

and, as I have said, I would like to see no open season at all on wildlife.

Perhaps one day when we become a little more civilised we may include the necessary provisions in future legislation.

There is one clause in the Bill to which the Opposition is completely opposed and which we intend to vote against. This is to be found on page 15 in subparagraph (vii) of paragraph (b) of clause 23. If this subparagraph is passed by the Chamber it will mean that any wildlife officer who suspects that an offence has been committed or is likely to be committed against the Act will have the right to enter any private property. He will be able to enter any person's back garden, courtyard, or patio without a warrant and search the area and seize the property. We see this as an invasion of the citizen's privacy.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is provided in quite a number of Statutes.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am not so sure that it is.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It happens to be provided in the Marketing of Barley Act.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: If it is it does not mean that it is right, and we should see just where we are going with this type of provision. Perhaps there may be occasions when it could be necessary because of some serious crime having been committed.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is provided for in the fruit-fly baiting scheme.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We are not talking about the fruit-fly baiting scheme.

The Hon. J. Heitman: This Bill is not unusual. The provision is in many other Acts.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Let us say it is not unique.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Perhaps it is not, but it is an added reason for us to stop and see where we are going, because the rights of citizens are gradually being whittled away. Every time legislation is introduced further restrictions are imposed which threaten the civil liberties of people.

In this particular piece of legislation the right is being given to the wildlife officer to enter a person's private property—not to enter his house, but to enter his back garden, courtyard or curtilage as the legislation states—and search for and seize property, not because the person concerned has committed any great crime against the State, or because there is any threat to the State, but merely so that he can implement the provisions of this legislation. While I cannot have any sympathy for persons who may commit offences against the Act, I still feel we should consider seriously as to how far we should go in infringing the civil liberties of the individual.

Earlier tonight another Minister introduced a Bill concerning radiation safety which also contains a clause to provide for entry to premises. However, the inspector in that case has to first obtain a warrant. Surely, if a warrant is necessary on a question of radiation which could be a threat to life, it is all the more necessary when the offences committed under this Bill are involved.

As I said, it is time we considered where we are heading and examine just how far we are prepared to go in reducing civil liberties. There are people who subscribe to the police State philosophy who say that the civil rights of the citizen should be sacrificed in the interests of the State and no doubt they could adduce arguments to try to substantiate that contention. However, most of us in this country are very jealous of our civil liberties and are not prepared to support their continued whittling away.

One of our most precious rights is the right to privacy in our own homes and it should not be eroded any further.

I hope the Government will demonstrate that it shares the Opposition's concern on this matter by agreeing to delete the provision. The Premier in the famous Liberal policy statement—

The Hon. J. Heitman: What page?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Still not numbered.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —had a full page on the guarding of civil liberties. Yet in this legislation is a further example of the rights of the individual being threatened. Therefore, as I have said, I hope the Government will prove it shares the concern of the Opposition and agree to the deletion of the provision when we are in Committee.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) 19.03 p.m.: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 2nd September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.04 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 27th August, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (57): ON NOTICE**1. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT***Public Playground: Cost Study*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Premier:

- (1) When will the costs of establishing a public playground in 4 000 hectares of land north of Perth be known?
- (2) Was a feasibility study of the costs of establishment held before a decision was made to set up a giant "public playground" in 4 000 hectares of land north of Perth?
- (3) If "Yes" will he table a copy of such study?
- (4) If "No" was any assessment made prior to agreement to purchase by any officer of any Government department of the likely cost of the establishment of such a "playground"?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Because of the scale and long-term nature of the proposals, the total cost estimate is unlikely to be prepared. It is more likely that progressive estimates will be prepared, as projects within the total concept are decided upon.
- (2) No. On reflection, the Member will realise why such an approach is not called for in a concept of this kind. The important thing is to have the land available for posterity.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) See answers to (1) and (2).

2. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT*Consultation: Tourist Department*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Was the Department of Tourism or the Tourist Development Authority advised or consulted about the Government's intention to purchase land north of Perth for a public playground?
- (2) Has a study been made of potential benefits for tourism in establishing a public playground north of Perth?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

3. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT*Public Playground: Car Parks*

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

Is it correct that plans for a public playground in 4 000 hectares north of Perth contain proposals for car parking in five peripheral areas?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Detailed plans have not been prepared for the 4 000 hectare reserve. It would appear the Member has confused the total reservation of 4 000 hectares with the concept proposed for Mussel Pool. The concept plan for Mussel Pool used to illustrate possibilities shows six areas for car parking. Obviously any area attracting large numbers of people will require some parking facilities.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION*Car Parks: Petrol and Oil Run-off*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is he aware that petrol and oil run-off from parking areas constitutes one of the most serious forms of underground water pollution?
- (2) If "Yes" has his department reports of any such instances?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No. This has not been shown to be a significant problem in the Perth metropolitan region.
- (2) No.

5. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT*Public Playground: Lawn Planting*

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

Does the plan for a public playground in 4 000 hectares north of Perth contain proposals for lawn planting?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Detailed plans have not been prepared for the area.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION*Chemical Fertilisers: Effect on Underground Water*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Is it correct that chemical fertilisers used to establish lawns and gardens, and chemical pesticides, can cause underground water pollution?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Under conditions of gross misuse of such chemicals pollution could obviously be possible.

7. URBAN LAND COUNCIL

Building Blocks: Cockburn, Wanneroo, and Beechboro

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

- (1) Will land purchased by the Urban Land Council at Cockburn, Wanneroo and Beechboro be used for residential blocks?
- (2) If so, when is it expected that this land will become available on the market?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Depending upon agreement of a programme between the State and Commonwealth Government lots in the Wanneroo Shire could be developed by early 1976. Cockburn and Beechboro would require 2-3 years before servicing could take place.

8. URBAN LAND COUNCIL

Building Blocks: Sale

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

- (1) When will the first sales be made of land acquired for residential purposes by the Urban Land Council?
- (2) Who will be the selling agent?
- (3) By what method will the land be released for purchase?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Subject to agreement of a programme between the State and Commonwealth Governments—early in 1976, unless an alternative source of development funds is found.
- (2) and (3) Decisions on these details have not been made.

9. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT

Public Playground: Effect on Gnangara Mound

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Has the Metropolitan Water Board been asked to comment on the environmental effects on the Gnangara mound of proposals for a public playground in the Santa Maria area?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The board is represented by its officers on the study group inquiring into the proposed land uses in this general area.

10. TRAFFIC

Pedestrian Overway: Lawley Street-Wanneroo Road

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Will he state the date on which the construction of the pedestrian overpass at Lawley Street and Wanneroo Road, Tuart Hill will be commenced?
- (2) If there is to be further delay will he state the reasons therefor?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Subject to final agreement to the design and sharing of costs by the local authority, which has agreed in principle to the location and provided funds in the 1975-76 Budget, construction will commence next year. Meanwhile, detailed design by the Main Roads Department is proceeding.

11. VAM AND WEST AUSTRALIAN GOLD DEVELOPMENT N.L.

Company Investigation

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

- (1) Is Vam registered as a company or a foreign company in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes" will the Minister direct inquiries to be made concerning payments to Vam by W.A. Gold Development N/L?
- (3) In view of the TDT programme of 21st instant will he direct that an inspector be appointed to investigate the affairs of W.A. Gold Development N/L, and/or Vam in the interest of shareholders and appropriate creditors?
- (4) Will the Minister direct that an inquiry be made into the records of the mine's tributers and the batteries concerned to ensure that such records are both complete and accurate?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) A company called Vam Limited incorporated in Victoria which was previously a "foreign company" in this State is now a "recognised company" in Western Australia.
- (2) No. West Australian Gold Development N.L. is (from the records filed with the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs) a subsidiary of Vam Limited. No complaint has been received by the commissioner from Vam concerning payments by West Australian Gold Development N.L. to Vam.

- (3) A copy of such parts of the transcript of TDT programme of the 21st instant which relate to West Australian Gold Development N.L. has been requested from the Executive Producer of the Australian Broadcasting Commission by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

Consideration of the Member's request for the appointment of an inspector on the basis of information disclosed in that programme cannot be given until a copy of such transcript is received.

- (4) I understand that questions concerning these records have been directed by the Member to the Minister for Mines.

12. PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

Bunbury, and Government Policy

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

- (1) Was the Minister correctly reported in the *South Western Times* of 7th August as having stated that Bunbury was one of the best equipped towns in the State as far as pre-school centres are concerned?
- (2) Is it correct that Bunbury is not likely to get a new pre-school centre on any of its primary school sites next year?
- (3) Is it State Government policy that pre-school centres will be established in areas where the need for such facilities is greatest?
- (4) If "No" to (3), why not?
- (5) If "Yes" to (3), why is a pre-school centre under construction in the Bentley area when that area is presently well served by facilities for pre-schoolers?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) The general policy is to establish pre-primary centres on the site of new primary schools each year. Such sites are usually located in developing areas where there is a clear need for educational facilities. However, in some areas, consideration might need to be given to special circumstances.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) The pre-primary centre at Bentley Junior Primary School will enrol 50 five-year-olds. Analysis of waiting list numbers at adjacent pre-school centres indicates a clear need for a minimum of a

further 50 places for five-year-olds in 1976. Within the school district boundary is a State Housing Commission multi-dwelling complex which alone will provide an estimated 40 five-year-olds in 1976. Hence, in view of these facts, the Bentley pre-primary centre is unquestionably located in an area of need.

13.

SPIRITS

Alcohol Content

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

- (1) Has the position of the alcoholic content of spirits in this State compared with the standard in the other States recently been reviewed, and if so, with what result?
- (2) Is it proposed to introduce legislation for this State to conform to the Australian standard?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
(b) No change.
- (2) No.

14.

POLICE

Gold and Drugs Racket: Threats to Journalists

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

- (1) In reference to the article in *The Sunday Times* of 6th July, 1975, headed "Gold, Drugs Racket Police probe at W.A. Mine", and in relation to the allegation therein, "Journalists have been threatened with physical violence . . . unless they dropped their investigations", has the allegation been investigated?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), will he advise whether the matter is still under observation or has an official conclusion been arrived at?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Journalists allegedly involved state that no such threats were made.
Apparently this is just another one of the phony allegations being made.

15.

GOLDMINING LEASES 4634 AND 4635

Eric Bernard Carnicelli

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

Would he please indicate as far as the records of his department show the interest (of a proprietary

type or simply a right to mine) of Eric Bernard Carnicelli in gold mining leases 4634 and 4635 (Yilgarn Goldfield)—

- (a) immediately subsequent to the withdrawal of tribute agreement No. 1 of 1973, withdrawn from registration on 26th June, 1975;
- (b) on 17th and 18th July, 1975; and
- (c) as of this date?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) to (c) Eric Bernard Carnicelli is not recorded as having any interest or right to mine in gold mining leases 4634 and 4635 (Yilgarn Goldfield) at the relevant dates.

However, E. B. Carnicelli Pty. Ltd. was the purchaser of 48/96th shares in each Lease by transfers lodged on 14th May, 1975, but registered only on 22nd August, 1975, with effect as from 13th August, 1975.

16. TRIBUTE AGREEMENT 1/73

Withdrawal of Registration

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

- (1) Reference the tribute agreement 1/73 Yilgarn Goldfield approved for registration on 19th July, 1973 and withdrawn from registration (No. 1 of 1975 registered 10 a.m. 27th June, 1975) would he please advise under which clause in the said tribute agreement was the withdrawal of registration made or whether the withdrawal of registration was effected pursuant to section 120 or section 128 of the Mining Act, and by what party, i.e., the lessee (W.A. Gold Development) or the tributer (E. B. Carnicelli)?
- (2) Would he please table the papers which initiated the withdrawal of this tribute agreement?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Tribute agreement No. 1/1973 withdrawn by mutual consent of the lessee West Australian Gold Development N.L. and the Tributer Eric Bernard Carnicelli by withdrawal No. 1/75 lodged at Southern Cross on 14th May 1975 and approved by the warden on 27th June, 1975.
- (2) Copy of withdrawal No. 1/75 will be tabled for one week tomorrow, or at the first opportunity.

17. WEST AUSTRALIAN GOLD DEVELOPMENT N.L. *Annual Returns*

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

- (1) Further to question 23 of 20th August, 1975 relating to the statutory annual returns of a company having a share capital and referring to West Australian Gold Development N.L. for the past three years, is the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs satisfied that the statutory obligations imposed upon the company have been duly and properly discharged, having regard to the fact that on information supplied by Parliamentary answer on 19th August, 1975, during the period August 1972 and July 1975 through the Marvel Loch State battery gold from Fraser's mine of which the said company is reported to be the registered proprietor in the order of 160.379 kilograms was won but yet the said returns do not specifically refer to Fraser's mine, or to any tribute agreement in respect of it?

- (2) If "Yes" would he explain in view of the above how such satisfaction is arrived at?
- (3) If "No" what action is contemplated?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs is satisfied that West Australian Gold Development N.L. has, for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974, met the statutory obligations imposed upon it in relation to the lodging of annual returns and accounts under section 158 of the Companies Act, 1961.

The accounts which accompanied each of those annual returns have been audited.

The ninth schedule to the Companies Act, 1961-1973 whilst requiring classes of assets and liabilities to be distinguished does not require a company to identify each asset and does not require a company to identify a particular source from which it derived income.

- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Not applicable.

18.

POLICE Gold Thefts

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

- (1) Further to my question 9 of 19th August last, would he please advise how many, if any, cases of

gold or gold matter have been confiscated by members of the gold stealing detection staff during the past three years where charges against the persons concerned have not been laid or where prosecution proceedings have not been commenced?

- (2) In each instance would he also advise the name of the centre (town) where confiscation was effected and the approximate open market value of the gold content?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) One.
(2) Kalgoorlie. Approximately, \$1.00.

19. FRASER'S MINE

Gold Specimen Stone: Value

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

Apart from ore from Fraser's mine at Southern Cross which has been crushed or treated through a battery during the past three years, what has been the value (open market price) of gold specimen stone won and disposed of as such during the period from the said mine?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I am advised by the Mines Department as follows—

309 kg of fine gold contained in specimen stone valued at approximately \$1 000 has been reported in the correct form and shown in the Mines Department statistics.

A further 5.8 kg valued at approximately \$21 000 reported by letter will be incorporated in the official statistics when the correct forms are obtained.

20. FRASER'S MINE

Gold Theft

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

- (1) Would he confirm that on or about 4th August, 1974, certain persons who were then interested in acquiring by purchase an interest in the goldmining leases comprising Fraser's mine at Southern Cross, reported their misgivings re the official production figures then current for Fraser's mine, to the gold stealing detection staff at Kalgoorlie?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) would he please advise what action, if any, was taken as a result of the complaint?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) Inquiries made—no foundation to the complaint.

21. GOLDMINING LEASES 4634 AND 4635

Transfer of Mining Rights

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

- (1) Has a transfer for the sale of proprietary mining rights in goldmining leases 4634 and 4635—Yilgarn Goldfield—been lodged with his department?
- (2) If "Yes" on what date was such transfer lodged and by what party to the said transaction?
- (3) Would he please name the parties to the transfer agreement and the consideration expressed therein?
- (4) Would he please table a copy of mortgage agreement No. 1 of 1973 between William James Grace and West Australian Gold Development N.L.?
- (5) With reference to question 23 of 20th August, 1975, would he please table a copy of the return (pursuant to regulation 216) for the month of November 1974 relative to goldmining lease 4635 (Yilgarn Goldfield) and also copies of the returns for goldmining leases 4634 and 4635 submitted subsequent to the said November 1974 returns?
- (6) Would he please furnish a schedule indicating as near as possible at monthly periods the price of gold as sold by the Australian Gold Producers Association since and including June 1973 to June 1975?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) Lodged at Southern Cross on 14th May, 1975, by Kenneth James Mellet a Director of E. B. Carnicelli Pty. Ltd.
(3) West Australian Gold Development N.L.—Vendor.
E. B. Carnicelli Pty. Ltd., H. Davies Mining Pty. Ltd, Purchasers.
Consideration expressed in agreement \$336 666.74.
(4) Copy of mortgage 1/73 between William James Grace and West Australian Gold Development N.L. is tabled for one week.
(5) Copies of returns for goldmining lease 4634 submitted subsequent to the return for November, 1974, are tabled for one week.

No returns have been lodged for goldmining lease 4635 in the period referred to.

- (6) A schedule accordingly is tabled.

The documents were tabled for one week (see paper No. 339).

22. FRASER'S MINE

Companies Office Investigation

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

- (1) Would he confirm that during the period 16th/17th May, 1974 or thereabouts a police officer attached to the then Companies Office in the company of a police officer then stationed at Southern Cross inspected Fraser's mine at Southern Cross?
- (2) If "Yes" did the first mentioned officer submit a report or make a record of his observations at and down the said mine?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.

23. HOSPITALS

Staff: Medical Examination

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

- (1) Is it correct that nursing staff and office staff employed at a public hospital are required to undergo a medical examination (at their own cost) and an X-ray examination prior to being so employed?
- (2) Is it also correct that all other staff including domestics and orderlies are not required to undergo such examinations?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "Yes" why should not the cost of the medical examination be borne by the employing authority?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) This applies in respect of most of the teaching hospitals but not uniformly in all hospitals.
- (2) This is the situation as a general rule.
- (3) It is the applicant's responsibility to satisfy the employer as to medical fitness.

24. IMMIGRATION

Building Company Nomination Scheme

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Has the migrant housing nomination scheme been reintroduced in Western Australia?

- (2) If so, would he table a copy of the conditions governing the scheme as reintroduced?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A copy of the conditions is tabled herewith.

The document was tabled (see paper No. 340).

25. CLOTHES AND FABRICS (LABELLING) ACT

Implementation

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) On what date was the Clothes and Fabrics (Labelling) Act proclaimed?
- (2) Have inspections been made to assess the acceptance of this Act by the trade?
- (3) What follow-up or on-going action is being taken?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The Clothes and Fabrics (Labelling) Act was proclaimed on the 8th February, 1974.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Regular checks will continue to be made to ensure that the Act and regulations are complied with.

26. BUILDING INDUSTRY

Construction Safety Regulations

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) From 1st July, 1974 to 30th June, 1975 how many employers have been prosecuted for breaches of the Construction Safety Act and Regulations?
- (2) What are the details of such breaches and results of prosecution?
- (3) How many fatal and nonfatal accidents were reported by employers as provided under the Act for the period above?
- (4) How many meetings of the Construction Safety Advisory Committee were held in the 12 months' period?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) 19.
- (2) 28 charges were laid which resulted in convictions and consisted of—
 - 11 for failing to notify commencement of work.
 - 5 for failing to comply with written directions.

- 5 for failing to provide guard rails.
- 5 for failing to provide public protection.
- 1 for failure to notify an accident.
- 1 for failing to display a warning sign.
- 2 charges were dismissed and 2 charges are pending a decision.

(3) 2 fatal and 78 non-fatal.

(4) 9.

27. KANGAROOS *Licensed Shooters*

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What was the number of licensed kangaroo shooters in Western Australia when the export ban on skins was implemented?
- (2) What is the current number of licensed shooters?
- (3) Is it intended that the number of licenses be now increased as a result of the lifting of the ban?
- (4) Is it a fact that "since the ban, kangaroo numbers had been building up in areas where shooters had reduced operations", as reported in *The West Australian* of Monday, 25th August?
- (5) If the answer to (4) is "Yes" what action is intended to rectify this situation?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The number of licensed kangaroo shooters operating under the red kangaroo management programme at 1st March, 1973, was 51, plus 6 station owners with restricted licenses.
- (2) 51 shooters are currently licensed under the red kangaroo management programme.
- (3) No.
- (4) Evidence suggests otherwise.
- (5) Not applicable.

28. BANANAS *National Marketing Development Scheme*

Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that the Australian banana growers council has received an exemption from section 45 of the Trade Practices Act 1974 and consequently the national banana marketing development scheme has recommenced operation in all capital city markets except Perth?

- (2) Is there any known impediment to the introduction of the scheme at the Perth markets?
- (3) Are there likely to be advantages to the Western Australian banana industry if the scheme were to be introduced at the Perth markets?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (3) This information has just been received and the position with respect to Perth is being examined.

29. FRASER'S MINE *Gold Theft*

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

I refer to question 9 of 19th August last and question 18 of 27th August (if applicable) and ask—

- (a) does the gold stealing detection staff suspect that any of the gold-bearing matter referred to in the answers to the above questions was derived from Fraser's mine at Southern Cross; and
- (b) even if there are no real grounds for such suspicion, having regard to the physical qualities of the gold-bearing matter would it be possible for such material to have emanated from Fraser's mine?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) and (b) No.

30. TOWN PLANNING *Kalgoorlie Shopping Complex: Rezoning*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) With regard to his recent decision to permit rezoning of portion of Hannan Street, Kalgoorlie, to enable an extension of the plaza shopping complex to take place, will he please advise the date of the decision and whether it is appealable?
- (2) Is he aware of the content of the second paragraph of a letter of date 5th June, 1975 sent by the Secretary of the Town Planning Board to the Town Clerk, Kalgoorlie (reference 653/11/3/2)?
- (3) Would he please outline the "further" sound planning reasons from the council which demonstrated to him a justification for approving of the rezoning?
- (4) Is it not true that in reply to a letter from him of date 18th July,

1975 the Town of Kalgoorlie confirmed—

- (a) that it still wished to proceed with the rezoning; and
- (b) that if the rezoning was to go forward the council would only allow an expansion of not more than 25 000 square feet?

- (5) Is it true that the matters raised in (4) (a) and (b) were his own suggestions and council merely confirmed them?
- (6) Did he regard the council's views with regard to (4) (a) and (b) above as constituting "further sound planning reasons"?
- (7) What guidelines have been adopted by MRPA with regard to the ratio that should be sought in terms of retail floor space per head of population?
- (8) What is the estimated ratio referred to in (7) above linking Kalgoorlie and Boulder retail floor space globally as of this date?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) (a) 19th August.
- (b) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The request for further sound planning reasons was based upon the presumption of the construction of a number of shops on the proposed zoned land. Further investigation showed that this presumption was not the case and hence the requirement lapsed.
- (4) (a) and (b) Yes.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) No, only confirmation of council's wishes to proceed.
- (7) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority retail shopping policy is still under consideration.
- (8) 20 square feet per capita.

31.

TRAFFIC ISLANDS

Fitzgerald Street, Northam

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Would he advise the total cost of installing traffic islands in Fitzgerald Street, Northam?
- (2) As the Northam Town Council has advised the Main Roads Department to remove the islands, when will this work be carried out?
- (3) What cost will be involved to remove the islands and the special tape between the islands?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) \$1 342.
- (2) The council has now requested a deferment until further notice.
- (3) \$120.

32.

TRAFFIC BRIDGE

Spencers Brook

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will a new traffic bridge be constructed over the Avon River at Spencers Brook this financial year, as indicated to me in my question of 1st August, 1974?
- (2) If "Yes" when will work commence and what will be the approximate cost?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) During the week beginning 1st September—\$145 000.

33.

RAILWAYS

*"Prospector" Service:
Cancellation*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

As the cancellation of the "Prospector" from Northam to Perth on Friday, 22nd August, caused inconvenience to many of the public, especially those with booked medical appointments, what action does the Railways Department contemplate to avoid a repetition when schools break up for the Christmas vacation?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Cancellation of the Friday Merredin-Perth "Prospector" service prior to the commencement of the August school holidays was caused by special arrangements made to convey children from the Northam and Merredin High Schools back to their homes from the inter-high school sports on Friday 22nd August.

This resulted in the non-availability of cars to work the return of the normal Merredin-Perth Friday service.

Advance advice of the altered service was published in both city and country newspapers.

The same situation does not arise at Christmas and as in the past, the Railways Department will provide a service consistent with traffic offering and to the extent of its ability to supply rolling stock to meet the demand.

However, should any alterations to services be necessary they will, as is usual, be publicised.

34. NORTHAM REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Permanent Care Centre

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

- (1) In view of the generous allocation of funds to Western Australia for medical services from the Australian Government, will the Minister advise if the permanent care centre at the Northam Regional Hospital will be reconstructed?
- (2) If "No" would he give reasons why?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) At the present time the Minister is not aware of a generous allocation from the Federal Government towards the hospital development programme. Advice is that \$108 000 000 is to be allocated between all States.

No decision in relation to Northam or any other new hospital project can be made until the State's loan allocation is determined and the amount and details of the Federal Government's allocation to Western Australia are known.

35. WATER SUPPLIES

Bedforddale Rural Zone: Survey

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Mines:

With respect to his answer to my question (2) of Thursday, 21st August, regarding the Bedforddale special rural zone (amendment No. 25 to town planning scheme No. 1 of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott) will he table—

- (a) any report which may have been conveyed to the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott at request and upon which any premise that adequate water for domestic purposes is most likely available in aquifers upon each lot, may have been based;
- (b) a plan of the zone showing the position of any known holes drilled for, or bores producing, water together with a note indicating age, approximate depth of each, potability and reliability of flow;
- (c) a short glossary of the most important investigations and/or reports undertaken from time to time which the department feels confirms its apparent opinion that water will most probably be available in sufficient quantity

and with sufficient regularity to provide for anticipated domestic use on each lot?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) There is no report as such. The only written communication between the Geological Survey Branch and the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire was a letter dated 23rd December, 1974, a copy of which is tabled. In addition the survey had discussions with a representative of the shire, but it was not stated that adequate water would be available on each lot—rather it was emphasised that this could only be proved by drilling and test pumping on each lot.

- (b) The Geological Survey Branch has a record of only five bores in the vicinity. The only known information is as follows—

- (i) Abandoned at 53 feet on hard rock.
- (ii) Abandoned at 36 feet on hard rock.
- (iii) Water at 20 feet.
- (iv) Depth 70 feet.
- (v) Depth 63 feet.

The approximate position of these bores is shown on the tabled plan.

- (c) The survey opinion as to the availability of water in this area is based on general hydrogeological knowledge.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 341).

36. PAY-ROLL TAX

Exemption

Mr MAY, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the current amount of general exemption provided under the Pay-Roll Tax Assessment Act, 1971?
- (2) How long has the current amount had application?
- (3) As a tradesman's weekly wage has increased in excess of 100% since 1972, has consideration been given to increasing the general exemption?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$20 300 per annum.
- (2) Since the commencement of the operation of the Pay-Roll Tax Assessment Act on 1st September, 1971.

- (3) This is under consideration, but it presents even greater problems to us today than it did to our predecessors when in office, and who rejected approaches for increase in the general exemption.

37. JUMBO STEEL WORKS *Meetings and Site*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Premier:

As in reply to my question 22 of Wednesday, 20th August, the Minister for Industrial Development advised that the Government would be associated at least in part with talks scheduled to take place in Perth next month as between members of a consortium considering the feasibility of establishing a jumbo steel mill in Western Australia, would he use his good offices to ask of the consortium members that they attempt to make time available to meet with representatives of the Shires of Kwinana and Rockingham and the Town of Cockburn so that the various interests and points of view of the local authorities in this area may be presented?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

It is understood that members of the consortium will be considering the economic feasibility study, which their technical group has undertaken, at its meeting in Perth and Melbourne next month. There will be some discussion with Government representatives on the general conclusions.

I believe it will be premature to ask the consortium members to consider, in detail, the particular matters of interest and concern in a specific area, such as Cockburn, Kwinana and Rockingham.

However, I can assure the Member that the Government will arrange for such discussion as he suggests as soon as the consortium advises it considers a steel plant on the Western Australian coast is feasible, and wishes to examine the alternative sites in depth with all interested parties.

38. WATER SUPPLIES *Bedfordale Rural Zone: Departmental Objection*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) With respect to the Bedfordale special rural zone (amendment No. 25 to town planning scheme No. 1 of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott), did the MWSSD Board lodge an objection to this proposed subdivision?

- (2) On what grounds and for what reasons were objections lodged?
- (3) Has the department expressed, in any way, reservations as to the likelihood of adequate water resources for domestic purposes being available on site on all or the great majority of the lots proposed?
- (4) Did wording included in any objection lodged by the department seek to convey or appear to convey the thought that the department—
(a) would not; and/or
(b) could not, supply reticulated scheme water to the zone?
- (5) Has the department made any general assessment as to—
(a) cost; and/or
(b) practicability, of extending scheme water to the zone?
- (6) (a) If "Yes" to (5)(a), what might be an approximate cost?
(b) If "Yes" to (5)(b), how far is the nearest scheme link capacity to provide sufficient water to the zone?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The board has reiterated that a reticulated water supply is not proposed.
- (4) to (6) See answer to (3).

39. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR *Cattle Prices*

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

- (1) Was the manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir correct when he stated over the radio on Friday, 22nd August, that prices being paid at beef cattle sales in the Eastern States exceed the price being paid for comparable stock in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, on how many occasions in the past three weeks has cattle sold at Midland been below prices paid in the Eastern States?
- (3) By how much has the price paid in Western Australia trailed behind Eastern States prices on each of these occasions?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (3) The General Manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board has advised as follows—

In each of the past three weeks cattle sold in some Eastern States markets at higher prices than Midland.

On the basis of the classification of cattle yarded prices in some Eastern States markets have averaged \$7-\$10 per head above prices in Western Australia.

40. MARGINAL DAIRY FARMS ASSISTANCE SCHEME

Applications

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

- (1) How many applications for assistance under the Marginal Dairy Farms Assistance Scheme have been received?
- (2) How many of these were successful and how many were rejected?
- (3) What is the total amount of finance which was involved with the successful applicants?
- (4) How many of the successful applicants hold market milk quotas?
- (5) How many successful applicants come from the following areas—
 - (a) Pinjarra - Waroona - Harvey-Brunswick;
 - (b) Busselton-Margaret River;
 - (c) Manjimup-Northcliffe-Walpole;
 - (d) Albany-Denmark?
- (6) On what date did the Government receive the first instruction that applications for assistance under the scheme would not be received after 31st August, 1975?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) 334 applications were received to 15th August, 1975, from 221 farmers for various forms of assistance available under this scheme.
- (2) (a) Approved 249.
(b) Rejected 33.
(c) Withdrawn 6.
(d) Pending 46.
- (3) The amount of finance for successful applicants totalled \$2 488 335. This does not include factory assistance totalling \$300 000 for changeover to handling bulk milk supplies.
- (4) 128.
- (5) (a) Pinjarra - Waroona - Harvey-Brunswick, 128 successful applicants;

- (b) Busselton-Margaret River, 87;
- (c) Manjimup - Northcliffe-Walpole, 25;
- (d) Albany-Denmark, 9;
total, 249 successful applicants.

(6) 21st August, 1975.

41. TOWN PLANNING

Bedfordale Rural Zone: Fire Brigade Board Objection

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

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

- (a) did either the Fire Brigades Board or the Bush Fire Brigade Board lodge any objection;
- (b) if "Yes" on what grounds did either or both object;
- (c) what answers were given to any such objection;
- (d) does any correspondence or any reports contain an observation by any responsible officer of either board indicating their agreement with, or rejection of, any answer offered to such objection;
- (e) if "Yes" what were such observations?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Neither board lodged any objections in connection with the Bedfordale special rural zone. However, the Superintendent of the Bush Fires Board met Armadale-Kelmscott Shire and town planning officers on 5th March, 1975, to discuss fire safety on lots 510, 514 and 417. The shire council planning officer informed the Government officers that council had already approved conditions as follows—

- (1) The open space areas designated as equestrian areas, passive recreation, buffers, walking trails, etc., are to be maintained as low fuel areas by either parkland clearing or regular prescribed burning schemes.
- (2) Bush areas within the subdivided lots to be subject to regular inspection by shire fire control officers who will institute a controlled burning programme on a 3 to 5 year rotation.
- (3) The foregoing conditions to be specifically included in the town plan.

This action was considered satisfactory as such provisions at the early stages of planning would greatly enhance fire safety in the area.

42. BEEF

Imports from Eastern States

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

- (1) Which firms imported beef for sale in Western Australia from the Eastern States in 1975?
- (2) Are any members of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee associated in any way with any of these firms?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) This information is viewed as confidential to the importers concerned and is not available to my department.

43. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR *Cattle Prices*

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

- (1) How many cattle have been yarded for sale at Midland in each of the past three weeks?
- (2) What percentage of the cattle offered were within the grade ranges set down by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee to be eligible under the minimum price scheme in each of these weeks?
- (3) What numbers of cattle were purchased at the set minimum prices in each of these weeks?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) August:
 - 4-6—5 221
 - 11-13—7 029
 - 18-20—6149.
- (2) August:
 - 4-6—11.8%
 - 11-13—8.7%
 - 18-20—7.4%.
- (3) The following numbers were purchased at or above the minimum prices—
 - August:
 - 4-6—616
 - 11-13—613
 - 18-20—452.

44. MILK QUOTAS *Purchases*

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

- (1) Will he list the names of the individuals, firms or partnerships

who have purchased market milk quotas from—

- (a) other producers;
- (b) the Dairy Industry Authority,

since negotiability was introduced?

- (2) What was the amount of quota purchased in each transaction?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) and (2) —

	gallons
B. M. & M. Clifton, Brunswick Junction	77
P. J. & J. Boley, Busselton	68
J. & R. M. Kitchen, Boyanup	180
C. R. McCall, Coolup	35
W. C. Scott, Elgin	96
W. E. & J. K. Davis, Harvey	14
C. S. & R. O. Maughan, Harvey	37
A. H., G. P. M. & M. A. L. Kau, Yarloop	64
E. & S. J. Bett, Mundijong	77
N. R. & D. G. Palmer, Harvey (14 + 16)	30
C. Marino, Harvey	21
A. L. & E. M. Johnson, Harvey	36
A. & T. Morabito, Harvey	84
B. W. & R. T. Harris, Waterloo	102
A. R. & J. E. Erith, Albany	20
M. R. Gillingham, Denmark	23
I. W. & E. M. Robinson, Narrikup	17
G. Ross, Denmark	23
W. J. & J. M. Bell, Waterloo	18
D. R. Bell, Waterloo	10
E. J. & J. M. Poller, Roelands	16
P. S. & J. M. Fry, Benger	25
V. B., B. S., K. V., S. E., G. A. & D. T. Bevan, Brunswick Junction	44
S. H. & L. A. Lang, Mundijong	28
T., S. & P. Kargotich, Byford	58
A. & J. D. Cumming, Byford	11
C. H., S. & G. Skipper, Pinjarra	80

- (1) (b) and (2) —

M. C. Fry & Sons, Donnybrook	62
R. R. Gulberti, Busselton	62
L. T., A. T. & L. S. Armstrong, Busselton	10
A. A. Woodward, Busselton	10
R. G. Kemp, Busselton	10
B. W. Becker, Cowaramup	10
J. M. & C. F. Boardman, Busselton	10
H. J. & A. E. Carter, Busselton	10
R. H., A. J. & J. M. Goldstone, Cowaramup	10
J. A. & R. E. Johnson, Busselton	9

45. WOOD CHIPPING INDUSTRY

Environmental Protection Objections

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Have the Department of Conservation and the Environment, the Environmental Protection Authority or the Environmental Protection Council any specific objections to the proposed woodchip industry commencing in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes" what are these objections?
- (3) Does the Department of Environment and Conservation of the Australian Government have any specific objections to the proposed woodchip industry commencing in Western Australia?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), what are these objections?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) The second interim report of the Environmental Protection Authority stating its position is currently in preparation and will be tabled after submission to Government.

The resolutions of the Environmental Protection Council in respect of the project are contained in the Environmental Protection Authority interim report of 24th August, 1973 (tabled paper No. 313 of 1973).

- (3) and (4) This question should be addressed to the appropriate Federal Government Minister.

46. TAXIS

New Regulations and Fares

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Traffic:

Further to his letter to me of 17th June—

- (a) have the draft regulations to replace the appendices to the Traffic (Taxi Cars) Regulations been submitted to Cabinet as proposed;
- (b) if "Yes" what was the outcome;
- (c) when is it anticipated that new fares and charges for Geraldton taxis will be gazetted?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) and (b) I understand that these were approved by Executive Council this morning.
- (c) It is hoped that this will be in the next issue of the *Government Gazette*. If not they will be printed the following week.

47. COUNTRY BUS SERVICES

Subsidies

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Transport Commission pay any subsidy to country bus services beyond that paid by the Community Welfare Department for carrying pensioners?
- (2) If "Yes" will he please advise the extent of the subsidy to each bus company in each of the last three years?
- (3) Is he aware of any subsidies paid by local government authorities to bus companies in country towns, and if so, will he give details of each for the last three years?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) South Hedland-Hedland Bus Service:
Year ended June, 1973—\$2 810
Year ended June, 1974—\$2 990
Hedland bus lines:
Year ended June, 1975—\$3 020.
- (3) Yes. Subsidies paid by local authorities towards the losses sustained by the bus operations of the Eastern Goldfields' Transport Board are—
Year ended 30/6/73:
Town of Kalgoorlie—\$3 450
Shire of Boulder—\$3 450
Year ended 30/6/74:
Town of Kalgoorlie—\$5 109
Shire of Boulder—\$5 109
Year ended 30/6/75:
Town of Kalgoorlie—\$8 900 approximately
Shire of Boulder—\$8 900 approximately
(exact figures not yet available).

48. TOWN PLANNING

Bedfordale Rural Zone: Lots

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

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

- (1) How many lots is it proposed to create?
- (2) What is the average size of each?
- (3) How many of such lots will have conditions applying which might enable them to be described as "duplex sites"?

- (4) Will such lots be appropriate for the use of strata titles?
- (5) In those lots described as duplex would each separate dwelling be required to have an independent—
 - (a) water supply of whatever type;
 - (b) 20 000 gallon or other capacity tank;
 - (c) bore supply?
- (6) Will prospective purchasers of any lots—
 - (a) be required to satisfy health authorities and others before building permit is issued that sufficient quantities of water for domestic purposes is readily available on site;
 - (b) be permitted to begin construction of residences before it is known that adequate water supplies are in fact available on site;
 - (c) be permitted to remain in full-time occupancy of any such completed residences, including duplexes, following any failure to locate adequate water supplies for domestic purposes on any such site?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) 103.
- (2) 1 hectare.
- (3) None, though the Council has discretionary power to permit a duplex development.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No lots could be described as "duplex" but if a duplex development was permitted the answers would be:
 - (a) and (b) Yes.
 - (c) No.
- (6) (a) Yes.
 - (b) No—they will be required to construct a 20 000 gallon tank.
 - (c) No—answered by (b).

49. WATER SUPPLIES

Rain Water Tanks

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Further to my question 21 of 20th August, 1975 under the circumstances described—

- (i) as to average daily water consumption; and

- (ii) the length of season last summer without significant rainfall, could he indicate approximate number of days' supply of water as may be obtained from a 20 000 gallon rain water tank—
 - (a) in the event of usual continued average daily use; and
 - (b) in the event of prudent but necessary average daily use?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (a) At the average daily consumption rate of metropolitan consumers (1.37 kl/day), 20 000 gals (91 kl) of water would last 65 days.
- (b) On the basis that an average family is 3.6 persons requiring a minimum of 35 gals per head per day, 20 000 gals would last 158 days.

50. BEEF INDUSTRY COMMITTEE

Cattle Sales: Control

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

- (1) In view of the further depressed prices being paid to farmers for beef cattle will he undertake as a matter of urgency to amend the existing Act to allow the beef committee to control the numbers of stock being offered for sale in Western Australia?
- (2) If "No" will he detail reasons for rejecting this request?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) Cabinet has already authorised the preparation of an appropriate Bill to deal with the situation.

51. HOSPITAL BOARDS

Public Servants: Membership

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

- (1) Has he recently written to some or all hospital boards indicating public servants should not be members of such boards?
- (2) If so, what is the reason for this?
- (3) Will he table a copy of that letter, please?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The major teaching hospital Boards and the Perth Dental Hospital Board have been advised of the Minister's decision.
- (2) The Minister considers that the officers' time spent at board and standing committee meetings can be better employed in their departmental functions.

(3) Yes, letter now tabled.

The letter was tabled (see paper No. 342).

52. TECHNICAL EDUCATION *Karratha*

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

Is consideration being given to the establishment of a technical education facility at Karratha?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Yes. However, until such time as the Federal Government has finalised its policy in regard to grants to technical and further education, the State programme cannot be formulated.

53. INDUSTRIAL SAFETY *Appointment of Inspectors*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Did he undertake to seek the appointment of more departmental inspectors to reduce industrial accidents?
- (2) If so, on what date did he approach the Public Service Board?
- (3) How many additional officers were requested?
- (4) What has been the decision of the Public Service Board?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Subsequent to a deputation of the Trades and Labor Council to me on the 5th June, 1975.
- (3) Five.
- (4) The board agreed to five positions being advertised which has been done and recommendations for appointment have recently been made to the board.

54. PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION *Classrooms*

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

Further to question (5) of 26th August, what is the total number of classrooms necessary to give effect to the Government's policy on pre-primary education?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The Government's policy is to offer pre-primary education on a voluntary basis to all five-year-old children in the State. This form of education is provided in centres which cannot be expressed in terms of classrooms. The number of centres to be established must depend upon the number and

distribution of children, and the number of existing centres to be incorporated. In the ultimate the Education Department might well be responsible for a pre-primary centre being associated with each of its 537 primary schools.

55. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION *Bedfordale Rural Zone*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Further to his answer to my question (14) of Wednesday, 20th August, regarding the Bedfordale special rural zone, does his reply mean that he is satisfied that from the reports conveyed to him by other departments from 100 to 150 families possibly with small numbers of domestic animals and stock, and with densities of up to two family units per hectare, could reside indefinitely within the zone, a large part of which is sparsely treed, and such family units not pollute by seepage or otherwise their own water supply which they are presumably obliged to obtain from ground-water supplies on their own lots, when, being situated on a divide, and where there is limited other catchment area for ground water other than the zone itself?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

A condition of each development contained in the town planning scheme for the area provides for the installation of a rainwater tank for domestic water supply.

Other development conditions will minimise the risk of groundwater contamination and it is envisaged that groundwater will only be used as a supplementary supply for garden watering, etc.

56. WEST COAST HIGHWAY *Swanbourne: Environmental Study*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

Has consideration been given to an environmental impact statement on the new coastal highway to replace the Servetus Street and Rochdale Road links currently termed West Coast Highway?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

From answers given to numerous questions in this Chamber, the Member should be well aware that a detailed investigation of the transport requirements of the area is currently in progress.

Until such time as the consultant's report is to hand, no decision will be made as to further action with respect to this matter.

57. SANTA MARIA DEVELOPMENT**Public Playground: Environmental Impact**

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Has the Department of Environmental Protection been asked to assess the environmental impact on the Gngangara underground water basin of proposals for a public playground in the Santa Maria area?

(2) If not, is it intended to do so?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) No.

(2) A decision as to whether such an assessment should be undertaken by my department will be made when and if the matter is referred to it.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE**1. FRASER'S MINE***Gold Theft*

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

(1) Apart from answering questions asked by me on the 19th August, has he made a public statement concerning serious allegations made in an article published in *The Sunday Times* dated the 6th July, 1975, and headed "Gold, Drugs Racket—Police probe at WA mine", which article called for official comment?

(2) If so, when, by what terms and, in essence, what did he say?

(3) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question, but as I did not arrive at Parliament House until about 4.20 p.m. today, I have not had much time to draft a reply. However, I do reply as follows—

(1) to (3) I cannot recall making any public statement to the Press in connection with this matter, and the reason I did not was that I knew the matter had already been investigated previously on two occasions.

2. NELSON LOCATION 7965*Acquisition for Reserve*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Has he seen in today's edition of *The West Australian* an advertisement offering 872 acres of land in the Windy Harbour area for sale

at a price of \$28 500 (Nelson Location 7965) as the vendors stated?

(2) As the block is situated in the area recommended by the Conservation Through Reserves Committee report to be set aside as a reserve extending for about 90 kilometres along the south coast will he indicate whether the Government will purchase this property for reserve purposes in the same way as the Tonkin Government did with 2 000 acres of land at Cape Leeuwin?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

I thank the member for Warren for adequate notice of this question, the reply to which is as follows—

(1) Yes.

(2) No consideration, at this stage, has been given to purchasing land within the area mentioned by the honourable member.

EXMOUTH*Development Plan: Grievance*

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [5.04 p.m.]: I wish to deal with some problems that concern the people of Exmouth at this time. I bring them before the House because as members will be well aware both the State and Federal Governments are involved in the affairs of the town of Exmouth. Therefore the matters I raise will come principally within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government. Nevertheless I put them before the relevant Ministers of the State Government in the hope that some assistance may be forthcoming.

There has always been a need for long-term plans for the town of Exmouth to be determined, but this has never been done. Unfortunately the situation became worse in the last year or two, particularly since the change of Government in Canberra, because this put the American base under a cloud. Members will also be aware of the "long march" by students—mainly from Melbourne—to the township of Exmouth, which was very unsettling to the people living there and earning their livelihood at the base. The very future of US bases in Australia has been under question with the present Federal Government, but in last Saturday's edition of *The West Australian* appeared an article under the heading of "PM reverses Bases Policy". Therefore it would now seem that the Prime Minister has changed his tune in regard to these bases and I am concerned about what seems to be a "soft-shoe shuffle" on the part of the Prime Minister. I only hope it does not turn out to be a game of Russian roulette for the town of Exmouth.

For example, the recent change of policy has been due to a change of control, which means that American servicemen will serve at the base jointly with RAN personnel, and, in fact, whilst speaking on the business of joint control I would point out that Mr Morrison, the Minister for Defence, put through a Bill in the Federal House last Thursday ratifying a new agreement for joint control of the Exmouth base.

Another disturbing feature is that in recent days I have been advised by Mr Morrison, the Minister for Defence, that the Civil Commissioner at Exmouth is to be retired on the 31st December this year. This is a most significant change.

Mr Taylor: Is he not already past his retiring age? Has he not already been granted extensions?

Mr LAURANCE: No, the Civil Commissioner will be retired on the 31st December next, and this is a significant change. The Civil Commissioner has been there since the township was formed and he has done a marvellous job. I have already paid tribute to the work he has performed on previous occasions in this House.

Mr Taylor: You had better check on that.

Mr LAURANCE: He has had recent extensions, but not because he has reached retiring age. A number of improvements effected at Exmouth have been the result of his work in that area. He has made desperate attempts to develop tourism to boost the economy of the town and give it some diversification.

Now that the role of the Civil Commissioner is to be changed, what happens? I believe this is an excellent time for both the State and Federal Governments to lay down clear guidelines for the future of the town to determine in which direction it is heading. Obviously the head of the RAN contingent will take over some of the duties performed by the Civil Commissioner, but I would like to see some guidelines set down by both Governments in this regard. There is the problem of the fate of the base in the future, and the problem of providing diversification for the town's economy and long-term security for the residents. The problems manifest themselves in a number of ways.

I wish to deal briefly with a few of these. The first relates to the provision of a television service. I asked a question in the House last week and I learnt that so far as the north-west is concerned, Exmouth is the largest town in that area that does not have a television service. In the last few days I have also learnt that Exmouth has not only the largest population in the State without a television service, but in discussion with a senior official from the Telecommunications Commission I have learnt that this is the largest population centre in Australia that does not have some form of television reception. This is

due in part to a lack of planning in the past. A spur line from the coaxial cable to Port Hedland has been put into Exmouth in recent years, but does not have sufficient capacity to handle a television service. This was poor planning. Last year a radio service was provided at Exmouth, but still no provision was made for television.

I have written to the US Navy requesting assistance with this problem and it has advised me that because there was no reconciliation of the two standards—that is the Australian standard and the American standard—no provision can be made for television transmission from the Navy base. A closed circuit service is provided for the Navy base alone, but not for the township. The service to the base was installed according to American standards and therefore cannot handle Australian television programmes.

The commercial interests in the town are very concerned as to what their future will be, particularly in the knowledge that the RAN personnel will be stationed at the base. The privileges extended to the Australian contingent are of the utmost importance to commercial interests. Previously there has been only the two groups; that is, US servicemen, who enjoy the facilities provided at the base, and Australian employees who are required to use the commercial facilities in the town. With the introduction of a third group—the RAN personnel—guidelines must be laid down as to whether they will enjoy the privileges extended to US servicemen or be required to patronise the services in the town. This point is of great importance to the commercial interests in the town of Exmouth.

The SPEAKER: The member has four minutes.

Mr LAURANCE: Another reason I bring this matter forward is that a great problem arose in the town this year when Toms stores were faced with some difficulty throughout the State. I had some discussions with Sir Thomas Wardle who was keen to transfer his interests to some other person to overcome the difficulty as this store is the town's major supplier. However, no-one was interested in taking over Toms store and fortunately Sir Thomas Wardle decided to continue his operation in the town. Other major retailers were not interested because even though the town has a population of more than 3 000 people, a significant proportion do not have to rely on the normal retailers in the town.

I also wish to highlight a question that the State Government may be able to assist with and I appeal to the Minister for Housing to liaise with the Federal Government for better planning in this regard. In the last few months a number of applications have been made by employees of the United States base to purchase their project homes. They have

been living in these homes for several years. Some of the applicants are the original employees at the base, and have been working there for 10 or 11 years. They are now approaching the age of retirement and they would like to purchase the project homes they have been occupying for that period. However, they have been refused permission to purchase them. Applications have been made to the Federal Minister for Defence, but the applicants have been told that there is no possibility of the homes being sold. If the employees were allowed, this would add greatly to the stability of the town.

The other question of housing to which I wish to allude relates to war service homes. I know of two applications for war service homes in the Exmouth area that have been made in the last 12 months, but both applicants have been advised by letter from the Department of Housing and Construction indicating that they were not eligible for war service homes. The letter included the following paragraph—

The Exmouth area has been previously considered by this Department and from information gained from various sources it has been determined that the purchase or the construction of a dwelling in Exmouth is not an acceptable security for the purposes of the Act.

This seems a crazy situation. On the one hand, we have created a multi-million dollar project which is operated jointly by the United States Navy and the Royal Australian Navy, and yet, on the other hand, ex-servicemen cannot apply for a loan to be granted under the Defence Services Homes Act because Exmouth is not an acceptable security for the purposes of the Act.

I therefore appeal to the relevant State Ministers to press for improvements to overcome these problems and have consultation with the Federal Government for much better long-term planning for Exmouth in the future.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.12 p.m.]: I trust the member for Gascoyne will pardon me for answering his queries in my capacity as Minister for the North-West and not as the representative of the Minister for Housing, because I propose to comment on the housing question raised by the honourable member as I do have some knowledge of it.

It is a fact that Colonel Murdoch has been advised by the Commonwealth that his services as Civil Commissioner of Exmouth will no longer be required as from the 31st December, 1975. Some explanation has been given that because the base is now operated jointly by the Royal Australian Navy as well as the American Navy there is no need for a man of Colonel

Murdoch's standing to occupy that position. We are certainly looking at the matter because whilst Colonel Murdoch, as Civil Commissioner, is paid by the Commonwealth Government he has certainly undertaken the role of local commissioner for the town of Exmouth and has performed that job excellently. Members on both sides of the House will recognise the services he has rendered. The matter still needs examination, because if the Commonwealth has its way and downgrades the position of Civil Commissioner it may well be that the person it appoints may not suit the State or the people of Exmouth.

On the question of housing and the requirement of people who are living in project homes at Exmouth, there could well be a problem. As I recall the position the houses built for the project at Exmouth were jointly constructed by the State and the Commonwealth. So once again the Commonwealth holds the whip hand. However it seems to me that this question needs some examination by the Commonwealth.

If Exmouth is to develop and become an established town with a stable population provision should be made for project homes to be sold to people who desire to spend the rest of their lives there. I am sure my colleague the Minister for Housing will take that matter up.

In respect of war service loans for remote areas, members will recall that prior to the advent of the present Commonwealth Government, the State Housing Commission of Western Australia administered the war service homes for the Commonwealth. With the change in administration, the responsibility for what is now referred to as defence services housing has been transferred to a Commonwealth department in this State. I might add that ever since that was done there have been complaints generally from people who have been seeking assistance in respect of defence services housing.

Mr Bertram: Nowhere near as many complaints as before.

Mr O'NEIL: I regret I have to advise the honourable member that he is absolutely wrong.

Mr Bertram: He is not, because he has evidence to this effect.

Mr O'NEIL: Plenty of evidence can be produced by people who have been seeking financial assistance for defence services homes, so what the honourable member has said simply will not bear examination. I suggest he should have another review of the situation.

In respect of war service loan assistance to people in remote areas, when we were in Government and administered this particular operation for the Commonwealth the State Housing Commission acted as guarantor in a number of cases

for war service loan applicants who desired to purchase homes in areas which the Commonwealth said were at risk. I can recall that at Kununurra many ex-servicemen desired war service loans to purchase houses in that town. The Commonwealth department refused to accept that Kununurra was in an area where defence housing loans could be made available.

At the time I, as Minister for Housing, asked the State Housing Commission to give a guarantee that if an applicant was in default of payment the commission would take over the house and buy it from the war service homes section. Surely the same sort of thing could be done in respect of ex-servicemen at Exmouth. It would be done if the responsibility for administering war service homes remained with this State Government, but the present Commonwealth Government is not as sympathetic to ex-servicemen as we were.

Mr Bertram: That is nonsense.

MINING DISEASES

Assessment of Workers' Compensation: Grievance

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [5.17 p.m.]: The grievance I wish to draw to the attention of the House relates to the manner in which the pneumoconiosis medical board, constituted under the Workers' Compensation Act, has failed to discharge its function in accordance with the prescriptions laid down by that Act.

Those of us who are familiar with mining diseases will recall that in the Bill which this Parliament passed in 1973 to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, with specific reference to the common mining disease of silicosis which unfortunately is all too prevalent amongst those who have worked in the mines on the goldfields, provision was made for people who suffered from such diseases and were thereby disabled from earning full wages to be compensated as though the disablement resulted by accident involving trauma in the ordinary way.

The Act provides that where a mine-worker or an ex-mineworker applies for compensation either for the disease of silicosis on its own, or for the disease of pneumoconiosis in association with chronic bronchitis, it is the duty of the Registrar of the Workers' Compensation Board to refer the claim to a medical board comprising the Mines Medical Officer appointed under the Mine Workers' Relief Act, a physician of the Public Health Department specialising in occupational diseases nominated from time to time by the Commissioner of Public Health, and a physician specialising in diseases of the chest nominated from time to time by the Commissioner of Public Health. That medical board receives certain directions under the Act as to how it shall discharge its functions. The question of the condition

of the worker and his fitness for employment is to be determined by, or by a majority of, the board whose determination shall be final, conclusive, and binding on the worker, on his employer, and on any tribunal hearing a matter in which such determination is relevant.

That sounds very reasonable. The question which arises is firstly whether the worker who is claiming compensation is suffering from the disease of pneumoconiosis in the form of silicosis. Secondly, if he is so suffering is he suffering to the extent that it interferes with his earning capacity and thereby disables him from earning full wages? If the worker is so suffering then he is entitled to workers' compensation, but the board must determine this question.

Guidelines have been laid down in the Act by this Parliament as to how those functions shall be discharged. Section 8 (1da) of the Workers' Compensation Act provides as follows—

On a reference under subsection (1d) of this section any duly qualified medical practitioner who has examined him on behalf of the employer may attend and make oral submissions to the Board, and, where such a medical practitioner does so attend the Mines Medical Officer shall so certify to the Registrar, and the practitioner shall be paid from the Fund such witness fee as he would have been entitled to receive if he had attended the Workers' Compensation Board to give evidence in a hearing before that Board.

Subsection (1db) provides as follows—

On a reference under subsection (1d) of this section, the Board, having examined the worker clinically—

that means physically, and not by means of radio transmission. To continue—

—scrutinised such x-ray films as it may think fit, considered such oral submissions as have been made pursuant to subsection (1da)—

that is by the doctor on behalf of the worker, or by the doctor on behalf of the employer as the case may be. To continue—

—of this section, and perused such certificates of other duly qualified medical practitioners as either party may in person or by his solicitor or agent tender to that Board, shall thereupon consider and determine the following questions—

What happened recently was that seven men, whose names and ages and their records of work as miners I have before me, applied under subsection (1d) of section 8 of the Workers' Compensation Act for examination by the board.

It was then the bounden duty of the board to call these persons up individually, examine them clinically, scrutinise their X-rays, listen to anything their doctor may want to say on their behalf, and listen

to anything a doctor may wish to say on the employer's behalf if the employer is calling a doctor to give evidence. After that the board has to devote its attention to determining the questions under the Act, and they are as follows—

- (a) Is the worker suffering from pneumoconiosis or mesothelioma?
- (b) If so, is he thereby disabled from earning full wages?
- (c) For what type of employment, if any, is the worker fit?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has four more minutes.

Mr HARTREY: Of course, those questions need not be answered if the worker is not suffering from pneumoconiosis. What happened in this instance was that recently those seven men were instructed to have X-rays taken; that was quite proper; and the board was entitled to examine the X-rays. After these men had been X-rayed and the board had looked at their X-rays, but not in their presence and without their knowledge, the board wrote to them and said they did not have pneumoconiosis.

That might have been correct; I cannot say, as I am not a medical man. However, not only is justice required to be done; it must also be seen to be done. If the law says the board must not give its decision on an examination of the X-rays alone, but only after it has examined the men concerned, heard their medical history from the doctors who have treated them for some time, and also permitted the employer to give evidence of their past medical history, and the board does not do so it has failed to comply with the provisions of the Act.

I say quite frankly I do not doubt the board honestly thinks in this instance that the men concerned do not have pneumoconiosis, but as the board has not made all the prescribed inquiries to find out, it is not legally competent to make that decision. The board having taken that attitude, I hope the Minister for Labour and Industry will see that in future the same thing does not happen again.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.27 p.m.]: The whole situation of people who are effected by pneumoconiosis and silicosis in relation to workers' compensation is extremely unsatisfactory. Personally I believe that compensation should be paid in the form of a pension to people who are afflicted by this and similar illnesses, rather than their being compensated under the Workers' Compensation Act.

In respect of the situation generally, and not only in respect of problems associated with pneumoconiosis and silicosis, I hope that very shortly a committee—preferably a judicial committee—will be set up to examine the question of workers'

compensation. Of course, the matters mentioned by the honourable member will come within the ambit of such an inquiry.

Mr Hartrey: In the meantime the board should still carry out its functions under the law.

Mr GRAYDEN: I hope this committee will be set up very shortly, and that it will be able to undertake an in-depth study of workers' compensation generally. I hope that one of the recommendations arising from such an inquiry will be to remove illnesses such as these from workers' compensation. In the meantime I shall certainly look at what has been put forward by the member for Boulder-Dundas. If anything can be done to overcome the problem to which he has alluded, it certainly will be done.

MEDICAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Pilbara: Grievance

MR SODEMAN (Pilbara) [5.28 p.m.]: The topic I wish to raise in this grievance debate relates to medical facilities and services in the Pilbara. Although this is the specific responsibility of the Minister for Health I feel the matter will be of particular interest to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer. As we all know, the State Budget is about to be formulated and it will be introduced early in October. It is important that sufficient funds be set aside to meet at least the minimum requirements in the Pilbara area. I appreciate that the Treasurer has many problems with the restricted finance that is available to him. His task has not been an easy one during the term of the present Government. I do stress that the points I am putting forward and the finance I am seeking are to meet the minimum requirements in my area.

The problem has been emphasised over the last few years by the increase in population, and although this increase has not reached expectations, nevertheless development of the medical facilities and services in certain areas in particular have stagnated to a degree. The services throughout the Pilbara need upgrading, but I wish to speak about the services in only three areas because of the shortage of time. These areas are South Hedland, Port Hedland, and Karratha.

South Hedland has only a nursing post at this stage, but it has a population of some 6 000. It is not safe to assume that South Hedland is being well serviced just because it is in close proximity to the town of Port Hedland. As a point of interest, Wickham, which is only 125 to 130 miles south of South Hedland, and has a population of some 2 500, has a 17-bed hospital and two doctors, and the doctors attend to between five and six outpatients an hour per doctor.

Getting back to South Hedland and Port Hedland, and their related problems, the Port Hedland Hospital is often filled to

capacity. Although statistics might prove otherwise, I am informed that the statistics do not take into account the fact that in the case of the intensive-care wards, used for specialised treatment such as obstetrics and so on, a certain number of beds have to be kept vacant. When that feature is taken into account it is found that the general service beds are filled to capacity. There is a dire need for an additional 25 beds in that hospital.

The number of doctors in Port Hedland is grossly insufficient. At the moment four doctors are located at the hospital and one other doctor is in private practice. The doctor in private practice is an orthopaedic surgeon and he services a number of other towns in the area. So, virtually, we have only four doctors at the Port Hedland Hospital.

I am informed by those who work at the hospital that at times, the doctors, have to service up to 16 outpatients an hour per doctor, whereas the preferred optimum is around five or six patients an hour. The Port Hedland Hospital had six doctors only 3½ years ago. Because of the increase in population the medical services in that town have taken a backward step in some respects. There is an urgent need for additional doctors at Port Hedland.

The doctors also have to cover the towns of Nullagine, Marble Bar, Jigalong, Goldsworthy and Shay Gap, and they have to look after the shipping requirements of the area. If it were not for the calibre of some of the people working in the hospital the situation would have got out of hand some time ago. On many occasions the doctors have to work up to 20 hours a day. If a doctor is not elderly, and he has had some experience, he can possibly work that number of hours for a short period.

I do not know whether members heard the radio programme during which Dr Peter Arnold, the Secretary of the General Practitioners Society of Australia, was asked certain questions. He said the situation regarding the shortage of general practitioners is critical. He had a pessimistic outlook for the future. The average age of GPs today is 52 years and this could indicate the cause of the present situation.

The situation at Port Hedland is supplemented by doctors being sent from Perth for 10-week periods. However, this system has proved to be unsatisfactory, even though it is better than nothing at the moment. Doctors do not have an opportunity to familiarise themselves with their patients, or with the hospital. The doctor-patient relationship is nonexistent, and the case continuity is dramatically affected. The family doctor concept is "out".

The SPEAKER: The member has four minutes.

Mr SODEMAN: The position in Karatha is that approximately 4 000 people rely on the services of one doctor who is provided with inadequate facilities. After-hours' service of any sort is nonexistent except in the case of an emergency. The doctor is continually harassed by people arriving at his house after hours. If the call concerns an urgent matter the doctor does not mind, but if the call is not urgent it causes frustration, and the doctor's home life is upset. Because of the additional pressures doctors eventually have to return to Perth.

What is required—as was stated in our policy prior to the last election—is a complete review of health hospital services in the north.

Mr Bertram: Has that been started yet?

Mr SODEMAN: I am not being critical of the Minister; I am emphasising our position so that it will be put into proper perspective and receive a degree of priority in the next budget.

Mr Bertram: It is long overdue.

Mr SODEMAN: We are in urgent need of improved physiotherapy services, a blood bank, and outpatient reception facilities at the Port Hedland Hospital. We require more itinerant specialists, especially in the fields of speech therapy, orthodontic treatment, and eye treatment. In one town, during a three-month period, more than 90 patients had to be transported to other centres in the area or to the metropolitan area, in order to receive treatment. They were flown out mainly by the Flying Doctor Service, or by means of other air services. That is an indication of the position in some of our Pilbara towns.

During the last 12 months I have submitted a number of suggestions and proposals to the Minister for Health but I realise that during the last 8 months his time has been taken up with Medibank and he has been extremely busy. Now that the question of Medibank has been finalised I hope the problem I have mentioned will receive some attention and that the medical requirements of the people in the Pilbara will be met.

I ask the Treasurer and departmental officers to give urgent consideration to this matter so that the people do not reach the position where their health suffers and, possibly, even lives are lost. If that happens the stability of the Pilbara area, in general, will be drastically affected.

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [5.36 p.m.]: The member for Pilbara has my complete sympathy because I experience the same problems in connection with my electorate even though it has not grown to the same extent as has the Pilbara area. I would like to say that the Minister for Health is well aware of the problems experienced in the Pilbara.

The Minister informed me that he recently appointed Dr Roe and Dr Roberts from the Medical Department to visit the north—including the Kimberley and the Pilbara—to carry out a comprehensive survey of the requirements of the area.

Mr Carr: Dr Roberts conducted a survey in the Geraldton area but we did not get any more doctors as a result.

Mr RIDGE: Well, give him time.

Mr Carr: How much time?

Mr RIDGE: How long ago was the survey carried out?

Mr Carr: During May.

Mr RIDGE: So it is now August. Has the honourable member followed up the matter to find out what the Minister is doing about it? It is no good just sitting there and complaining while not asking the Minister to do something.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RIDGE: I understand that application has been made to the Health Services Commission for funds to be made available to construct a health centre at South Hedland, and that consideration is being given also to the construction of a new hospital which would follow at an appropriate time.

The problem concerning doctors is one which is receiving a great deal of attention in an attempt to solve it. I know that one town in my electorate has had something like 13 doctors in two years. It appears the rewards are not great enough to keep the doctors in that town. Of course, other features such as climatic conditions affect the position.

The Medical Department is hopeful it will overcome the problems in the not-too-distant future. The Karratha and Dampier areas are not so badly served when one considers that three hospitals are situated in their immediate vicinity at Roebourne, Wickham, and Dampier. It is appreciated that something is badly needed at Karratha and I understand the department hopes to establish a health centre there soon.

Summing up: I cannot express the views of the Minister for Health completely, or perhaps as he would like to do himself. However, I am sure he will keep the situation under control and, hopefully, be able to keep up with the needs of the area.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Use of Office for Electoral Advantage: Grievance

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.39 p.m.]: The grievance I wish to voice concerns the use of office by Government members to gain electoral advantages. Allow me firstly to make several points which should be

borne in mind. It is always difficult to distinguish precisely between legitimate official action and political activities, which can infringe on each other. That is admitted, and recognised, and I am not suggesting they are at the Indira Gandhi level in the points I wish to make.

Further, I acknowledge and appreciate the courtesy extended to me, personally, by all Ministers in the existing Government. I certainly do not have any grounds for complaint at all in that regard.

A total of 12 ministerial visits have been made to my electorate during the last 18 months. I make the point that in quite a few cases a notice of the visits has been received via the office of the Liberal MLC for the area which is situated in another town. The initial notification has been passed on to shire officers and Government departments. In most cases the Minister's office has confirmed the visit officially. However, in several cases this did not occur. I do not take umbrage in those cases where the Council member has initiated the visits by the Minister, and where he has arranged the itinerary and handled the preparations. I have no objection where the initial action has been purely to project the Legislative Council member for the area.

Three Ministers have notified me directly, through their own offices. Coincidentally, they were three Country Party members. One Minister visited my electorate without giving any indication to me at all. I was unaware that he had been to the electorate until he had departed.

I find it difficult to excuse one visit by the Minister for Mines, when he was accompanied by two members of the Legislative Council and myself. Two local Press reports subsequently referred to the visit, both of which were telexed to Bunbury from the Minister's own office. The Press reports referred to the tour and to the fact that the Minister was accompanied by the Liberal Council member, but there was no reference to the presence of the member for Warren or the Country Party MLC.

I refer also to the CPA visit by members of the House of Commons when they toured the south-west. Preliminary arrangements were made by the Liberal member of the Legislative Council of his own volition. From my inquiries I understand he was not requested to do so and the initial arrangements were erroneous and confusing. The situation had to be retrieved by personal contact by myself so any political advantage hoped for by the member concerned was lost on that occasion.

It has been stated to me that it is the object, during the three-year term of the Government, to ensure that the other Legislative Council seat in the province is gained by the Liberal Party at the expense of the Country Party. That has been

stated categorically and I am sure that something along those lines has been started.

Mr Rushton: I think the member is unfair in saying I did not get in touch with him. When I visited the electorate he travelled with me.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I did not refer to the Minister in that context.

Mr Rushton: We were in direct contact and travelled together.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I ask the Minister to read the *Hansard* report where he will see I said I appreciated the courtesy he has shown to me. I make the point that I would be personally disappointed if I did not receive political opposition. I would feel I was falling down on my job. The Country Party member should be concerned because it looks as though 30 per cent of the total representation of the Country Party in the Legislative Council is in jeopardy.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.44 p.m.]: In answer to the honourable member and his grievance, I would say we could divide his speech into two parts—and not even parts either. One part is a matter of genuine protest where, apparently, he has not been advised through the proper channels of visits by Ministers. If that notice has not been given he has a genuine protest and it is accepted as such. His comments will be duly noted and passed on at the appropriate time, which is at a Cabinet meeting. When I receive complaints such as this, I make it my business to raise the matter because it is the intention of the Government to observe the courtesies.

However, I feel by far the greater part of the honourable member's speech was a mischievous one. He thought he could get out that little wedge, give it a gentle tap, and then a harder tap. I have been here for so long that I have become used to the sound of the little hammer, and then the bigger hammer, on the wedges. I think the honourable member should reconcile himself to the fact that the wedge will not get a grip at all, and it will fall right out.

Mr Bertram: I would not be too sure of that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I advise the member that as far as his genuine complaints are concerned, they will be taken up at the appropriate time and place.

The SPEAKER: Grievances are noted.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Justices Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), read a first time.

2. Medical Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill.

2. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Rushton (Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning), and read a first time.

3. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government) and read a first time.

4. Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr B. T. Burke, and read a first time.

5. Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interests) Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin, and read a first time.

BUILDERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL

Sale: Motion

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [5.53 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government has made a wrong and publicly unacceptable decision in regard to Tresillian Hospital and it should continue to use this hospital for its present purposes until all demands for accommodation for profoundly retarded physically handicapped persons have been met.

Further, that a full investigation should be made into:

(1) the effects on the aged residents of the Kareeba Nursing Home of the decision to transfer them unnecessarily; and

(2) the circumstances surrounding the Government's decision to drastically reduce the purchase price requested for Tresillian following the Nedlands City Council's decision initially not to purchase Tresillian.

The Charter of the United Nations—to which Australia is a signatory—says—

The concept of the dignity of man stresses that the self image of man... whether handicapped or not... is important. The mentally retarded person has the right to Education, Training, Rehabilitation and Guidance as will enable him to develop his ability and maximum potential and to participate in different forms of community life.

In Western Australia some 4 500 persons are registered as mentally retarded. Each year this figure is increased to the tune of some 500 more. Of the total number of people registered as mentally retarded, approximately 250 in this State are regarded as profoundly mentally retarded. This figure of 250 is estimated to increase perhaps by an additional 20 each year.

One in every 40 children born in Western Australia suffers from some handicap or another. The incidence is frightening, but the concern for these children should be the concern of us all.

In the case of the Tresillian Hostel, the Government has shown a remarkable lack of concern, a remarkable lack of compassion, and a remarkable lack of feeling.

Opposition members: Hear, Hear!

Sir Charles Court: Just the reverse. Do you want a solution to the problem?

Mr B. T. BURKE: In a few short months this Government has roused the community, angering many of its traditional supporters, but most of all it has carried out actions that can only be described as alarming and disturbing to those of us who see the care of the handicapped as a special responsibility of government. If in fact the care of the mentally and physically handicapped persons is one of our special concerns, then this Government stands indicted by its actions, and perhaps even more importantly, it has shown that in an era many people like to refer to as an enlightened era it is possible for an elected Government of the people to bow to the pressures of a dwindling number of people who would promote social discrimination within our community.

Sir Charles Court: That is not correct.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Not only has the Government not ignored the presence of those who would press for discrimination, it has aided and abetted those people in their purpose.

The motion says several things. It says that the decision to relocate the inmates of Tresillian was a wrong decision, and it says that this wrong decision was publicly unacceptable. The motion says that the present use of Tresillian Hostel should remain until the needs of all profoundly retarded people have been met. It says a full inquiry is needed into the position of those aged persons being forced from the Kareeba Nursing Home; and finally, it says that a full inquiry is needed into the decision to reduce drastically the purchase price of Tresillian Hostel.

Mr T. J. Burke: The Government could not care less.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Tresillian Hostel was established because it was needed. It was not considered ideal, but the experts then and the people who are still experts now, considered it was adequate to accommodate the profoundly retarded people.

But Tresillian never had a chance, and this fact is highlighted and illustrated by reference to the minutes of meetings of the Nedlands City Council, and also the minutes of the meeting of one of the sub-committees of that council.

On the 22nd January, 1974—members will see that this was before one profoundly retarded person had taken up residence at Tresillian—in that month, on that day, the council was complaining already to the Minister for Health about the plans to provide accommodation for profoundly retarded people at Tresillian. In fact, the council sought a meeting with the Minister for Health and the Mental Health Services, and also, it circularised residents about the situation as it then obtained. So we see that initially, before profoundly retarded people were shifted into Tresillian, the council was complaining. Not only was it complaining, but it was circularising residents—a move that was certain to stir up a storm of protest. Circulars were sent to the residents by the council about complaints that had not even been justified to that stage, or had not even been heard.

On the 19th March, 1974—the same year—the council considered the reply of the Minister to its previous approach. Quite rightly, in his reply the Minister said that the problems postulated by the council were problems and difficulties that could occur and perhaps would occur were Tresillian used to house aged people or for some other social purpose. He said in fact that whether Tresillian was used as a State or private facility, the difficulties postulated—that is, lack of air-conditioning, lack of parking, and lack of outdoor areas—were frequently encountered in facilities of this type.

The council considered the Minister's reply, and decided to do three things. Firstly, it decided to seek an assurance from the appropriate authority that Tresillian's purpose was to be a temporary one. This was the first time the word "temporary" had appeared in the council's minutes relating to discussions about Tresillian. The second thing it decided to do was to seek first option to purchase Tresillian, should the Government decide to relocate the residents living there. The council then took the third step, and decided once again to circularise residents, informing them of the present situation and providing them with additional ammunition to stir up the hornets' nest once more.

But not only did the council decide to do that; it also decided to contact none other than its local member of Parliament, Sir Charles Court, and put to him—a man surely not renowned for compassion—these problems which, if they had occurred, had been only during the first three weeks of Tresillian operating as a home for the profoundly retarded.

Sir Charles Court: Compassion! Listen to who is talking about a lack of compassion! I have more compassion for the handicapped in our society than you will ever have.

Mr Mensaros: It is only your youth which excuses you.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I heard the interjection of the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr Mensaros: Your father would never have said anything like that.

Mr B. T. BURKE: My youth is my excuse; the Minister does not have one.

Mr Mensaros: You are not worthy of your father!

Mr B. T. BURKE: On the 21st May, 1974, the Minister replied to the council's earlier approach, informing the council that there was no indication at that time of any transfer date. The Minister said that the transfer or relocation of the residents at Tresillian would depend upon the demand for a similar sort of facility by other profoundly retarded people, and the amount of money available.

Members should recall that I am not referring to a Labor Minister for Health but to a Country Party Minister for Health in a Liberal Government. We see that again, the Minister indicated quite clearly that the profoundly retarded residents of Tresillian were there indefinitely. If the Minister's statements were not enough indication of that, the council's reaction to his reply certainly was because it decided, firstly, to ask Sir Charles Court to hasten the transfer proceedings; not satisfied with the answer from the Minister for Health, the council decided again to approach its local member and ask him to hasten the transfer. To keep the Minister up to the mark, the council also decided to request from him details of all the efforts he was making to relocate these profoundly retarded residents of Tresillian.

I stress once again that this was not a Minister of a Labor Government under challenge and being asked to explain the details of his efforts to relocate these people; this was a Minister of the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government.

In July, 1974, the council once again discussed a reply from the Minister to its previous representations. Once again, that Minister indicated unequivocally that the present use of Tresillian at that time would continue indefinitely. In fact, he said that, given finance, two hostels the size of Tresillian would be needed to meet demands as they existed at that time. In effect, he said to the council, "Please do not ask us to relocate these people when, if we had the money, we would need to acquire two hostels the size of Tresillian just to meet present demands." He contended that four new centres would need to be built in the next six years to meet

the anticipated demand. So, we are certainly not playing around with a situation in which we have excess resources to meet a demand; we are playing with extremely scarce resources.

The Minister made a third point in his letter; he said that relocation was some time in the distant future. He did not say it would be a matter of weeks or months; because he had not been told by the Premier at that stage just what to say, he said it would be at some time in the future.

The council was disappointed by this reaction as evidenced in its record of minutes together with the result of the Minister's answer to its previous approach. But what did the council decide to do then? It decided not to give up the ship and not to sacrifice all hope but instead to approach once again its local member, Sir Charles Court, and request him to come to the council's offices to give them a situation report on what was happening with Tresillian.

Things then went quiet until the 15th April, 1975. On that date, the council considered a letter from the Minister for Health. Lo and behold, all things had come to pass and the Public Works Department had placed a valuation of \$250 000 on Tresillian and had offered the council the opportunity to purchase the facility.

Mr Bryce: A little work behind the scenes.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The council, having achieved a situation in which a relocation or transfer of these people was possible, decided firstly to reject the offer. It thought that \$250 000 was too much. However, it had an extra arrow in its quiver because after rejecting the offer it decided to seek a meeting with Sir Charles Court and the Minister for Health to discuss a further proposal.

Then, on the 25th June, 1975, the die was cast; the council voted, on the casting vote of the mayor, to accept an offer to purchase Tresillian at \$125 000. Although I do not intend at this time to dwell on the drastic reduction in purchase price, Mr Speaker, you can be sure that your curiosity will be satisfied when I deal with another part of the motion at a later stage.

So, Tresillian was sold and there were several interesting aspects to the sale. Firstly, the Nedlands City Council began its efforts to remove these people from its midst even before the first profoundly retarded person had taken up residence at Tresillian. Secondly, successive Labor and Liberal Ministers for Health had indicated to the council that the present use—as it was then—of Tresillian would continue indefinitely. The third very interesting aspect was the vivid presence and influence of Sir Charles Court throughout all the negotiations to which I have referred.

The decision to sell Tresillian was wrong by reference alone to the manner in which it was done, and the machinations and

methods by which the council and the other main actors in the scene carried out their roles. But it was more wrong by reference to the profoundly retarded and their right not to be shunned by the community in which they sought to live. It was wrong also by reference to the parents and families of the profoundly retarded who had fought so long and so hard for many years previously to avoid the prejudice and stigma which so often in the past have attached to people suffering this handicap, only to find in 1975 that this prejudice, stigma and discrimination was present once again.

It was wrong by reference to the experts in the Mental Health Services, who had advised the previous Labor Government that, while not ideal, Tresillian was adequate and appropriate for the profoundly retarded. Those experts presumably gave the same advice to the succeeding Liberal Government but, by reference to the fact that their advice was ignored, this decision was wrong.

The decision to sell Tresillian was wrong also by reference to the need that we as legislators and representatives of the people have to educate all people not to discriminate against the unfortunate and disadvantaged in our society. By deciding to sell Tresillian, this Government pandered to perhaps the most unworthy motive that any community or group within a community can exhibit. In fact, far from opposing this unworthy motive, the Government aided and abetted its implementation.

I do not think there can be any doubt to any member in this House that the decision to sell Tresillian to the Nedlands City Council was an unacceptable one. Let us consider the original petitioners who sought from the council action to remove the profoundly retarded from Tresillian. The result of that petition is an interesting highlight to the whole situation.

Originally, some 50 residents signed the petition seeking the removal of these children. The council decided at a later date to call a special meeting to permit those who had signed the petition to acquaint themselves with the latest information. Of the 50 signatories, only 30 arrived; of that 30, only 16 remained firm in their opposition to Tresillian. So, even that first fulcrum on which the Premier and the council placed their lever, to lever out of Nedlands and Tresillian these children, had begun to crumble.

In the following weeks, the Nedlands City Council received three petitions and numerous letters from people seeking to retain Tresillian in the Nedlands community. If that is not proof or evidence of the unacceptability of the Government's decision, let me refer members to one or two Press statements made by interested bodies in those months. I refer firstly to a Press release by the President of the

Slow Learning Children's Group of W.A. (Inc.). He had this to say—

As President of the Slow Learning Children's Group of W.A. (Inc.) I am speaking I believe with the full support of our several thousand parents and friends when I express grave concern over the possible consequences of the sale of Tresillian Hostel and the transfer of the children to another place. I believe I also express the sentiments of many other thinking and interested people in the community.

In this so-called enlightened era, it is difficult to appreciate that a local government authority, the Nedlands Council, can accede to the pressures of a few people to bring about a policy of social discrimination in our society . . . For many years now our Association has co-operated with the Government's Mental Health Services . . . This calls for integrating these people into ordinary society after periods of training and development . . . the major concern is the implications for the future and the effect on our policy of normalisation—placing facilities in the community to help the mentally retarded to develop to their optimum potential.

The President of the Slow Learning Children's Group of W.A. continued—

I feel sure that the actions by the few who have forced the removal of Tresillian will be frowned upon by people in the other Australian States and by many people here. I only hope that it does not bring us into ridicule there and does not jeopardize further progress in Western Australia . . . On behalf of the retarded who unfortunately cannot defend themselves, I raise this strongest possible protest.

So, the decision certainly was not acceptable to the Slow Learning Children's Group of W.A., which had achieved an official status through many years of hard work and dedicated devotion to the interests of these children. The Anglican Archbishop of Perth joined the Slow Learning Children's Group in protesting about the sale of Tresillian.

Mr Bryce: He should have some impact upon the Premier.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Yes, I believe the Premier is a vestryman. The Press report of the archbishop's comments is as follows—

The archbishop told the Mayor, Mr Charles Smith, that he wanted to protest against community attitudes that wanted to put handicapped people out of sight.

He said that 200 years ago a disadvantaged person was accepted by the village, known by the village and cared for by the village.

But today's affluent society wanted to flush all unpleasant things out of sight.

This was not to society's credit—nor to the support of those in need of care, their parents and relatives.

The archbishop said: "Mental illness or handicap should be seen as no different from physical handicap, and it is high time we removed the stigma and saw these people as people.

If there is one thing this Government did not do, it was to treat these people as people. This Government saw these people as objects to be shifted at the behest of a small group who did not want these unfortunate people in their midst.

Sir Charles Court: Of course we want them! I have had more to do with handicapped people than you will ever have.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I will prove to the Premier that there is no rhyme or reason for his actions, and without rhyme or reason there can be no alternative motive but to be rid of these people.

Sir Charles Court: Listen to the member standing and pontificating. We will have something to say about you in a moment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Prior to the tea suspension we saw quite clearly that the Government had made a wrong decision with regard to the relocation of the profoundly retarded from the Tresillian Hostel. The next proposition contained in the motion was that the decision while wrong was also publicly unacceptable; and we saw from the point of view of the Slow Learning Children's Group and from the point of view of the Anglican Archbishop of Perth that this was definitely true.

"Watchdog" is an organisation specially set up to safeguard the rights of the handicapped; and about the Government's decision "Watchdog" had this to say—

The Government's decision to close this Hostel without notification to the relevant Government Departments; parents and associated organisations, is a dictatorial move aimed at the previous intervention of concerned organisations and members of the community.

By what right should Tresillian be closed and the patients moved away as these children are not "mentally ill" but "physically and mentally handicapped" and should remain within the ongoing community.

The dictatorial principal of this sale should concern all organisations as it could set a precedent in respect to much needed facilities for all members of the community.

So we can see that "Watchdog" has joined the Anglican Archbishop of Perth and the Slow Learning Children's Group to condemn the Government's action.

A meeting of 400 people called specifically to discuss the Tresillian Hostel sale decided to ask the Nedlands City Council to reconsider its decision to move the patients. The speakers said it was frightening that people who were disadvantaged should be segregated from society. At that meeting the Associate Professor of Psychology at the WA University, Professor Birnie Birnbrauer, spoke strongly in favour of assimilating, rather than segregating, the disadvantaged.

In the *Daily News* under the heading, "Tresillian sale causes anger", we find the following—

Anger grew today over Nedlands City Council's decision to buy Tresillian Hospital from the State Government.

A group of Nedlands ratepayers started a petition to force a special council meeting about the matter.

On the 31st July there was a report in *The West Australian* headed "Strong vote to keep Tresillian", which stated—

A meeting of more than 200 Nedlands ratepayers last night voted overwhelmingly in favour of retaining Tresillian as a hostel for mentally and physically handicapped children.

The motion in support of Tresillian was carried by 181 votes to 36.

The Minister for Health Mr Baxter, said last night that the State Government would not be influenced by the result of the meeting.

"It is not a local issue, and I do not see how a meeting of Nedlands ratepayers can influence the Government's policy on this issue," he said.

I think what he neglected to say was that a smaller group of Nedlands ratepayers had definitely influenced the Government's attitude towards this matter. The group was so small as to be insignificant. In the *Sunday Independent* of the 12th August the following appeared—

The Court Government has shown many signs of wanting its own way—and this week's stand on Tresillian is a prime example—rather than seeking to do what is right for the public.

The Minister for Health, Mr Baxter, said the Government would move the mentally-retarded patients from Tresillian regardless of whether the Nedlands City Council was swayed by public opinion and rescinded its decision to buy the hostel from the State Government.

In doing so, the Government is completely ignoring suggestions from a responsible quarter. Its mind was already made up. It didn't want to listen.

How many times have we on this side of the House said similar things about the Premier?

Mr Moller: Hear, hear!

Mr B. T. BURKE: In July, 1975, under the heading, "Tresillian row; new petitions", we find the following—

Supporters of Tresillian Hospital at Nedlands yesterday changed tactics in their fight to retain it for mentally and physically handicapped children.

They are seeking signatures for new petitions to the Mayor of Nedlands, Mr Charles Smith, and to the Premier, Sir Charles Court.

The new petition to the mayor calls on the council to:

Support the continuation of the hospital.

Take steps to rescind any agreement with the Government.

If necessary, call a referendum on the matter.

A second petition to the Premier calls on the Government to reconsider its decision and to take no action in the meantime that would prevent the City of Nedlands from acting on the recommendation of a ratepayers' meeting.

On the 28th June there appeared the heading, "Tresillian sale brings protest". The article reads—

Other supporters are seeking legal advice on the possibility of an injunction to prevent the patients being moved till all aspects of the situation are considered.

In the face of these few Press reports, is any member of this House able to say that the Government's decision was a publicly acceptable one? Of course it was not! The Government's decision was foreign to the wishes of so many people in our community, but its decision is one that we have come to accept as being typical of the Premier—his will will out.

The unacceptability of the wrong decision was not stressed only because that decision on its merits did not appeal to many people, but also because of the manner in which it was implemented.

On the 27th June, 1975, a story was published in *The West Australian*, under the heading, "Tresillian sale was kept quiet". It reads—

A decision by the State Government to sell the Tresillian Hospital to the Nedlands City Council was made without telling the hospital's administrators and supporters.

The State's Mental Health Services, which runs the hospital through its mental deficiency division, was also apparently not told of the proposed sale.

With your forbearance, Mr Speaker, perhaps we could pause to ask the Premier why he did not bother to tell the administrators of the hospital that it had been sold.

Sir Charles Court: That is not my job. What do we have Ministers and departmental heads for?

Mr Bryce: Sometimes we wonder with your type of Government.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Just what action is the Premier to take against his Minister for failing to notify the administrators of the hospital?

Sir Charles Court: Surely you are going to tell us about the departmental heads; they are all part of the transaction: Don't you know how Government departments are run?

Mr B. T. BURKE: I know how this Government is run; it is a one-man band. The Premier takes a certain action and then tries to hide behind the departmental heads by saying they were responsible for the transaction and that they should have notified the people concerned.

Besides being implemented in rather slipshod fashion and besides being the wrong decision, the decision was unacceptable because it was a decision of double dealing; double dealing which the Premier was forced to hide behind to avoid an open confrontation with the department which served one of the Ministers in his Cabinet.

In *The West Australian* of the 1st August there appears the heading, "Court, dept differ on Tresillian". The article reads—

The Mental Health Services and the Premier, Sir Charles Court, differ over the use of Tresillian Hostel for the profoundly mentally retarded.

Sir Charles said last week "people in charge" had misled others early last year when they said the use of Tresillian for the retarded would be temporary.

But the Director of Mental Health, Dr Arch Ellis said: "The word temporary, so far as I know, has never been used by anybody except the Nedlands City Council.

What has the Premier got to say about that? There was not only double dealing by the Premier, his Minister, and his Cabinet, but also there was double dealing by the council; the council which during earlier complaints about Tresillian decided that it would not use the facility because of a lack of parking space. Yet when faced with the decision about the use of Tresillian for a senior citizens' centre the Nedlands City Council decided it could easily block off one of the streets near the hostel to provide sufficient parking. Of course the Government could find the answer, and the Nedlands City Council could find the answer provided the problem was not one which involved profoundly retarded children.

Here let me sound a note of warning of the words that will flow from the

Premier's lips when he confronts the problem. The Premier will seek refuge behind a big smokescreen. He will talk about the overall plan and say that the Government is going to purchase five hospitals for these people and how he will provide the necessary facilities for all these people, in the same way as, when we sought concessions for pensioners, he announced plans for an "overall" inquiry. That is the thing the Premier usually does. Faced with a specific problem, he will talk about buying five hospitals; not just one. If he buys more than one hospital it will be because the opposition of the people of Western Australia has shamed him into doing so.

Sir Charles Court: We are committed to a programme of accommodating the lot. We are not engaged in the political mischief that you are trying to encourage. In fact half your supporters have deserted you.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier has been nothing if he has not been committed, but the problem is determining just what he is committed to. Our motion also calls for a full investigation into the position of those aged residents who will be shifted from the Kareeba Nursing Home.

Sir Charles Court: They are going to be housed.

Mr Bryce: They are not, and you know it.

Sir Charles Court: This is part of our programme. Why don't you stick to the facts?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Throughout the years there have been a number of studies which show the impact of relocation upon mortality rates of institutionalised aged persons, and this is something to be concerned about. One such study is by Aldrich and Mendkoff in 1963, by Killian in 1970, and by Grad and Berenson in 1968; and they have all suggested that the relocation of aged persons has a negative effect, and for some people it is accompanied by increased morbidity and mortality. The Western Australian Government cares not, because to solve the problem of profoundly retarded children in the Premier's electorate it is going to relocate the aged people currently living at the Kareeba Nursing Home. Another study published in the *Gerontologist*, Volume 7, June 67, deals with the involuntary relocation of the elderly. It says, in part—

The data to the contrary disclosed that the older persons who had been forced to relocate had poorer personal adjustment scores as a group than did comparable persons not experiencing enforced relocation during the past five years.

These findings support the assumptions underlying the present study and indicate that forced relocation is a

stressful experience for older persons and is detrimental to personal adjustment in later maturity.

The Premier cares not. In addition to those theoretical and general statements made by the Premier about relocating the aged people, it is necessary only to refer to a report in the *Daily News* to see some of the harmful and disturbing aspects of the problem.

Under a heading "Tresillian move—a new heartbreak?" published on the 14th August, 1975, was the following—

"It would mean the end of a way of life for us," said Mr Kemp, whose wife, Olive (83) has been a patient at Kareeba for about nine months.

Several times every day Mr Kemp strolls 50 metres from his home in Knutsford Avenue across to the nursing home to be with his wife.

Does the Premier care?

Sir Charles Court: Of course he cares.

Mr B. T. BURKE: What really happened is this: the Premier has rushed to make a decision, and having made that decision, has found it is too late to renege. As he is wont to do, he has committed himself very quickly on the spur of the moment only to find a storm around his ears about which he can do nothing.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the whole Tresillian controversy centres around the drastic reduction in the price asked by the Government for the facility. If an inquiry is needed into any aspect of the Government's actions during its 18-month term, this is certainly one aspect which requires it.

As I mentioned earlier, the initial offer by the PWD was for \$250 000. The council rejected this offer to purchase and sought a meeting with the Premier (Sir Charles Court) and the Minister to discuss an alternative offer. What alternative offer were they to discuss? It was not mentioned in the minutes of the council meeting. The next thing on record concerns a discussion which took place at a special meeting of the Nedlands City Council's Health and Traffic Committee which was held to discuss possible alternative uses for Tresillian.

Up to that time the council did not even know for what purpose it would use the facility if it purchased it from the State Government. So we find the situation is that the council is told it can buy a facility and then must find a use for it rather than the more desirable situation under which an established need is fulfilled by a scarce resource—a scarce resource which until this time had been catering for profoundly retarded children.

That special meeting decided to purchase Tresillian at a cost of \$125 000 to establish a senior citizens' centre. In the space of just two months the purchase price of Tresillian had been halved from

\$250 000 to \$125 000. In effect it had been more than halved because of this \$125 000 the centre which was proposed to be established would attract an Australian Government grant of some \$80 000. In addition, the centre would attract a State Government grant of \$20 000. So the State Government was asking for no more than \$105 000 and the terms on which the Government negotiated the sale were nothing short of appalling because the Government agreed to accept from the Nedlands City Council \$25 000 per annum interest free in five equal instalments.

Sir Charles Court: Do you think that that valuation of \$125 000 is a fair one for the land and buildings?

Mr B. T. BURKE: I would not accept \$125 000 to evict 19 profoundly retarded children who can be rehoused only at a cost of \$290 000.

Sir Charles Court: Do you want to re-house and accommodate all of those children? Why don't you answer that question instead of trying to make political mischief out of this?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let me put this question to you, Mr Speaker: Would the continuation of Tresillian for its present use and the acquisition for the same use of Kareeba accommodate more children or fewer? Answer that as a reasonable man. It seems quite clear to retain both organisations and facilities would be to house more children.

Sir Charles Court: It is unsuitable and is acknowledged as being unsuitable. Do you want to keep them there forever?

Mr B. T. BURKE: How much more unsuitable is it to maintain these children at Princess Margaret Hospital?

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr B. T. BURKE: The initial choice was between retaining the children at Princess Margaret Hospital or providing them with accommodation at Tresillian. The experts the Premier employs opted for Tresillian, but he, facing the problems which arose, opted out.

Mr Bryce: He should look at Kareeba.

Mr B. T. BURKE: So the \$125 000 purchase price would comprise \$80 000 from the Australian Government, \$20 000 by way of a grant from the State Government, and an interest-free loan which was the amount of interest forgone when the Government said it would accept five equal instalments of \$25 000 interest free. Rough calculations show that in effect this State Government gave Tresillian to the Nedlands City Council and then gave it an additional \$5 000 at a time when the Premier continually exhorts the people to tighten their belts.

In addition the State Government has committed itself to the provision of another \$1 500 as an annual recurring grant to help cover the running costs of the

senior citizens' centre. Just how fair is that? Knowing that to relocate these profoundly retarded children from Tresillian the Government had to purchase the Kareeba Nursing Home at a cost of \$290 000, the Government first asked for \$250 000 for Tresillian and then accepted \$125 000.

Sir Charles Court: That was a ridiculous thing for the department to put up in any case, and the department knows it. You know it, too. You know that \$125 000 is a very good price to get for that land and buildings.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Is it not passing strange how the Public Works Department varies between being efficient and inefficient depending on how its actions support the Premier?

Sir Charles Court: They never changed that valuation on the land and buildings. Why do you distort the figure? Why do you distort?

Mr B. T. BURKE: If I do that, the Premier distorts the morality so many people hold dear.

Sir Charles Court: You of all people to talk about morality! You would not know the meaning of the word.

Mr Bertram: Oh what nonsense! You can do better than that surely!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr B. T. BURKE: In effect the Premier has handed Tresillian to the Nedlands City Council and, as a parting gift, has given that council \$5 000 and promised \$1 500 per annum to help the operation continue. If that is acceptable to the Premier and other members on his side of the House, then I am sorry for them.

The whole issue is one on which we have seen the judgment of the Premier very badly astray.

Very significant questions were raised by the member for Ascot during his discussions in this place at an earlier time. When he firstly asked the Premier whether he was disconcerted or concerned that the Government failed to notify him of the transfer of these people to the Ascot electorate, the Premier immediately sought refuge behind the Minister for Health; but a little earlier the Premier told the member for Rockingham that he was concerned he had not been informed when the Government decided to shift the mentally retarded children to Tresillian in his electorate of Nedlands. If it is good enough for the Premier, it is certainly good enough for the member for Ascot.

Sir Charles Court: Of course the member for Ascot should be advised, and I hope the Minister has done that.

Mr Bryce: That is really not the point.

Sir Charles Court: From the correspondence on the file it seems there has been

correspondence between the Minister and the member for Ascot.

Mr Bryce: We sought confirmation and received insults.

Sir Charles Court: I cannot see any evidence of insults in the file.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr B. T. BURKE: Another significant aspect was the Premier's lack of comment on another question asked by the member for Ascot. When he asked the Premier whether it was true that he, the Premier, had told certain residents in Nedlands that the Labor Party Government in 1974 had shifted the children into his electorate to embarrass him, the Premier merely asked for details concerning who provided that information to the honourable member.

Sir Charles Court: And I am still waiting for an answer to my letter.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier may still be waiting for details. We are still waiting for a straight answer. Did the Premier say that or did he not?

Mr Bryce: I guarantee you get a reply, a lot sooner than I did from you.

Sir Charles Court: I hope I do because the people concerned denied they said it.

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

Mr B. T. BURKE: By way of interjection the Premier assures us that everyone else has denied that he said it. Why do we not hear the denial from his own lips?

Sir Charles Court: I want the member concerned to say who told him that. That is fair enough.

Mr Bertram: What is fair about that?

Sir Charles Court: The people he accused have told me they did not say it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Balga.

Mr B. T. BURKE: This motion deserves to succeed because the Government made a wrong decision. By all the criteria we use to judge the worth or otherwise of the Government's action, its decision in this case was wrong. It is quite easily demonstrable that that wrong decision was not acceptable to the public. Furthermore, if the decision was wrong and not acceptable to the public, it is self-evidently true that the present use of Tresillian should persist.

Further, the contention of the Opposition is that an investigation is warranted into the effects on the residents at Kareeba of their unnecessary relocation. Also, there is a good case to say that in its financial dealings in regard to Tresillian a full and open inquiry into the Government's action is not only warranted, but essential.

Mr BRYCE: I formally second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands).

VERMIN ACT

Disallowance of Regulations: Motion

MR BARNETT (Rockingham) [7.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the regulations made under the Vermin Act, 1918-1973, published in the *Government Gazette* of 27th June, 1975, and laid on the Table of the House in the Legislative Assembly on 12th August, 1975, be and are hereby disallowed.

Firstly, I feel it is necessary for the benefit of members to give some explanation of what these regulations are and what they will do to aviculturists if passed in their present form. There are virtually five categories of birds listed by the Agriculture Protection Board. There are those which are not here at the moment and are not to be allowed in the State in the future, and there are those birds which are completely exempt from these regulations, and that includes birds such as swans and ducks.

Category 1 birds are those which are to be permitted to be kept and imported from the Eastern States and sold to other aviculturists in this State with the proviso that, as has always been the case in the past, aviculturists obtain a license from the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. Under the new regulations a \$2 permit must also be obtained from the APB.

Category 2 involves a list of birds which only those people who now have them within the State, or had them on the 26th June, will be allowed to retain. No more are to be imported into this State. Those who already have them must obtain a license from the Wildlife Department and a \$2 permit a head up to a maximum of \$20 from the APB.

Category 3 is a list of birds which the APB considers so harmful or potentially harmful that they are not to be kept in the State at all. People with birds in this category will have to get rid of them.

There has been quite a furore over these regulations, as members are aware. We have heard all sorts of statements made about the subject, but the most appropriate heading for these regulations would probably be "500 Ways to Cook Parrots".

I believe there is a possibility—a possibility only—that the APB has acted in good faith in submitting these regulations. It sincerely believes it has done the right thing. It believes that they are not anywhere as harsh as the original regulations and so aviculturists would be quite happy with them.

I can assure the Minister that nothing is further from the truth. Aviculturists are hopping mad, and this is quite evident from the number of them in the gallery tonight.

Nobody likes regulations which control his hobby, probably least of all the avi-

culturist; and to a certain extent I agree. I am not sure that the basis of the evidence put forward by the Agriculture Protection Board shows any need at all for regulations to control aviculture as such. I concede that the evidence it has put forward shows problems have been caused by the release of birds elsewhere in the world outside their natural environment, but to the best of my knowledge no evidence whatsoever has been produced by the APB to show this problem is attributable directly to aviculturists. Indeed, there is a great amount of evidence to show that Governments and Government departments are responsible for the problems which have been caused in this State and elsewhere in the world.

These regulations are highly discriminatory. They say that certain sections of the community, provided they were fortunate enough to own certain birds on the 26th June this year, will be able to keep those birds and swap them with other people who were also fortunate enough to have those types of birds on the 26th June. However, those who did not have such birds cannot now have them, nor can they ever have them. Those people are faced with the situation that their next-door neighbours may be able to keep those birds but they themselves cannot. Nothing could be more discriminatory than that.

As far as I am concerned, it is a scurrilous situation. Consider the aviculturist who has been keeping birds for many years and has raised his family with birds. Members of the family may want to leave home and take up the hobby of aviculture. Their parents are permitted to keep the birds they had on the 26th June, but the members of the family are not so permitted. They are permitted to keep only a certain type and number of birds.

Mr Thompson: You do not tell us what you believe the regulations should be.

Mr BARNETT: I have a long way to go and will develop that. Let us consider the situation of retired people or people who are about to retire. Those people may well have wanted to keep birds during their lifetime, but by virtue of the fact that they were working they could not have looked after the birds properly, so they hope to get the birds, perhaps at the end of this year when they retire; but they will not be able to do that because of these regulations.

There is nothing just about the regulations. The reason they have been put forward in their present form is that in 1972 the APB, as a result of research by one man, published a list of birds and said any aviculturist who held these birds would have two years to dispose of them. They could be disposed of outside the State, not within the State, and if they were not disposed of outside the State within that period they would have to be delivered up to the APB to have their

necks wrung. During this period regulations necessitating keeping the sexes apart and so on applied to them.

As a result of these initial announcements, a society called the Combined Bird Organisations was formed precisely for the purpose of posing the hardship created by the proposals put forward by the APB. The Combined Bird Organisations consists of the Avicultural Society of Western Australia, the South West Avicultural Society, the Melville Districts Caged Birds Improvement Society, the Midland and Districts Caged Birds Society, the Northern Districts Caged Birds Society, the Budgerigar Society of Western Australia, the Geraldton and Districts Avicultural Society of Western Australia, the Goldfields Avicultural and Wildlife Society, the Canary and Caged Birds Improvement Society of Western Australia, and the Rockingham Caged Birds Society. Two of those clubs have now become defunct but I understand the members have joined other organisations and are still pledging their support to this cause. The financial membership of the organisation is between 4 500 and 5 000—not a small number of people.

Mr Thompson: What percentage of the total number of bird-keepers does that represent?

Mr BARNETT: When this organisation was formed it agreed on the 30th March, 1972, that its aim would be the maintaining of acceptable conditions regarding regulations governing the species of birds, types of which had to be approved by the body. In a letter sent out by representatives of the Combined Bird Organisations recently it was mentioned the organisation had never been in favour of these regulations and had done everything possible to lay a basis for the effective keeping of birds which all bird-lovers would accept.

After three years of work and meeting after meeting, the Agriculture Protection Board has reached what it considers is a tremendous compromise. It has agreed that the birds it said would have to be sent out of the State or have their necks wrung could now be kept under the provisions of category 2: those who now have them may keep them, but those who do not now have them may not acquire them. I submit to members opposite that aviculturists are forced to accept that type of regulation unless we here decide the regulations are discriminatory. Aviculturists have the alternative of, on the one hand, sending the birds out of the State or killing them, or, on the other hand, keeping the birds under these regulations. I suggest it is better to keep them according to these scurrilous regulations than to kill them and not have them at all; but it is up to us to make a much more just and acceptable set of regulations than those which have been presented to this House.

I quote only one newspaper item at the time the original list was published by the APB in 1972. It is headed "Man kills 36 lovebirds", and reads—

Rather than wait for the Agriculture Protection Board to wring the necks of his birds a man yesterday humanely disposed of 36 of his birds, declared vermin by the APB.

These regulations have been produced almost in total on the work of one man—a biologist working with the APB. Later in my speech I will dispute what this man has to say. I do not wish to cast aspersions on him but I feel quite strongly that the APB has no right to present to us regulations which are based on the work of one man only which no person or authority either here or in any other State has been able to look at and criticise.

In a sheet put out by Mr A. R. Tomlinson, the Chief Executive Officer of the Agriculture Protection Board, he said—

Whilst some people who do not know all the facts have criticised the Government, the Agriculture Protection Board and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife for bringing in these restrictions, the facts of the matter clearly illustrate that aviary birds do pose a threat, both to primary production and to our native species of wildlife. During the research programme evidence was uncovered of 287 species of birds which had been released (or escaped) in new habitats throughout the world. Of these, 138 species became established, and, of these, 35 species became pests in their adopted homes. A total of at least nine species are already known to have been introduced and established in W.A., while more are now acclimatised in other States.

Perhaps I misinterpret the reasons put forward by Mr Tomlinson for the regulations but in my opinion he implies that aviculturists are responsible for these releases. He leaves no room for doubt in my mind, in any event, that this is his attitude.

On the 20th August, 1975, I asked the Minister for Agriculture to advise—

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

The Minister replied—

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

Mr Old: Did you bother to go out?

Mr Sibson: Did you go?

Mr BARNETT: Yes, I did. I will come to that. What the Minister for Agriculture was telling me was that after 10 years' work by the APB he could not answer that question. He could put forward allegations about those species of birds being released or escaping and becoming a menace but he could not list them in answering my question.

On Monday this week I rang the APB to ask whether it would be all right for me to peruse the manuscript. At the same time I asked why it was that after 10 years' work the board could not answer a simple question like that. Surely the birds would be listed somewhere and the list would be fairly easy to obtain. I was told by an official it may take some months of work to compile the answer.

It is not a very satisfactory state of affairs when people put forward regulations like that. Surely they should have the facts to back them up. I went to the research department of the APB at Forrestfield on Monday and I was permitted to read through a copy of the manuscript. I might add, before I quote from it, that the author updated the list for me, so it cannot be said the list was compiled in 1972, as was stated at a meeting on Monday afternoon.

It is unfortunate that I will have to read the list. I would rather hand it in and have it incorporated in *Hansard*, but as that is not possible I hope members will bear with me while I read it. The section I copied from the manuscript was headed "Introduced and established species which have become established or evidence indicates have become established as a result of escape from captivity". The author admitted to me it was difficult to draw the line between escape and release. The list of birds is—

Name	Pest In Country of Origin	Pest In Country of Introduction
Ostrich	No	No
Green Munia	No	No
Strawberry Finch	No	No
Cordon-bleu	No	No
St. Helena Waxbill	Minor.	No
	If any	
White-bellied Munia	No	Minor pest
Spice Finch	Major pest	Pest—established in Queensland and NSW
Bronze Mannikin	Minor pest	Not known

Name	Pest in Country of Origin	Pest in Country of Introduction
Tri-coloured Mannikin	Major pest	No*
Java Sparrow	Major pest	Major pest
Grenadier Weaver	Minor pest	No*
Madagascar Weaver	Major pest	Pest
Black-headed Weaver	Minor pest	Minor pest
Green Singing Finch	Minor pest	Minor pest
House Finch	Minor pest	Pest
Goldfinch	Isolated cases	Isolated cases in WA and throughout Australia
Senegal Turtle Dove	Occasional nuisance	Occasional nuisance
Collared Turtle Dove	No	No
Indian Spotted Dove	Not known	Occasional nuisance. Established in Australian capitals
Domestic Pigeon	Major pest	Major pest
Agapornis Lilianae	Pest	Pest
Eastern Rosella	Pest	No*
Sulphur Crested Cockatoo	Pest	Pest. Established in Pinjarra
Rose Ringed Parakeet	Major pest	No*
Ecdectus	No	No
Spotted Breasted Oriole	No	No
Chinese Thrush	No	No
Red Whiskered Bulbul	Minor pest	Minor pest in Eastern States
Common Fowl	No	No
Green Jungle Fowl	No	No
Pea Fowl	No	No. Established in NSW and possibly WA
Guinea Fowl	No	No. Possibly established in WA
Mallard	No	No
Mandarin Duck	No	No
Mute Swan	No	No. Established in Northam
Canada Goose	No	No
Barbary Dove	No	No
Crimson Rosella	Pest	No. Possibly established in the hills
Monk Parakeet	Pest	No*
Virginian Cardinal	Not known	Not known
Brazilian Cardinal	Not known	Not known
Orange Cheeked Waxbill	No	No
Sydney Waxbill	No	No. Established in WA
White Winged Wallow Bird	No	No. Possibly established in NSW
White Winged Dove	No	No
Black Hooded Parakeet	Not known	Not known
Canary Winged Parakeet	Pest	No
Yellow Headed Parrot	Not known	Not known
Red Crowned Parrot	Not known	Not known
Brown Throated Parakeet	Not known	Not known
Blue Grey Tanager	No	No
Rainbow Lorikeet	Pest	No. Nine in King's Park
Red Rumped Parrot	No	No

* Not established in sufficient numbers to know whether or not it will be a pest.

Mr O'Neil: What about the double-breasted mattress thrasher?

Mr Jamieson: If you catch one of those, it is up to you.

Mr BARNETT: We know the only birds the Minister for Works is interested in are the rosy-bottomed beach runners, but if he cares to pay attention I am sure he will learn a little more.

Mr O'Neil: We are absolutely enthralled.

Mr B. T. Burke: I don't know what you are worrying about, because they haven't done anything about cuckoos yet.

Mr BARNETT: The only birds I am worried about are the ones the APB considers a pest in their countries of origin. The list I read out contains 53 species, and that does not tally with the APB

reports of 287, 135, and so on. Of the 53 species listed, only 29 are in this State at the moment; so we can dispose of 24 species straightaway. The APB claims that nine of these species are established in this State as a result of having escaped from captivity. On the surface, I agree that if nine species have established in this State the situation looks bad. But let us look a little below the surface to see why those species have established in this State.

Firstly let us consider the Goldfinch. It was released by the acclimatisation committee at the zoo. In fact, the Goldfinch which the APB claims to have become established in this State has not been seen for the last three years. The only person who claims to have seen it at all in the last three years—and he claims to have seen it only once—is the author of this report.

The Senegal Turtle Dove was released not by aviculturists, but by the acclimatisation committee—a semi-Government department. The Indian Spotted Dove was also released by the acclimatisation committee. The APB claims the Crimson Rosella established itself as a result of escaping from an aviary. I asked the author of the report for the basis of this claim and he said, "We shot one in the hills just outside Perth a few weeks ago, and we understand there is another one there." With regard to the Rainbow Lorikeet, there are seven to nine of these in Kings Park; that is the APB's basis for claiming that the bird has become acclimatised.

I come now to the Sulphur Crested Cockatoo. Apparently from reports filtering through from the APB two birds were released at Pinjarra over 25 years ago, and reports now—after 25 years—indicate there are 11 of these birds.

Mr B. T. Burke: Quick breeding.

Mr BARNETT: Then we have the Pea Fowl and the Guinea Fowl. For the benefit of members, I point out Guinea Fowl are a little like grey bald-headed chooks.

Mr Sibson: The member for Morley is not here.

Mr BARNETT: The APB claims these birds have become established in Western Australia, and the basis of the board's argument in this respect is that these birds are kept at large by people who have them; they are not kept in cages, but are left to roam. The last bird on the list is the Sydney Waxbill. This is the only bird in my personal opinion which could possibly have become established as a result of an aviary escape, although I do not admit in any way that it did. There is a small colony of Waxbills in the hills outside Perth and the orchardists love them because they eat all the black aphids off their trees.

On the basis of all this one cannot help but wonder how many of the other species

listed in this report, which was prepared by one man in the APB—who was not allowed to be criticised by any experts—are actually aviary escapees. Certainly most of the species I have researched are not the result of aviary escapes. However, aviculturists are being asked to shoulder the blame for mistakes which I say have obviously been made by Government departments.

The Agriculture Protection Board claims the list is an ongoing thing. It claims that if evidence is put forward by aviculturists that evidence will be assessed and, if found to be acceptable, category changes will be made and birds will be reclassified if they are proved not to be a menace to our wildlife. I submit that, once again, this is just so much bureaucratic bulldust it is not funny. Proof of this can be found in the submissions which have been made to the APB in recent times.

I would like to refer to a phone call made this morning to a Mr Amos who works in the Department of Primary Industry in Queensland, which is the equivalent of our Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. His position in that department is that of adviser to the department; in other words, he is the adviser through the department to the Queensland Government. His information, imparted this morning, was that all the birds in Queensland are totally protected and have been for some time, with the exception of two species which were declared to be a minor menace in Moreton Bay in 1952 for a short period of time. Those species are the King Parrot and the Pale-headed Rosella. However, there are now no birds natural to Queensland which are declared a pest in that State.

Yet, when we look at the list prepared by one man in the APB—who is not allowed to be questioned in respect of it—we find that the Rainbow Lorikeet is said to be a pest in its country of origin, even though Mr Amos, who is the adviser to a department in Queensland which is the equivalent of our Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, says it is not a pest. Who are we to believe?

In addition, the Aviculture Society or the CBO put forward a submission on the Strawberry Finch, which is listed as being under category 2. The society presented a submission to the department in an endeavour to have this species listed under category 1 instead of category 2. It put a great deal of time and effort into its submission, but it was rejected by the APB on the grounds that insufficient research had been carried out into the possible harmful effects of this species if it became acclimatised. Yet, the list I had the privilege to read and to have copied states the Strawberry Finch is not a pest in its country of origin, nor is it a pest in the country of introduction. In that case, why would the APB not accept the submission for reclassification?

Mr Hartrey: Isn't that unreasonable?

Mr BARNETT: Of course it is. Another species, the *Agapornis lilianae*, or Peach-faced Lovebird, was the subject of a submission presented to the APB very early in the piece. The only evidence I have been able to find of this bird breeding outside its own range is in the situation which occurred in Dar es Salaam, and I will explain what happened there.

Approximately 9 000 of these birds were to be sent in a shipment to a place elsewhere in the world, and when the shipment reached the port of Dar es Salaam I understand the conditions in which they were confined were so bad that the Government or semi-Government department controlling this matter in that area decided to release the lot—nine thousand birds. Is that an aviary escape?

Mr Hartrey: It's an invasion.

Mr BARNETT: Of course it is an invasion. Regardless of whether those birds became a menace in the country in which they were released at that rate, it has no bearing whatsoever on why they should not be kept in aviaries in this State. However, that submission was also refused by the APB. So it is quite obvious this list is not an ongoing thing, and if these regulations are not disallowed now they will remain unchanged.

We are told by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife that there is a fear of introducing diseases into the State if birds in category 2 are allowed to be imported. What a lot of rubbish that is. I have never heard so much rubbish in my life. What about the birds in category 1? What about the birds which are exempt altogether from any regulations and are allowed to be imported into this State? Surely a disease will not pick out birds in category 1 and not affect them. Surely a disease would affect birds in all categories. Therefore, that argument does not hold water.

Regulations have also been incorporated concerning the types of aviaries in which these birds may be kept. We are told we must have aviaries with safety doors. That is quite reasonable and understandable, and I am sure most aviculturists would accept it. However, certain types of birds must be kept in double-wired cages. I am at a loss to understand this. If a bird can bite through a single wire then it can bite through two wires almost as quickly; yet the APB says this will not happen if the cages are double-wired.

So we are left with two alternatives, because the birds cannot escape through the door as safety doors are used. The first alternative is that a storm could cause a branch of a tree to fall on the aviary. The APB thinks that double wiring will withstand such treatment, but single wiring will not. Again, what a load of rubbish. The only other alternative is that a dog

might bite through the wire. However, if a dog can bite through the first wire, then surely it could bite through the second wire. I find the regulation with regard to double wiring to be completely repugnant and absolutely unnecessary.

We want the total withdrawal of these regulations for a period of time so that all parties concerned—hopefully under the control of a world-recognised expert—can examine the submissions put forward by the APB, which I have torn to pieces to-night and have shown to be absolutely groundless, and come up with a compromise acceptable to all. If this is unacceptable to members of the Government—and I hope it is acceptable—then the absolute minimum compromise I would make is to have all the birds in category 2 placed in category 1, because there are sufficient provisions guarding against the importation of birds with the possible exception of the Java Sparrow, the Spice Finch, the Green Finch, the Green Singing Finch, and the Collared Turtle Dove.

The names of those birds have been supplied to me by experts in aviculture in this State as being those which, quite reasonably, could be expected to be kept under the regulations as proposed in category 2, but certainly none of the other birds that are listed.

Before I conclude, surely it is the right of every Australian to keep Australian birds. The majority of the birds set out in the lists of regulations are Australian birds. I am sure members on the Government side of the House, when they make a study of these regulations, would not accept them in their present form and would agree that they demand some alteration at least by transferring these birds from category 2 to category 1.

I am glad to see that the Minister concerned has remained in his seat during the whole of my speech on the motion, because I have noticed that some Government members have not. I ask the Minister and members to consider this situation seriously and to ensure that all the liberties now enjoyed by Western Australians are not removed. The Minister should give serious thought to rectifying this matter which, in my opinion and in the opinion of other members on this side of the House, is a serious injustice to every Western Australian.

Mr SKIDMORE: I formally second the motion.

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

MILK QUOTAS

Policy Alterations: Motion

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.32 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I wish to advise the member for Warren that all words after the word "reduced" in paragraph (c) of

his motion as set out on the notice paper must be omitted when he moves the motion as they are referred to in his motion as contained in Order of the Day No. 4.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will take heed of your injunction and accordingly, I move—

In the opinion of the House the Dairy Industry Authority should be directed to effect the following alterations to its existing policy—

- (a) the minimum daily quantity of a market milk quota be reduced;
- (b) that in 1976, all manufacturing dairymen who are prepared to accept a daily 30 gallon market milk quota should be awarded such an entitlement on a year or part year basis provided they can meet the health requirements of the Dairy Industry Authority;
- (c) the purchase price of market milk quotas to be reduced.

This is certainly the year in which decisions which will affect the dairy industry in the long term will have to be taken. The dairy industry is one of those that requires specialised technology and can be developed only after a very long period of time. The basic structure of the industry—a herd of dairy cows—is something that is developed over many years. Sometimes it represents the work of a lifetime.

So this is the year of crisis for the manufacturing section of the industry in this State. The trends within the dairy industry leading up to the existing position were canvassed thoroughly during the debate on the Bill which established the Dairy Industry Authority and, as you will recall, Mr Speaker, that Bill was assented to in December, 1973.

However, I think it is necessary to recapitulate the position of the industry and to update to some extent the current existing conditions. At the time of the takeover by the Dairy Industry Authority whole-milk producers in 1959-60 numbered 580; in 1973-74 they numbered 577; and in 1974-75 the number, according to an answer given to a question asked last week, was 564. I was a little surprised to see that particular figure, but I suspect that new licenses and amalgamations had some bearing on it. By way of contrast the reverse development of the manufacturing industry shows the following approximate numbers—

1959-60	2 181
1965-66	1 567
1971-72	834
1973-74	652

In the current year of 1974-75, 280 were engaged in the production of manufactured milk, and 165 were engaged in the manufacture of butterfat, making a total in all, in the manufacturing section of the dairy industry, of 445. So we have had a sharp decline of in excess of 1 500 in the past 14 years.

Mr Blaikie: Would you also explain why the decline has come about?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Certainly. That is part of the story and a most important aspect that must be clarified to ensure that the changes in policy are fully understood and there is need to prevent further decline. As I say, there has been something in excess of a decline of 1 500 in the manufacturing section of the dairy industry since 1959-60.

In the production of milk, past trends have shown that in 1959-60, 16.1 million gallons were produced by licensed holders; in 1965-66, 18.2 million gallons were produced, and in 1972-73, 25 million gallons were produced. The total production was 55.7 million gallons in 1959-60; 61.9 million gallons in 1965-66; 58.4 million gallons in 1971-72, and 53.4 million gallons in 1972-73. Those figures will become significant and more meaningful as we apply all the circumstances and the trends that have developed in the industry over those years.

The volume of production of milk used for local requirements—that is, sales of milk used for human consumption as we know it in the metropolitan area—from the source of quota holders has been 24.9 million gallons, and milk for other uses amounted to 3.4 million gallons, making a total of 28.3 million gallons. In 1974-75 the quantity of market milk produced was 25.5 million gallons and the volume of manufactured milk produced was 16.5 million gallons. So all in all, in 1974-75, the total, according to the figures supplied, was 42 million gallons in that sector. On the manufacturing side the total is 54.9 million gallons.

So we now have before us the trends in production; we have available something on which we can base our predictions for the future. Western Australia is by no means self sufficient in its requirements of dairy products. As a matter of fact in 1973-74 Western Australia used 9 100 tonnes of butter, which is 8 kilograms or 17.61 pounds per annum—a figure which is falling. The production of cheese in the same year amounted to 4 100 tonnes, or 5.5 kilograms or 12½ pounds per annum—a figure which is rising. Also, the production of fluid milk in 1973-74 amounted to 25 million gallons, or 34 litre or .6 pint per household daily. The stage has now been reached where this figure has become nearly static.

Figures for imports in the year 1973-74 are rather startling. In all they total \$11 599 000 from the Eastern States together with another \$427 000 from overseas countries. So Western Australia is in the unfortunate position of spending something like \$12 million annually on dairy products which it is capable of producing itself. It is a question of economics that precludes it from so doing.

It is a matter of some regret that the structure of the industry has developed in

the way it has, particularly in regard to quotas which has brought about a one-sided development of the dairy industry in Australia and a development which has been adverse to our own State.

Mr Blaikie: And the *status quo* existed while you were Minister, anyhow.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes, but we set up the DIA.

Mr Blaikie: I am just trying to establish that this is something that has not happened overnight.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The honourable member will have noticed that I went back over a decade with my figures. This is a developmental situation and is one that is not easy to rectify in its entirety, but it is a matter to which we can pay some attention, and the policies as defined by the Government and the Dairy Industry Authority must be changed so that we can restore the situation to the greatest possible maximum. This is the only year in which we have an opportunity to rejuvenate the industry which is faced with some tremendous problems.

Mr Blaikie: We have to explain why some 1 500 people have left the industry.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I will deal with the points raised by the member for Vasse as that is a most important and fairly significant question. Perhaps if I refer to the pressures that have been placed on the industry and the results of them it will explain to some extent why the existing situation has come about. It may be as well to do that by citing the circumstances surrounding a fairly typical manufacturing dairy farm which would budget for 16 000 pounds or 7 500 kilograms of butterfat. In 1973-74, the surplus after tax, available to meet interest, repayments, or capital expansion, amounted to \$3 000. This is a tremendous sum, and the production of 16 000 pounds of butterfat on a dairy farm is a fairly major undertaking. Probably it would be above the normal, but the cost of production is something that has affected all industries, and the dairy industry is certainly no exception. Probably it has been harder hit than most. The high rate of inflation must have an impact on farm production costs as you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane) would be well aware.

In 1971-72 the costs rose by an average of 133 per cent compared with the 1960-63 figure. So, from 1960-63 to 1971-72—and the figures are readily available—the increase in costs was in the order of 133 per cent. This gives an indication to those who are not aware that whilst costs have risen very steeply there has not been any increment in the price paid to the manufacturing dairy farmer for his product.

In 1975-76 the average increase in costs was 11 per cent of the current cost, and 146 per cent of the base year cost. So, between 1960-63 and 1975-76 there has been an increase in cost of the order of

146 per cent. That represents \$600 on the returns of production in the budget I referred to in respect of the hypothetical farm.

I would like to refer to the decrease in beef cattle returns, which has resulted in a decrease in the incomes of most dairy farmers. Generally the returns have been halved, compared with the figures for the previous year.

It is interesting to note the increases appearing in the audited figures contained in the table I have before me, because it is a random selection of clients. These figures apply to what are considered to be the average good producers in the area. The table tabulates the figures of beef returns and random cattle sales, and they show the comparison in the returns for the years 1972 to 1975 inclusive. I shall not go through the 44 sets of figures applying to the 11 growers for those four years; it is sufficient to look at the totals.

I shall deal with the average return for those four years. The decrease was \$114, \$103, \$122, and \$66 for the year 1975-76. So between 1974-75 and 1975-76 there has been a decrease from \$122 to \$66; that is about half of the income each of these producers derived from beef sales.

This has proved to be a disaster to many people in the lower south-west, because beef production is closely allied to the activities of the vast majority of producers in that area.

Mr Blakie: Can you tell us how the loss in Commonwealth subsidy of 8c per pound will affect those producers?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I shall turn to the loss in subsidy. I have made the point that it is not only the decline in the price of butterfat and milk, but also the decline in the price of beef, that has contributed to the existing situation. The member for Vasse has raised the point of the loss in subsidy. This will reduce the unit value of butterfat from 92.4c per kilogram during 1972-73 by 4.9c in 1973-74, by 9.7c in 1974-75, and by 14.7c in 1975-76. This represents a vast difference over the period during which the subsidy has been removed.

It is probable that the member for Vasse will point out the position in Western Australia, but will not make reference to the position in Victoria where the opening price this year for milk was about 80c per pound, and an excess amount of the subsidy was going to farmers in Victoria. They were getting nearly four times the amount of subsidy that was paid to farmers in Western Australia. That is an inherent difficulty with subsidies, and the situation should be seen in that light. As far as Victoria was concerned it was to a large extent a case of gilding the lily. However, the position was certainly the reverse in Western Australia, and that has had a very marked effect in this State.

The reduction to the farmer represents in the order of \$350 in the first

year after the removal of the subsidy, \$700 in the second year, and \$1 050 in the third year. At the same time the manufacturing dairy farmer still has to live. He is confronted with the same problem which confronts the rest of the community. To maintain his position he must receive a rise of 10 per cent or \$300 based on the figures for the base year, and that is a fairly conservative rise.

The net effect after taxes is that a farmer with a \$3 000 surplus is reduced to a marginal position of having something like a \$400 surplus. To maintain his 1972-73 position he must increase his production per cow by 48 kilograms at no extra cost, and it would be almost an impossible undertaking to do that; or else he must increase his overall production or receive an increase in the price of butterfat.

In this regard rather the converse occurs—the conversion to beef production, and the seeking of an outside job. To say the very least, once a farmer takes on work away from the farm he has great difficulty in maintaining his level of development. I know that some of these individuals take jobs in timber mills—milk the cows in the morning, work in the day, and milk the cows again in the evening. I have said to some of these people, "You will kill yourselves working this way." They replied, "We have to keep the place going." It is this sort of devotion and faith in the development of their properties which is rather baffling. We have to respect the individuals who do this, and I have tremendous regard for them. However, what this is doing to their health and to their lives is difficult to ascertain.

So, the choice between increasing production, and converting to beef production and taking a job, is an individual one. The first course—the increase of 48 kilograms per cow at no additional cost—is technically unlikely to succeed. It is very difficult if not impossible to achieve, so we can disregard that. The second course of an overall increase in production is unlikely, and in fact the total production has dropped.

At the onset I did say that 1975-76 would be the crucial year. It is a year in which far-reaching decisions have had to be taken by the industry, and this means by individual farmers. The increase in costs, and the decline in prices, have caused the overall position to become untenable.

The Australian Government has increased the scope of its dairy industry assistance programme, firstly by broadening the present Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme. It has extended the parameters of the scheme by introducing interest-free loans to help the settlers to change over to refrigerated bulk milk delivery, and to reallocate assistance to displaced farmers and dairy factory workers. All this has come out of the dairy

industry adjustment programme, as conceived by the Australian Government.

Under the plan the farmers are expected to expand dairying, or to diversify out of dairying. These are the underlying principles behind the programme. Other measures are also involved, and the first is that land purchase is possible if it will assist the farmer to increase production. It is possible for a dairy farmer to obtain a loan to increase the size of his property, and this loan is provided over a period of 25 years at 6 per cent interest. Loans for property development are procurable from the same source. The interest rate depends on the purpose for which a loan is made.

The desire of many people in the industry—the farmers and the Farmers' Union alike—is to convert the industry into a bulk pickup system. This is more readily achieved by the availability of interest-free loans for the acquisition of vats so that bulk milk pickup can be introduced.

Some farmers will convert, but others will not. This is a decision that is left to the farmers themselves. The great difficulty which will arise in some areas is that there will be conversion on the part of a number of farmers. Once a bulk tanker has been put on the run it is quite possible that those who wish to remain in butterfat production, with sidelines of dairy calves and pigs, will not have an assured source of pickup. This is one difficulty which will emanate. However, it is a decision which could be forced on some farmers.

The immediate prospects for beef production will be detailed during the course of a later debate, notice of which has been given for some time. However, one thing is certain: Because of low beef prices, opportunities to diversify in the lower south-west have been reduced and, in fact, they are now quite limited. There are other areas of diversification, apart from beef production, but beef production is the best means.

When the producer is receiving less than the cost of producing an animal, obviously one will not find many takers being prepared to enter that line of production. There are certain opportunities left, but each has a corresponding problem.

The main lines of diversification are vegetable growing in some areas, but here again this year the contracts have been halved by the processors as a result of which some beef farmers and vegetable producers have been caught. Orchardring is no longer a profitable undertaking. The remaining opportunity to enter orchardring is certainly not in the growing of apples, but rather in the growing of the canning varieties of peaches for which there is now, and probably will be in the future, a fairly healthy market.

Potato production is feeling the effect of Eastern States competition, because there has been increasing production in the Eastern States as a result of the decline in beef prices. Because of section 92 of the Australian Constitution potatoes grown in the Eastern States can be dumped in Western Australia to the detriment of the growers here. This being a closed industry, with limits applied to production, dairy farmers find great difficulty in breaking into potato growing. So the prospect of potato growing as a means of diversification is rather limited. That is the position which pertains to opportunities for diversification in the dairy industry.

The member for Vasse probably will be interested in the equalisation position, as it has developed in the course of this year. Equalisation simply means that the proceeds from overseas sales are pooled with the proceeds received from local markets. The producer is then paid an equalised, or averaged, amount. The payment comes through his factory. The system has had a grievous setback because of very low export returns. The greater the quantity exported the lower the return to the producer. We are an overall importer which means that the Eastern States exports have an effect on Western Australian producers. This is something which puts our own producers in a very awkward position.

The equalisation figures showed an increase of about 6c per pound on the original figure mooted in 1974-75. At the beginning of the 1974-75 season the interim price—that is, the price paid by the factory at the start of the season—was 49.5c per pound. By comparison, the interim price for this year is 47.56c per pound, which is 2c lower than it was last year. It came as something of a shock to the dairymen to find that the price at the end of last year, which was 55c per pound, was reduced to 47.56c per pound for the interim price for 1975-76. The drop has caused some reaction but it has to be appreciated that the significant figures are 47.5c and 49.5c. Those are the two starting figures—the prices paid at the beginning of each of the two seasons. There will be an increase but it is impossible to say by how much at this time. The increase will not be known until the results of the overseas sales have been presented to the equalisation committee, when the price will be determined. The drop in price is virtually 2c, and not 8.5c which might appear to be the case when the wrong pair of figures are contrasted.

The member for Vasse referred to the cost-of-production figures and had he been present I could have pointed out to him those very figures. The most recent BAE survey of the industry covered the 1969-70 period, and it was a useful insight into the capacity of farmers to adapt themselves to changing situations, especially in the light of economic conditions. The

survey showed a marked improvement in income levels for farmers, with the 1971 average being a little over double what it was in 1964.

The increase can be attributed to a number of factors: greater farm size; increased productivity associated with the increase in farm size; increased capital investment resulting from better use of labour; the use of herring-bone dairies; the use of bulk milk tankers for bulk pickup, and the economies which this represented; innovations; disease control; artificial breeding; improved milking techniques; and fodder conservation.

However, there has to be a limit to which a farmer can go in adapting and innovating in an effort to keep pace with economic trends. A one-man unit must finally reach a physical limitation which precludes further innovation and development.

The dairying industry, probably more than any other animal production industry—and here I am having regard for the full spectrum of stock farming—requires a high level of technical competence by the producer. This is not generally realised but, nevertheless, it is a prerequisite of success. It is an industry which requires high capitalised modern facilities, and it has to keep pace with changes not only in this State but also in the Eastern States and throughout the world. It also requires herd development over many years of patient husbandry.

Dairying is a form of production not to be entered into lightly. Once an individual leaves it, it is most unlikely he will return to it. The effort of starting again and developing a herd, and establishing management routines and techniques is something which very few people are likely to take on for a second time. So while we have dairymen it is in the interests of the State and our economy to see that they remain in the industry as far as possible.

The corollary to this matter—and it is necessary to have regard for it—is the population figure and the overall requirement for milk and dairy products with which this State will be faced in the coming years.

Current figures show we have a population slightly in excess of one million. Demographic studies reveal that our population levels in 1995 and 2000 will be much higher. If we allow for a 2 per cent increase, by 1985 the population in this State will be 1.33 million, and in 1995 we will reach 1.62 million.

If we allow a 3.2 per cent increment we can expect a population of 1.66 million by 1985 and 2.2 million by 1995. The actual increase during the period 1963-68 was 3.22 per cent, and for the 1968-73 period it had reached 3.36 per cent. It is a matter for conjecture whether the increase in past years can be correlated with the expected increase in the future. To some

extent the figures for the future could be crystal ball gazing, but one thing is certain: we can expect some level of increase in population.

The population of the future, naturally, will require whole milk and dairy products. A population of 1.62 million could be expected to require 32.4 million gallons of milk per year, and a population of 2.2 million would require in the order of 55 million gallons of milk per year. The gallonage produced as market milk during 1974-75 was 25.5 million, with a total over-all State production of 54.9 million. So, we have to maintain only the existing production of the State at the present time—naturally with a safety margin—to ensure there is no deficiency. This is a principle which has always been adopted in the industry and it will need to be retained in the future.

A level of this order needs to be retained to meet the State's requirements, and we are considering a very real responsibility. I again make the point that if the industry is allowed to deteriorate and run down to a level below that which it has now reached, it will be almost impossible to retrieve it. This is the only year in which we will have an opportunity to reconstruct the industry to the level required.

Obviously, farmers will not stay in the industry unless net returns are such as to enable them to maintain a reasonable standard of living. For their own personal reasons, a few of them will accept a standard which is not acceptable to the general population. For personal reasons they are prepared to accept the poverty which will result if the industry sinks to a lower level.

I also point out that factories cannot stay in operation unless they are provided with a throughput which allows economic operation. Economies of scale play a large part. At the present time factories are faced with reduced throughputs. Factories and depots are also faced with increasing costs, particularly for labour. Factories are subject to very restricted diversification and they are constantly plagued by increasing competition from the Eastern States. More and more varieties of dairy products are coming in from the Eastern States.

It is axiomatic and a fact of life that if somebody can make a profit out of bringing a commodity into Western Australia he will do so. This has been demonstrated with potatoes, beef, eggs, and lamb. There is very little loyalty as far as merchants are concerned: if there is a margin to be made, they will make it. It is the same story with dairy produce; if it is economic to bring it in, it will be brought in. At the present time the butter oil and solids required for the manufacture of ice cream are being imported from the Eastern States.

Mr Blaikie: And milk from Queensland.

Mr H. D. EVANS: With UHT milk capable of lying on the shelves for months, the practicalities of that cannot be discounted. As the price differential between UHT and fresh milk decreases, the proportion of imports will increase, as the member for Vasse points out.

Without the production and throughput required to maintain these factories, a problem will exist for the total industry. Market milk producers will always require an outlet for their surplus milk. At any rate, they are obliged under the terms of their license to provide 10 per cent over their quota, and as dairying is a very seasonal business there is a considerable surplus to be disposed of in the flush periods. So it is in the interests of market milk producers to have an active, viable manufacturing segment of which they have the opportunity to avail themselves.

A survey two years ago showed it was possible that as many as 60 per cent of manufacturing dairymen in some areas could leave the industry. The impact that represents is very damaging indeed and has a total effect as far as all dairymen are concerned. The challenge today is to try to find ways to avoid that situation.

The Tonkin Government put in the hands of its successors the machinery whereby the dairy industry could have been revitalised and restructured to a very large degree. Up to this stage the present Government has made a thorough mess of it as far as the long-term security of the manufacturing section of the industry is concerned.

Although this is a year in which decisions are necessary, it has been marked by almost an absence of guidance, direction, and leadership on the part of the dairy companies, which certainly have an involvement. It is noticeable that they will not commit themselves. They have made no effort to organise the situation or give an indication to the industry of their plans and commitments in the future. They are prepared to sit back and pick up the crumbs without affording proper access to information for the decisions which are far-reaching not only for themselves but also for the State. So on this count the dairy companies rate fairly low in my opinion.

The Dairy Industry Authority does not rate a great number of marks, either. The authority was vested with the necessary powers at the time the Dairy Industry Bill was introduced. That was done deliberately so that the authority could meet any contingency and resolve the industry in terms which would be the most satisfactory for the State as a whole. Its failure in this regard is one of the reasons this motion is before the House. The policy it has followed is not conducive to long-term stability and revival.

The Government, likewise, has shirked or omitted to fulfil its role. It has not got to the areas where these decisions are made—remembering that farmers are confronted with going into bulk packing. To some extent this has been forced on them. They must make a decision whether or not to upgrade their premises and remain in dairying in future years. They have been given no guidance. They have just been allowed to flounder around on their own. Those people whose responsibility it was to give direction have certainly not done so.

Mr Blaikie: Tell us how the position was forced on them by the bulk milk vats.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I referred earlier to the dairy farm assistance scheme. Initially, loans for bulk milk vats were to extend until June next year. A sum of \$28 million was made available. This is one of the reasons we do not have to look far. It is a year in which there is to be an examination of many points. The availability of interest-free loans for bulk vats is one of the factors; the removal of the subsidy, the increase in the costs farmers are confronted with, and the decline in the price paid for their product emanating from the equalisation situation are other factors. A series of factors has contributed to this situation. It is for this reason that so many problems need to be resolved this year, but no action is being taken.

The point that concerns me about the \$28 million to which reference has been made is the announcement that applications under this scheme will not be received after the end of this month; that is, the 31st August. The reason for this is the proposed expenditure of these funds. I understand that two Treasury officials will visit us early in September to review the situation. However, at the same time the position is further clouded and intensified by the fact that finances under the aid programme may not be available after the 31st August, and this most undesirable situation is confronting the industry.

Mr Blaikie: Have you taken it up with your Commonwealth counterparts?

Mr H. D. EVANS: By telegram and letter, yes.

Mr Blaikie: What was the reply?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The only practical solution that presents itself is that contained in the motion I have moved. Firstly, the minimum daily quantity of a market milk quota must be reduced. Currently the existing minimum market milk quota is 62 gallons, and this is based on a calculation made by the Dairy Industry Authority as being the minimum amount of production that would give an individual market milk dairyman a return to keep his enterprise viable and economic. It must be remembered that we are considering a purely whole-milk operation,

and very few sidelines would be involved. So what the manufacturing dairymen needs, and needs urgently, is an increased income if he is to stay in business much longer. He needs money to convert to a bulk pickup and the necessary upgrading which will be inevitable in most cases.

An increased quota of 30 gallons a day, if it were available to all dairymen who were prepared and able to accept it, would result in an increase of something like \$12 per day to each dairyman, representing the difference between 30 gallons at 20c and 30 gallons at 40c. This would be \$84 per week or \$4368 per year increased income to the dairyman for no additional work as he is producing the milk already. The additional income would at least finance the conversion, and it is the only source of increased income available to him.

The initial increase on the quota would not need to be for a full year, and, of course, there would be inherent difficulties in the implementation of the system. If a minimum quota of 32 gallons were available for a period of nine or 10 months in the normal course of the manufacturing season it would provide the income that is necessary to keep manufacturing dairymen afloat and able to convert. Probably it would take some time for a dairyman to adjust his management techniques—for instance double calving annually, the provision of irrigation, fodder conservation, and such matters—to enable him to continue his operation for a full 12-month period. So at the same time it would be necessary to allow quotas for that period of several months to those dairymen who desire to take them up. To ensure the quotas are taken up perhaps it would be necessary to institute some form of incentive payment but there is no reason that this could not be achieved through an industry fund. If we reach the stage where partial quotas are given, or quotas for a limited period of the year, incentives will be necessary, and the industry must consider the type of incentive. However, such a system is quite practical.

We must consider how these quotas can be allocated to the people concerned. In 1976, 30 new quotas at the 62-gallon minimum rate will be made available.

Mr Blaikie: No, 31.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes, 31. That means that just over 1 900 gallons of milk per day will be available for distribution next year. When we consider the number of quotas transferred in recent times and the reply given early last week to the Leader of the Opposition that there was in excess of 2 600 gallons per day available, something over 4 500 gallons per day could have been distributed. This would give 150 dairymen a minimum quota of 50 gallons a day. So the whole thing has been practical right along the line, because I do not believe we would find more than 150 dairymen who would be in a position or

who would desire to take on a whole-milk quota.

I would like to suggest also some system of an annual increment, but it would need a great deal of research and projection before any positive statement could be made on that. However, the fact remains that had the Government wanted to do it, it could have been done. Dairymen operating in the more remote areas could have been provided quite easily with a minimum quota which would have enabled their survival.

There is no difficulty about the transportation of the milk to Perth. Much of the milk produced under market milk quotas in the southern areas now finds its way to Perth, without ever finding its way into a bottle. This is over-quota milk which is utilized through a process of accommodation which the factories have adopted amongst themselves. The system is practical, but it has not been utilised fully. This is the tragedy that the industry faces.

I have made the point that this looks like being the only year that the Government will have the opportunity to make any real attempt to retain a manufacturing dairy industry. It is a deplorable situation, when we look at it objectively. The more dairy farmers we can retain in an area, the greater the prospect of maintaining a transportation system to them, as well as everything else that will ensure the continuation of the industry in that particular area.

My motion refers to the need to reduce the price of market milk quotas. The current price has been fixed at \$250 per gallon, but I doubt very much whether \$250 per gallon would actually purchase a quota. There is no way to control the price once the quota gets onto the market place.

Mr Stephens: You would have a chance of getting one at \$350 per gallon.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am sure that if one did not offer \$350 per gallon, one would not stand much chance of obtaining a quota at this juncture.

Mr Stephens: No.

Mr H. D. EVANS: However, it would be very difficult to prove this point. Even the \$250 per gallon price is repugnant. I believe \$50 per gallon would be far more appropriate and as much as the industry could stand, of course, excepting those producers who are in the position to avail themselves of every opportunity to purchase quotas. I indicated the economics of purchasing by established market milk producers the other night.

I do not propose to go over the points I made on that occasion even if you, Sir, were sufficiently tolerant to allow me to do so.

If manufacturing dairymen can purchase a quota from the Dairy Industry Authority at \$50 a gallon they would have a chance.

The quota that has already actually been transferred was available at that price. It could be made available to the dairymen by the Dairy Industry Authority and charged to them at \$50 a gallon, not as a substantial whole amount but as a deduction from the monthly payments the farmers receive for their products. Deductions from cream cheques have been part of the industry since its establishment in this State, and the same system could quite easily function for this purpose.

Mr Blaikie: The companies would do the financing?

Mr H. D. EVANS: No, the authority should be given access to funds for this purpose, and probably an interest rate would be involved. The point I make is that this method is practicable, but it is being neglected. The result of the policy of the Government will be to create a dairy industry elite. This is what will happen, and the policy of the Government will encourage the growth of large producers up to the 250 gallons a day maximum. Obviously these are men who will not be dairymen in the true sense because they will each have to employ a couple of fellows and they themselves will not be involved in dairying. This is the situation that will arise, and it is typical of the attitude of the present Government which supports the big man and big industry. The Premier himself has gone on record as saying, "Get big or get out." Here is that attitude in practice, and undeniably so. It is contrary to the interests and the retention of the smaller family unit which is the backbone of the structure of the dairy industry.

The policy that has been adopted and the trends which will arise as a result of it are undeniably favourable to the large established market milk man. The trend will continue that way because he is the only one who will be able to buy a quota.

Mr Blaikie: You are not being completely fair when you say that.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The policy will give rise to this trend, and the member for Vasse knows it as well as anybody else in this House does.

Mr Blaikie: I will challenge you on this point. Who laid down the policy of \$250 a gallon? Let us be honest.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Dairy Industry Authority.

Mr Blaikie: No. The Farmers' Union agreed to the policy of \$250 a gallon.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Dairy Industry Authority laid down the figure of \$250 a gallon, and it was supported by the Farmers' Union.

Mr Blaikie: You are wrong. The Farmers' Union laid down the policy and it was supported by the DIA.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The fact is that both the DIA and the Farmers' Union support a negotiability price of \$250 a gallon.

Mr Blaikie: And a maximum quota of 250 gallons.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is right.

Mr Blaikie: Now you are being honest.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have never been anything less than that.

Mr Jamieson: Ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The fact remains that the situation is not the right one. I do not care whose policy it is; what I am pointing out is that if the policy is followed it will be to the detriment of and will mean the dead finish of the manufacturing section of the dairy industry.

Mr Blaikie: You said it was the policy of the Government, and you are wrong.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It is still the policy of the Government; it is still the policy of the Farmers' Union; and it is still the policy of the DIA.

Mr Blaikie: Now you are starting to really get going; you are doing well now.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What is the honourable member's problem? The policy that is currently being followed is the wrong one in the interests of the manufacturing section of the dairy industry and in the long-term interests of the total dairy industry in this State.

Defence of negotiability at that level is impossible to justify. It is rather a hopeless proposition to try to defend a figure so intangible as this if one cares to be objective and honest. There are other matters in the policy of the Farmers' Union which are also followed by the Dairy Industry Authority, but these are matters of lesser consequence and while I agree with some of them I do not agree with others. It is the essential matters—the ones which will determine whether the industry will survive or not—that we are concerned with tonight.

I would like to make reference to another aspect of the long-term outlook of the dairy industry in this State. I refer to the cost of production figures. By way of an answer to a question I was informed that the cost of production of market milk in Pinjarra is 59.2c a gallon; in Harvey it is 40.84c for dry land and 42.02 for irrigated land; in Busselton it is 37.12c, and in Albany 51.01c. Arising from that answer I asked a further question regarding the loss sustained by the Government in providing irrigation to those areas in the whole-milk producing section of the State, and I was told that in 1974-75 the loss was \$1 082 161. I asked a further question regarding whether this loss had been taken into account in the calculation of milk production costs, and I was informed that it had not. I was told that if it were taken into account it would result in a further 1.69c a gallon. That

gives us a better perspective of the cost of production in the existing accepted areas in which historically milk has been produced.

It means that the deficit between Busselton and the Harvey area is actually 6.58c a gallon, which is a considerable cost about which several conclusions may be drawn.

We have seen the production of potatoes move from Benger to the areas of Donnybrook, Pemberton, Manjimup, Marybrook, and Albany for the very good reason that those areas are more suited to the production of potatoes. The soils, the climate, and the total geography of those areas is conducive to better crop production and, as a consequence, the more northern area has declined.

On the same basis it could well be that milk production as we know it could recede in the future to the areas which are more naturally climatically suited to it, because the figure for the Busselton area is 37.12c a gallon as against something approaching 6.68c higher for the irrigation areas. So there is a further aspect to this cost business, and it is one to which I have alluded before. If we are going to build into the cost structure of a pint of milk the purchase price of a quota, we will be constructing a false economy in which the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs should be taking a close interest.

So while we are producing milk at an artificial cost in one particular area and building into the economic structure of the industry a cost which should not be there, surely the consumer is entitled to question whether or not the industry is entitled to the protection the current cost structure affords it. This is inherent in any orderly marketing situation. There must be a fair go not only for the producer but also for the consumer, otherwise it cannot and will not be acceptable, and will not work.

Members will appreciate from my remarks that the difficulties of the industry have intensified to such an extent that if they are not resolved this year, it will be too late. The policies that have been followed by the Dairy Industry Authority have been against the long-term interests of the industry and the State in general. If we are to maintain the industry as we know it, for the future production of our dairy requirements, as well as to retain in the southernmost regions of this State an industry which will permit the population to be retained—not increased, but retained and maintained—action must be taken immediately in regard to prices, and the lack of alternatives and opportunities to diversify.

After all, if we remove manufacturing and dairying from the lower part of the south-west, it would represent a blow

from which I could not foresee any recovery in the mid-term; perhaps in the long term the area may recover, although I cannot be certain even of that. In my opinion, the State will take a long time to recover if the dairy industry is reduced to the level predicted by the surveys.

The measures to which I have alluded this evening in speaking to my motion are fundamental; they are major measures which will enable a reasonable percentage of the existing, manufacturing dairymen to survive. If the situation remains unchanged, their chances will be very limited indeed. The same situation applies with the minimum daily quantity of the market milk quota; if reduced, it will give the producers an opportunity to make something in the order of \$84 extra a week on the work and production they are now achieving. An entitlement of 30 gallons should be given to every dairyman who is in a position to accept it, and who wants to accept it. Such quotas should be granted on a partial basis, rather than the annual entirety of the industry.

The purchase price of market milk should be reduced accordingly. I have suggested a figure of \$50, but I believe even this figure is still too high. There is no justification for a price on market milk. When in New South Wales it was announced that in 18 months' time the negotiability price would be reduced, the price fell from \$185 to \$5.10, indicating the sort of artificial inflation existing in the industry. The negotiability of quotas, coupled with the very questionable costs of production we see before us, make it most important that an examination be carried out on the general situation in the industry. I trust that in the long-term interests of the dairy industry my motion will receive the support it deserves.

Mr SKIDMORE: I second the motion.

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

COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

Condemnation: Motion

MR YOUNG (Scarborough) [9.45 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the Commonwealth Government's Budget for 1975-76 will:

- (a) fail to stimulate the rural, mining and secondary industries and employment;
- (b) make no inroads on galloping inflation which is continuing to rob the average Australian of his savings, security of employment and the prospect of owning and keeping his own house;
- (c) cause a huge increased taxation burden to fall on the shoulders of certain selected sections of the community;

- (d) cause massive reductions in necessary State works programmes such as housing, schools and roads; and
- (e) contribute to the further deterioration of the rural communities as well as continue to aggravate the worst unemployment record in the nation's history.

For these and other reasons the Whitlam Government is to be condemned for failing to properly manage the affairs of the nation.

The new Treasurer (Mr Hayden) who was the champion of Medibank—

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr YOUNG: I knew there would be a "hear, hear" very early in my remarks. The new Treasurer is now the perpetrator of a document of deceit, the like of which this nation has rarely seen before in its history. Before members opposite start to laugh too much, I suggest they read not the Treasurer's Budget speech but the real facts contained in the income and expenditure statements prepared not by the Treasurer but by the Treasury, because therein lies the real truth of the economic management of the country for the next 12 months.

I can assure members that there will be no laughter from the other side of the House, in the Labor Party generally, or amongst the people of this country at the end of the next fiscal year as the result of this Budget. This self-professed champion of private enterprise—as he claimed to be when he became the fourth Treasurer of the Whitlam Government—has suddenly found himself in the situation of presenting his first Budget, and has given no incentive whatsoever to private enterprise or to the people of this country.

In fact, the verbiage of the Treasurer's Budget speech was so clever and Machiavellian that when reading the Treasury papers and the Budget speech alongside one another, I can honestly tell members that I had to check the date of the document titled "Estimate of receipts and summary of estimated expenditure" which accompanied the Budget documents because I could not believe that what the Treasury had to say about the Budget related to the same year. I am referring now to Budget paper No. 4; however, I intend to go into that aspect in more detail later in my remarks.

Every now and again in the history of a nation some Government, as a result of its own actions, finds it impossible to resist the temptation to avoid its due ignominy by putting forward a false economic situation to the people of the nation. I believe that moment certainly has arrived in this country. However, what the Whitlam Government in Canberra has overlook-

ed is the fact that one must always face up to a day of reckoning.

It is all very well to write a Budget speech in flowery verbiage and draw attention to all the so-called advantages of the Budget; but when the day comes when the people the Government is supposed to represent put their hands into their pockets and find they are empty, and find next that their bureau drawers are full of bills which cannot be paid, suddenly the words contained in the Budget speech will become so meaningless as to be ridiculous.

Mr Skidmore: That is a well substantiated argument if ever I heard one.

Mr YOUNG: It is, and I will continue to substantiate it fully for the honourable member; if he cares to refute my arguments at the conclusion of my speech, I will be very glad to hear him. In my opinion, the day of reckoning for this Commonwealth Government will come about six months after the inception of the Budget.

Mr Barnett: Is that the time of the next Federal election?

Mr YOUNG: Do not get frightened. I believe the real crunch for the average Australian taxpayer will come in six months, when he finds out what the Budget is all about, and what the Treasury has in store for him in 1976.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You are no expert, you know, in examining the Budget.

Mr YOUNG: I do not claim to be an expert in anything.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You made a mess of examining my Budget.

Mr YOUNG: What I claim to be able to do is to read the 1975-76 Budget presented by the present Federal Treasurer and the Receipts and Summary of Estimated Expenditure issued by the Treasury. I claim to be able to read them, and so does the Treasury.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What about this empty Treasury you were going to find when we went out of office?

Mr YOUNG: We have been through that on a number of occasions.

Mr Taylor: You have been through what was left in the Treasury.

Mr YOUNG: Certainly enough has been said about that. I want to quote some words uttered by a Federal Leader of the Opposition. He said—

Do you believe that Australia can afford another three years like the last 20 months? Are you prepared to maintain at the head of your affairs a coalition which has lurched into crisis after crisis, embarrassment piled on embarrassment, week after week?

Will you accept another three years of waiting for next week's crisis, next week's blunder? Will you again entrust the nation's economy to the men

who deliberately but needlessly created Australia's worst unemployment for ten years? Or to the same men who have presided over the worst inflation for 20 years?

Mr Bertram: Why is it you have no faith in your Federal Leader of the Opposition?

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition who said that was Mr Gough Whitlam at the Blacktown Civic Centre in November, 1972. What a statement that was! He said—

... Australia's worst unemployment for 10 years? Or to the same men who have presided over the worst inflation for 20 years?

When the previous Government went out of office inflation was running at about 5 per cent. In the Treasurer's Budget speech he has built in, as acceptable, an inflation factor of 23 per cent. When we look more deeply at some of the figures in this Budget speech there are certain areas of the economy that will eventually increase by more than 23 per cent.

Mr Bertram: What can we do about that?

Mr YOUNG: That is what the Federal Government is saying. It keeps on saying, "What can we do about it?" Has any Opposition member known one single overseas factor that has caused inflation in this country?

Mr H. D. Evans: Not much!

Mr Sibson: You were asked to name them; not to argue.

Mr H. D. Evans: Overseas investment of \$1 900 million in one year and failure to devalue started inflation before the change of Government.

Sir Charles Court: That did not cause inflation.

Mr YOUNG: In three years the Commonwealth Government has brought about a total deficit of \$5 000 million. Every other country in the western world that has suffered inflation at least has a basic reason to put forward as the cause, and that was an increase in fuel prices. Australia did not have that reason to advance. This country has been brought to its knees as the result of the activities of the Commonwealth Government in failing to recognise that the only thing that stops inflation is production, and production is not being encouraged by the present Commonwealth Government and never will be, because it does not suit it to have no inflation.

Mr Bertram: You would not agree with the philosophy of your own Premier.

Mr YOUNG: I think it is basic socialistic philosophy to have inflation. It is a necessary platform to bring about socialism in a free world, because socialism—

Mr Skidmore: Russia does not have inflation.

Mr YOUNG: I was saying that socialist countries have to have inflation in order to bring everyone down to the one level.

I want to go into more detail with some of the aspects of the Hayden Budget which have not been readily recognised by members of the Opposition, and which perhaps have not been given sufficient publicity in the Press in regard to their effect on the people of the country. I am particularly concerned that members should know the difference between my condemnation of the Treasurer and the Treasury, because the Treasury has to be totally circumspect in the way it programmes its accounts. It cannot use flowery terms to describe plain, diabolical, and desolate facts relating to finance. It can use figures only. I want that to be clearly understood by members opposite.

Firstly, I will concentrate on the failure of the Budget to stimulate the private sector of the economy generally. I want to concentrate also on the huge increase in taxation that will result from this particular Budget. For the sake of members opposite they have to understand that the Treasury of this country has said that the increase in taxes per head of population will be \$256 for every man, woman, and child, employed or unemployed, in the country next year.

Mr Bertram: The average.

Mr YOUNG: It is an average of \$256 per head of population for every man, woman, and child. The increase in income tax alone, as a result of the Budget produced by the great benevolent Australian Government will be \$187 per head for every man, woman, and child employed or unemployed, and one can imagine what effect that will have on those who are employed. The Treasurer has admitted that this is so.

Let me point out to members opposite that this is in respect only of those people who are paid their salaries and who pay their taxes as they earn. It has no bearing on a person such as Lang Hancock who is the highest individual taxpayer in Australia. This figure is in respect of people who pay their taxes at the source out of their salaries and wages.

I think it must hurt all socialists to learn that their socialist Government has raised taxation by \$256 per head of population on every man, woman and child in the country.

Mr Jamieson: That is an average figure.

Mr YOUNG: An average figure?

Mr Jamieson: Yes.

Mr YOUNG: I will get down to specifics in a moment.

Mr Jamieson: I will lend you a handkerchief when you start to cry in a moment on their behalf.

Mr YOUNG: In other words, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not mind the average taxpayer being hit like that.

Mr Hartrey: I do not admit it.

Mr YOUNG: Does the honourable member deny the document produced by the Commonwealth Treasurer?

Mr Bertram: How do you calculate the six months? I suggest it is more like nine months.

The SPEAKER: I would suggest that the honourable member should address the Chair.

Mr YOUNG: I also intend to cover the inflationary aspect of the Budget and its total acceptance by the Commonwealth Government for its own obvious purposes. The effects of the Budget on State works programmes is significant. Firstly, in regard to its failure to stimulate industry, company taxes have been reduced by only 2½ per cent. The Federal Treasurer estimates that this will cost \$120 million in a financial year. At the moment inflation in this country is forcing every company, private and public, to pay dividends out of capital, because the real profits—

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Did you say every company?

Mr YOUNG: Every company would be paying dividends out of capital.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: That is absolute nonsense, and I have proof of that in my bag here.

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition has?

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Yes.

Mr YOUNG: I will be interested to hear it. If the situation is such that the company accounts being presented daily by large and small companies is according to the way financial analysts read them; to the way that the Institute of Chartered Accountants reads them; to the way that the Australian Society of Accountants reads them, and to the way that the Institute of Management reads them, then the situation is diabolical. At this point I will have to admit that the Leader of the Opposition is probably correct in that there would be certain circumstances where companies could be geared in capital where they may not be paying dividends out of capital.

In the main the inflation rate has caused companies to pay not only their taxes but also their dividends out of capital.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I am telling you that Colonial Sugar Refinery is not paying dividends out of capital.

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition talks in very interesting terms. I think last year the net profit of that company was in the vicinity of \$100 million.

The saving in the magnanimous gesture of the Commonwealth Government in regard to company tax represents about the net profit of one company; the amount involved is \$120 million. That is the total cost to the Commonwealth Government,

and the total benefit that is to be granted by it to industry. If the Government continues with the policy it is adopting at the moment in regard to companies and individual taxpayers, then I say the incentive to produce in this country will almost certainly disappear to the extent that real production will slowly grind to a halt within the next 12 months.

No attempt has been made by the Commonwealth Government to remove the mandatory distribution of dividends by private companies; I consider that to be scandalous. I admit that for years and years the Liberal-Country Party Government maintained the mandatory distribution of dividends in private companies, but at least there was a different rate of tax paid by private companies, as compared with public companies. However, the present Commonwealth Government says that all companies must pay the same rate of tax. The private company after paying its taxes is forced to pay dividends to shareholders who in turn are taxed again. If that is an inducement to the private enterprise sector then I am a Dutchman's uncle.

The private enterprise sector has managed the affairs of this country very well, and until recently we had been used to this form of management. We expected full employment and enough commodities to go around to meet the needs of everybody. However, a few dissidents said that was not good enough and they started to cripple the private enterprise sector. What the private enterprise sector has done so well in the management of the economy, the present Commonwealth Government will undo in its term.

If we look at page 4 of the Commonwealth Budget papers, which contains the estimates of receipts and a summary of estimated expenditure, and compare what appears there with what appears in the Budget speech of the Commonwealth Treasurer we find a great number of anomalies. In his speech the Commonwealth Treasurer said—

The cost to revenue of the new system I have outlined cannot be as simply summarised as is usually the case. On a true "full year" basis, the cost to revenue will be \$205 million.

The combined effect of the taxation measures I have outlined and of the more accurate PAYE deductions which they make possible will be a substantial reduction in PAYE tax instalments for most taxpayers from the beginning of 1976. The precise instalments to be applied will be determined in due course, but I mention, for purposes of illustration, that the rise in the take-home pay of a wage-earner with a dependent wife and two children, and earning between \$100 and \$150 per week, will be well over \$5 per

week. There will be small rises—generally of less than \$1 per week in the PAYE instalment deductions of some taxpayers without dependants.

If we look at table 4 of Budget paper No. 4 of the Treasurer's document, we find under the heading of "Estimates of receipts for the year ending 30th June, 1976" the following—

	Estimate 1975-76	Receipts 1974-75
Income Tax— Individuals (P.A.Y.E.)	\$3 653 000 000	\$C 071 293 248

This is the relief the Commonwealth Treasurer has given to the average employed taxpayer of the country—an extra \$2612 million in taxation in a year!

Mr McIver: It will buy a packet of cigarettes!

Mr YOUNG: That might seem funny to the honourable member but not to me. In the same table the following also appears—

	Estimate 1975-76	Receipts 1974-75
Individuals (Other)	\$1 657 000 000	\$1 042 725 620

The term "Individuals (Other)" means the people who are not employed. It refers to the self-employed people, but there is to be no reduction or increase in income tax for them. It is all very well for the socialist Opposition in this House to say the Federal Budget is a marvellous Budget. It is the employed person who is being ripped off; and it is the person whose tax is deducted at the source and who receives a group certificate at the end of the year who is ripped off to the extent of \$2612 million.

I wonder whether members opposite can explain which Father Christmas will pay this \$2612 million. Obviously it is the individual taxpayer who is employed; not a company; not some other Government, and not Mr Khemlani. It is the individual average taxpayer. That might sound terrific to the people who support those who have introduced the Budget, but not to me.

It is very clear that Mr Hayden, the Federal Treasurer, in framing the Budget took no notice of the report of the Mathews committee which was appointed by the Labor Government. It was appointed because many people and organisations, including the ACTU, said there had to be a stop to the ridiculous escalation of inflation. They said that inflation caught up with people as their incomes moved into higher brackets, with a consequent increase in income tax, thereby causing them to pay a disproportionate amount of taxation. That was why the Mathews committee was set up.

The report having come down in favour of tax indexation—a principle which was supported by the ACTU, a member of which was a signatory to that report—the proposal for tax indexation was completely ignored by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr Moller: The Federal Treasurer gave reasons as to why his Government could not agree to it.

Mr YOUNG: With due respect to the member for Mundaring, the Federal Treasurer merely uttered words, as indicated in the part of his speech dealing with taxation. He did not give any reasons at all. The people for whom the Mathews report came out so strongly have been sacrificed; they are the average taxpayers who pay the tax as they earn. It was not through any decision of the average taxpayer that he moved into a higher income bracket so that it would be possible for him to pay for the increase in the price of his groceries. He has to pay higher taxes, and he has been sacrificed by this Commonwealth Budget.

If the Commonwealth did intend to introduce tax indexation it would have had to be honest in the presentation of its Budget speech. Instead of relying on taxation to find the amount of \$2612 million it was seeking to only half balance its Budget, it would have to rely on taxes which everybody could see quite clearly, or else it would have to rely on cuts in expenditure which it would not implement.

I will give an example of the average family man. Take the man on \$5400 a year, with a wife and two children. Under the old system if he had only \$250 worth of additional concessional deductions he would have paid \$503. Under this Budget with rebates and the general rebate of \$540 he will pay only \$60. That is the plain fact of the matter. It gives him a saving of \$443. That is the obvious point in the Budget which the Treasurer is trying to get over. That is what it will save that taxpayer per annum in income tax.

When we take into consideration the increases in excise on beer, cigarettes, petrol, and what-have-you, even a very moderate man would be caught for \$3 a week. Therefore under this arrangement his total saving would be \$291 on the Budget today as written.

Mr Taylor: How many packets of cigarettes and bottles of beer in terms of additional excise does that mean? Surely it would be a tremendous amount.

Mr YOUNG: No it is not. The honourable member has failed to recognise some of the subtleties in the Budget.

Mr Taylor: You referred only to those items and mentioned \$3 tax. That is a lot.

Mr YOUNG: It works out to an average of six bottles of beer per week for the family, an average of one packet of cigarettes per day each for the husband and wife, and the normal motor travel in a car which averages around 20 miles to the gallon, plus an estimate of mine which includes \$20 per year for increases in petroleum products. The Treasurer admits that these costs will increase as a result of his tax on crude oil. So it whittles the savings down to \$291.

Sir Charles Court: That assumes he does not post any letters and does not have a phone.

Mr YOUNG: That is right. He would not be able to afford it.

Mr Moiler: And does not use electricity.

Mr YOUNG: But his inflation is running at 20 per cent. This is where the crunch comes in. This is what the Treasurer is not telling us, but it is something we must take into account.

Inflation of 23 per cent is written into the Budget. It is written into it, is accepted, and is accounted for. The Budget is geared to it. Because the rebate remains exactly the same whether a person earns \$4 million a week or \$20 a week, that man will find himself at the end of the year on an income of \$6 200, and that will be a naked \$280 more in tax. The advantages are gone. He is getting them now, but not later. The Treasurer is giving them now to the fellow on that income with two children and a wife. He considers he will save \$291, but by the end of the year that has gone because the rebate does not change. Therefore that naked increase of tax robs him of everything he has got in rebates, in addition to which he will be facing the normal day-to-day problems of all the other inflationary factors in the economy.

Now let us shift away from the classic example of the married man on which the Treasurer hinged his entire Budget, and let us consider on the same income the single man and woman whose existence is certainly not discouraged in any shape or form by the Commonwealth Government. If a single person—and there are many thousands of them in the community as members probably know—is on the same income of \$5 400 a year, and let us assume he has a deduction of a moderate \$400 a year, under the old system he would have paid \$680 in tax. Under the new system he will be levied \$1 350 in tax. He would get a rebate of \$540 and therefore pay a net \$810, so he is \$130 worse off before he does anything in regard to paying excise or before inflation even touches him.

Mr Clarko: And when wages go up 20 per cent he will be further behind.

Mr YOUNG: That is so, as will be the case with a married man.

Mr Moiler: Obviously if the Premier—

Mr YOUNG: It would be a better idea if the member for Mundaring were to listen to me. I can recall the time when the former member for Merredin-Yilgarn (Mr Brown) exhorted the last Budget, or the one before the last, introduced by the Commonwealth Government. When I spoke I said to him, "You have just lost your seat." If the member for Mundaring does not believe that is the reason he lost his seat, he should ask the present member for Merredin-Yilgarn what cost the former member his seat.

Mr Moiler: It certainly was not that.

Mr YOUNG: It was not the Commonwealth Budget? Have you also got fairies at the bottom of your garden?

Mr Moiler: Have a look at the redistribution of boundaries.

Mr Bateman: Be factual. What a lot of tripe!

Mr YOUNG: It is starting to work!

If we add the \$150 amount for the increased excise and \$130 which the individual single taxpayer will be up for in tax, he is \$280 worse off in a year, before he starts fighting the inflation to which the member for Karrinyup referred. In fact, if his concessional deductions under last year's taxable situation amounted to \$1 350 which many responsible young men have because they are providing for their future, he would be in fact \$337 a year worse off, plus the \$150, which would be \$570 a year.

This Budget will really hit the taxpayer on the 1st January, 1976. The single man will be the worst hit by the Budget because he will be \$377 worse off in a year, but he will have to catch it all up in six months. It does not take long to work out that it will cost him \$15 extra a week from the 1st January to the 30th June to catch up that amount and from then on the extra will be about \$7-odd a week if things are not worse then than they are now. Yet Mr Hayden, the Federal Treasurer, said that there will be small rises generally of less than \$1 a week on the pay-as-you-earn instalment deductions of some taxpayers without dependants! That is a clever observation!

The Commonwealth Government has an obligation to warn those people, even if they do not want to admit it to themselves, that they will have to make some provision for the tax bill they will receive in 1976 or at least make some provision to save up for what they will be faced with on the 1st January, 1976, because it will be difficult to rip that sort of money off a single person.

If we take a single person in the north-west, with a zone allowance, earning a large salary of \$10 000 a year—and many of those fellows up there, working very hard, do earn around that amount—according to my calculations he will be in the vicinity of \$344 worse off. If we take into consideration the increased excise costs in the north-west, in the zone A situation it could be anywhere around \$200 more next year, so he will be in the vicinity of \$600 a year worse off.

The higher the income goes—and obviously the rebate remains exactly the same—the more the Budget will tell against the taxpayer, and in these days of inflation that means each and every one of the people in the community because incomes are going up. The Commonwealth Government has accepted the

fact that they are going up, because it has built the increased factor into the Budget. Consequently, as a result, everyone will be hit by the Budget.

Another side effect of the Budget is the \$540 rebate which the Commonwealth Government is now to give to every taxpayer, whether or not he is spending the money in a manner which would justify a concessional deduction. That rebate will affect the life assurance companies in this country and, in turn, it will affect every facet of production and investment. One of the greatest motivations for investment in life assurance was the tax deductibility of the premium. The present attitude of the Commonwealth Government will affect that form of investment. I must admit the Commonwealth Government has been consistent in its attitude. It has never shifted from its diabolical down-the-line approach. Its attitude is: Do not worry about working or saving, you will be looked after. Under the new scheme of rebate every taxpayer will be able to deduct \$540. If his taxation amounts to \$540 he will receive a rebate of the same amount and will pay no tax. A person will not have to invest his money or channel it to a life assurance society; he will simply receive the deduction.

Mr Clarko: The Commonwealth Government is trying to destroy private insurance, is it not?

Mr Bateman: So it ought to.

Mr YOUNG: For the benefit of members opposite I would point out that much of the development in some areas of Australia is as a result of investment by life assurance societies. Employment has been generated because many people have invested their savings in life assurance companies.

Mr Bateman: They soak the community, that is what they do.

Mr YOUNG: It is all very well to talk in terms of soaking the community, but who ends up with the money? I tackled the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on this matter a couple of years ago.

Mr Bateman: The life assurance companies end up with the money; they almost control the country.

Mr YOUNG: Who ends up with the money?

Mr Bateman: The life assurance companies.

Mr YOUNG: The people who are insured end up with the money.

Mr Jamieson: That shows how little you know about it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bateman: Life assurance companies are like bookmakers; they cannot lose. The member opposite has not done his homework.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: The life assurance societies of this country are mutual societies and they are owned by the policy holders.

Mr Jamieson: They are money monopolies.

Mr YOUNG: The money goes back to the policy holders. Also, the investment of huge sums of money creates employment for the sort of people represented by the member for Swan and by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—before they were members of Parliament—as trade unionists. The workers were able to obtain employment because of investments by the assurance companies. How much employment is created by the attitude of the present Commonwealth Government? Absolutely none.

Members on the other side seem to believe in the free lunch system; that a free lunch will turn up somewhere around the place. There is no free lunch; it has to be paid for.

Mr McIver: Who finances the hire-purchase companies? Do not tell me the money does not come from the life assurance companies, at a high rate of interest.

Mr YOUNG: Most of the money comes from private investment and banks.

Mr McIver: Yes, and the assurance companies are making a profit.

Mr YOUNG: Do they lend the money for nothing?

Mr Bateman: No, they do not.

Mr YOUNG: If the member opposite invests his money does he not get something back?

Mr Jamieson: They double charge for their money.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Just try to cash your bonus and see how much you get.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Scarborough.

Mr Jamieson: Members opposite do not know which side they are on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: To return to the subject of the increase in total pay-as-you-earn tax, members on the other side have to face up to the fact—as does the Commonwealth Government—that the increase of over \$2 600 million has to come from somewhere. Obviously, the money will come from inflation. The loudest voice in this Chamber will not change the situation. The money will be gained as a result of inflation because, once again, this Government's Budget is based on inflation. It cannot manage the affairs of the nation without causing inflation. It cannot, in any way, keep its promises without inflation. It is part of the Commonwealth Government's basic philosophy; it is deliberative and diabolical.

Any Government can spend any amount of money on any single aspect of any Budget which it brings forward provided it accepts any rate of inflation. In such a situation the Government can act as though it is Father Christmas.

Mr Bateman: How long has inflation been with us?

Mr YOUNG: Never at this rate. If we were talking in terms of an inflation rate of 5 per cent, 6 per cent, or 7 per cent, I can assure the member for Canning I would not be speaking in this manner.

Mr Bateman: I am sincere. Inflation is a dirty word created by your Government and by your people.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: The member for Canning certainly reminds me of Mrs Whitlam. She said we invented the word "inflation". It was said to be a dirty word and if the newspapers did not talk about it no-one would notice it!

The deficit Budgets of the Commonwealth Government have totalled \$5 658 million in a period of three years. That is a greater deficit than all previous deficits in the entire history of the nation. It is thousands of millions of dollars more.

Mr Bateman: Has inflation occurred in any other country of the world? Is it only in Australia? What about England, Holland, and Germany?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: For the edification of the member for Canning, the United States has brought its inflation rate down to about 13 per cent.

Mr Jamieson: And taken the unemployment rate up.

Mr YOUNG: Germany has got the inflation rate down to about 8 per cent. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said that the unemployment rate has gone up. Once again, members opposite think that Father Christmas lives in Canberra. However, the trade union leaders are going to the Commonwealth Government and asking what the hell it intends to do about the situation.

Mr Jamieson: You would not care how many were unemployed as long as you solved inflation.

Mr Clarko: There will be half a million unemployed by Christmas.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr A. R. Tonkin: The member should read the latest edition of *The Economist*; it is worth reading.

Mr YOUNG: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not seem to have accepted the fact that inflation increased with the present Commonwealth Government.

Mr Jamieson: Inflation would have occurred irrespective of which Government was in Canberra. Any decent banker in the country will tell you that.

Mr Clarko: It would never have increased to its present extent except for your mob.

Mr Jamieson: Read last Saturday's paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Scarborough resume his seat. There is an increasing tendency during this debate for a chorus of interjections. I do not mind so much when one member interjects, but that interjection should not trigger off an immediate interjection from somebody else. The Speaker cannot handle a chorus of interjections. A chaotic situation has developed. I have asked members to watch the situation in the past, and again I ask them to do so. The member for Scarborough.

Mr Jamieson: He cannot handle his own case.

Mr YOUNG: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not accepted the fact that irrespective of the reason for inflation it is in the same proportion to unemployment.

Mr Jamieson: Not necessarily.

Mr YOUNG: Well, the Commonwealth Government is aware that inflation and unemployment run at exactly the same rate. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can check the figures if he does not believe me. An increase of 1 per cent in inflation increases unemployment by 10 000.

Mr Jamieson: That is a lot of ridiculous nonsense.

Mr YOUNG: The socialists say we should let inflation run because the longer it runs, the harder it runs, the quicker it will reach everyone in the community. That is the simple plain fact of the matter and that is the sort of Trades Hall thinking which is ruining the country at the moment. Who is running the country? If there were a real economist running the country we would not be in this situation.

Mr Jamieson: You would be in exactly the same situation whatever Government was in power in Australia.

Mr YOUNG: I hope that very soon we will have an opportunity to find out.

Mr Jamieson: If Fraser carried out the Budget he proposed we would be a darned sight worse off.

Mr YOUNG: Let me assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the loudest screamer when we take the Treasury benches in Canberra will be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Consider the fiasco caused by a deficit of \$5 658 million in three years: he will ask, "Why didn't you fix it overnight? You couldn't fix it."

Mr Jamieson: You are saying you could fix it overnight.

Mr YOUNG: As a further example of the total acceptance of the Commonwealth Government in relation to inflation budgeting we will have a look at sales tax.

Sales tax was not mentioned in Mr Hayden's speech. There was no percentage increase in sales tax; therefore it is obvious the percentage of sales tax applicable to every item has not increased. But the Commonwealth Government has budgeted for an increase of \$270 million—once again, strangely enough, an increase of 23.5 per cent which represents \$19 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Pay-roll tax has not increased at all but in the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory, where the Commonwealth Government can impose pay-roll tax, there will be an increase of 33 per cent. If we read deeply into that it becomes very clear what kind of income the Commonwealth Government is expecting, not only from pay-as-you-earn taxation and pay-roll tax but also from increases in wages and, obviously, in prices.

The Budget deficit of the Commonwealth Government in 1973-74 was \$293 million. In 1974-75 it was \$2 567 million after being rigged. In 1975-76 the Commonwealth Government has budgeted for a deficit of \$2 798 million. That makes a total of \$5 658 million in three years. I pointed out that is over \$3 000 million more than the Budget deficits of the Liberal-Country Party Government over a period of 23 years, and it is probably higher by at least \$2 000 million than the entire Budget deficits of the nation since it became a nation.

The worst feature is that the 1974-75 final accounts were not even true because according to the Treasury the deficit in July ran at about \$750 million. We all know it did not run at \$750 million, because that would mean a deficit of \$9 000 million for 1975-76, and not even the present Commonwealth Government is as mad as that. What has obviously happened is that at the end of June, 1975, the Commonwealth Government was in a situation where it could not pay its bills, so it held back the cheques. The Budget deficit at June, 1975, was not \$2 567 million; it was about \$500 million more than that. So the Commonwealth Government paid the cheques in July, which made the deficit for July over \$750 million. That is a straight case of lying to the people. It cannot be anything else. I know it is not a parliamentary term but I call it hoodwinking or something else.

The SPEAKER: It would be better if you said "misrepresenting".

Mr McIver: Withdraw it.

Mr YOUNG: I will withdraw it. I said I knew it was not a parliamentary term. I will say it was straightout malicious misrepresentation.

The effect of continually budgeting for a deficit is obvious to anybody who has to work out a personal budget. Commonwealth and State Governments are no different. One cannot keep on spending \$5

when one is earning \$4; and that is what the Commonwealth Government is doing. It is saying, "Inflation will hide it; the people will not wake up to it. We can hide it with this and that." But the fact of the matter is a Government can continue to budget on a deficit basis only for so long, until the disparity between production and inflation becomes obvious.

A dollar in this country, or in any country in the world with proper economic management, must be backed by production. If it is not backed by production the obvious thing that happens next is inflation. Inflation makes the tax dollar completely false because the tax dollar which a person is paying becomes worthless and he has to keep on paying more and more. That is obvious from Budget paper No. 4, to which I referred, in which the Commonwealth Government has accepted the fact that \$2 612 million more will be paid in taxation this year. As a result of this the snake swallows its tail and we get more inflation.

Not only have we not funded Medibank but we also have a \$2 800 million deficit, and Medibank makes up half of that. We have not only failed to fund Medibank by \$1 400 million, but in addition to failing to fund this grand and glorious scheme every person in Australia will be up for another \$256 a head this year. Lo and behold, everything everyone was trying to tell the Commonwealth Government and Mr Hayden, the author of this deficit Budget, has come true. Finally, the people running Medibank have realised the costs will go up. It is stated in today's issue of *The West Australian* that Medibank administration costs are likely to go up because there are more claims than were expected. Is that not sweet? We have a Treasurer who was the author of Medibank and the author of this Budget document, and he is so naive and sweet he did not expect that would happen. I do not believe for one minute he is so dumb. He is diabolical; he is clever; he is cunning; and he does not miss a trick.

Mr Bertram: Whom are you speaking about now—the Premier? He will discipline you quickly.

Mr YOUNG: In addition to taxation and inflation, the States' programmes for works will be drastically cut this year. They will have to be cut because the amounts available for school building programmes, housing, and roads have been dramatically reduced. We will be in real trouble. That is purely my estimate. I might be wrong and I will concede it very readily if I am; but I think in six months' time it will be found I am right.

The rate of increased costs for a stage 1 high school is \$1 000 a day. The amount of money to be made available to this State by the Commonwealth for school building programmes has decreased in money terms by 36 per cent and in real

terms by about 50 per cent. With inflation costs in the building industry running at about 30 per cent, we can imagine where that leaves the school building programme.

Mr Skidmore: I was under the impression you thought inflation was a State matter.

Mr YOUNG: Inflation is the problem of the person who has the purse-strings of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr Bertram: Your Premier does not agree with that.

Mr YOUNG: It is, if members would like me to elaborate on it. State Governments, given the opportunity to perform, can solve the problem by themselves. All that members of the Opposition party have to do is take the bonds off and we will perform and fix up inflation. Give us a chance to get back on the job. Give us a chance to get one north-west shelf project off the ground. But no, it cannot be done, because it is the people's oil, but they cannot use it; they are not allowed to do anything with it. We are not allowed to do anything with the gas; it is the people's gas. It is the people's land; it is the people's paradise, according to members on the other side.

We are not allowed to touch our natural resources or to use them. We may develop them only *a la* R. F. X. Connor, and that is all.

Mr Skidmore: Who is stopping the development?

Mr YOUNG: The Commonwealth Government.

Mr Skidmore: I thought it was you.

Mr YOUNG: I see, so the honourable member would rather that we were pushed from that side. As I recall, when I was sitting on the Opposition benches, the then Premier (the present Leader of the Opposition) refused to take a case to the High Court in regard to offshore oil. He refused with the support of everyone in the Opposition at that time. When the Labor Party members were on this side, they said, "What is the use; you cannot do anything about it. The Commonwealth Government will win." I know the legal eagles told us all about the technicalities, but technicalities are what the law is all about.

Mr Jamieson: No.

Mr YOUNG: On many occasions the member for Boulder-Dundas has said that the golden thread running through law is what the words say. That is the pure technicality of it—what the words say.

Mr Hartrey: That is not a technicality.

Mr YOUNG: Perhaps I should have used the words "common sense" rather than the word "technicality". That is fair comment. However, until we have a judgment from the High Court, who is to say we

should not challenge the Commonwealth Government?

Mr Skidmore: What I say is: you made the challenge, you are forcing the play.

Mr YOUNG: What the member for Swan is saying is, "If Mr Connor would let us get on with the job of developing our resources, we could get on with it."

Mr Skidmore: That is not what the member for Swan says.

Mr YOUNG: Oh no?

Mr Bertram: Is it not usual to tackle the Federal Treasurer in his own Chamber and not 3 000 miles away?

Mr O'Neil: He is not far enough away.

Mr YOUNG: I believe this document deserves to be attacked from every point in the land, including this House, the Upper House in this State, the Senate, on the Esplanade and on the Domain in Sydney.

Mr Bertram: In the future you will not have any objection to our attacking Ministers in their absence from this Chamber. You will have no objection to that.

Mr YOUNG: That is an absurd statement, especially from a man who is supposed to have a trained mind.

Mr Bertram: There is no need to be insulting—be logical.

Several members interjected.

Mr YOUNG: In regard to the allocation of housing funds, the amount of money to be given to the State this year for this purpose is about the same as last year. However, if we consider the present increase attributable to inflation—even at the modest rate of around 22 per cent suggested by the Commonwealth Treasurer—we do not have to explain that housing finance will not go very far next year.

I believe local authorities will have some troubles in regard to road funds.

Mr Moiler: Just because the State keeps ripping it all off them.

Mr Bertram: What do you suggest we should do—hike up road expenditure and build up inflation?

Mr YOUNG: What are we to cut down on?

Mr Shalders: Medibank.

Mr YOUNG: That is only \$1 400 million—a mere pittance when considered in the total.

Mr Bertram: If people did not have Medibank, they would have to pay into hospital benefits. What is the difference?

Mr YOUNG: The final words of my motion are these—

For these and other reasons the Whitlam Government is to be condemned for failing to properly manage the affairs of the nation. One of the things members opposite should remember, and one of the questions the Commonwealth Government must ask itself

is: What sort of a nation are we? Have we really reached the stage where this sort of thing could happen in three years to a fairly reasonably hard-working nation? The people do not deserve the problems which have been foisted upon them by this Commonwealth Government.

Mr Hartrey: Do you remember the Lyons Government in 1934?

Mr YOUNG: The average Australian is not impressed with being unemployed—he does not particularly like it.

Mr Davies: The average Australian is not unemployed.

Mr YOUNG: That is a very good and pertinent comment. The average Australian is not unemployed because at this stage a small percentage only of the work force is unemployed. However, I have been trying to make these points—

(a) We should not have anywhere near the percentage of unemployed that we do have, and

(b) Unless the policies of the Commonwealth Government are curtailed to some extent, the average person in this country will be unemployed.

So many people are unemployed at the moment—

Mr Barnett: What about 1933?

Mr YOUNG: —including many who would far rather be employed. We have reached the stage where we are accepting the fact that in this nation we cannot get away from an unemployment problem. I know members opposite have accepted the fact that we cannot do anything about it.

Mr Bateman: That is not so. Put the Tonkin Government back, and we will do something about it.

Mr YOUNG: From the comments I heard throughout the whole of my speech, I believed that Opposition members had virtually accepted the fact that nothing could be done about it. The only people in this country who can solve the problem are those who actually produce goods. The Government produces nothing; computers do not produce; and academics who decide Government policy do not produce anything. The only people who produce anything in this nation are the ones out there working, producing, and endeavouring to keep on producing. However, to produce they must have a job; to create jobs there must be industry; and to establish industry there must be encouragement and profit. There must be something for which it is worth having industry and a job. Until the Commonwealth Government accepts that fact, no solution is possible. I am sure that come March, April, or May next year, when the real effects of this Budget are known to everyone in the country, the Commonwealth Government will accept it, but by God, it will be too late.

Mr Bertram: What will happen then?

Mr YOUNG: With a deficit at that stage of something around \$5 600 million for the three years, the nation will take so long to haul itself out of the quagmire, it will be an interminable hard slog for the people who did not desire to be put in this position in the first place. It was a grand socialist scheme, but it is almost buried and, thank God, for the people of the nation it will not be too far in the future when such incompetent moments of madness will be behind us. I thoroughly urge members of this Chamber to support the motion.

Mr Bertram: You should not condemn socialism when you practice it.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

Mr CLARKO: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr J. T. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [10.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 2nd September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 2nd September, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (9) ON NOTICE.

1. BUSSELTON HIGH SCHOOL *Adjoining Land*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Minister intend resuming the 3½ acres owned by a Mr A. Scott and adjoining the Busselton High School, for use by the school?
- (2) If not, what is the Government's intention in respect of this area of land?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Education Department has no current plans, which involve Mr Scott's land, for the school.