessary to make an early investigation and take suitable remedial action because of the price factor. That is fair enough. One of the suggestions was that there should be an improvement in the subdivisional standards, and this has done more to influence the price of land than anything else.

I submit that this is where the Commonwealth Government could assist. I do not believe it is necessary for the Commonwealth to resume large tracts of land and do all the servicing. We are in a Federal system and I think the States have their responsibilities. Whatever the political party, if it could find loan moneys at low interest which could be applied to putting in the basic services it would do much to rectify the situation.

How do we accommodate those who have paid the price for their house blocks on the present basis? Do we bring the price back by a few thousand dollars? However, history tells us that the price of land has increased steadily. We may be able to hold reasonable prices for land by using this method. The improvement of subdivisional standards was not the answer to holding prices. In fact, it stimulated prices.

The question of public ownership of land is still at issue. I—and, I believe, my party—want people to own their own land and homes. We would be happy if 100 per cent. of the population could do so. Some people cite Canberra as an example of what can be done, but when one really gets down to the basic costs and the type of community that develops, one gets a clearer picture of what is and is not desirable.

It has been suggested that a capital gains tax be imposed. This could have all sorts of results. The levy of a betterment on rezoning was suggested. I would hate to think the Government would put some of these recommendations into practice. They would be disastrous.

When the Government was in Opposition, it urged all sorts of ways to control the price of land by the imposition of land tax. Certain action was taken in regard to land tax but at the present time it is working against the limitation of land prices.

While speaking of land tax, I mention that it has come to my notice in recent times that people who have small holdings

on which they are carrying on agricultural pursuits such as fruit-growing or poultry farming are being hit to the leg by the changes of policy. They find they will have to leave their properties because the land tax has risen to such an extent.

The next matter I wish to mention is the increased tax on unimproved land, which is another recommendation stemming from the 1966 report. With hindsight, we can see what has happened. I think it is now working against us to some degree, but it is a matter which is always difficult to handle. We must always be mindful of what the reactions can be. There is also the question of the payment of large deposits on land.

I turn now to the provision of flats by the State Housing Commission. In my opinion, this has worked against the way of life we should have. The building of flats is a method of dealing with a shortage of housing. At the last election the Brand Government undertook to reduce the percentage of flats, because the accommodation problem had been relieved, and to work towards the building of individual houses. Earlier today I expressed my objection to the densities which the State Housing Commission now intends to perpetrate upon the people.

The urban residential categories used in the survey were: land with existing street frontages; land with existing street frontages but requiring approval of subdivision; land requiring provision of roads and approval; and large areas of land requiring approval and provision of roads, reserves, etc. If the same system was used, these are the categories of land which were included in arriving at the 33,600 blocks. It is clear to anybody who has studied this issue that we are not on sound ground in saying 33,600 blocks are now available for building homes.

We are on sound ground when we say the position has slipped because, as I said, in 1966 it was estimated by methods of which we do not approve that 50,000 blocks were available; but now only 33,600 are available, even though our population has increased by at least 50 per cent. since then.

The **SPEAKER**: The member has five more minutes.

**Mr. RUSHTON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those figures prove the stewardship of the Government has not been good. In the remaining time left to me I would like to indicate what our aims should be. I think basically we can get into a tremendous amount of trouble if we do not consider the ultimate result. Some time ago we cut out subdivisions for small farmlets. I believe that action has had an effect directly opposite to that which was intended by the planners. I think we must now reconsider the issue

of providing small farmlets for those who want to buy them. At present such people are frustrated by the very limited supply.

We must create areas of free choice in, for example, places like Kalamunda and Roleystone. We need mixed communities in the sense of a combination of private and State Housing Commission development; but before we start that we must have a clear understanding of what the result will be. Certainly we need to know what are the policies of the State Housing Commission and just how far it intends to go in purchasing private subdivided land.

I think it is true to say that the Government has not been conscious of the need to apply itself continually to the provision of building blocks. It just has not been conscious of how quickly the matter can slip from its control. The figures I have quoted clearly indicate that. I think the request of the Opposition, that the Government apply itself more vigorously to the problem and take note of the proved methods, is quite reasonable.

We are conscious that the price of land is rising, and the only remedy the Government has to offer is to ballot a few blocks, and even the price of those blocks is higher than the Government promised it would be. I think we should remove this subject from the political arena. In this motion we are simply pointing out to the Government certain clear signs and saying, "For heaven's sake get on with the job!" The Government now has a different Minister responsible for this matter and we hope that within a short period he will devise new methods or adopt the older, proven methods to remedy the situation. Some years ago this subject was quite an emotional one, but the situation has been retrieved to such a degree that it was not a political issue during the last State election.

I ask that the Minister concerned and the Government apply themselves to this matter for the benefit of the people who wish to build homes. The Government should restore a state of confidence in the community so that it will not be necessary for the Opposition to move a similar motion next session.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—21

<b>Mr. Blaikie</b>	<b>Mr. O'Connor</b>
<b>Sir David Brand</b>	<b>Mr. O'Neill</b>
<b>Sir Charles Court</b>	<b>Mr. Ridge</b>
<b>Mr. Coyne</b>	<b>Mr. Runciman</b>
<b>Dr. Dadour</b>	<b>Mr. Rushton</b>
<b>Mr. Gayfer</b>	<b>Mr. Stephens</b>
<b>Mr. Hutchinson</b>	<b>Mr. Thompson</b>
<b>Mr. W. A. Manning</b>	<b>Mr. R. L. Young</b>
<b>Mr. McPharlin</b>	<b>Mr. W. G. Young</b>
<b>Mr. Mensaros</b>	<b>Mr. I. W. Manning</b>
<b>Mr. Nalder</b>	

(Teller)

## Noes—22

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

## Pairs

## Noes

Mr. Williams	Mr. May
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Graham
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Brown

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

**BILLS (2): RETURNED**

## 1. Fruit-growing Reconstruction Scheme Bill.

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

## 2. Iron Ore (McCamey's Monster) Agreement Authorization Bill.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

**NOISE ABATEMENT BILL***Council's Message*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not insist on amendment No. 3, and that it had agreed to the further amendments made by the Assembly to the Council's amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 32.

**CONTRACEPTIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL***Council's Message*

Message from the Council notifying that it had disagreed to the amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

*In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. Lapham in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Assembly, to which the Council had disagreed, were as follows:—

## No. 1.

Clause 3.—Delete.

## No. 2.

New Clause.

Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—

3. Subsection (7) of section 4 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by deleting the word "or" in line twelve;

(b) by deleting the expression "practitioner—" in lines twenty-five and twenty-six and substituting the expression "practitioner; or"; and

(c) by inserting after paragraph (d) a paragraph as follows—

(e) any statement issued by any organisation approved by the Minister as an organisation concerned with the dissemination of information concerning matters of family planning.

The Council's reason for disagreeing to the Assembly's amendments was as follows:—

The original clause in the Bill is considered to be more practicable of application than the suggested amendment.

Mr. LAPHAM: Members will be aware that the Bill has been debated fairly fully and I feel there is no need for me again to go over the whole matter. The Legislative Council has indicated that it disagrees to the amendments made in this Chamber because it considers the original clause to be more practicable of application than the amendment. On reflection I feel that is so. Therefore, I move—

That the amendments made by the Assembly be not insisted on.

Dr. DADOUR: I am aware this matter has been discussed at some length, but I feel it is necessary to reiterate the purpose of the measure. The Bill was introduced to facilitate family planning clinics and to remove an inhibition on their operation. The purpose of the Bill is to allow family planning clinics to advertise contraceptives and hours of lectures, etc.; and to distribute literature. When it was first introduced a great deal of misapprehension arose in connection with its intention.

The Bill proposes to delete section 4 from the Act, and this deals with the advertising of contraceptives. The Assembly amended the Bill to permit family planning clinics to advertise and to function without restriction. This arose from the fear that if an open go was given in respect of the advertising of contraceptives some unscrupulous people might take advantage of the situation.

The other point at issue is that we are not dealing with the Contraceptives Bill of 1939, because in those days the contraceptives were very different from those of today. It was felt that the Act contained many anomalies and would require many

amendments to correct them. We considered that the Minister should have the Act examined with a view to introducing a Bill next year to bring it up to date.

In 1939 only mechanical contraceptives were in use, but today there is the pill and this has put a different complexion altogether on contraceptives. This Chamber considered that it was better to amend the Act so as to remove the restrictions imposed on the family planning clinics. The amendments made by this Chamber seemed to cover that aspect.

When the Bill was returned to the Council it disagreed with our amendments. The whole Act leaves much to be desired, but whichever way we go we will not achieve very much; by insisting on our amendments we will achieve the intention of enabling the family planning clinics to function without restriction. I suggest that we insist on our amendments.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We on this side of the Chamber have very firm views on this question, and we are prepared to go along with the original intention that was proposed by the authors of the Bill. That was to overcome the possible legal doubt in connection with chemists and contraceptives, and to remove the restriction on the family planning clinics. We were prepared to accept an amendment under which any doubt about family planning organisations of an approved nature being able to advertise their existence would be removed.

The amendments which we placed on the notice paper and were eventually adopted achieved that purpose. I believe that those who are now sponsoring the move made by the Legislative Council do not, in fact, understand what could happen if this Bill is amended as they desire. I do not think they fully understand the intention of the amendments that have been proposed.

Having read the debate on the measure in the other place, having seen the original Bill, having looked at the reasons advanced for it, and having examined the parent Act, I have come to the conclusion that the other Chamber does not fully appreciate what it is doing.

I hope the members of another place are sincere in their objection to our amendments, but if they have their way the net result would be far wider and far less capable of control than it would be if our amendments were agreed to.

We have gone along with the two amendments that were made. Their purpose was to clean up the legal position of chemists and family planning organisations. I suggest that we stick to our amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Leader of the Opposition is adopting a rather unusual role in objecting to the move by the Legislative Council in disagreeing with our

amendments. I understand the Council is asking that the Bill be accepted in its original form. In effect it is saying that our amendments are unacceptable.

I am quite convinced that the situation will not be abused. It has been pointed out that magazines imported from overseas, particularly those dealing with feminine needs, contain advertisements of products of even a more intimate nature than contraceptives. I do not think there will be any great increase in advertising if the Bill is passed in the form in which it was originally presented.

Sir Charles Court: It is not only advertising but also displaying.

Mr. FLETCHER: The degree to which contraceptives are made more readily available will be balanced by the decrease in the need for the termination of pregnancies. As a consequence, I believe the Bill in its original form is more worthy of consideration.

Mr. BRADY: I am staggered with what I believe to be the irresponsibility of another place in treating this measure in the way it has. I am also staggered that the Leader of the Opposition should express himself on this matter in the way that he did, because when the measure was before another place an attempt was made to show that the Labor Government was trying to put the Bill through the House. However, the Labor Party members in another place are outnumbered by two to one, yet the Bill is returned from that place which has insisted on the Bill being passed in its original form. It would appear that the Country Party and the Liberal Party in another place are prepared to allow this legislation to be placed on the Statute book.

Sir Charles Court: Was it not a mixed vote there?

Mr. BRADY: The position of Labor members there is such that the Labor Party could not win, if the Liberal Party and the Country Party did not want legislation to go through.

Sir Charles Court: As far as this side of the Chamber is concerned our members are free to vote according to their consciences.

Mr. BRADY: I do not think the Liberal Party and the Country Party should try to gain a victory out of this.

Sir Charles Court: It is not a question of "victory" but a matter of principle.

Mr. BRADY: I think the mistake of the age has been made by this Parliament in altering the 1939 legislation which contains three pages of restrictions on publicising and advertising of contraceptives, etc. There is just as much a need to have these restrictions today as there was in 1939.



I can argue at length against the viewpoint that because contraceptives are made more readily available the number of abortions will be reduced. That seems to be the viewpoint of many of those who support this legislation.

Anybody who reads the English newspapers will realise that despite the easy accessibility to contraceptives the number of abortions has not been reduced in that country. In fact, the hospitals are filled with abortion cases, and this has resulted from the permissive way of life. This way of life has been fostered through contraceptives being made readily available.

Parliament is letting the young people of this State down. I do not wish to vote against the members on this side of the Chamber, but this seems to have become a party political vote.

Sir Charles Court: It need not be.

Mr. BRADY: It need not be, but it will be.

Sir Charles Court: As far as the Liberal Party is concerned our members are free to vote according to their consciences.

Mr. BRADY: I am sure the honourable member will not tell me that half a dozen members on his side of the Chamber will support the question before the Chair. I am sure they will all vote in unison against it.

Sir Charles Court: Only if they want to.

Mr. BRADY: That is what they will do. I am not in favour of this legislation but I shall not be made the scapegoat to vote it out, because I feel it contains one or two redeeming features.

Since this legislation was introduced we have also had before us the Bill to amend the Indecent Publications Act. It seems that the onus will be on the Minister and the Government to ensure that the Indecent Publications Act Amendment Bill places some restriction on this type of advertising.

Veneral disease is rampant in this State, and has been on the increase for some time. It may be argued that if this legislation is passed the incidence of venereal disease will be reduced as will the number of abortions. If that is the case then something can be said for this legislation.

Unfortunately I do not know how far that argument can be advanced, but although it has advantages, it has many disadvantages. I am disappointed the Minister did not introduce a Bill to amend the Act because this Bill does not achieve what the Labor Party has advocated at its conferences. It does not insist that medical practitioners shall be at a clinic or that the contraceptives must be available free of charge, to mention but two items. I feel it would be better if we did not pass this legislation.

Mr. Gayfer: Vote against it then and it will not be.

Mr. BRADY: I have seen the member for Avon vote for many things he does not want! I am expressing my view and I am disappointed this legislation has been introduced. As I have said before there could be arguments for and against it, but in my opinion as a private member with a responsibility to vote, I think the arguments against it far outweigh those in its favour.

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this matter. I believe we should recall the reason for the introduction of the prohibition of the advertising of contraceptives in about 1935. I can recall that the weekend newspapers showed very clearly condoms with reinforced heads, French ticklers, and so on. The advertisements were not as savoury as we would desire, particularly in that day and age.

Dr. Dadour: And letterbox sampling.

Mr. JAMIESON: Probably other kinds of sampling go on in this day and age. As was pointed out a while ago, the position regarding contraceptives has changed entirely, and how the advertising of the modern contraceptive could be offensive I do not know. Probably all that will be advertised is a trade name and this will probably not be anywhere near as objectionable to the public as was the advertising in the old days.

I do not know whether a complete rehash of the legislation is necessary, but in the meantime I consider we should give the Bill a go and await the outcome. In 1935 very few people would approach a medical practitioner in order to have contraceptives prescribed, but these days nearly all women consult a medical practitioner because no real problem exists with the various kinds of oral contraceptives available. I believe we should let the legislation pass as was the original intention.

Sir CHARLES COURT: In view of the comments of the member for Swan I want to make it clear that my views have not changed and I could not care less how he votes. I made my position quite clear because we on this side of the Chamber are free to vote how we like. I indicated that two principles were being sought by the original author of the legislation and I was quite prepared to go along with those, but I think it is far too dangerous to contemplate going beyond them.

If the Government of the day saw fit to undertake a complete rehash of the whole legislation and introduce it on an expert basis as the result of a total review, no doubt we could arrive at legislation quite different from this. However, when a private member's Bill is involved and we depart from the original concept, I think it is far too dangerous. I believe we have gone far enough, and I want to make my views quite clear.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

**Ayes—21**

Mr. Bertram  
Mr. Bickerton  
Mr. Bryce  
Mr. Burke  
Mr. Cook  
Mr. Davies  
Mr. H. D. Evans  
Mr. T. D. Evans  
Mr. Fletcher  
Mr. Hartrey  
Mr. Jamieson

Mr. Jones  
Mr. Lapham  
Mr. McIver  
Mr. Moller  
Mr. Norton  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. A. R. Tonkin  
Mr. J. T. Tonkin  
Mr. Harman

(Teller)

**Noes—21**

Mr. Blaikie  
Sir David Brand  
Sir Charles Court  
Mr. Coyne  
Dr. Dadour  
Mr. Gayfer  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. W. A. Manning  
Mr. McPharlin  
Mr. Mensaros  
Mr. Nalder

Mr. O'Connor  
Mr. O'Neill  
Mr. Ridge  
Mr. Runciman  
Mr. Rushton  
Mr. Stephens  
Mr. Thompson  
Mr. R. L. Young  
Mr. W. G. Young  
Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

**Pairs**

**Ayes**

Mr. Brown  
Mr. Graham  
Mr. May

**Noes**

Mr. Williams  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Lewis

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Assembly's amendments not insisted on.

**Report**

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

**SALES BY AUCTION ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL**

**Second Reading**

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [10.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Before outlining the details of the Bill I feel that in the long run, some time may be saved if I were to give some background of the circumstances leading to the necessity for the amendments.

The Bill is introduced to overcome some of the weaknesses disclosed in the Act as a result of cases known as the "Borthwick's affair." I want to indicate that no reflection is intended on the firm, but the cases resulted in the imprisonment of three men and the fining of two.

The original legislation was introduced in 1937 by the late Hon. A. F. Watts and its purpose was primarily to discourage "tossing" or "lot splitting" which was a prevalent practice at that time. Lot splitting or tossing was a system whereby a group of buyers agreed between themselves that only one would bid; and quite frequently there would be only one successful bidder. This, in turn, of course, reduced the demand and the price paid for

the stock. The buyers then decided ownership by tossing a coin or, in certain circumstances, they would split the lot between a number of buyers. As I have said, the system reduced the competition and deprived the vendor of the true value for his stock. Because of the lower prices, lower commissions were received and the auctioneer also lost out.

The original legislation had no policing clause as it was anticipated it would be self-policing because the auctioneers themselves would watch the situation in their own interest; and this point was made perfectly clear by the late Hon. A. F. Watts in his second reading speech. The original legislation was designed to keep the buyers honest. I think it can be truthfully said that the present amendments are designed to keep the auctioneers honest. Much has been said about the cases which occurred three or four years ago, and it is quite true that the buyers from Borthwick's conceived the idea of being able to make—let me put it this way—a quick quid.

However, they would not have been able to carry out their scheme had it not been for the co-operation of the stock firm auctioneers and clerks. At least one stock firm—Elders-G.M.—knew what was going on. I think this is apparent from the details in a copy of a letter which was sent to the general management of that firm some little time after the cases had come to court. The letter was sent by a member of the staff of Elders-G.M. I have his permission to quote parts of the letter. As the interval of time is some two or three years, I think I am quite justified in not mentioning the names of the people involved, but only their positions. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read parts of the letter, as follows:—

I joined the company in October, 1967, and within three months was aware that certain transactions, if not of a sinister nature in themselves were being carried out primarily for the benefit of clients who were acting both as buyers and sellers at the same time. While I appreciate the fact that there can be, and are, genuine dealers who make their living by fattening cattle for resale, this situation was different, as you will now be well aware. During the greater part of last year the matter gave me a great deal of concern. I discussed the question with our stockmen and repeatedly indicated my disapproval to the chief clerk. On every occasion I got the feeling that I was becoming too interested in business which was no concern of mine. By the end of June, 1968, I saw fit to discuss the whole problem with our branch inspector, and he left Albany after one of his visits with figures showing that a substantial profit was being made by these activities, and in the full

knowledge that a great number of our Auction Sale Clerking Books bore numerous alterations, nearly all from the big butchers in the area, to two selected accounts. This in itself was evidently not enough to arouse official suspicion.

On the 13th September, 1968, while processing the latest Albany Cattle Sale, I had reason to query certain entries made by our head stockman. The encounter developed into a personal quarrel which has not finished yet, but during the conversation he admitted to me that entries made by him were false, and that cattle shown as having been auctioned were never at the yards at all, but were picked up from the dealer's property. He told me there were things I did not know about stock firms and their methods and suggested we talk the matter over with the manager.

A little later on he said—

The manager explained to me that these were big clients and they liked to do their business that way. The explanation did not satisfy me, as any account which had two legitimate outlets, namely sale by weight and grade, or private contract, would be unlikely to seek the co-operation of a stock firm in creating false entries in their records.

Let me point out here that the two legitimate outlets were those that the management of Thomas Borthwick and Sons had arranged with their assistant manager who was also chief stock buyer. They knew he was trading and this was a means by which the company tried to protect itself. Later on in the letter he says—

What does surprise me, however, is that those in authority who were fully aware of what was going on, were disinclined to attempt to stop it. I had warned my immediate superiors frequently, that sooner or later matters would come to a head, and I was repeatedly rebuffed. Had they heeded my warning earlier, the trouble with which the firm is now faced, and the almost certain loss of goodwill that will inevitably result would have been avoided.

That letter was sent on the 22nd March, 1969 and was acknowledged on the 1st April, 1969. The relevant part of the reply is—

Whilst we all know now that the points which you raised as far back as last July certainly warranted further investigation at the time when the branch supervisor looked into these various aspects he was obviously not able to pick up from his investigations and our records exactly what was going on.

It seems strange to me that a firm with access to all the records and the information was not able accurately to ascertain what was going on. Subsequently when the police moved in as a result of a warrant, they were able to establish that fraudulent dealings were occurring.

By the apparent default on the part of the firm, it makes one wonder whether the situation that existed was being condoned. I have pointed out that the management of Thomas Borthwick and Sons knew that their assistant manager, who was also chief stockman was associated with firms engaged in dealings. The company had tried to protect itself in a written agreement setting out how the stock belonging to the firm in which their assistant manager was involved could be bought by Thomas Borthwick and Sons. I made reference to this when I quoted the letter a moment ago.

It is not necessary to detail the court cases that took place, but I will give a quick outline of the manner in which the dishonest practices were carried out to the benefit of certain people. Both sheep and cattle at an auction sale were, in principle, knocked down to Thomas Borthwick and Sons. At the conclusion of the sale the clerical records—usually at the request of the buyers involved in the conspiracy—were altered so that the successful bidder appeared either under one of the trading names or, in some instances, under a fictitious trading name. This entry from the fictitious trading name or the genuine trading name was turned around again and the stock sold to Thomas Borthwick and Sons at appreciably higher prices.

I have with me a photograph of one of the entries in the clerical records which shows a sale in which 11 animals were involved. These animals had originally been knocked down to Thomas Borthwick and Sons. Subsequently the entry was altered to D.W. and Company. As I have said, 11 animals were involved and the total cost price of the animals was \$834. Immediately afterwards another entry was placed from D.W. and Company back to Thomas Borthwick and Sons at a substantially higher price—in fact, a total of \$1,210. By one manoeuvre, \$376 profit was made.

Another ruse was that cattle which never entered an auction yard were entered in the clerical records as having been sold at auction. They were subsequently taken from the dealer's place direct to Thomas Borthwick and Sons. I repeat that they had never been to the auction yards.

These practices resulted in the vendors being denied the full price that Thomas Borthwick and Sons were prepared to pay and the price which, in fact, they eventually paid. The only difference was that a substantial amount was taken out by these dishonest practices. In the process, the

stock firm—or firms—received two commissions because the same stock was sold twice. This may have been one of the reasons for the apparent lack of action to stop the practice.

Mr. Thompson: How is it that the vendors were not aware that their cattle never went to the auction yards?

Mr. STEPHENS: These stock were those belonging to the firm with which the assistant manager of Thomas Borthwick and Sons was associated. It was one of the ways by which he circumvented the written arrangement he had entered into with that firm. The firm thought that it was protecting itself.

Some members may feel the penalties in the Bill are too heavy. I emphasise they are always the maximum penalties and I would like members to bear in mind that the offences I have been discussing had been carried on for a number of years. The amount of money was considerable and far in excess of what was made known by the few cases which eventually went to court.

I will run briefly through the clauses of the Bill. Clause 3 alters the interpretation placed on the word "cattle" and adds an interpretation for a stock inspector.

Clause 4 seeks to bring the penalties more into line with 1972 money values, by increasing the penalties from £10 to \$250 and from £25 to \$500. Where imprisonment is a penalty, this is increased from one month to one year.

Clause 5 seeks to add new sections 3A and 3B requiring the auctioneer to keep a register, the details of which are outlined in the schedule to the Bill. These proposed sections outline the manner in which the register will be kept and the power of the police and stock inspectors to check same.

Clause 6 again brings penalties into line with current money values and makes provision for a successful bidder, buying on account of a third party, publicly to declare the fact. A new subsection is also added which makes provision for a penalty to any successful bidder who supplies wrong information.

Clause 7 defines an employee of an auctioneer and places restrictions on an auctioneer or his employee purchasing cattle on his own behalf without previously obtaining the consent in writing of the vendor.

Clause 8 contains a consequential amendment, adding a new section contained in this Bill that must be read aloud prior to the commencement of an auction. The penalty for noncompliance is also raised from £10 to \$50.

Clause 9 contains two new sections. The first of these is section 6A which retains a person's right to take any civil remedy.

The second is 6B allowing the Governor to make regulations to give effect to the provisions of this legislation.

Clause 10 sets out the details and form in which the register must be kept. I point out that the information required is virtually the same as is at present kept in the auctioneer's clerking books. The schedule merely outlines the manner in which the information will be kept.

I have placed one amendment on the notice paper and I have circulated copies of a second amendment. I will go into the details of the first of the two amendments more fully in the Committee stage. Its purpose is to tidy up any doubt as to whether rough books can be kept and the register written up at the end of the sale. As the Bill appears at the moment there is some doubt that perhaps a rough clerking record could be kept and, at the end of the auction, these records transferred into a register. If this is the case it would defeat the purpose of the legislation; because it was at the end of the auctions that the alterations were made. We must make it clear that the register must be kept during the period of the sale. It would be easy to transfer to the register different details and there would be no record of the malpractice taking place.

I have circulated copies of the second amendment to some members at least. The purpose of this amendment is to allow the police to follow through any entries that are made in the register including sales by private treaty of cattle that were passed in during the sale.

It is only reasonable that the police should be able to follow through to the accounts, sales, and invoices if they have any suspicions. This provision relates purely and simply to the Police Force. No reference is made to stock inspectors.

I believe the Bill contains two important provisions. The first is that a successful bidder—if he is not bidding on his own account—must publicly declare the name of the person on whose behalf he bid.

In the case mentioned earlier of a grower taking fat cattle to market, suspicion would immediately arise if the stock is knocked down to a dealer. However, when it is knocked down to a known wholesale or retail butcher, no suspicions arise. I suggest this is one of the reasons that in the past the stock has been knocked down to a wholesaler and processor—to cover up what was going on.

The other principal point in the Bill is the provision to give the police the power to check the register. The case referred to in Albany was discussed in the district for years. I think I am correct in saying that for three to five years farmers were aware that everything was not right in the conduct of sales. I know now that one of the police sergeants in the district was aware of this, but he could not get the

information on which to swear out a warrant to enable him to investigate the record. Giving the police the power to check the records is a very important point.

I do not believe that this Bill will entirely eliminate every malpractice. Laws against stealing have existed for hundreds of years, but this offence still occurs. I sincerely believe the amending Bill will tighten up the Act and the provisions will act as a deterrent. It will certainly make it more difficult for such a case to occur again. I commend the Bill to the House and I trust it will receive the support it deserves.

**MR. T. D. EVANS** (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [11.03 p.m.]: On behalf of the Government I will take what appears to be an unusual, but perhaps not an unexpected course of action in this matter. This Bill has been before Parliament for some considerable time and naturally the Government has pursued its hazardous course through and from another place with some interest. We now have the Bill before us.

I have studied the measure and I will briefly indicate the Government appreciates the motives behind its introduction. It is hoped to better regulate the conduct of sales by auction of farming produce in the interests not only of the vendor but also of the purchaser.

I commend the author of the Bill, Mr. Jack Thomson, and his co-author in this Chamber, the member for Stirling. I indicate that, with the amendments, the Government proposes to support the measure.

**MR. I. W. MANNING** (Wellington) [11.04 p.m.]: I would like to make a few comments on the measure before us. I have had a long experience in the buying and selling of stock. It is tremendously important that all the procedures at auctions are kept honest—not only must they be kept honest but they must be seen to be honest. It is of great importance when large numbers of stock are being bought and sold that the correct price be recorded. As well as this, the correct procedure must be followed.

I would like to commend the members concerned for the introduction of this measure. I am well aware of the details of the case mentioned by the member for Stirling. It highlighted the loopholes in the Act and it would be most improper to leave the situation uncorrected.

It has always been recognised that there must be free competition between purchasers of stock at auctions. This measure pays attention to the actual conduct of the auction and the recording of the buyer's name, which also is of importance. Quite often arrangements are entered into and occasionally a private individual will buy for another. However, such a situa-

tion is usually checked out by the auctioneers before the sales and is a recognised and quite fair procedure.

Representatives of stock firms frequently buy on behalf of clients, and this is also an accepted procedure. Such a case as that mentioned by the member for Stirling should never be permitted to occur again and, on my interpretation of the legislation, I believe it goes a long way towards preventing such a recurrence. I support the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bate-man) in the Chair; Mr. Stephens in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Addition of sections 3A and 3B—

**MR. STEPHENS:** I move an amendment—

Page 3, lines 8 to 14—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following:—

- (b) immediately after each lot is purchased or passed in at such a sale, shall, under the respective headings in the register or book that are applicable, make or cause to be made an accurate entry of all the particulars and on the same day shall sign or initial such entries, .

The clause clearly indicates the intention is that a register shall be kept during the course of the sale. The proposed amendment removes any doubt.

**MR. I. W. MANNING:** I am endeavouring to determine the difference between the Bill and the proposed amendment. I notice the Bill contains a provision for stock firm books to be inspected by the police and stock inspectors.

I have no objection to the police being given the right to inspect the books of a stock firm because this is a right we must always ensure the police shall have. However, I question the wisdom of a stock inspector being given the right to examine the books of a stock firm. I think at all times we should take care as to who shall be granted permission to have access to someone's books, and unless there is some good reason for a stock inspector to be given the right requested in this Bill, I do not think we should agree to the provision.

Also, a considerable increase in the penalties prescribed are indicated in the Bill and the member for Stirling has not told the Committee why there should be such a substantial increase in the penalties. I appreciate the object behind the Bill, but in an effort to close a loophole in the legislation we should ensure that we do not

include any provision that will give a stock inspector the right to inspect the books of a stock firm. Also we should take care about increasing the penalties to the figures proposed.

Mr. STEPHENS: It is not the intention that a stock inspector should take out any prosecution against anybody. I think we are all aware that at many stock sales in the country a police officer is not present, but a stock inspector is invariably present. Therefore, if anyone were suspicious about any transaction, the stock inspector could investigate it, but it need not go any further. However, if the stock inspector considered that further action should be taken he could then approach the police. The provision is sought purely and simply as a matter of convenience, because in some areas it could take a considerable time to get a policeman to attend a stock sale.

In view of the fact that the amount shown in the Bill is the maximum penalty, I do not think the figure is excessive. The court will still have power to adjust the penalty in accordance with the circumstances of the case presented to it. During my second reading speech I quoted an illustration that on one deal alone \$376 was made. Therefore, in such circumstances, I think that the penalties prescribed would be reasonable. Malpractices have continued over a number of years and I hesitate to name the figure that should have been in the pockets of the farmers instead of those who were engaging in those malpractices. In one year \$18,000 was made in one account alone. Therefore, I consider that the penalties sought are reasonable.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I appreciate what the honourable member is endeavouring to do and I accept his explanation in regard to the penalties. When we look at the facts of the situation relating to stock firms it must be appreciated that they enjoy a position in the community comparable to a banker. Many stock firms in the dairying industry, for example, have considerable sums of money on their books in the names of various clients. Therefore I would like an assurance from the member for Stirling that if a stock inspector seeks to make an examination of a stock firm's books, the books he seeks to check are only those that are made up at the completion of a stock sale and not the books of accounts of a stock firm which would contain highly confidential information concerning that firm's clients' accounts.

Usually there is never any argument over making a check on the successful buyer at a sale. I have often asked a stock firm to check its books at the conclusion of a sale. That is done fairly regularly. I seek further comment from the member for Stirling along those lines.

Mr. STEPHENS: I think I can give that assurance to the member for Wellington. I draw his attention to subsection (2) (b)

of proposed new section 3B which appears on page 3 of the Bill and I also draw his attention to the relevant section in the Act which provides that every auctioneer who conducts an auction shall keep a register or book, which relates to the register kept at the time of the sale. To me that is quite clear—that is, a stock inspector can only check a register that is required to be kept in accordance with the relevant section in the Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. STEPHENS: I move an amendment—

Page 4, after line 6—Add the following new section to stand as section 3C:—

3C. (1) Where a sale by auction of cattle to which section 3A of this Act applies is conducted by a person whose license is held by him for the benefit of a firm or company under section twenty of the Auctioneers Act, 1921, any member of the police force of the State may, at any reasonable time, inspect all invoices, account sales and other records kept by the firm or company as the case may be concerning that sale.

(2) Any member of a firm or any company referred to in subsection (1) of this section—

(a) shall hold all invoices account sales and other records available for the purpose of any inspection authorised by subsection (1) of this section; and

(b) shall, on the request of any member of the police force of the State produce the invoices, account sales and other records to him for that purpose,

and any member of a firm or any company failing to comply with the provisions of paragraph (a) or (b) of this subsection shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars.

(3) Any person who hinders any member of the police force of the State acting pursuant to the power given to him by subsection (1) of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars.

The purpose of this amendment relates purely and simply to the functions of police officers and not those of stock inspectors. After police officers have checked a register and a doubt arises they will be able to pursue the matter further by inspecting

the account sales and invoices relating to sales that had been entered previously in the register.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 6 to 10 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Stephens, and returned to the Council with amendments.

## **LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Council's Further Message*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's request for a conference, and had appointed The Hon. A. F. Griffith, The Hon. L. A. Logan, and The Chief Secretary (The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs) as managers for the Council; the Select Committee room as the place of meeting; and the time 10.45 a.m. Friday, the 24th November.

**MR. TAYLOR:** (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [11.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the time and place fixed by the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Legislative Council acquainted accordingly.

**MR. TAYLOR** (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [11.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the member for Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Bertram) replace the Attorney-General (Mr. T. D. Evans) as a manager appointed by the Assembly.

The Attorney-General will be absent tomorrow, and it is proposed that the member for Mt. Hawthorn take his place.

Question put and passed; the Legislative Council acquainted accordingly.

## **TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3.)**

### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

## **IRON ORE (McCAMEY'S MONSTER) AGREEMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL**

### *Council's Amendment*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

The amendment made by the Council was as follows:—

### *Schedule.*

Page 8, lines 15 to 17—Delete the words "together with such additional areas as the Minister may from time to time approve".

**Mr. T. D. EVANS:** The amendment made by the Council is to the schedule which contains the agreement. This applies to the definition of "mining areas" which is as follows:—

"mining areas" means the area delineated and coloured blue on the plan marked "A" initialled by or on behalf of the parties for the purpose of identification and comprising Temporary Reserves Nos. 4194H, 4326H, 5004H and 5006H together with such additional areas as the Minister may from time to time approve;

The Government recommends that the Council's amendment be agreed to. I therefore move—

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** The reason for this amendment is very simple, and it was mentioned when the Bill was debated in this Chamber. Under the present draft agreement there is a new format dealing with the definition of "mining areas." Under this it is possible for temporary reserves to be added indefinitely to the temporary reserves specified under the draft agreement.

I understand there are four temporary reserves mentioned in the agreement, but there could be another 11 under negotiation. Under the previous Government's format it was required to bring these types of major additions under the agreement back to Parliament.

I think the Government will find this a desirable situation because it does greatly increase the negotiating strength. Of course, some aspects of the variation clause could be used for this purpose, but I do not think completely, and I do not believe the Government would desire to do so anyhow. If adding new areas is not a substantial change warranting the matter to be brought to Parliament, I imagine nothing would be substantial. Therefore we support the motion.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

### *Report*

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR. I. W. MANNING** (Wellington) [11.32 p.m.]: I wish to direct the remarks I shall make on one or two items to the Minister for Works. I have previously mentioned land resumption compensation and the need for some speeding up in regard to the titles of land which has been affected by resumption.

A very real problem exists in this situation and it is one the Government should study because many landholders have suffered a great deal of frustration in regard to it. I am thinking now mainly of land which is acquired for roadmaking or roadwidening purposes, and very frequently properties are severed by such resumptions, and naturally some adjustment is necessary to the title, because without such adjustment the landholder is unable to borrow against it.

I have said on previous occasions, and I want to repeat it, that some speeding up of compensation payments must be made. I know that this is an area in which considerable disputes arise concerning the difference in the valuation placed on the land by the landholder and that placed on it by the department; but I do not think that this dissension should be used as an excuse for continual delays in finalisation.

Some very fine officers, skilled in diplomacy, are employed in the land resumption office of the Public Works Department and I often admire the manner in which they deal with people who are frustrated and upset about having their land resumed against their wishes, and about various other associated problems. So far as the departmental officers are concerned I could not raise any criticism at all.

However, something must be wrong with the system when these matters are continually dragged on and sometimes months and even years elapse before any finality is reached. I would very much like the Minister to have a close study made of the situation to ascertain whether he can have matters expedited. If he can achieve this he will be achieving something in regard to which all former Ministers have failed.

I also wish to refer to the necessity for the expediting of adjustments to titles which are necessary as a result of resumptions. Most landholders have their title committed in some way and if it must be altered because of Government action then it would be fair for the Government to use its influence to expedite the rearrangement of the title for the benefit of the landholder.

I could provide a list of those who have been inconvenienced in this way, but I would not be prepared to name anyone at this stage. I have personally studied a number of the cases and I can say in all sincerity that the landholders are extremely frustrated when the titles are not available in order that they might use them as security. In many instances farming operations are interfered with also.

I do not wish to comment further, but I do appeal to the Minister to arrange some speeding up as I have requested.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL**

**MR. J. T. TONKIN** (Melville—Premier) [11.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow (Friday), until the ringing of the bells, not before 11.00 a.m.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.*

---

## **Legislative Council**

Friday, the 24th November, 1972

The **PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 11.45 a.m., and read prayers.

### **LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Conference Managers' Report*

**THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS** (South-East—Chief Secretary) [11.48 a.m.]: I wish to report on the conference of managers as follows:—

The Committee of Managers agrees that the Amendments made by the Legislative Assembly to the Bill to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1954-1970 be not proceeded with; and that the Bill as presented to the Legislative Assembly by the Legislative Council be agreed to.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question put and passed and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

### **APPLE AND PEAR INDUSTRY BILL**

#### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 7, 8 and 10 and had disagreed to Nos. 1 to 6 and No. 9 now considered.