

I am quite sure that the passing of the Clean Air Act was an indication that we were concerned about air pollution, but if the Act as it stands prevents us from taking the necessary action we should amend it to enable such action to be taken.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The principle of the Act is that the firm must use all practicable means. This was because of the fairness of Parliament.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Even though the company has not been able to reduce or control the dust nuisance, we still come back to the point that we do not want our air polluted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Tell me what Act you would use to order the company out?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And what money you would use to buy it out.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I am sure that if Sir Halford Reddish wanted the company out he would get it out.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Clean Air Act could be used. Surely it contains sufficient power for the purpose.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You suggest we pass a separate Act to get this firm out of that position?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It seems to be the only way. We talk about conditions in the rest of the world and how we would like the conditions in Perth to be, but the Minister does not want to introduce an amending Bill which would affect this company. It must be done.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I was interested in your solution.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is the only way I can think of. As the Minister has already indicated to me, this could only be decided in a court of law; but I have doubts whether the non-conforming use right would extend to the manufacture of lime. I do not know the position in regard to the manufacture of cement, and I know less regarding the manufacture of lime. However, if the company has changed, or altered its equipment in any way at all, to deviate from the manufacture of cement to the manufacture of lime, I maintain its non-conforming use right has been violated. This, of course, is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did the company have to make alterations? I did not think it did.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I think so. The company certainly had to make some alterations because it put in a new plant. I am wondering whether we are tackling this problem or are adopting the attitude that as it is too big—it has been with us for a long time—and we are not sure how to go about it, nothing can be done. If people do not complain, the problem will remain. I think we should face up to it and take some positive action.

The other night I said that if it is beyond the financial ability of the company—this could even extend to the shifting of the company—I would go along with the idea of the people being asked to contribute.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you mean the people or the Government?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Government is the people. In making this suggestion I am in pretty good company, because it is recorded in this file that Mr. Graham, who was Minister at that time, made a similar suggestion. In the interests of everybody, I feel that this factory must go. It is inevitable; so why not now?

I have now covered the points upon which I wished to speak and I thank members for listening to me. I trust the Minister will have a look at the matters I have raised because I feel sure there is room for improvement in regard to some of them. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, the 27th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 21st August, 1969

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (37): ON NOTICE NATIVES

1.

Reserve at Carnarvon

Mr. **NORTON** asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Has a start been made on supplying the native reserve at Carnarvon with an adequate water supply?
- (2) If "Yes", when is it anticipated that the work will be completed?

Mr. **CRAIG** (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) Yes. A contract was let earlier this month.
- (2) Within 10 weeks.

2. FISHING

Useless Loop and Inlet

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) It is practicable for inlets such as Useless Loop and Useless Inlet, if reopened, to re-establish themselves as fish nurseries?
- (2) Has any research been carried out with respect to the closing of inlets, such as Useless Inlet, and the period of time that may elapse before they become barren as far as marine life is concerned?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes—provided the salinity of the water is reduced to a tolerable level for marine life.
- (2) No research of this nature has been undertaken.

3. SALT

Solar Production

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) During the process of solar evaporation of sea water for the production of salt, what minerals are deposited before the salt can be produced?
- (2) Is there any sequence in which the various minerals are deposited and, if so, what is that sequence?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Only one mineral of any significance is deposited before salt crystallises during the concentration of sea water by solar evaporation to produce salt. The mineral is $\text{Ca SO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ —commonly known as gypsum.
- (2) The sequence of deposition of the mineral components of sea water during concentration are—

gypsum;
salt;
magnesium salts.

At certain degrees of concentration two minerals may be deposited simultaneously resulting in salt being produced that is contaminated with gypsum or magnesium salts.

Experienced salt makers do not harvest the salt so contaminated.

The concentrated liquor normally discarded by salt makers is referred to as bitterns.

Other elements, such as bromine, iodine, potassium, calcium, and various sulphates, are still in solution. These can be extracted with further processing.

A further note, which helps to clarify the answer, in case I have misunderstood the honourable member's question is as follows:—

Note.—Sea water contains minute quantities of potassium and is not used normally as a source of potassium.

Lake McLeod brines contain a much higher concentration of potassium which is the reason why they are being developed by Texada Mines Pty. Ltd. as the basis of a potential potash industry.

4. EDUCATION

Bungaree School

Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Education:

Referring to my questions on the 13th August and the 19th August relating to the Bungaree School—now that students from Bungaree School already occupy the available spare classrooms at Rockingham Beach and figures indicate a further 100 enrolments by this December, will the department review its decision and provide three demountables from the present contract to meet early accommodation need and also protect adequate classroom supply for the start of 1970 school year at this school?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

No guarantee can be given that any specified number of demountables can be made available during third term. The department will arrange further temporary accommodation as required.

5. EDUCATION

Classroom Furniture

Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Education:

Is there any difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply of classroom furniture (desks and chairs) for the estimated student enrolment next year?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

No difficulty is anticipated.

6. This question was postponed.

7. HEALTH

Cigarette Smoking: Hazards

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Further to his answer to my question of the 19th August will he now state some of the many people said by him to make allegations

about the effects of cigarette smoking in practically every country of the world, whose allegations he accepts as authoritative?

(2) If "No", why?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) and (2) I have nothing to add to my answer of the 19th August.

8.

HOUSING

Applicants

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Has he a record of the number of applicants whose names were removed from the list for failing to reply to the Housing Commission's enquiry and who subsequently approached the commission?

(2) If "Yes", will he state the number?

(3) In how many cases did applicants already listed fail to reply to the first enquiry but not fail to answer the commission's reminder?

(4) How many applicants who had their names removed from the list have been reinstated?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) No applicants were removed from the list for failing to reply to the survey questionnaire.

(2) See (1).

(3) 6,519 applicants did not reply to the survey questionnaire. Reminders are still being sent out by certified mail, the number failing to respond a second time is not yet available.

(4) See (1).

9.

TRAFFIC

Children's Crossings

Mr. LAPHAM asked the Minister for Traffic:

(1) Has he concluded investigations into the advisability of installing "children's crossings" as defined in regulation 103 of the Road Traffic Code in areas for which "guard controlled crossings" have been refused?

(2) If so, what is the result of such investigations?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) No. Investigations are proceeding.

(2) Answered by (1).

10.

LEGAL AID SCHEME

Details

Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Is he able to detail the form the

legal aid scheme to be introduced at the commencement of next year will take and, in particular, indicate whether it will apply to civil as well as criminal proceedings and also indicate upon whom will rest the responsibility for assessing an applicant's eligibility for legal assistance?

Mr. COURT replied:

The legal aid scheme will be administered by the Law Society in accordance with the provisions of part V of the Legal Contribution Trust Act, 1967.

11.

TOWN PLANNING

Regional Development

Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Premier:

What progress has been made in regional development planning since his reply to my question on the 23rd October, 1968, stating that the whole question was under review?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

Since my reply to the member's question of the 23rd October, 1968, a departmental review of regional development planning has been carried out and a submission is currently under consideration.

In the meantime the concept of regional development is being employed in the planning of development going on throughout the State.

12. *This question was postponed.*

13.

POLICE STATION

Guildford

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Is it proposed to close the Guildford Police Station?

(2) If "Yes", when will the closure take place?

(3) Is the Shire of Swan-Guildford opposed to the closure?

(4) Is the Police Department aware of the increased building activities taking place in the immediate vicinity of the police station and near suburbs?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The actual date has yet to be decided.

(3) Yes.

(4) Yes.

Mr. Brady: Shame!

14. MINING

Hills District

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has he received any protests from the hills districts; that is, Mahogany Creek and Mundaring, etc., regarding possible mining activities in the area?
- (2) What action is being taken with regard to the protests?
- (3) Is there any area in the metropolitan area or near metropolitan area excluded from mining activities if applied for?
- (4) Is it proposed to amend the Mining Act to exclude areas like King's Park and similar areas being used for mineral mining?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes and the Minister for Mines received a deputation from the local authority and residents which presented its views.
- (2) Consideration is being given to the matters raised by the deputation.
- (3) and (4) There are no areas in the metropolitan area expressly excluded from mining activities. However, there are adequate safeguards in the Mining Act respecting areas like King's Park and similar areas, therefore no amendment to the Act is proposed.

Mr. Graham: What are the safeguards?—None at all.

15. *This question was postponed.*

16. LOTTERIES COMMISSION

Payments to Hospitals

Mr. BRADY asked the Chief Secretary:

How much money has been paid to the State or private hospitals from the Lotteries Commission in each of the last five years ended the 30th June, 1969?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Amounts paid to all hospitals are—

1965	\$692,026.84
1966	\$587,626.79
1967	\$527,091.29
1968	\$926,786.45
1969	\$1,141,726.44

17. HOSPITAL

Collie District

Mr. JONES asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

When is it anticipated that new extensions will be made at the Collie District Hospital to replace the old sub-standard buildings?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

In 1967, at a cost of \$45,000, the Maternity Ward Block was extended to provide accommodation for an extra 14 patients. This was regarded as the first stage of a long range programme to upgrade the hospital.

Other projects planned for the future are:—

- (1) Casualty treatment area.
- (2) Administration section.
- (3) Kitchen, dining room, stores and boiler house.

These replacement buildings will be provided when funds are available.

18.

CHILD WELFARE

Office at Collie

Mr. JONES asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) Is he aware of the small office at the Water Supply building, Collie, which is made available to the child welfare officer and the recently appointed social welfare worker at Collie?
- (2) Is he also aware that women with children are forced to wait out in the open and sometimes in rain to see the officer because no waiting room accommodation is available?
- (3) If "Yes", will he give urgent consideration to providing adequate and proper accommodation for the employees and the general public at Collie?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, but use has been made of a nearby shelter.
- (3) Action is already being taken to secure more adequate premises. A house that may be suitable for child welfare purposes is being considered.

19.

DROUGHT

Wheat Supplies

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Has the Government considered approaching the Wheat Board to ascertain, where a farmer in a distressed area requires wheat, if it would be possible for him to be supplied from the pool on the understanding that the farmer concerned returns the amount advanced from the pool?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Nalder) replied:
The Government has approached the Australian Wheat Board to give consideration to a programme for re-delivery of wheat to farmers in areas affected by drought.

20. WATER SUPPLIES

Pensioners

Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Am I correctly informed "that some pensioners pay only 5c per 1,000 gallons of water" in certain circumstances in areas away from the metropolitan area?
- (2) If "Yes", does this concession also apply in the metropolitan area where similar circumstances prevail?
- (3) If so, in how many cases?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

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

21. LAND

Price Assessment Tribunal

Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

Is it his intention to set up an impartial price-assessment tribunal to control land prices as he suggested after his visit to Crawley, Sussex?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

No. The suggestion attributed to me by the Leader of the Opposition appears to relate to a Press article published in *The West Australian* of the 11th June, 1969. This comment was the subject of clarification in a further article which was published in *The West Australian* of the 12th June, 1969, and to which the Leader of the Opposition's attention is directed. That article also contained a footnote by John Harrison to the effect that I only regarded the suggestion of a tribunal being used as a last resort. The fact was that after the tour of the area a large number of Press men gathered around the table in the conference room—they were mostly local Press men—and general discussion took place as to the problems of land prices. I was questioned by the Australian representatives there as to whether we felt that this was the answer. My reply was that we had not made any move and we did not believe this was the answer but, perhaps, in the event of not being able to resolve the problem satisfactorily further

consideration might have to be given to other measures which had been suggested in certain reports. My attitude has not changed. Having been to the housing areas this morning and having seen the trend at auctions in relation to land prices I feel there is less likelihood of our having to take such a drastic measure as the setting up of a tribunal which, in any case, we have sought to defer right along the line.

22. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Underground Power Lines

Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

- (1) What was it about the underground power lines of Crawley, 29 miles south of London, which impressed him?
- (2) Did he make any enquiries as to comparative and actual costs?
- (3) Was he sufficiently impressed about underground power lines to cause him to make an early opportunity to endeavour to alter the attitude of the Minister for Electricity?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) The fact that these installations were underground.
- (2) Yes, but these figures were not available.
- (3) It is clear from an analysis that the cost of undergrounding of electricity lines is beyond the present financial resources of the State Electricity Commission.

We discussed the effect of prices and although the people concerned did not have at hand the information, probably because the setting down of these lines was the subject of other departments, they clearly seem to feel that undergrounding would be more costly. I should imagine this information could be obtained because the people there were willing to give any information they could though I gathered that this would take some time to obtain: we gleaned this from their answers in relation to the cost. Clearly they would cost more.

I think we have to recognise that whatever the costs in respect of changes to undergrounding of electricity, we should be prepared to review and look at the situation. It is my intention to continue to see we are abreast of

developments; and we will put mains underground whenever we can afford to do so.

23. AIR STRIP

Exmouth

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for the North West:

- (1) Will he advise whether an airstrip for commercial and private aircraft is to be constructed seven miles from Exmouth townsite and whether this new strip is to be used in lieu of Learmonth for commercial aircraft?
- (2) Is he aware that extensive work involving millions of dollars is being undertaken at the existing Learmonth airstrip?
- (3) Can he advise whether the extensive work at Learmonth means that the airstrip will accommodate either F111 or similar type of aircraft?
- (4) Is Learmonth to be used as a large airforce base?
- (5) If (1) is "Yes", when is it anticipated that the new airstrip will come into operation?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The airstrip under construction by the Shire of Exmouth approximately seven miles south of the Exmouth townsite is for light aircraft only. It is 3,500 ft. in length and 50 ft. wide.

If "commercial aircraft" is intended to refer to MMA D.C.3's, Fokker Friendships and Fellowships, such aircraft could not use this airfield.

- (2) A recent report indicated that the Federal Treasurer had confirmed the Government's intention to proceed with major airfield works, though expenditure in 1969-70 was unlikely.

No official advice has been received from the Commonwealth Government of the plans for upgrading Learmonth airstrip.

- (3) and (4). In view of the defence significance of the matters referred to, I would not be prepared to comment publicly at this stage.
- (5) The new light aircraft strip approximately seven miles south of the Exmouth townsite should be in operation by the 31st August, 1969.

24. *This question was postponed.*

25.

PORT

Port Hedland Port Authority

Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Works:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a port authority at Port Hedland; if so, what are the details and the reasons?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

It is the intention of the Government to establish a port authority at Port Hedland. The principal reason for this is that it has been a matter of policy, where outports have reached appropriate size and status with a reasonable diversity of exports and imports, to have their management placed under separate statutory control.

Mr. Bickerton: A very retrograde step.

26.

EDUCATION

Kindergarten at Roebourne

Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received a petition from residents of Roebourne requesting the use of the old school building as a kindergarten?
- (2) What action has been taken to accede to the request?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In view of the anticipated growth in the Roebourne, Karratha, and Dampier areas it is not considered advisable to release the old school building at this time.

27.

EDUCATION

Students and Teachers: Pilbara

Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the numbers of children—
 - (a) coloured;
 - (b) white,
 attending the following schools:
 - (i) Marble Bar;
 - (ii) Port Hedland;
 - (iii) Cooke Point;
 - (iv) Roebourne;
 - (v) Onslow;
 - (vi) Wittenoom;
 - (vii) Dampier;
 - (viii) Tom Price;
 - (ix) Mt. Newman;
 - (x) Nullagine;
 - (xi) Goldsworthy?
- (2) What are the respective teaching staffs at each of the above schools?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

Enrolments and teaching staff at August, 1969—

	Primary Pupils Non-White	White	Secondary Pupils Non-White	White	Full-time Teaching Staff
(i) Marble Bar primary	77	59	4
(ii) Port Hedland junior high	64	315	55	145	23
(iii) Cooke Point primary	129	3
(iv) Roebourne primary	159	56	8	6
(v) Onslow primary	86	56	1	1	4
(vi) Wittenoom primary	10	59	4	2
(vii) Dampier primary	335	45	10
(viii) Tom Price primary	322	33	9
(ix) Newman primary	69	4	2
(x) Nullagine primary (special native)	5	9	1	1	1
(xi) Goldsworthy primary	116	4

28. HOUSEBOATS *Committee Report*

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the committee appointed by the Government to investigate the use of houseboats on inland waters in Western Australia completed its report?
- (2) If not, when does he expect to receive the report?
- (3) What is the present situation regarding houseboats in Western Australia?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The final report is not expected before the end of 1969 or possibly into the first quarter of 1970.
- (3) A total ban exists on the Swan and Canning Rivers.
A total ban exists in other areas until consideration is given to the final report or any interim report by the Committee.

29. *This question was postponed.*

30. HEALTH *Therapeutic Claims*

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Does any public authority examine claims made by way of advertisement or otherwise for therapeutic substances so as to prohibit or control the use of claims which are considered to be false or misleading?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The publication of any false statements intended to promote the sale of therapeutic substances is an offence under section 227 of the Health Act. General surveillance over this matter is exercised by the Department of Public Health.

31. HOUSING *War Service Loans*

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Minister for Housing:

By reason of the great disparity in the price of land and houses in Western Australia with other States, will he approach the Federal Government or take other action thereby to ensure that war servicemen in this State will be granted loans under the War Service Homes Act equal to those enjoyed by war servicemen in other States?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

Figures available in the 1967-68 Annual Report of the Director of War Service Homes (the latest available) do not indicate a great disparity between the States.

An approach was made in 1968 in respect to the higher cost of houses north of the 26th parallel in Western Australia.

In its reply the Commonwealth indicated that any increase in the maximum loan should be effected on a general basis and apply in all parts of the Commonwealth.

32. *This question was postponed.*

33. PORTS *Giant Bulk Carriers*

Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for the North West:

- (1) Is the Government in its planning for the north and in other places allowing for the possible use of giant bulk carriers bigger than those currently being handled at Port Hedland and Dampier?
- (2) Would the introduction of some of the super giant bulk carriers currently under study be beyond the potential developments of north west ports?

- (3) Has Hamersley Iron cancelled dredging contracts and abandoned dredging operations at East Intercourse and is it currently seeking alternatives within the Dampier Archipelago?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. Dampier can already take 100,000 ton bulk carriers.

Port Hedland's 75,000 ton capacity is currently being developed to 100,000 ton capacity.

Hamersley Iron in consultation with the State Government is preparing to develop Dampier's capacity to 150,000 ton vessels with the intention of going even higher if need be.

- (2) No.

There are wide differences of opinion as to what will be the main and ideal size of bulk carriers for mineral cargoes as distinct from fluids like petroleum. Current plans are that as fast as the world trade needs bigger ships we will—through company development programmes—be able to cope within the Dampier Archipelago and/or at Cape Lambert. Suffice to say the Government is in close touch with shipping trends. It is also aware of some of the limiting factors that inhibit the use of very large bulk super carriers for minerals. Some of these factors are the limited number of places throughout the world that can receive such ships and cargoes, and also the limitations as to depth in some of the world's recognised shipping lanes.

- (3) Dredging contracts have not been cancelled, nor have dredging operations been abandoned at East Intercourse. The existing contracts expired both as to time and quantity of work covered by those contracts.

On the assumption the question arises from some recent statements that have been made without authority, it is appropriate to add:

- (a) there is no so called "crash" programme of drilling for locations as an alternative to East Intercourse. A routine drilling programme in Dampier and East Intercourse approach channels is being undertaken to determine optimum depths to which these should be developed for bigger ships as a pre-requisite to further dredging works.

Also a number of other sites, including Legendre, are being examined but only as routine studies to determine maximum potential of the general area.

- (b) Present programmes are essentially routine programmes which were being undertaken in consultation with the Government before and not as the result of the recent Japanese steel survey mission.

34 to 36. *These questions were postponed.*

37. LAND TAX AND STAMP DUTY

Receipts

Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:

- (1) In past years cash receipts into the Consolidated Revenue Fund in respect of land tax and stamp duty for the month of July have been at approximately the same level as for the month of June; will he explain why the collections for July of this year are, in respect of land tax, \$681,763 and stamp duty, \$405,152 in excess of collections for June?
- (2) Is it expected that the amount of collections of land tax for July which is more than double the amount collected in June will be maintained in succeeding months of this year?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) The main reason for stamp duty collections in July, 1969, exceeding those for the previous month was the fact that there were three extra days in July on which business was conducted.

All taxes and rates collected by the Taxation Department are in the first instance credited to Revenue each month under the heading of land tax. It is not until the following month that the amounts applicable to metropolitan region improvement tax and vermin and noxious weeds rates are transferred to respective trust accounts except for June when the transfer takes place in that month.

The result is that June collections of land tax are reduced by the transfer to trust accounts of the other levies for the month of May, whereas July collections are gross and subject to adjustment in August.

In June, 1969, land tax collections totalled \$905,029, of which \$321,750 were transferred to trust accounts on account of other levies for May, 1969.

July, 1969, collections totalled \$1,265,042, of which \$144,457 represented other levies transferable to trust accounts in August, 1969.

The increase in net land tax collections for the month of July, 1969, was therefore \$215,556 due mainly to delay in the issue of assessments for 1968-69 as the result of amended legislation in 1968.

(2) No.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. RAILWAYS

Financial Assistance

Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware it has been reported that Sir Henry Bolte, Premier of Victoria, has discussed with the Prime Minister the effect on his Government's finances of substantial losses incurred by the Victorian railways resulting from reduced revenue from wheat freights and that Sir Henry Bolte has expressed the opinion that he "was able to get through to him (the Prime Minister) on this problem although the solution has still to be found."?

(2) As Western Australian finances have been similarly adversely affected to those of Victoria, is he prepared to follow Sir Henry Bolte's example and seek special financial assistance?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for giving me notice of this question. In reply—

(1) No. The report may have appeared in one of the papers when I was away. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could furnish me with a copy.

Mr. Tonkin: It appeared in the Melbourne paper *The Sun*.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I did not get my copy while I was away.

(2) If the Leader of the Opposition can supply me with a copy of the report I will consider the matter when framing the Budget for this year.

I have not had time to discuss this matter with the Prime Minister, and as far as I know no approach has been made to him.

Mr. Tonkin: You might miss the bus.

Sir DAVID BRAND: No, we will not miss the bus; there is enough money in the Federal Treasury to help us in this regard.

It is quite clear that the Treasury, or the Treasury officers, will put this matter to the Commonwealth, because we will have large deficits as a result of not carting the wheat. That will probably be one of the main points put forward. The Leader of the Opposition can be sure that it will be done in time to be included in the Budget, having regard to our present financial position.

When Sir Henry Bolte states that he has been able to get through to the Prime Minister it must be remembered that he also said that a solution has still to be found. I have had deputations come to me which have got through, and I have been impressed, but a solution to the matter is another thing.

Whilst I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for drawing attention to this matter, it is fairly obvious that we will not miss out on any opportunities to approach the Prime Minister on this subject.

2. TRAFFIC

Accidents: Hay Street-George Street Intersection

Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Traffic:

Is he aware that collisions are still occurring at the intersection of Hay Street and George Street, and that a serious accident occurred today?

Will he give consideration to the installation of overhead traffic lights at this intersection to assist all motorists, particularly those proceeding in a westerly direction?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

A similar question has been asked today in another place and the reply I had prepared to that question will answer that asked by the member for Mirrabooka.

Sixteen accidents have been reported since the traffic signals at the intersection of Hay Street and George Street were commissioned on the 20th May, 1969, the date of opening the Bailey bridge.

An examination of the accident pattern by the Main Roads Department indicates that the main cause appears to be the failure of west-bound motorists to obey the traffic signal.

All accidents were recorded by the Police Department as being due to negligent driving, with the exception of two rear-end collisions.

The signals are synchronised with the Hay Street-Elder Street signals so that a motorist clearing Elder Street would normally clear the George Street intersection. To provide added safety the "all red" phase at George Street was extended on the 7th August, 1969. Only one accident has been reported since that date, but I agree that another accident has occurred.

I will refer the matter of overhead lights to the traffic engineering section of the Main Roads Department for consideration.

3.

DROUGHT

Relief Assistance

Mr. GAYFER asked the Premier:

- (1) In view of the drought areas now being proclaimed within the State and the action announced by State Cabinet to be taken, could the House be informed if he has made representations to the Prime Minister for Commonwealth drought relief assistance?
- (2) If this approach has been made, could the House be informed what form of assistance has been requested?
- (3) If not, when is it likely that such a move all be made?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question.

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) When drought-affected areas have been defined and an estimate of the cost of relief measures announced by the State Government has been taken out.

I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that we believe it is important to have a thoroughly prepared case. The Commonwealth Government requires that in cases of difficulty, when a State Government makes a request for money, that request has to be backed up with a good reason. It is not until we get the information—important information which the Ministers will bring back from today's tour—and clearly define the areas of the drought that we can approach the Commonwealth.

It is only in the last few days that a number of shires have declared that they wish their areas to be declared drought areas. In fact, the situation is not at all clear as to the extent of the drought, which could worsen every day we do not get rain. We want to be

sure that we have an impressive and positive case for budgetary assistance, and we will lose no time in presenting the case.

COLLIE RECREATION AND PARK LANDS ACT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [2.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In submitting the second reading of this Bill, I would like to explain to the House that the Collie Recreation and Park Lands Act of 1931 provided for the vesting of certain reserves in a board consisting of five members: one person nominated by the Governor; the Mayor and a councillor of the Collie Municipal Council; and the Chairman and one member of the Collie Road Board.

The board became defunct following the merger of the two local authorities, and for this reason the Collie Shire Council has requested repeal of the Act so as to enable the council to obtain control of the area and have authority to continue existing leases and to negotiate further leases within the area.

The land in question, Wellington Locations 1314 and 4515, and part of Wellington Location 4344, containing some 576 acres, is held in fee simple by the board, and the Bill proposes this land be reverted in Her Majesty and removed from the operation of the Transfer of Land Act.

The shire council requires clarification of requirements for roads and sites to be made available to various clubs, and it is the intention, should Parliament approve this measure, that the land, after provision has been made for roads and specific reserves and the inclusion of land in closed roads, be set apart as a new reserve for "Recreation and Park Lands" and classified Class "A". The reserve will be vested in the Shire of Collie in trust with power to lease for the purposes specified.

The rights and privileges of sporting clubs will be preserved, although some bodies such as the rowing club and the racing club are now defunct. Should these clubs be re-established in the future, they will be able to apply to the Shire of Collie for a lease.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Jones.

FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Forests) [2.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Under section 41 of the Forests Act, nine-tenths of the net revenue of the Forests Department is credited to the Reforestation Fund for improvement and development of forestry.

This section does not prescribe precisely how that revenue is to be determined. Expenses that have been taken into account for this purpose have excluded interest and sinking fund on loan funds used for forestry purposes. This method is contrary to an opinion of the Solicitor-General, and the Auditor-General has drawn attention to the need for an amendment to the Forests Act. I think this provision has been in the Act since 1919 and successive Governments have never seen fit to amend the Act.

Mr. Graham: As a matter of fact I amended that section when I was Minister.

Mr. BOVELL: Well, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition evidently did not go far enough.

Mr. Graham: That was not as far back as the time you mentioned.

Mr. BOVELL: The amendment will provide that the net revenue of the department shall be determined by deducting from the gross revenue as defined under subsection (5) of section 41 the amount appropriated against the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purposes of the Forests Act, but excluding amounts provided to meet interest and sinking fund charges on loan fund moneys used for forestry purposes. This is a simple Bill which will merely adjust the method of accounting in the Forests Department.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [2.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

During the last Parliamentary session, and subsequently during the special session, it will be remembered that I was involved in a piece of legislation which presented, to say the least, some few difficulties. At that time I resolved that the next piece of legislation with which I had to deal would be one wherein the heat of controversy did not burn so fiercely. The Bill before the House at the present time just fits this situation, and I present it to the Chamber with confidence.

The purpose of the Bill—as will be seen from the briefest viewing of it—is to delete the word “male” from the relevant section of the principal Act. By so doing, females will be enabled to serve on water boards in future.

Mr. Tonkin: That is a very good idea. Is it to be taken as a precedent for all other boards?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no objection in other cases; but a restriction was written into this legislation that only a male person could serve on a water board, and the drafting of the Act appears to me to be quite wrong.

Mr. Jamieson: I hope you examine them for their fluoride or anti-fluoride tendencies.

Mr. Bovell: The Busselton Water Board is principally involved.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is something I can say to the member for Belmont regarding this—

Mr. Jamieson: Now, don't be rude!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Of course we would not take any action along the lines suggested, because it is important to obtain a representative who is desired as a proper representative on the board, and who could make decisions on all matters.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition).

WOOD CHIPPING INDUSTRY AGREEMENT BILL

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [3 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so, I would like to explain that the Bill is a rather unusual one.

Mr. Jamieson: I'll say!

Mr. COURT: It affects two portfolios particularly, and many others, of course, indirectly, but the actual negotiations in respect of this agreement were conducted conjointly by my colleague, the Minister for Forests, and myself. One reason is that raw materials will, of course, be needed, particularly, from forests, and this part of the project will come under the normal administration of the Forests Department. Beyond that point it becomes a matter for the Department of Industrial Development, and the arrangement has therefore been worked out to meet these circumstances.

Mr. Jamieson: Who drew up the agreement—Nostradamus? He would be about the only one that could.

Mr. COURT: I also want to explain that there was good reason for this agreement having to be ratified. Most of it could be arranged within the terms of the existing Statutes, but there are some aspects in

regard to which the Statutes had to be modified. It was therefore desirable to bring them all together in one agreement and have it ratified by Parliament. This became more and more apparent as the companies concerned were negotiating their financial and other arrangements, because it is an industry which is not without its complexities, and it is not without its economic problems. In some respects it is a marginal industry, and therefore the companies had to have something clearly set out in terms which could be stated with confidence in negotiating with finance houses.

The Bill now before members seeks ratification of an agreement dated the 28th June, 1969, between the State and W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. and Bunning Timber Holdings Ltd., for the establishment of a wood chipping industry at Diamond near Manjimup, transport of the wood chips by rail to Bunbury, with export overseas from that port.

A further object of the agreement is the investigation of the feasibility of the establishment of a pulp mill for processing wood chips into unbleached wood pulp.

This agreement, relating to industrial development, differs from the majority of those presented to Parliament within the last few years inasmuch as, instead of dealing with mineral exploration and development in the Pilbara region or the North Kimberley region, it provides for forest produce to be used from an area in the south-west of the State.

The implementation of the provisions of the agreement will give substantial impetus to our timber industry. In fact, it will represent an addition of at least one-third to the existing use of timber within the State. It also represents a step forward for decentralisation of industry and will give employment to some 210 workers at Manjimup and an additional 30 at Bunbury, in addition to the consequential employment increase that flows from industries of this kind.

Of prime importance, too, is the fact that another use will be provided for the little-used marri timber, although some karri and jarrah will also be chipped, as well as sawmill wood waste. Tests in Japan have proved the suitability of marri for the production of unbleached kraft pulp and its conversion into the final product of paper. I should add further that there are some matters yet to be resolved in connection with the economic effectiveness of marri as compared with some of the Eastern States' and Tasmanian eucalypts. This is, of course, a crucial factor in determining the economic price the industry in Japan will eventually pay.

There are some variations of opinion as to whether our local hardwoods, because of their density, have in fact values comparable with those in the Eastern States

and Tasmania. Some people claim that this is offset by other factors. However, the experts within the industry are currently assessing these aspects. It does not alter the fact that practical successful tests have been made of converting our marri, jarrah, and karri into pulp, and from there, of course, into paper, as evidenced by the samples tabled in Parliament some time ago.

Establishment of the industry will also play a major role in developing the first stage of the proposed \$20,000,000 deep water export harbour at Bunbury. This first stage is to be completed by late 1971 or early 1972 and will involve dredging a berth and access channel to a depth of 36 feet. At a later stage it is hoped that it will be feasible to increase the depth beyond 36 feet.

The work of establishing the berth and access channel at the new inner harbour at Bunbury will be financed through the Government and the Bunbury Port Authority, aided by a contribution of \$2,900,000 from the W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. and an amount yet to be determined by another potential port user.

In explanation of the parties to the agreement, Bunning Timber Holdings is the guarantor of the W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd., up to the time of the "commencement date". I will explain later the significance of "commencement date". Bunning Timber Holdings will also be guarantor for payment by W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. of the first instalment of \$1,000,000 towards the estimated cost of the reclamation of the stockpile area and the dredging of the berth, turning basin, and access channel at Bunbury. It will therefore be seen by members that Bunning Timber Holdings will be behind the W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. until that company reaches the stage when the Government is satisfied it can stand on its own feet.

Under the agreement the company, that is, the W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd., has contracted to establish—on a leased area of land of approximately 65 acres at Diamond, a few miles south of Manjimup—a chipping mill to produce not less than 500,000 tons per annum green weight of wood chips for export through Bunbury by 1972. To achieve this target the company must satisfy the State that it has—

satisfactory contracts for the sale of wood chips;

obtained an export license from the Commonwealth Government;

made arrangements for financing of all its works; and

had its proposals, including plans and specifications for the project, approved by the State.

The proposals to which I have referred must adequately cover the construction and

establishment of a chipping mill and all other necessary ancillary works, such as buildings, plant, equipment, and services at a cost of not less than \$11,000,000, unless the company is able to satisfy the State that it is able to provide the required facilities at a lesser cost than \$11,000,000.

For members' information, the "commencement date" is the date on which the State is satisfied that the company has entered into contracts, obtained an export license, and made satisfactory arrangements for financing the works required under the agreement. Under the agreement the company had until the 15th August, 1969, to settle these matters, but this time has been extended to the 30th September, 1969.

The chipping mill to be built at Diamond will be connected by rail to the existing Bunbury-Northcliffe line and the cost of any additional railway track required is to be met by the company. In addition, the company will provide rolling stock, sidings, and loading and unloading equipment, but Railways Commission locomotives will be used until such time as the annual export tonnage exceeds 300,000, after which the company will supply two 2,000 h.p. engines. I might add that this change-over from Railways Commission locomotives to company locomotives is allowed for in the freight rates covered by the agreement, but there had to be a transition period while the changes were being made.

The timber for this project will be available from an area of some 3,900 square miles broadly centred on Manjimup. This area is referred to in the agreement as the "production area." I will table a map which sets out the production area as well as the chipping mill site. The company will be formally issued, after application is made, with a forest produce (chipwood) license to remove trees from this area for a period expiring 15 years after the date of the first export of wood chips.

On the expiration of this initial period—providing suitable species of timber are still available—the forest produce (chipwood) license may be renewed for such period and on such conditions as the Minister determines.

Land to be leased to the company includes the chipping mill site at Diamond, for a term of 17 years after the commencement date, and any land needed for necessary rail access thereto. The cost of any land acquired by the State for these purposes is to be paid for by the company. If the forest produce (chipwood) license is renewed, then the company may also have its lease of the chipping mill site renewed for the same period as the renewed license. It will be observed that the lease and the license are in harmony so far as time is concerned, for obvious reasons.

Provision is also made in the agreement that should the company require an additional area to be added to the chipping mill site for the purpose of extending its operations or otherwise complying with the agreement, the State will, subject to the company's request being reasonable, provide the area under the same conditions as for the original area.

Brief mention has already been made of the use of the existing Bunbury-Northcliffe railway line; and, although the company is required to construct and maintain any additional track needed to connect the chipping mill site with the Bunbury-Northcliffe railway, it must have plans and specifications for the connection approved by the Railways Commission. The additional line will also include any necessary loops, spurs, and sidings at the loading point and at the stockpile area at the port. Use of these facilities will be available at all times to the Railways Commission, provided that the operations of the company are not unreasonably interfered with.

To allow for a regulated increase in the company's rail traffic operations from Diamond to Bunbury, the agreement provides that for the first year of operation 300,000 tons of wood chips must be railed, to be followed by 400,000 tons in the second year, and 500,000 tons per annum thereafter.

As mentioned earlier, the possibility of a pulp mill being established is provided for in the agreement, and if this is built the question of minimum tonnages of wood chips and freight rates over the Diamond-Bunbury railway will be renegotiated by the State and the company. Quite obviously if pulp is substituted for chips there will be an entirely different transport problem. Further, some of the additional chips will come from another area.

Clause 15 of the agreement sets out the rail freight payable on a scale which provides for a lesser rate per ton as higher tonnages are carried. A review of these rates, according to the formula prescribed under subclause (3) of clause 15 is provided for, the first of such reviews being on the 1st July, 1970, and at half-yearly intervals thereafter.

The State has recognised that the company may wish to develop its own supply of water at Diamond, independent of the existing Public Works' Manjimup supply; and should the company elect to do so, it is required to submit full proposals for the consideration and approval of the Minister for Works. If, on the other hand, water is drawn from the State's supply at Manjimup, either because the company prefers to do so or because its proposals to supply its own water are unacceptable, then the State will supply to the boundary of the chipping mill site sufficient

water for the normal operations of the chipping mill, subject to the company paying the cost of any extensions required to the existing mains.

The prospect of the company wishing to use a hydraulic debarker, or some equipment or process using an abnormally large quantity of water daily, has also been considered; and, should this eventuate, all matters, including apportionment of the cost of the supply, will be negotiated at that time between the State and the company. I should explain that the water provisions as set out in the basic requirements of the agreement were determined on the basis that a hydraulic debarker would not be used. The company will use the normal dry method, but there are circumstances in which it will be more economic to use a hydraulic debarker, which makes a tremendous demand on water supplies; hence the provision to protect the State against the situation when an increased demand for water is made.

Mr. Jamieson: Has not the recent investigation into this subject resulted in a recommendation that there be a reversion to the use of a mechanical debarker?

Mr. COURT: The company hopes to use a mechanical debarker, and as a result of the Gambier test it appears to be effective; but if in the light of experience the tonnages were to become greater the company might want to change over to a hydraulic debarker. If it wants to do that it will have to renegotiate the water requirements.

At the port the company will need to establish a stockpile area for its wood chips, and the agreement allows for an area to be leased to the company for a period co-terminous with the lease of the chipping mill site and at a rental of \$200 per acre per annum. It is also necessary for the company to erect a conveyor to convey wood chips from the stockpile area to the berth, and for this purpose a license will be granted to the company for the operation.

With regard to the port facilities, the State will, at the request of the company, design and prepare specifications for the berth; and when these have been agreed upon between the parties, the State will have the berth constructed not later than 24 months after the commencement date. In addition, the State will arrange for the berth to be dredged to a depth of 36 feet below the Bunbury Port datum, the access channel to a bottom width of 400 feet and a depth of 36 feet, the turning basin to a bottom width of 1,200 feet and a depth of 25 feet. The State has also agreed to use its best endeavours to complete the required dredging not later than 24 months after commencement date.

By way of explanation of the different depths in the turning basin, as compared with the approach channel and the actual berth, it is important to remember that the ships coming into the harbour will be riding high; and therefore they will be able to turn in water 25 feet in depth, although they will need 36 feet in which to load and to sail out to sea again. In view of the fact that the agreement was written on the assumption that the wood chipping industry would be the first to use the new harbour, the company did not want to wait until such time as developments necessitated a greater depth over the whole turning basin. Provision was therefore made for an access channel and a berth of required depth, and also for a turning basin which could be used by ships when they arrived empty.

The sum of \$2,900,000 to be contributed by the company for the development of the Bunbury Harbour is to be paid in three instalments—\$1,000,000 30 days after the commencement date; \$1,000,000 12 months after the commencement date; and the balance, \$900,000, 24 months after the commencement date.

The bulkloading facilities to be constructed by the company at the berth will, as far as is reasonable, be for the company's exclusive use, but provision is made under the agreement for the State and third parties to use the loading and other facilities at the berth in accordance with by-laws to be submitted for approval by the Governor in Executive Council.

Following the commencement date, the company has three years in which to complete construction of all the facilities necessary to export wood chips, so that for all practical purposes, export of wood chips should commence sometime in 1972.

A wharfage charge of 15c per ton on wood chips loaded at Bunbury is payable to the port authority, and the agreement provides that this charge shall be reviewed on the 1st January, 1975, and at the beginning of every third year thereafter. If the review shows that there has been an increase on the 30c per ton now payable at Bunbury on minerals, metallics, and earthy products, the amount of the increase will be added to the original charge of 15c per ton. This is based on the amount of the increase, and not on the percentage of the increase.

With regard to housing, there is no commitment on the State's part, the company being required to provide proper and reasonable accommodation and facilities for its workers.

Mr. Bickerton: How far away from the existing houses is this project?

Mr. COURT: Diamond is not very far away from existing houses.

Mr. Bickerton: One would assume from that that there are many houses already existing which could be used by the employees of this company.

Mr. COURT: Well, the position is the State has no responsibility regarding employee housing, and, if the company has employees it wants to house and these houses are not available in the ordinary way, the company would have to provide them. But I gather the point the honourable member is making is that if the company employed people currently housed in Manjimup then these people would obviously continue to occupy these houses.

Mr. Bickerton: The point which strikes me is that the agreement does differ considerably from the iron ore agreements, concerning the commitments, and for that reason I wonder why you insist on having section 36 of the Interpretation Act waived in this agreement as in the others.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member will notice that it refers only to the company's own facilities, and this has a very limited application. It does not refer to harbour facilities, but only things which are specifically provided by the company. Therefore this is an entirely different concept from that of the point to which the honourable member has taken exception on previous occasions.

Mr. Bickerton: What area of land from the central point of operation would be involved as far as company control is concerned?

Mr. COURT: One would be the stockpile area.

Mr. Bickerton: At the port?

Mr. COURT: Yes; and all the stockpile facilities and conveyor system. However the port operations are essentially under the Bunbury Port Authority, and will remain so. The actual area which is the company's own area—and this is fair enough—is subject to these by-law provisions.

Mr. Bickerton: Are you ever going to negotiate an agreement which does allow section 36 to operate?

Mr. COURT: It operates under many agreements and there are many activities in respect of which it operates, although I can never convince the honourable member—or his leader—of that.

The chipwood license to be issued to the company among other things provides for royalty to be paid to the Conservator of Forests at the rate of \$1.50 per 100 cubic feet of log timber measured in the round and obtained under the chipwood license. This rate will apply for the first five years from the commencement of production of chips and thereafter may be reviewed and adjusted every five years in the light of royalty generally on hardwoods cut for other purposes and having regard to the

f.o.b. price at the time of review, compared with the f.o.b. price of wood chips at the commencement of export.

As mentioned earlier, an objective of the agreement is the establishment of a pulp mill and to this end the company is required to investigate in detail the feasibility of establishing a pulp mill within an area having a radius of 130 miles from Manjimup.

If a pulp mill is established an additional quantity of wood chips will be required for this purpose. The State has recognised that the source of supply of timber from the production area will not be adequate, and alternative sources of supply will be made available to the company from the Manjimup-Pemberton area and the Collie-Bunbury area. These areas will supply respectively sufficient timber to produce a maximum of 150,000 tons green weight of wood chips per annum and 225,000 tons per annum. A grant of a further forest produce (chipwood) license over areas in the two localities mentioned will be granted to the company on such special conditions—including the payment of royalty—as the State determines.

I should explain that if we do not provide for this extra supply of timber from which to produce chips, the whole of the economics of the transport system could break down when there was a transfer from exporting 500,000 tons of chips to producing the paper pulp from those chips. Therefore in order to maintain a continuation of an economic use of the facilities at the harbour and in the transport system, the idea would be for additional tonnages of wood to be made available to produce wood chips so the company could continue in the dual business of producing export chips and producing chips for the local manufacture of pulp.

The company is required to keep the State informed at half-yearly intervals, commencing during the first three months after the first shipment of wood chips, of the progress and results of its investigations regarding pulping, and submit its findings not later than two years from the date of its first shipment of wood chips from Bunbury. This is expected to be in 1974.

If, as a result of its investigations, the company advises that the processing plant is neither feasible nor economically viable, the Minister can require the company to undertake further studies as may reasonably be required in the light of any significant changes that have occurred in the costs or economics of production or the availability of markets. The Minister may also, in any event, undertake or cause to be undertaken other studies and investigations as he considers necessary or desirable.

Should the company's investigations show that pulping is feasible and economically viable, it is required to submit

detailed proposals showing where the pulp mill is to be established and giving full information regarding commencement and completion of construction of the plant.

The capacity of the plant is to be not less than 100,000 tons of unbleached wood pulp, and is to be in production not later than three years after the company's proposals have been approved.

The company is required to ensure that its proposals relating to water supply and effluent disposal are adequate for the requirements of the plant and to this end it must retain expert consulting engineers who, in turn, must collaborate closely with the State in the design and development of these schemes.

In a manner similar to that provided for in the iron ore agreements, the State may negotiate with a third party to undertake the pulping process should the company be in default.

Specifically the State may, by notice to the company, determine the agreement if—

- (a) the company fails to inform the Minister of the progress and results of its investigations;
- (b) the company fails to submit reports and proposals as required under the agreement;
- (c) as a result of studies undertaken by the company or studies undertaken or furnished to the Minister, the Minister is of the opinion that the production of unbleached wood pulp is feasible and economically viable but the company is unwilling or unable to undertake such production;
- (d) proposals are submitted by the company and approved, but the company fails to commence construction of the plant or, having commenced the construction, fails to continue and complete construction within the prescribed time.

All of the above are points for declaration of default under the agreement.

Should a third party take over the pulping commitment, it must do so on terms on the whole not more favourable than those which were available to the company. In particular, the establishment of a pulp mill must be within the 130 miles radius of Manjimup and wood chips used must be produced under the forest produce (chipwood) license granted under the agreement.

Also, if the agreement is determined and the company still has an obligation for the supply of wood chips from contracts which it has entered into, the third party is obligated to supply wood chips in accordance with the contract on a basis which is fair and reasonable as between the company and the third party.

That provision is, of course, to provide for a situation where the Government is able to negotiate for a third party to produce pulp, but the original company is still in the process of supplying contracts for wood chips, contracts the Government had approved. It would be quite incongruous if there was not some machinery available under which these contracts could be completed, because this would be in the interests of both the company and the good name of the State and the industry.

Mr. Brady: Is there any reference to the nationals to be employed in this industry? It would not be possible, would it, to transfer this to some other organisation and get employees from outside Australia?

Mr. COURT: No more than with any other industry. Any company coming here has to comply with the laws of the country and not make its own arrangements in respect of its work force. If a company was bringing in nationals from other countries and those nationals required special permission to enter, the company would get those nationals through the normal Commonwealth channels. The agreement does not and cannot provide for any overriding of those provisions.

As I understand it, and there has never been any intention expressed to the contrary, the industry will be worked in the normal way. In fact, in writing out the agreement and including the license attached, my colleague and I have endeavoured to depart as little as practicable from the provisions of the Forests Act so far as the actual forestry side of the operations are concerned, because if we departed more than was absolutely necessary we could create a precedent, and the industry as a whole could maintain that if it could be done for the wood chipping section, it could be done for other parts of the industry.

As the honourable member reads the agreement, and, particularly, the license, he will find that there has been a minimum departure from the provisions of the Forests Act so as to avoid anomalies creeping in. I can only repeat that we have not attempted, nor have we the power, to write in provisions to override the normal migration laws of Australia.

Because of the expenditure to which the company will be put in establishing the chipping mill and associated facilities for perhaps a very limited term of years if it does not undertake the pulping process, special provisions have been written into the agreement which provide that in default the company will be reimbursed, not only for its machinery, equipment, removable buildings, bulk loading facilities and conveyor, but also for the expenditure on civil engineering works.

With regard to the machinery, equipment, removable buildings, etc., value will be assessed on a basis which has regard for their use in a going concern, whilst with civil engineering works value will be

calculated on a 10-year amortisation basis, commencing from the date of the first shipment of wood chips from Bunbury.

That might sound rather complicated, but the provisions are deliberately included in the interests of fairness. If the company ran its normal term as a wood chip industry, of course it would be able to amortise all of these things over the life of the license, which would normally be at least 15 years. However, if the license was prematurely terminated because of a form of default due to the inability or the unwillingness of the company to go on with the pulping plant, it was felt that there had to be a more equitable means of reimbursing the company for those assets which would go to a third party.

If members study the provision, I am sure they will realise that it is only just and proper that this different method of reimbursement should be assessed. In other words, if a third party comes in and takes over the assets, the original company will be reimbursed on what is, for all practical purposes, a going-concern basis; whereas, under other forms of default, the reimbursement to the company would be of a very minimal nature. We agreed that it would be fair and reasonable to include this special method of valuation if the agreement was terminated in the interests of having a third party establish the pulp industry.

Other normal provisions included in the agreement are of the usual machinery nature and cover such matters as arbitration, export license, no discriminatory taxes or charges, rating, no resumption, variation, *force majeure*, etc.

I want to thank my colleague for his co-operation in the negotiations, because this was a rather complex operation. Without the co-operation of him and his department, it would have been impracticable to arrive at a properly balanced agreement covering all phases of forestry, transport, processing, port development, and the like.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Has Commonwealth concurrence been given to this proposal?

Mr. Jamieson: What is the minimum f.o.b.?

Mr. COURT: I am going to refer to these aspects now. Commonwealth concurrence with the agreement, as such, is not required, of course, because this is essentially within the sovereignty of the State, and the State would not ask for Commonwealth concurrence in an agreement such as this. However, we have made sure all along that the Commonwealth has been kept informed, particularly because we knew that at one stage the Commonwealth was concerned about certain negotiations in other States.

I have stated publicly that I was very disturbed when the Commonwealth did, however, go the whole hog and decide to introduce export licensing; because the two companies which the Government was weighing up in order to see which should get the license had made what appeared to be very satisfactory f.o.b. price arrangements in respect of wood chips. These prices were disclosed to us and to the Commonwealth. The price that was indicated by both companies was a price acceptable to the Commonwealth for export licensing purposes.

Members know the story from that point on. At the critical moment when the Government was about to make the decision to give the license to the Bunning group, the Commonwealth Government announced export licensing. This had an immediate reaction and the situation was changed, almost overnight, from a question of a straight-out negotiation between a number of companies, which was moving along very satisfactorily from our point of view, to an entirely different form of negotiation where it virtually became, one might say, almost a Government-to-Government type of economic confrontation.

This is not an unusual situation. We reacted rather sharply to the matter because we felt that had it been allowed to go along as it was, neither company would have been embarrassed by the situation that developed. However, the Commonwealth had its own reason for wanting to step in at that time.

I do not know the particular project that was causing the Commonwealth Government the most concern. I personally felt that had that Government asked the various State Governments to make sure that no arrangements were permitted which would violate the Commonwealth's idea of a fair price, then the State Governments themselves could have made sure—as this Government was making sure—that this was not breached. We had a good reason for wanting to know the f.o.b. price; namely, because it had a serious effect on the economics of the project.

I want to say that this is not an easy project. In itself, it is a profitable operation, but not a bonanza. However, it does have tremendous value from the overall economics of forestry and sawmilling in the State. Members must realise that, overnight, the volume will be increased by one-third. This means that the economies of scale will benefit within the sawmilling industry plus the fact that this allows for better forestry practice. Yet another benefit to the State will be the fact that large areas will be cleared and this will permit reforestation with other species which will have a greater role to play in the future.

Up to now marri has not been a popular timber from a commercial point of view, and if this area can be applied to other species, so much the better.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Has the Commonwealth license actually been granted at this stage or is it assured?

Mr. COURT: No Commonwealth license has been granted to a Western Australian company, because, at this stage, it has not been able to consummate a sales contract. The only contract that has been publicly approved by the Commonwealth is the Tasmanian one, which has been stated at approximately \$27 per B.D.U.—which means, per bone dry unit.

There is a lot of argument going on between Japan and the Commonwealth at the moment because Japan will not accept a price of \$27 per B.D.U. I would not like to be drawn any further as to what Japan will accept, because there is a difference between the various species within Victoria and Tasmania, and New South Wales and Western Australia. My own view is that none of the States will receive an identical price, because all these factors will have to be expertly weighed up as to the relative economic values.

I wish to make a comment which will interest the member for Warren, as the member for the district. When I said that large areas would be cleared because of this operation, I would not like to give the idea that this means marri will be taken on a face regardless of its millable quantities. It is the intention of the Minister for Forests and his conservator that marri of millable quality will, of course, be used for milling purposes. However, marri will not be put into chipping merely because it happens to be in a particular stand.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I take it then that the company has not consummated a contract at this stage.

Mr. COURT: That is the problem which confronts the company and which I mentioned in my announcement the other day. The company has demonstrated to us the actions it has taken in respect of a sales contract, but it has run into a situation where the Japanese industry at the moment is offering a price of approximately \$22 per B.D.U. The Tasmanian price, which the Commonwealth has approved, is \$27. Consequently, the price of \$22 is the one that is subject to argument.

I come back to the point that we should not assume that \$27 is the only price that will be approved. I should explain that the Eden operation is one where the Commonwealth has, of course, departed from this principle and has approved the Dals-hower-Harris operation on a basis which is not related to a declared f.o.b. price. The Commonwealth explained to us and to the public that it had agreed to this operation

with reluctance, only because the negotiations had proceeded so far that the Commonwealth Government could not reasonably ask for it to be cancelled. Consequently, this operation is quite different from all the rest.

It is on a basis where it is related more or less to an intercompany arrangement rather than to a fixed f.o.b. declared price, such as is the case in Tasmania and such as our industry will have to declare in Western Australia.

We are giving all the support we can to the Bunnings people in their discussions in Japan to arrive at a contract as quickly as possible. However, we have had to say to them that we cannot continue to give them an extension of time indefinitely, because it would not be fair to the other company—the one that was not granted a license when it was a matter of tweedle-dum and tweedledee as to who got the license.

I hope I have covered most of the points the member for Warren raised, or might raise, but the price controversy is causing us quite a deal of concern and just at the moment there does not seem to be any break occurring. However, I am confident from what has happened recently that the results will be successful. If the Japanese want the wood chips badly enough, and they cannot get alternative supplies, I feel that in the course of business they will arrive at a sensible price and one which will be approved by the Commonwealth under the export system.

Mr. Williams: For how long does this present extension of time continue?

Mr. COURT: Until the 30th September. The company has until that time, but after that, if it cannot satisfy us that the negotiations have been successfully completed, the matter will have to be considered on its merits at the time.

Mr. Speaker, have I your permission to table a plan showing the production area, which is bordered in green, and the chipping mill site, which is coloured in red, and which is referred to in the agreement.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The plan was tabled.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 20th August, on the following motion by Mr. McPharlin:—

That the following Address-in-Reply to his Excellency's speech be agreed to:—

May it please Your Excellency:
We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of

Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. CASH (Mirrabooka) [3.42 p.m.]: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech on Opening Day, I wish to point out that the Governor, in his Speech, reviewed many aspects of continuous progress in Western Australia. He referred to the population increase in this State, commenting on the fact that the population of Western Australia has reached 939,000, which is an increase of 4.3 per cent.—twice the Australian average. He also pointed out that this State has the lowest rate of unemployment, being under 1 per cent. of the work force.

This is interesting, because if one casts one's mind back to Labor Party policy throughout Australia not very many years ago, and particularly at the Federal level, one will see that the party was prepared to accept 5 per cent. of the work force unemployed as a satisfactory situation. I am certain no Liberal Party, Federal or State, has ever been content to accept such a situation, and in Western Australia we have a rate of unemployment of under 1 per cent. which, as I said, is the lowest rate in Australia.

In his Speech the Governor referred to Government measures to ease the land and housing problems. This Government is endeavouring to tackle those problems which are the result of the development and continuous expansion in the State. Government members who have already spoken during the debate have, in their speeches, showed appreciation of the growth problems brought about by our development and expansion, and they were quick to re-emphasise many of the achievements of the Government in solving the problems.

However, Opposition members, in their contributions to the debate, have not really made any beneficial suggestions. There has been no constructive approach to many of the problems confronting Western Australia. The Opposition tended to look at the position as though they were governmental problems rather than problems of the State.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

Mr. CASH: I was referring to the many achievements of the Government over the last 10 years and also to the reference by Government members in their speeches on the Address-in-Reply in which they indicated appreciation of the growth problems of the State and the manner in which they had been tackled by this Government.

I also mentioned that the Opposition had made no real contribution to the solution of these problems, and that in their speeches on the Address-in-Reply the members of the Opposition had indicated no constructive approach from a State point of view; nor did they make suggestions to the Government as to how some of our problems of growth and development could be solved.

Mr. Toms: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CASH: The view taken by the members of the Opposition in their speeches seems to move along the lines that everything in Western Australia is going badly and that the Government is doing nothing about anything. This, of course, is a very negative approach, but it is one that is typical of Labor Oppositions in both State and Federal Parliaments.

If one were to look back at the records in *Hansard*, and in other records where *Hansard* does not operate, one would find that with this type of Labor Opposition approach both in the State and Federal spheres over a great number of years they can be classified as calamity howlers of the first degree. The approach of the Opposition in this Parliament is no different.

Mr. Brady: I take it you are going to give us something different.

Mr. CASH: We do, of course, have our problems, but the Liberal-Country Party Government has made genuine efforts to tackle these problems since it came into office in 1959.

Mr. Graham: Which problems?

Mr. CASH: The sincerity with which the Liberal-Country Party Government has tackled these problems has, of course, encouraged the people of Western Australia—and the members of the Opposition are well aware of this fact—to re-elect a Liberal-Country Party Government at election after election. It is this same confidence of the people of Western Australia which has enabled our Premier (Sir David Brand) to create a record as serving Premier in Office.

In his Speech, the Governor referred to matters of education and I now propose to discuss this subject. The Governor pointed out that student enrolments in Western Australia over the last 10 years had risen by 41 per cent., from 120,000 students to 169,000 students. His Excellency also reminded Parliament that there had been a 207 per cent. increase in revenue expenditure on education from 1959 to 1969.

The student population increase has, of course, created many problems in the field of education, which the Government had to tackle, but I believe—as I am certain that all members on this side of the House believe—the Government has been coping pretty well with most of these problems. The members of the Opposition have failed

both in this debate and in other debates to acknowledge the achievement of this Government in the field of education.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What achievement?

Mr. CASH: Exactly the same approach has been taken by the executive of the Teachers Union and the president of the P. & C. Federation. It was only recently that all members of this House, and particularly Government members, received a letter from Mr. Darragh in which he pointed out that at a recent public meeting of 3,200 people the opinion was that drastic action was needed to overcome the weak and critical condition of education in Western Australia. Recently a mass meeting of teachers was held at the Mt. Lawley High School under the chairmanship of, I believe, Mr. Bennett, who said—

Our publicity campaign started as a result of the almost criminal neglect of education by our present Government.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. CASH: These are simply political clichés and when they are placed alongside other references by Mr. Bennett in which he referred to political action against not only the member for Moore—the present Minister for Education—but also other members of Parliament, it seems to indicate that some of the members of the Teachers Union executive are seeking to make political capital out of the situation. I will not say that all members of the Teachers Union try to derive some political advantage, because quite a number of them have no such idea in mind. Is there any sound basis for criticism of the present Government's efforts in connection with education?

Mr. Graham: Of course there is.

Mr. CASH: Before referring to the efforts made by the Government in relation to education, I propose to refresh everybody's memory—and certainly the memory of the members of the Opposition—by taking a quick look back at the Labor Government's policy and approach to education.

Mr. Graham: You are always looking back.

Mr. CASH: It would take some hours to go over this policy of neglect in detail, so I propose simply to quote some examples which will indicate the attitude of the Labor Government to education. In August, 1958, the then President of the Teachers Union—from memory I think it was Mr. Sampson—said in his presidential report that 374 single classes and 33 grouped classes contained over 50 pupils. He also pointed out that in the grouped classes there were 12,000 children, and each class had over 40 pupils. He said that 900 children were taught in public halls, 1,000 children were taught in hat

rooms, and hundreds in makeshift buildings. Towards the end of his address he said—

Thousands of our present youth are being led to an educational death.

Mr. Bovell: Which party was in Government then?

Mr. CASH: This statement was made on the 5th August, 1958, when a Labor Government was in power. Surely this constitutes a strong condemnation of the policy of the Labor Government, which was being guided by the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members on the front bench opposite. In the same year—1958—we find that at one of our suburban schools it was necessary for the children to eat their lunch in the nearby cemetery grounds.

Mr. May: That was stiff.

Mr. CASH: The school was short of 60 desks and 60 chairs; each class at that school averaged 44; and they took a day's holiday each week to help cope with the extra enrolments and overcome the shortage of classrooms. What sort of education policy is that? How can anyone involved in such a policy criticise any efforts made by the present Government?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Did the Teachers Union go out and campaign against the Government?

Mr. CASH: I will deal with that point later.

The policy of the Labor Government neglected the primary schools, and there was serious schoolroom shortages and class-size problems. This aspect should not be forgotten. The situation was so bad at the time that the Teachers Union suggested the school commencing age be raised from six years to seven years. The motion that was put forward at the meeting or the conference was on the grounds of shortage of staff and buildings.

In February, 1959, the President of the Teachers Union had a survey made of 13 metropolitan high schools and it was found that the increase in enrolments from 1958 to 1959 was 2,000, and two extra teachers were supplied to teach the students at those schools in 1958. So we find that while the enrolments increased by 2,000 from 1958 to 1959, only two additional teachers were provided at the high schools in question to cope with the position.

One of the high schools involved was the Midland High School, situated in the electorate of Swan. The member for the district at the time was the present member for Swan.

Mr. Brady: We had five public halls used for schools during the time of the McLarty-Watts Government.

Mr. CASH: The other high schools involved were the Kent Street High School, the John Curtin High School, and the Tuart Hill High School. There were 39 classes each with over 46 students, and 10 classes each with over 50 students.

In answer to a recent question asked of the Minister for Education we find that in respect of "secondary classes as a whole 2.7 per cent. are over 40, 57.5 per cent. lie between 31 and 40, and 39.8 per cent. are 30 and under." This is certainly a great alteration in class sizes in our schools in Western Australia.

Mr. T. D. Evans: How long did it take you to do that?

Mr. CASH: While there was a serious situation in 1958-59 no militant action was taken by the Teachers Union executive, or by the members of that executive which included such names as Mr. Moore, Mr. Darragh, Mr. Evans, Miss Harken, and Mr. Cotton, which are names to be found in the Teachers Union executive circles to-day.

The only comment I could locate as coming from Mr. Darragh was that the whole problem of education was a financial one. There was no militant action by the Teachers Union executive. The teacher housing situation was worse then than now.

Mr. Graham: Tommy rot!

Mr. CASH: However, the Teachers Union simply said it would have the executive examine the situation. But early in 1960—a few months after the Liberal-Country Party took office—what a different approach there was from the Teachers Union. Anyone interested in education will remember that the new word "crisis" sprang up in regard to education. What were the main points at issue that brought the word "crisis" into education within a period of a few short months? There were news items with headings such as "Teachers to Join Parents in Talks," and the points to be discussed were "Grave Accommodation Problems"; "Big Classes"; "Inadequate Amenities"; and "Leaving Age Too Low."

The Labor Government refused to increase the school leaving age at a time when young people were having difficulty in obtaining employment. Young people had to queue up at the Commonwealth Employment Office and, in many cases, had to wait 12 months before they could obtain a job. These young people would have been far better off had they been able to stay at school; but the Labor Government of the day refused to raise the leaving age, and the young people were forced to fritter away their time at home, in the city, or in shopping centres, because they had nothing to do.

Mr. Jamieson: Do you know that it was a Labor Government?

Mr. CASH: Statements by the Teachers Union and the Parents and Citizens' Federation included such expressions as "Demand a Better Deal in Education" and "There is a Crisis in Education"—"Crisis" the new word.

Mr. Jamieson: Don't read so fast, the *Hansard* reporter cannot get it down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mitchell): Order!

Mr. CASH: Six years under a Labor Government left many problems for the new Government to sort out. Nevertheless, the new Government brought a new look to education.

Mr. Jamieson: You want to watch out.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mitchell): Order!

Mr. CASH: The new Government made a greater financial allocation for education; it built more schools; it reduced class sizes; and it provided larger subsidies for purchases by the parents and citizens' associations. The list of items not subsidised was far longer under the Labor Government than it is under the present Government. This Government has provided more educational aids and more essential equipment than the Labor Government did.

With this rapid increase in the provision of finance for education, some people were still not happy. It was not enough for the critics. The Teachers Union executive, and the President of the Parents and Citizens' Federation stated that this State was spending a lower percentage of its Budget on education than was the case in any other State.

The Teachers Union held a mass meeting of teachers, at Mt. Lawley, at which such expressions as "Boom State," "State on the move," "Smaller percentage of annual Budget spent on education than in any other State except Tasmania," and "Last few years Western Australian expenditure—percentage-wise—had steadily decreased," were made by Mr. Bennett.

The Teachers Union executive took the Minister to task when he said that \$66,000,000 was being spent on education in this State—\$55,000,000 from Consolidated Revenue, and \$11,000,000 from Loan Funds. Attacks were made on the Minister in the newspaper which, of course, were unwarranted. The advertisements inserted in the paper by the Teachers Union were a disgrace, and I am sure most teachers resented them.

Mr. Jamieson: Some of the ideas behind the advertisements approved by the Minister were a disgrace.

Mr. CASH: The President of the Teachers Union criticised the Minister because his explanation of the \$66,000,000 expenditure did not refer to expenditure on

the University, the Institute of Technology, and kindergartens in Western Australia. The Budget estimates of every State, including Western Australia, clearly set out what items are included under the heading of "Education." However, in this State expenditure on the University, the Institute of Technology, and kindergartens is not shown in the education estimates.

It should be obvious to anybody with any accounting knowledge or clerical ability that he should look elsewhere for these items; and the obvious place is part II under the heading, "Premier and Treasurer." The Teachers Union executive simply did not examine the Estimates of the Parliament of Western Australia; and it is essential to do this in order to make a comparison of our Estimates with those of the different States of Australia.

Mr. Darragh, Secretary of the Teachers Union, wrote a letter, dated the 11th August, to members of Parliament, quoting the Budget percentage required to be spent on education in this State and compared it with the percentages of other States. This comparison was quite invalid, because it was made on the estimates for the Minister for Education only. The estimates for education in the other States include items which are not in the education estimates as presented to this Parliament by the Treasurer in regard to the Minister for Education.

For instance, in Victoria, the estimates for education include grants to colleges, adult education, kindergartens, and other items, which account for a total expenditure of \$14,000,000. In the State of New South Wales an amount of \$45,000,000 is included for items that do not appear in the estimate for Western Australia. That State includes provision for such things as maintenance expenses—which are provided for here under the Public Works Department estimates—universities, kindergartens, culture, museums, libraries, observatory, and other things. It also includes \$3,400,000 for free milk. Everyone knows that this is a Commonwealth expense and the States are reimbursed for the amount they spend.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Is Mr. Askin dishonest?

Mr. CASH: Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania operate on a similar basis and all three States include payroll tax as expenditure on education. In Queensland and South Australia that amount is more than \$1,000,000. It is interesting to have a look at the estimates for Queensland because in that State the Government includes expenditure for the Police Department, totalling \$15,000,000. So, how can the critics take a snap-glance at the education estimates for the other States and compare them with the estimates in Western Australia?

A member: What about Victoria?

Mr. CASH: I have already mentioned Victoria. Western Australia is doing as well as any other State in regard to education. If the Teachers Union and the executive of the Parents and Citizens' Federation do not believe this, then they should pay a visit to the Eastern States to have a look at the schools in the cities and suburbs and be in a position to judge for themselves.

In regard to school buildings in Australia, I would say that overall this State leads the way.

Mr. Bertram: We reject the wise men from the east.

Mr. CASH: If one wants to make a valid comparison in regard to the Australian gross national product, one must realise that the amount of \$66,000,000 spent in Western Australia is fed into the Australian total.

Earlier in this debate the member for Warren quoted U.N.E.S.C.O. figures and I made a helpful interjection. I said the figures were invalid and should not be used for comparison in Australia either in the case of a State or the Commonwealth. If the member for Warren looks at those figures, he will find they refer to different years in different countries. Some figures are in relation to the gross national product and others are a percentage of national income.

Mr. Jamieson: The Liberal Party is using them in official publications.

Mr. CASH: The member for Warren said that of the gross national income, in Australia in 1967-68 we spent 4.3 per cent. I checked this in *Hansard*. What he meant was that we spent 4.3 per cent. of the gross national product, which means that he read the U.N.E.S.C.O. table incorrectly. The member for Warren can check this for his own satisfaction.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What about other countries?

Mr. CASH: What the member for Warren said was invalid, as I pointed out during his speech, because the items under expenditure on education vary in different countries. None of the items I will mention in relation to education are calculated in Australia as a percentage of gross national product, although this might be the case in other countries.

The United States of America includes its free milk scheme, which, in Australia comes under the Commonwealth Department of Health. The United States of America also includes interest payments on loans for school buildings. In Canada the figures show that 8.8 per cent. of the national income—which is 6.3 per cent. of the gross national product—is spent on education, which includes items such as loan interest on school buildings, citizenship and language courses for migrants

armed services colleges, and ex-service rehabilitation and repatriation. Canada also uses some of the money to sponsor foreign students to go to that country.

In the United Kingdom—which is a fair comparison to make with Australia—we find that school meals are provided in most schools and are included in the education estimates. Also included is expenditure on school health and youth activities. These items are not included in the education estimates in Australia.

Mr. Jamieson: You want to go carefully in regard to school health.

Mr. CASH: Members may be interested to know what the position is in the Soviet Union. In that country the estimates for education include culture, the Moscow Ballet, and the Moscow State Circus. The Soviet Union also includes money for space research and other scientific activities; and it has a Ministry of sport. All of this expenditure comes under education. From memory, I think the Soviet Union spends 7 per cent. of its gross national product on education, but not a great amount of news comes from that country on which one can make a reliable statement.

Other countries spend money from education estimates on child welfare, public libraries, industrial training, basic nursing training, and radio and television services. Not one of these is included in the items for education expenditure calculated at a percentage of the gross national product in Australia, while the budgets for education ministries of various overseas countries do include them.

The U.N.E.S.C.O. figures quoted by the member for Warren make no allowance for education expenditure in the private sector, despite the fact that 20 per cent. of children in Australia attend non-Government schools. This expenditure has to be added to the Australian expenditure, which gives a much higher percentage of the Australian national product being spent on education.

Mr. Jamieson: You want to check the U.N.E.S.C.O. figures, too.

Mr. CASH: If the honourable member wants to make a true comparison of the progress in education, he should compare the rising percentages of the gross national product that is spent year after year in Australia. A far greater authority on this than myself or the member for Belmont, Sir Douglas Copeland, made this point.

Mr. Jamieson: It looks as though he wrote your speech, so it does not matter very much.

Mr. CASH: He would probably say to me, "Thank heavens, you are on the Government side." In 1948-49, when I think Labor was in Government, 1.65 per cent. of the gross national product was spent

on education. In 1957-58 this figure had risen to 2.79 per cent., and in 1968-69 it had risen to 4.3 per cent. It should be remembered that although the percentage figures have risen they are always based on a far bigger base figure, which is the gross national product.

Mr. Tonkin: Would it be any news to the member for Mirrabooka to know that Labor was not in office in 1949?

Mr. CASH: I want to emphasise the figures I have just quoted. The members of the Opposition, the Teachers Union, and the Parents and Citizens' Federation should look around to see what is happening in other countries. It will be realised that Australia is doing as good a job as any other country in the world.

I now want to say a few words about teachers. We hear about teachers in the United Kingdom, but that country also has a shortage of teachers, and it has overcrowded classrooms. It has statutory class sizes, and they are comparable with the class sizes in Western Australia.

Teachers are migrating to other countries all over the world. If one used the criteria of the Teachers Union and the Opposition, one could say there is a crisis in the United Kingdom. I understand that in Quebec the teachers marched on the Parliament in protest against salaries so I suppose that the same could be said about Canada: a crisis exists there. Every country has this problem.

The Soviet Union has class size problems, and that country is extremely short of teachers. As I have said, every country has these problems, and they have been recognised by the United Nations General Assembly. That organisation has declared 1970 to be education year. The object of education year is to see if the international countries can take action to alleviate the world-wide education problems; not problems just in the developing countries or the undeveloped countries, but the world-wide problems.

Every country has the same problems that the members of the Opposition, the Teachers Union, and the Parents and Citizen's Federation seem to think exist only in Western Australia.

We can take the position of the teacher-pupil ratio. Questions have been asked from the other side of the House, and it is known that the ratio is based on the statistics issued by the Education Department. I was interested to read criticism referring to something which occurred in Tasmania in 1968. On that occasion the Labor Government and the Acting Director of Education were criticised because they included in the teacher statistics librarians, laboratory assistants, and other non-teaching staff. This raised the question in my mind, having had some experience, that statistics could be made up to

present an incorrect picture. I checked *The Teachers' Journal* published in August, 1958. The journal contained comment on a question asked by the member for Stirling (Mr. A. F. Watts). The question was—

How many teachers are now employed—

(a) as permanent;

(b) on supply?

The then Labor Minister for Education replied—

(a) 4,079;

(b) 800.

The permanent teachers numbered 4,079, and *The Teachers' Journal* criticised that answer because it claimed that the figure included gardeners, cleaners, and general workers. The journal stated that the correct figure was 3,272 and not 4,079.

It is no good members of the Opposition sighing or attempting to interject, because I have heard the member for Fremantle talk about the authenticity of figures supplied by the Teachers Union. The article I have quoted puts a nail in the coffin of the Opposition with regard to education statistics.

The statistics presented to this Parliament, and to the people of Western Australia, are as factual as statistics can be. If an error occurs it is simply a clerical error.

Teachers have been attracted to Canada, and all sorts of reasons for this have been advanced by the Opposition and the Teachers Union executive. The fact is, simply, that a shortage exists in some parts of Canada, the same as in other parts of the world. The Canadian authorities have advertised extensively in Australia, because they know that Australian teachers are as well educated as any teachers in the world. The demand comes mainly from Alberta and British Columbia, and Canada's problems will end in 1970.

Mr. Bickerton: Canada is more fortunate than Western Australia; it has not got the member for Mirrabooka.

Mr. CASH: I might add that Alberta is one of the coldest civilized countries in the world. The Teachers Union and the Parents and Citizens' Federation executive have been critical, and have said that teachers leave because of better conditions in other countries. I would say that most teachers leave because they want a holiday and they want to travel. They want the experience of overseas teaching and overseas education systems.

When one looks at the statistics supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Immigration for 1967-68 one will see that 3,132 teachers departed from Australia. Out of that number only 211 said they were leaving permanently.

In October, 1968, we had a very qualified visitor to Western Australia, and I refer to Professor Neville Scarfe. He has been the Dean of the University of British Columbia since 1956. I will not quote what he said in great detail, but I want to comment on several points he made. He said that Australia had more alternative forms of education than Canada; that he was impressed by Australia's colleges of advanced education; and that the movement of teachers was both ways—teachers came to Australia from Canada and went from Australia to Canada. The Western Australian figure for 1968 shows that 40 Western Australian teachers went to Canada and 21 Canadian teachers came to Western Australia.

Professor Scarfe pointed out that when Canada was able to get overseas teachers, those teachers were sent to remote and undeveloped areas where the conditions are much colder than those in Western Australia.

Mr. Davies: Why don't they come back?

Mr. CASH: I pointed out that 2,921 out of 3,132 said they were coming back. Professor Scarfe went on to say that class sizes were smaller in Canada, generally, but not in all parts. He said that the teachers were employed by local education boards, which were part of local politics. It is fortunate from every aspect that teachers do not have to be involved in local government politics in Australia.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They are not allowed to.

Mr. CASH: Professor Scarfe also said that the Australian education system offered teachers security and protection. We have heard reference by the Opposition to trainee teachers, and Professor Scarfe has said that in Canada the trainee teachers receive no allowances at all. An important point he made and emphasised was that it was a delusion that salaries were much higher in Canada. He said that a teacher going to Canada gained very little financially.

Professor Scarfe's final point was that Canada does not devote more money to education than does Australia. The percentage difference is not very wide. Professor Scarfe said, "We do not spend more money on education but we spend our money a little differently."

When Professor Scarfe was in Western Australia he was a guest of the Teachers Union executive, and he addressed that body. However, no reference was published in *The Teachers' Journal* or in the *Parents and Citizens' Federation Gazette* regarding what he said and the points he made while in Perth. I can well understand that omission because, in fact, he knocked on the head many of the arguments put forward by those two organisations in their publications over the past year or so.

Curiously enough, in the same month—October, 1968—the executive of the Teachers Union also received a visitor from India. I refer to Mr. Raghavachari, who was a member of the Legislative Council in an Indian State. He was also a former President of the Teachers Union in that State.

Mr. Raghavachari was reported in *The Teachers' Journal* as having given a most interesting address on which, I emphasise, he pointed out the need, as he saw it, for political pressure in the teachers' struggle. However, in spite of all the important points raised by Professor Scarfe, all that was said about him was that he gave an address on teaching in Canada. This is interesting.

I would say that education in Australia—and State education—is in pretty good hands under Liberal-Country Party Government. I am interested in the survey which is to be undertaken into the needs of Western Australia. I am certain it will reveal that there are one or two gaps which need to be plugged. But overall it will reveal a healthy situation when compared with the other States of the Commonwealth.

Although the Minister is not present—I understand he is absent for the day—there are one or two points which I would like to have placed on record, and which I think the Minister for Education and his department should look at. The first concerns overseas leave for Western Australian teachers. I understand that only 10 or 12 applications for overseas leave, without pay, are granted by the Education Department.

Young people, after spending a year or two in a particular school, sometimes feel that they would like to travel overseas. That is a good outlook and they should benefit from such a trip. Travel is the best form of education and if the teachers could spend a period overseas it would be of benefit to them and to their pupils.

Mr. Runciman: And to the members of the Opposition.

Mr. CASH: Yes, I am certain of that. However, to allow only 12 teachers to go overseas is insufficient. I do not know what the quota should be, but if a teacher is refused permission to travel overseas all he needs to do is to resign. He can then come back or he can stay overseas. The Minister could well give some thought to the matter of resignations and, perhaps, allow a higher quota of teachers to travel overseas so that they will return to teaching in Western Australia rather than be lost to some other country or to some commercial or private industry.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. CASH: The second point I wish to raise is that we spend 80 per cent. of the education vote on salaries for teachers. I do not think that is a fair proportion. Only 20 per cent. is being spent in other directions. The Government should be concentrating on how to widen this gap. The only way to do this, of course, is to make far greater use of television, and teaching aids, so that, perhaps, we do not need the same teacher-pupil ratio as we have at the present time.

A recent survey of teachers shows that five, six, or seven hours a week are spent on administrative duties. If we had a system of administrative assistance, that would be beneficial. We should proceed with the experimental school cluster system, and, by so doing, I am certain that we would be able to teach more students with less overall expenditure.

I think the Minister and his department could well look at a system to ease the trainee teacher bond conditions. There could be a provision whereby a first-year trainee teacher, if he decided that his earlier decision—made some years before—to become a teacher was the wrong decision, could resign. First year resignations should be permissible, and I would like to see a provision for resignations during later years of training.

Greater consideration should be given to the situation where a teacher resigns and subsequently takes up an appointment with the State Government. In some cases the bond has still to be paid although the teacher concerned is generally employed as a public servant by the State Government. But because that teacher has been through teacher training, and is under bond, he still has to refund the money.

Teacher promotion without transfer should be considered. This system would probably benefit some schools, but not all of them. There should be some curricula changes considered, because I think the time has arrived when education should be less fact cramming and perhaps more along the lines of art, music, literature, and languages.

The magnitude of the expansion in Western Australia certainly has created problems in education. I believe that the Government is attacking the problems very vigorously and I am certain that with the co-operation and patience of the parents and citizens' associations, and certainly with the co-operation of the teachers themselves, Western Australia will continue to expand its education system. I believe it will become a system which will be equal to any in the world. I support the motion.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [4.45 p.m.]: I am sure that the speech just completed by the member for Mirrabooka would have been very welcome so far as

the Minister for Education is concerned had it been made at a time when the Education Department was under attack for its policy. The honourable member had a lot of good material indeed. However, it is unfortunate that he speaks at such a rate of knots that is difficult to comprehend what he is saying, especially when he is quoting statistics.

I might perhaps be allowed to comment on a couple of points made by the honourable member. He seemed rather aghast at the fact that in 1958 under the Labor Government there were 50-odd grouped classes in the metropolitan area. He thought that was very bad. However, if he cares to look at a question I asked in this House on the 13th August, 1968 he will find that there were then 1,051 grouped classes; and this was under the Liberal Party Government. If the honourable member had listened to the debate the other night he would know that because of this fact, class averages are being reduced and the Teachers Union, the students, and the parents, are very unhappy about grouped classes.

The member for Mirrabooka also said that after the Liberal Government took office in 1959 the word "crisis" appeared. He overlooked the fact that after nine years the word is still with us because insufficient has been done on the part of the Government to overcome the crises which have occurred. The Liberal Party Government must take the blame for the whole nine years. I think this was a bad debating point by the honourable member, because if there was a crisis in 1960, there is a crisis now.

Another thing I did not like was his rather unfair attack on the Teachers Union. I wish to get this absolutely clear: the Teachers Union is non-political and always has been.

Several members interjected.

Mr. DAVIES: If members opposite can give me any evidence to show that the Teachers Union has ever had any affiliation with the Australian Labor Party—

Mr. Williams: We did not mention the Labor Party; that is your conscience.

Mr. DAVIES: If the member for Mirrabooka says the Teachers Union has political affiliations, then it must be affiliated with a political party. This is wasting time; but the fact remains that the Teachers Union has no affiliation with the Australian Labor Party. Indeed, I have on only one occasion spoken to any officer of that union.

If the member for Mirrabooka wishes to defend the Government, there have been occasions in the past when he could have done so. There was one occasion at Beatty Park and not one person rose to defend the Government. I would remind the honourable member that at the end of that meeting a motion was carried by

the 3,000-odd people present that the Government should be put out of office at the next election unless it did something about education. Those are the facts as they exist.

However, I did not see the member for Mirrabooka get up to defend the Government, nor did any member of the Australian Labor Party or the Opposition in this House speak. They did not need to.

Even if we could have followed the figures quoted by the member for Mirrabooka, they would have been almost impossible to check. Then again, if they were figures given by the Education Department they would be very suspect, because we have already found great differences in the figures given in this House. The Minister for Education was good enough to take up a matter with the Director-General of Education for me the other night and he subsequently passed me a note explaining the position. Once again, the Director-General was 100 per cent. wrong. So I regard all figures from the Education Department as being suspect.

A member: Are you a drop-out of the Education Department?

Mr. DAVIES: No, I am a product of the Education Department and not a drop-out.

Mr. Dunn: Did it do a good job or a bad job?

Mr. DAVIES: I do not wish to waste time criticising the member for Mirrabooka. However, I think he was a little unfair, particularly when he mentioned the name of Mr. Bennett. I do not think this man has any political affiliation, and I do not think I have ever spoken to him. The fact remains that he is a member of the Teachers Union and he is trying to do something for the union and education generally; and he is being decried because of it. I think there are other places in which he could have been challenged.

The only other point I would like to make is that I believe that at the beginning of his speech the member for Mirrabooka said it was part of Labor policy to have a 5 per cent. unemployment figure. I challenge the honourable member to show where this has appeared in the platform of any of the branches of the Australian Labor Party since it was first established. I cannot find where this has been a part of Labor policy at any stage. However, I can remember that this was attributed to Sir Robert Menzies on one occasion.

Mr. Cash: It was attributed to the then member for East Sydney (the late Mr. Eddie Ward), and the then member for Parkes (Mr. Haylen).

Mr. Graham: It came from Menzies, of course.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that never on any occasion—and I have read a lot of Labor Party history and platforms—have I seen this point mentioned. Our policy has always been full employment. The Liberal Party and the Country Party seem to think that they are the only parties which want to see Australia advance. But those parties have no monopoly on this; the Australian Labor Party, as much as anybody else, wishes to see this country as a whole advance.

Mr. O'Neil: The people of Australia consider there is only one party which can make Australia advance.

Mr. DAVIES: I think we are comparing completely different times. It is a decade since the Australian Labor Party was in office, and world conditions are now absolutely different. There are considerable problems in Britain, America, and the Scandinavian countries. The Premier told us during the luncheon yesterday that there were other countries in the world with just as great economic difficulties as Australia is experiencing, and with exactly the same problems as we have. All members receive the *Ulster Commentary* each month. One has only to look at that publication to see the development which is going in that country, and it is quite astounding. I think that country is having more difficulties than we are.

However, I do not think it is fair to stand up and make statements like those made by the member for Mirrabooka, unless one is able to substantiate them. He now says it was the late Mr. Eddie Ward or the then member for Parkes; he is apparently not certain. However, any member can say things, but that does not mean they are part of the Labor Party platform.

Mr. Tonkin: It would not say such a thing.

Mr. Court: Do you remember the figure that Chifley said was full employment?

Mr. DAVIES: No.

Mr. Court: He said 2½ per cent. unemployed was full employment.

Mr. DAVIES: Times have changed. Let me say that I applaud full employment. My broad policy is to see the workers of Australia properly fed, properly clothed, properly educated, and properly housed; and this Government has fallen down badly on 75 per cent. of those four items.

When I rose, I intended to speak to the debate on the Address-in-Reply. This debate has just about run the gamut at the moment, but I do not suppose it is too late to make a few comments on it. Without being disparaging to His Excellency, I thought his Speech was fairly stodgy, and there was nothing in it to excite me very much. I would mention

two impressions I got from the Speech: firstly, it shows that the policy of the Government is to further the gap between the haves and the have-nots, and little will be done for the man in the middle. Secondly, the Government is going to spread its bureaucracy by the appointment of further boards, commissions, and semi-Government bodies and corporations.

I want to remind members that the theme of the propaganda which was put out by this Government in 1959 was that socialism would do away with free enterprise; that we were being taken over by Government departments; that we were being over governed and over ruled; and that there were too many civil servants. If members care to look at the report of the Public Service Commissioner for the year ended the 30th June, 1968, they will find there is now a greater ratio of civil servants to population of Western Australia than ever before. Indeed, when the Labor Government reluctantly left office in 1959 there were 6.52 civil servants to each 1,000 of population. I am talking of staff under the Public Service Act and not of staff employed by the M.T.T., the Fremantle Harbour Trust, and other Government institutions. In 1968, under this Government which favours private enterprise and abhors Government control, there were 8.07 civil servants per 1,000 of population.

One has only to look at the graph to see how the two-lines are coming closer together and that each year—indeed even under the legislation forecast in the Governor's Speech—we are going to have more civil servants. This will probably be pleasing to the Civil Service Association, but I wonder if the country can afford it. It is no good the Government saying that the increase in public servants is due to the increase in population, because the rate of increase of civil servants is greater than the rate of increase of our population.

I was also pleased to see that Sir Paul Hasluck was appointed Governor-General, not only because it is part of the Australian Labor Party policy to appoint an Australian to this position, but also because he is a Western Australian. I am pleased to see that he is speaking out on a few matters; indeed, he must have had to bite his tongue when he was a member of the Federal Government. He has now developed more liberal thoughts—and I do not use that word in its political context.

I wish to congratulate Sir David Brand on his elevation to the knighthood. He said he accepted this honour on behalf of the people of the State. I would rather that he got a first-class knighthood if he was accepting it on my behalf.

Mr. Craig: You would not care for it yourself?

Mr. DAVIES: No, I think these things are outdated.

Mr. Jamieson: The Canadians have done very well without them.

Mr. DAVIES: This is one part of our policy with which I agree 100 per cent.

Mr. Bovell: To be elevated to the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George is one of the highest honours of the realm.

Mr. DAVIES: The fact remains that it is an honour, if that is how one looks at it; and Sir David now holds the record for leading a Government in Western Australia. This deserves our congratulations.

Mr. Craig: What is your opinion of foreign orders?

Mr. DAVIES: Anyone who wishes to accept them is quite entitled to. I certainly do not like them, and I would not accept one. The Governor also mentioned the levelling-out of land prices. We know land prices are levelling out, and we hope they have reached a ceiling; but what we are concerned about is the price at which they have levelled out. \$6,000 for a block of one-quarter of an acre or less in a suburban or near-suburban area is out of all proportion to what the price should be.

I would take the most drastic action to bring the price of land down. The son of a member of the staff of this Parliament recently left this State because of the high price of land. He is a fitter and turner, and in a letter to his father the other day he said that he had bought a block of land in South Australia for \$2,500. His father had sent him some newspaper cuttings about new land opening up at Sorrento, but he received a reply from his son pointing out that in South Australia, in a suburb of Adelaide, a distance from the city equivalent to the distance that Sorrento is from Perth, he could get three blocks for the price that was being asked for one block at Sorrento. This certainly does show that Western Australia is leading the way among all the States of the Commonwealth in regard to high land prices.

Mr. Bovell: The blocks there may not have been in an equivalent area to that of Sorrento.

Mr. DAVIES: I said that they were an equivalent distance.

Mr. Bovell: They may not have been in an equivalent area.

Mr. DAVIES: I cannot say. I am just passing on the information. No doubt it would need further investigation. Without the slightest doubt we will be in trouble in regard to our wheat production and we will look forward to the legislation that is to be brought down this session. We are not exporting wheat, but we are

exporting wool and iron ore, and for this we can be thankful. The restriction on our wheat exports has upset our balance of payments overseas. Although I notice that we can export a lot more, we are still importing far too much. I wonder what the Government has done in regard to promoting the sale of local goods?

I can recall, when the Australian Labor Party was in office, local committees being set up to promote the sale of Western Australian goods, and those committees did an excellent job. It was a shame they were disbanded. The only step towards this goal the Government appears to be taking is to issue an index of available Western Australian goods. However, proposing to do so it apparently upset the Chamber of Commerce—I think it was the Chamber of Commerce—which claimed that it had already prepared an index of Western Australian goods and there was no need for the Government to issue one.

However, the Department of Industrial Development has stated that this is not sufficient and it will go ahead and issue its index. I congratulate the department on its action in this respect and I hope we will be able to promote some of our Western Australian goods as a result. We have, of course, an index of wheat, wool, and iron ore, to refer to, and we can be thankful to the Japanese Government, I suppose, for purchasing these products in the quantities it does.

Nevertheless, if one studies the position one might say that although the Japanese lost the war that they fought from 1942 to 1945, they have certainly won the peace. They have certainly won the economic peace. I believe that something should be done to examine their methods of trading and to ascertain how they are hoodwinking this country and other countries of the world. I do not make this statement lightly, because in November, 1968, the present Social Services Minister (Mr. Wentworth), in speaking of the Japanese, said—

They have very cleverly erected a facade of competition to deceive the people from whom they buy, whether it be iron ore, wool or whatever.

This is how the Japanese have been making such rapid economic strides. They have been able to carry out collective buying, fix the price, and then wait for the people who have the goods for sale to agree to their price.

The words I have just quoted were not uttered by a Labor Party member, but by Mr. Wentworth, the present Minister for Social Services in the Commonwealth Government. Another interesting quotation, taken from *The Australian* of the 23rd November, 1968, reads as follows:—

The Japanese Consul-General in Sydney, Mr. Teruaka Mizonoue, said yesterday he could not understand

why the Minister for Social Services, Mr. Wentworth, had accused Japanese importers of acting in collusion.

He said, "In general I can't—

He did not say "I don't." Continuing—believe Japanese traders are involved in this kind of monopoly. Japanese trading companies are always independent and competing—sometimes to the extent of reducing each other's prices."

Mr. Mizonoue said the import of iron ore was a special case where the various steel milling companies had formed a group to exploit raw materials in India and Brazil as well as in Australia.

That was not a statement by a member of the Australian Labor Party; that was a statement by the Japanese Consul-General in Sydney, admitting there is exploitation of iron ore by the steel milling companies in Japan which have formed combines.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think he is using the word "exploit" in the sense that he means "develop." I have often heard the word "exploit" used, but in those instances, as in this, I think it means develop.

Mr. DAVIES: He said that in regard to the import of iron ore. I think this means that the Japanese steel milling companies are getting together to dictate to Western Australia the price they will pay for iron ore. I am of the opinion that some of the latest developments that have been entered into by the newer iron ore companies will be bogging down on this point. Indeed, the negotiations in regard to iron ore development are always bogging down on the question of what price Japan will pay for the iron ore. I think that this is an admission by the Japanese.

Let us have a look at the item for which legislation was brought down by the House this afternoon. I understand that, once again, the export of wood pulp has bogged down on the question of price. Because the Japanese were exploiting the price of wood pulp, it became necessary for the Commonwealth Government to step in and say, "You cannot export any wood pulp unless you meet our terms."

Mr. Court: They were not exploiting the Western Australian trade.

Mr. DAVIES: They have bogged down on the price.

Mr. Court: The price that was available when negotiations ceased was a fair price and one acceptable to us and the Commonwealth. We ran into trouble following the Commonwealth licensing decision.

Mr. DAVIES: Of course, it is hard to know what is a fair price. If the buyers say, "We will not come down below such and such a price," then they will not do it. I will not argue with the Minister for

Industrial Development on this, because it would be beyond me. However, it would appear that the Commonwealth Government has found it necessary to exercise some control and do something about the price.

Mr. O'Neil: I think you have misinterpreted the use of the word, "exploit" in the quotation you made. I know that we are publishing a booklet for the guidance of apprentices in which the expression "exploit your skill" is used. In this sense it means "develop" or "use."

Mr. DAVIES: We are talking of exploiting iron ore and the export of raw materials. In that newspaper article the Japanese Consul-General in Sydney admits that a combine has been formed to do these things. I cannot argue forever about this, because if I do the Speaker will ask me to justify the newspaper cutting I have quoted, and I am unable to do so. However, I wrote to the publishers of *The Australian*, and this is the newspaper cutting they forwarded to me.

I have spoken on iron ore and wood pulp. Let us now have a look at wheat. In July last, the Japanese said, "We will not buy any more wheat," and they did not until we had agreed on a reduced price. A news item which I heard over the air at 11 p.m. yesterday indicated that the agreements which we thought were fairly sound are no longer valid, and the price of wheat has now been reduced. Japan did not buy any wheat for about three or four weeks, until it got what it wanted: a reduced price. This is another move by Japanese buyers in following the principle of sticking together to get a reduced price, and I think we could learn something from them.

We are rushing the Japanese in an effort to sell them our goods, and they tell us, "We will buy at our price." The Government should watch the position fairly closely. The evidence is sufficient to indicate that we are being exploited by the Japanese. They do not need to watch the market; they are beating us down every time. I think that when we look at wool, wood pulp, iron ore, and wheat, we can certainly learn something from the Japanese. We certainly need to get together and to say, "Let us combine to prevent them exploiting us. Do not let us have one State competing against the other. Let us combine and protect ourselves." After all is said and done we have a lot to protect.

However, that was only a comment made in passing, and as I see my time is running out I will not bother any more to comment on the Governor's Speech, except to say, as I did at the beginning, that the policy of the Government will widen the gap between the haves and the have-nots. It will spread the control of Government bureaucracy. This is evident

when we learn that we are now to have our own State taxation department. This will be another little empire in the Public Service built up under somebody. Already Mr. Townsing has been appointed as the State Commissioner of Taxation, and he will have his deputy, his chief clerk, his senior clerks, his junior clerks, his private secretary, his female typists, office boys, and so on.

Mr. Bovell: Not Mr. Townsing.

Mr. DAVIES: He will make all these appointments.

Mr. Bovell: He will not do anything; he is not appointed.

Mr. DAVIES: I thought he had been appointed; or is it only a rumour?

Mr. Bovell: It is Mr. Ewing who has been appointed.

Mr. DAVIES: My apologies to Mr. Townsing. I am wrong again. Actually I do not suppose it makes much difference to me whether it is Mr. Townsing or Mr. Ewing, because whoever is appointed will still build a little empire within the Public Service.

A board of secondary education is to be formed, as a result of a recommendation emanating from the report of a committee on secondary education headed by Mr. Dettman. This committee brought down its report earlier this year, and this apparently created some confusion in the mind of the Minister for Education. If one looks at section 182 of that report, one finds there is a recommendation for the establishment of a board of 25 to 27 men to control various aspects of education.

If a board of that size is constituted, once again it will have its chief clerk, its senior clerks, junior clerks, typists, office boy, and tea girl. This will be another little empire built up within the Education Department. It is Parkinson's law gone mad! I will not continue to comment on that theme, because there are one or two other things I want to say about my electorate.

In my opinion, there was a grave omission from the Governor's Speech in that it did not make reference to the Apollo crew landing on the moon. This has been described as the most wonderful happening since the birth of Christ, so far as the Christian world is concerned. As Western Australia played some small part in being associated with the venture, and because of the tremendous fields that have now been opened up, the Governor's Speech on the occasion of the Opening of Parliament might have put forward Parliament's congratulations.

In regard to Victoria Park, I would like to bring many matters to the attention of Parliament, but time seems to have run away. However, I must make an urgent plea for a firm decision to be made by the

Government—and made very soon—on the building of another crossing over the Swan River. Eight years ago when I entered Parliament I mentioned this matter in my first speech. I did hope that by now some action would have been taken to build this bridge. We have been fobbed off with all kinds of plans, with committees of inquiry, with proposed action, and the like; but up to date no firm decision has been made on this very necessary bridge.

In 1965 De Leuw Cather & Co. was charged with the duty of making an inquiry into the traffic needs of Perth up to 1980, in relation to the inner ring road, to the Mitchell Freeway, and also to roads within a three-mile radius of the city centre. The report of this company was brought down belatedly in 1967, which was later than was originally anticipated. It is now nearly two years since the report was presented. The report recommended that the next bridge should be built at the western end of Heirisson Island, or alternatively across Burswood Island which is just south of the cement works at River-vale.

I waited with interest for an announcement by the Government as to what the future of this project would be, because a tremendous amount of interest is shown in Victoria Park on what is to be done about the existing traffic congestion. I would have thought that by now the pattern would be fairly clear.

Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister for Works about the provision of this bridge, and he advised me that following the receipt of the report from De Leuw Cather & Co. it was forwarded to the local authorities concerned with a request for its views. The Minister informed me that opinions from the local authorities had only come to hand recently. The local authorities had about 12 months in which to inform the Government of their views on the report. Since then no further announcement has come forward from the Government, and all I can see is the traffic problem becoming more acute and continuing to worsen daily.

It seems that the only people who are benefiting from this delay are the doctors, because I am sure there has been a great increase in the hypertension and associated complaints suffered by motorists who are bogged down at each end of the Causeway every morning and evening. The figures show that between 7.30 and 8.30 a.m. something like 3,320 vehicles travel over the Causeway to Perth, and that during the evening peak hour even a greater number of vehicles travel over the Causeway in the other direction. I understand the traffic volume is increasing at the rate of 2½ per cent. every three months, or 10 per cent. in a year.

When we take into consideration this increase, the expansion which has taken place in the city, and the land which is being opened up in the Cannington-Armadale corridor we see that the figures which De Leuw Cather & Co. have given as an estimate for 1980 have almost been reached. We have a tremendous traffic problem right on our doorstep, and the Government has known about this for years. It has stalled off the problem by seeking expert advice, but although it received the expert advice some two years ago, no decision has yet been made.

The need for a bridge at the location I mentioned is so urgent that it must surely be looked upon by the Government as the next requirement in its roadwork programme. I will continue to bring this matter before the House on every possible occasion until some decision is made, because if there is to be a bridge across the western end of Heirisson Island, so much land resumption is necessary that it will be years before the Government will have the money to proceed with the project.

Last November a most disgraceful event occurred in Western Australia in regard to industrial arbitration. This was the payment by some anonymous person of the fine which had been imposed on members of the Boilermakers' Union. The fine was approximately \$400. I would like to know who paid the fine. Surely the Government must have some idea! Somebody must have taken delivery of the money. A person does not appear anonymously with bank notes and say, "I want to pay the fine."

Mr. O'Neil: Why not?

Mr. DAVIES: That does not happen. The person paying the fine would have to announce himself.

Mr. O'Neil: You are implying that a person cannot pay a fine without disclosing who he is.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not implying that. I am saying that some person came along, allegedly anonymously, at the deathknock, paid the fine, and disappeared; and that nothing has been heard of him since. He saved the Government from a confrontation with the union.

Mr. Court: Are you sure of that? This could be put the other way around. It would save the union a confrontation with the public.

Mr. DAVIES: I can give the Minister an assurance that it would not be a confrontation of the union with the public. The union was quite prepared to have a go. This is a good debating tactic which the Minister for Industrial Development has adopted, but it is completely wrong.

Mr. Court: I am reminding you of the facts.

Mr. DAVIES: The Minister is turning the argument around. I can certainly give him an assurance that this was not a person who paid the fine anonymously on behalf of the union.

Mr. O'Neil: Are you certain of that?

Mr. DAVIES: If there is any doubt, let the Government amend the Act so that a person paying a fine will have to give his name and address. I challenge the Government to do that. It will be an answer to the whole business. We will show the Government how genuine the Labor movement is.

Mention has been made of the worker in Western Australia being well off. I think it was the member for Stirling who said that the Western Australian worker received the highest average wage in the Commonwealth. I am sure he does not read the newspapers, because the latest figures published by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics show that the Western Australian worker receives the third-highest average wage.

Mr. Mitchell: My figures related to the position as at the 16th July.

Mr. DAVIES: The latest figures released by the Bureau of Census and Statistics show that as at the 19th August the average wage received by the workers in this State had increased by \$4.80 a week bringing the average wage up to \$65.60. The workers in this State do not receive as much as the average worker in the Commonwealth; because the Australian average wage increased by \$5.30 a week, or 50c a week in excess of the increase in Western Australia.

Mr. O'Neil: You had better exchange newspaper clippings.

Mr. DAVIES: Western Australia has only the third-highest average wage of the Australian States. In Victoria the average is \$69.50, and in New South Wales \$69.60, which is \$4 in excess of the Western Australian average.

What is interesting to note is that to earn the average wage of \$65.60 in Western Australia, the worker has to work 45.8 hours per week; whereas in the other States he has to work a little over 43 hours a week to receive the average wage for his State.

Mr. Mitchell: The average Western Australian wage is \$73 a week; and that is \$4 above the national average. It is the highest in Australia.

Mr. DAVIES: I have been quoting from the figures published by the Bureau of Census and Statistics, but I do not know from where the member for Stirling has obtained his figures. I was about to mention the hours which the wage earner has to work in Western Australia to obtain the average wage.

Mr. Mitchell: I did not mention hours.

Mr. DAVIES: The honourable member mentioned the wages, and I am pointing out the number of hours the workers have to work to earn the average wage. If the workers in Western Australia were to work on the average 40 hours a week they would earn \$47.85 a week, or \$17.75 a week less than the Western Australian average earnings.

Mr. Mitchell: I obtained my figures from cuttings in the Parliamentary file.

Mr. DAVIES: I got mine from *The West Australian*. I shall write to the Bureau of Census and Statistics, and I shall let the honourable member see the reply that I receive.

I now wish to refer to the penal clauses in the industrial arbitration legislation of Western Australia. I believe that an approach has been made by the trade union movement to the Minister, and this could well bear examination. What we do not like about the penal clauses in our legislation is that when a strike occurs a fine is imposed; there is no alternative. Under the Commonwealth law, if a strike occurs in the Eastern States the union is called before the court, and a bans clause is applied. Argument can be raised as to whether or not this bans clause should be applied. When it is applied, and the union still goes on strike, it is up for contempt of court; and that is when a fine can be imposed.

In Western Australia, the employer has only to make an affidavit that a union is on strike to take action. The justice of striking does not seem to matter. A fine of \$500 can then be imposed. This is totally unjust.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. DAVIES: I am sure there will be an opportunity later on for me to say something more about the penal clauses in our industrial arbitration legislation.

I now wish to draw the attention of the House to the remarks of one honourable member who took the Opposition to task for having brought up the things that it did. He said the Opposition had not brought up anything of consequence. I would remind him that a few years ago we drew attention to the acute housing shortage, but the Minister replied that although there were pressures there was no crisis. We have argued that before, and I am sure we will argue it again.

The other evening the Leader of the Opposition, during this debate, mentioned, in passing, something about a drought in Western Australia. The Minister for Agriculture wanted to know whether he had been out to have a look at the situation. The Leader of the Opposition did not have to do that; all he had to do was

to read the newspapers to know the position. The Minister for Agriculture then said—

That is a different situation altogether. You said "drought." The Government admits there are some areas of distress, but not areas of drought. There is a difference.

That was on the 6th August.

That seemed to have precipitated some action on the part of the Government. If that casual comment had not been made by the Leader of the Opposition I doubt whether the Government would have made any move. Since then this has been turned into one of the worst droughts that the State has known!

Mr. Bovell: We have known about this for a long time. I have travelled over the State in recent weeks to see the position for myself.

Mr. DAVIES: It seems that members opposite are shedding crocodile tears over the plight of the farmers. Previously we have brought up the plight of the small farmer, the mutton and lamb prices, and various other matters; and we introduced motions in the House last year, but not one member opposite supported us.

Mr. Bovell: Have you been out to find out about the position? I have travelled over 3,000 miles in the last few weeks to see for myself.

Mr. Graham: Some of us on this side have.

Mr. DAVIES: It is not only in regard to these matters that we are distressed; we are also distressed because of the contempt this Government shows to Parliament. We have become used to civil servants running the State, to Executive decision, and to agreements being brought before Parliament after they have been signed, sealed, and delivered. We could do nothing to alter those agreements. That is what has happened, and it is not good enough. It is time the Opposition expressed its feelings in this regard.

Amendment to Motion

I therefore move the following amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply:—

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

; but we regret to have to inform Your Excellency that the Government has been so oblivious to the serious situation which was developing in the farming areas because of diminished rainfall, that no preparations at all were made to deal with the position until after the Opposition had drawn attention in Parliament to the necessity for action and as a consequence valuable time has been lost in taking remedial measures.

We regret also to inform Your Excellency that the action of the Government in declining to inform Parliament of its proposals and in preferring to make its statements outside, is an affront to Parliament and calculated to reduce its prestige.

We have had evidence of affronts to Parliament on other occasions. Last night the Leader of the Opposition asked a question without notice of the Premier as to what was proposed. I could not hear the Premier as he was rather confidential in his reply, but I gathered that he said the announcement would be made at the appropriate time and that it was really no concern of Parliament. We want it to be understood that it is a concern of Parliament. As a matter of fact, the Country Party has done very little since the subject has been given the full glare of publicity.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.32 p.m.]: I was terribly impressed with the case submitted by the member for Victoria Park!

Mr. Davies: Actually, I ran out of time. I must apologise!

Mr. O'Neil: He had no case.

SIR DAVID BRAND: One would hardly believe that the moving of this amendment was not an arrangement so late in the week on Thursday afternoon when there is little time for debate, bearing in mind that it has already been announced that Parliament will not sit on Tuesday and that it is private members' day on Wednesday.

Of course it is well-known that the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for Transport are touring the areas under discussion to see for themselves the problems concerning water and, indeed, any other problems associated with the drought.

Mr. Graham: Just a few weeks too late, of course!

SIR DAVID BRAND: The fact remains that it is not a few weeks too late. Whenever it had been done it would have been too late!

Mr. Graham: Too little, too late!

Mr. Jamieson: You have obtained a better grasp of things overseas than your Ministers have here.

SIR DAVID BRAND: The fact remains that this move is purely a political one. I have not seen a more political move here in my time, or a move so blatantly obvious!

Government members: Hear, hear!

SIR DAVID BRAND: Whilst the Opposition in any Parliament takes advantage of situations like this one—do not misunderstand me—the fact remains that those in Government have the right to observe the situation.

Let me deal with the tail end of this amendment. I was asked yesterday a simple question by the Leader of the Opposition and I replied in a very simple and direct way. We had not finalised some of the detail of the various items with which we were dealing; and surely Parliament, and the Leader of the Opposition, who was a Minister for a long time and would know the situation, should be understanding enough to realise that had we been able to make an announcement earlier to Parliament, or anywhere else, we would have done so!

As a matter of fact I believe that Parliament is the best place to make the announcement of a decision, because then it gets real publicity. But we were not in the position to make the announcement, and it was no use our being half-cocked before we had finalised the arrangements; and, indeed, as a responsible Government, we had to ascertain what these decisions were going to cost, and whether assistance for water, transport, or any other associated matter would be required during a drought.

Mr. Jamieson: What time will the decisions be released?

SIR DAVID BRAND: They were released last night, too late, as a matter of fact, for my liking, because they did not catch the country Press.

Mr. Graham: That is before 9 p.m.

SIR DAVID BRAND: We know that. We endeavoured to get something finalised to announce to members, but were not quite able to make it. I want to assure this House that this was the direct and honest situation and there were no manoeuvrings to belittle any status of Parliament or, indeed, to be disrespectful to it. I daresay that if we were to look back in the records of our friends on the other side we would find some evidence of this sort of disrespect.

Mr. Brady: The member for Mirrabooka has been looking back all the afternoon.

SIR DAVID BRAND: I want to say it is difficult to assess a situation in respect of drought areas. Certain areas have now been delineated in which less than four inches of rain has fallen this year, but there are other areas nearby where the rainfall has been better and has been increasing; and this occurs right through to the coast and, indeed, down to the south.

Whatever decisions were to be made had to be of a general nature to apply to the areas of drought as they became worse or as they improved as a result of rain.

It is most important that this State should follow the pattern of assistance granted to the other States. Queensland, let me add, has experienced bad drought conditions in certain parts of the State for three years; and it is well-known that last year the Commonwealth Government came to the aid of New South Wales because of the emergencies there in respect of its Budget. An amount of \$8,000,000 was granted to New South Wales and an amount of \$1,000,000 to Victoria. But let me make it very clear that the Commonwealth gave that aid as a general grant to assist with budgetary problems. It did not give any money as direct assistance to any particular person.

When we make our decision and finalise the case which must be presented to the Commonwealth, it must be recognised that we have to work within the framework of the pattern laid down if we desire to get a dollar for dollar expenditure. Any move we make outside this pattern will result in this Government having to carry the expenditure. I believe that every responsible member will realise that it is important we do not make irresponsible decisions in this regard and thereby send the State bankrupt.

We must have regard for the ever-increasing demands on the Treasury in many other directions. I need not recall these right now, but there have been large amounts outlaid over the last few months which have had an impact on our Budget. Therefore the decision we take now in this matter must follow the pattern adopted over the years by Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia.

If members study the statement published this morning they will realise that we have been very careful to do just this, but certain undertakings we have made will have to be financed by us. As a matter of fact there is no clear undertaking that we will get any of this back, for the simple reason that the Commonwealth might look upon the economy of Western Australia as being such that Western Australia can carry some of this financial burden.

As I said to the member for Avon today, we have to have a good case to put to the Commonwealth. We cannot afford to put up a half-baked case or go off half-cocked. We cannot say that Western Australia is different from any other part of the Commonwealth; and when we put the case forward I can assure members that we will have covered every possible point in our endeavour to get the maximum assistance, directly or indirectly, from the Commonwealth.

As the statement sets out, the problems fall within three main categories. The first is grain for stock feed and this problem has developed gradually. It must not be forgotten that the Government, before

I came home, made a decision to make coarse grain available. The coarse grain was in the metropolitan area and the Government was paying the freight to transport it to where it was required. This was an emergency action.

Mr. Tonkin: On what date was that decision made?

Sir DAVID BRAND: I could not say; I was not here. I have not had time to make full inquiries. If I had had a little more notice of the urgency of this matter I would have found out, but the decision was certainly made some time ago.

Mr. Graham: Nothing was done outside a fortnight ago.

Mr. Gayfer: Some action was taken 11 weeks ago.

Mr. Young: Action was taken in the Jerramungup area.

Sir DAVID BRAND: In any case it could have been last week or the week before.

Mr. Tonkin: The Government denied that the position existed.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The Government did not wait for the Leader of the Opposition to ask what was being done. Leaders of Oppositions are always asking such questions and trying to take advantage of a difficult situation in which Governments find themselves. Indeed, a difficult situation is a drought. No Government, Liberal or Labor, has been able to resolve these problems to the full satisfaction of the people concerned.

Mr. Graham: Two weeks ago the head of the Government denied that there was any such situation.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The point made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could possibly be argued for a long time. I think someone asked, "When is a drought not a drought?" We have to bear in mind the fact that there are pockets within the drought areas which are doing quite well. If it rained right now, or before the end of the month, they might well find themselves in the situation where they could carry through without difficulty.

I am sure that the Acting Premier, being a farmer himself, would be very anxious not to delay a decision of this kind. I believe that in making the coarse grain available he took the first action first.

The next problem, of course, is that of water, and this problem cannot be resolved overnight, whether we lay pipelines or dig wells. Most of the affected areas have been lightly explored for water and we are now taking steps to explore the areas thoroughly. Indeed, five drills are being made available immediately. I do not know where they were gathered from but action has been taken by the Water Advisory Committee set up a number of years ago. That committee is right on the job, trying to ensure that the five drills operate in

the areas most likely to produce water, even though the water may be brackish. Every line of action, in regard to this problem, has been considered, and a decision has been reached. What other decisions can be made, I cannot say at the present time.

There is one exception in the pattern which has been set by the States. In Victoria the State Government paid 25c a bushel as a subsidy. The overall figure involved was some \$3,500,000. However, in the case of Victoria, the grain was already at the terminals and stored in the silos. In our case the wheat is still in the silos in the various country districts—or at least the majority of the wheat is.

Our Government has decided to pay a transport subsidy of 5c in order to offset the added cost incurred by farmers carting the wheat. This will apply, especially, to the farmers who have to cart their wheat for some distance. So the position in this State is that the farmer does not have to pay the freight on the coarse grain from the port terminals.

I understand that the Premier of Victoria made that decision in order that the farmers could get wheat at a price below the home consumption price. I believe that with the aid we are giving the farmers here—short of nothing else happening—they will get their wheat a little below the home consumption price.

We have written to the Australian Wheat Board, as has already been published. We have not written to the Federal Government yet because we believe that the time has not arrived for this approach to be made—the Wheat Board and, indeed, the growers' organisation which is known as the Australian Wheat Growers Federation has not finally decided what to do about the matter. We hope that common sense—if I can use that expression—will prevail with respect to this situation inasmuch as we have the wheat in the districts concerned.

We are having difficulty in selling our wheat and, indeed, some is now being sold to other countries at a lower price than we are accustomed to receiving. The price is that set for the sale of wheat in Europe and, therefore, to this extent, is nothing very special.

Mr. Tonkin: Have you any plans to deal with the situation if the Wheat Board declines to agree to your request?

Sir DAVID BRAND: We are giving consideration to this aspect right now. If it declines to help us we will be in exactly the same position as we are now.

Mr. Tonkin: Would you be prepared to bring legislation here to deal with the situation?

Sir DAVID BRAND: If legislation is necessary to implement our plans, we will not hesitate about that. However, I am

not making any commitment about legislation until the Government is satisfied it is necessary to achieve what we want. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition knows that.

Mr. Graham: I think the drought will be well and truly over by the time you get down to business.

Sir DAVID BRAND: That is a bald statement, and everybody knows it. Everybody knows that at the present time we are spending hours endeavouring to assess the problem and to find ways in which to cope with it.

Mr. Graham: It should have been done a month or more ago.

Sir DAVID BRAND: We have reached decisions and taken action similar to that taken by other State Governments when they were placed in the same position. It is all very well for the Opposition to adopt this attitude. The Opposition has no responsibility in the matter of making decisions with regard to subsidies without very real justification backed up by an examination of the position. This should be our attitude.

We are attempting to help the wheat farmer and the primary producer for all we are worth because it is clear that those people constitute a very important part of the economy. Primary production is vital to us. We cannot overlook the fact that at the present time wheat is hard to sell and we have a lot of it. I hope the Wheat Board will come to our aid and allow the wheat to be returned to the farmers at a price which is acceptable to everyone.

I think perhaps I should refer to the policy of the Commonwealth Government because everybody seems to think that the first thing a Government does is to send a telegram to the Commonwealth Government, and the Commonwealth Government then looks at it and hands out money here and there. The Commonwealth makes it very clear—and it is not only Liberal-Country Party Governments which have made decisions with respect to this policy—what its position is.

Governments of either political colour, when in office in the Commonwealth, have always taken a very cautious line about commitments of aid to the States, until the Commonwealth Government concerned has been completely satisfied that the aid is absolutely necessary to help the State out of its predicament.

I will read this statement, Mr. Speaker, because it sets out certain information. We have been making inquiries from the Federal Treasurer on these matters. We have not been sitting down. The Government has been getting all the information it can so that it might be able to put the strongest case to the Commonwealth and to other authorities to receive the maximum aid under the various headings that have been set down.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the document from which the Premier proposes to read?

Sir DAVID BRAND: It is simply a document that has been prepared by the Treasury for my information. I was going to read the outline of the Commonwealth's policy. A great deal of detail is given in the document which simply states what has been the case with, and the experiences of, other States over the past few years in respect of the policy laid down by the Commonwealth. It says—

The provision of direct financial assistance and relief is primarily the function of State Governments.

However, where the situation requires relatively large relief expenditures, the Commonwealth usually assists the State by meeting half the cost of certain measures.

Let me say that we endeavoured in all of the decisions which were announced last night to ensure that the measures came in this direction, for the simple reason that we would then be able to get half the cost of certain measures back. It may not be that we will get it back directly, but we could get it back later on when the whole matter had been considered. To continue—

With the development of severe drought in the Eastern States, the Commonwealth agreed to assist the States in respect of four main categories of relief measures:

- (a) loans for carry-on and restocking purposes where credit is not available through normal commercial channels.

Here in this State we have arranged for the general agency side of the Rural and Industries Bank to be ready, at least, to provide people with some loan assistance in the event of all other channels failing. Here, again, the Government has shown a readiness to help and has shown that it is planning ahead to meet what might be a difficult situation for a particular individual. To continue—

The basic approach of the Commonwealth is that governmental assistance should be concentrated primarily on those who are in real need and who are unable to obtain assistance elsewhere. As a general rule, the general taxpayer should not be asked to provide assistance to those who, though perhaps suffering financial losses, still have ample financial resources or are able to obtain sufficient finance through normal channels to see them through the drought.

This is the basis of the decision made by the Government and it is in line with decisions which have been made in every other State. To continue—

Accordingly, it was agreed with the States concerned that carry-on and

restocking loans should be restricted to farmers who cannot obtain credit through normal commercial channels.

The Commonwealth financed these loans on the basis that the States repay them over 10 years but without interest.

Although interest was charged by the States, this was at a low rate—normally 3 per cent, although it may be a little higher—and was designed mainly to help meet administrative costs and losses on loans.

This outline of Commonwealth policy has been laid down, point by point, under various headings, the majority of which were referred to in the statement I made to the Press last night.

All the talk in this Chamber, all the censure motions, and all the amendments that may be moved are not going to resolve the problem for the people who are experiencing drought conditions. All the talk in this Chamber will not make the slightest bit of difference and, in fact, any talk in the Commonwealth House would not do a great deal of good, either.

As a State we have to prove that our situation calls for urgent assistance from the Commonwealth. I hope we will be in the clear when we go to Canberra and say, "This is Western Australia's case" which is what we propose to do as soon as the case is ready. In the meantime we are trying to ensure, as far as is possible, that individual people in drought-stricken areas are looked after by the State.

There is one question which is very difficult to resolve; that is, the supply of water. The carting of water could be a very costly matter. It is for this reason that the Government is endeavouring to offer a subsidy of some kind to people to help them take their stock out for agistment and to bring them back. We know how important it is for the farmer to retain a flock of sheep which he has built up over the years. If a nucleus of well-bred stock can be retained for him, it is a good start when the rains do come.

These are the vital problems which we know so well and out of which no political capital can be made—none whatsoever. The Government realises that if it does not rain, there will be many more motions moved by the Opposition, because the position is wide open for Opposition members to move motions. However, members of the Opposition know that in our position as the Government we are helping as far as economics allow and as far as is physically possible. Further, there is the obvious challenge that members of the Opposition could not do anything about it if they were in Government. They would not be able to do one thing more than we are doing. In fact, if there is more sympathy for the farmer than for any other

part of the community, then men with firsthand knowledge are at least in the Government.

I myself have a farm. The position in my area is not nearly as bad as it is in the eastern areas. However, if it does not rain the position in my area will be bad, too. The end result, if it does not rain, will be a problem which faces not only the Government, but the whole Parliament and it will grow, and grow, and grow. Members of the Government and members of the Opposition should unite and get together instead of trying to stir up problems everywhere. Local government and the community, local government and the State Government, and the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, should unite on this matter.

Mr. Graham: Talk to the Minister on your left.

Sir DAVID BRAND: He is up in the areas now.

Mr. Graham: I said, "Talk to the Minister on your left." He is the one who has stirred up world-wide trouble against Western Australia.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Rubbish; he did not!

Mr. Graham: The greatest stirrer.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should go around the world and see for himself. The reputation of Western Australia is as high as it could be, and the Minister for Industrial Development has made the greatest contribution.

Mr. Graham: That is nice stuff from a public platform.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on a public platform. Do not let us say any more about that.

Mr. Graham: It does not seem to have done you much good.

Sir DAVID BRAND: It is no water on my shoulders; do not let us get into a controversy.

Mr. Graham: It may have been water on the brain.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Graham: It may have been water on the brain.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Yes; this is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I had hoped that he might have become more mature in his responsibilities in the hope that he might some day become Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Graham: Only 10 minutes ago you said that the Opposition was irresponsible and the Government carried all the responsibility.

Sir DAVID BRAND: When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is in a position such as this, the sort of thing he refers to is "water on the brain." This kind of comment does not disturb me in the slightest.

Mr. Gayfer: Is he concerned with water on the land?

Sir DAVID BRAND: As I said, this kind of comment when it is made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not disturb me in the slightest, because I know he is a friendly sort of fellow.

Mr. Davies: The Premier will get an Oscar for that performance.

Mr. Graham: A bit more like the "David" and less like the "knight".

Sir DAVID BRAND: Here it comes. Let us leave that little remark at that point. This does not hurt me at all. I want to point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I saw in the paper where he was a knight of the Italian community. Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. Graham: Nobody suggested it; nor in your case, either.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir DAVID BRAND: I was not cynical or sarcastic towards the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about that.

Mr. Graham: I have never noticed the Premier pointing the finger and talking down to the Opposition before. What is the reason?

Sir DAVID BRAND: I am talking to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and not to the Opposition as a whole.

Mr. Graham: What is the reason for the change?

Mr. O'Neil: You are!

Sir DAVID BRAND: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had not opened his mouth so wide, nothing would have been said.

Mr. Graham: The Premier wants to keep on talking.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I am going to keep on talking.

Mr. Graham: Very well.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The amendment which has been moved by the member for Victoria Park, at the direction of the Labor Party, is an amendment which the Government might have expected to be moved for political reasons. However, I can assure the House that the Government is right up to date with all its planning in case the drought should get worse.

We have taken every step necessary to render immediate assistance, and indeed we will be ready with a first-class plan to submit to the Commonwealth Government to obtain the maximum financial assistance and any other aid we can obtain and provide within reason to ease the burden of these unfortunate people.

It may be said that many of them have had good years, but there are also many of them who have not had good years; some of them young farmers who have not had an opportunity to accumulate any reserves. However, I can assure the House that we will do our best, with the backing of the community, and I hope with the backing of the Opposition, to resolve the drought problems as best we can. Let us all hope it rains and that the drought will not get worse. Let us all hope that farmers will be able to carry on at least until the drought breaks, when they will again be able to earn their own income.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, moved by the member for Victoria Park, as being unjustified in both the points that have been laid down in it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [6.1 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m., Wednesday, the 27th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 27th August, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. DROUGHT

Commonwealth Assistance

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the recent reports from the Federal Parliament indicating that sympathetic consideration would be given to any application from the Western Australian Government for drought relief in this State, and in view of the extremely disastrous situation which is becoming critical in farming areas, will

the Government give urgent consideration to submitting an immediate application for drought relief?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The honourable member was good enough to indicate to me that he intended to ask this question. The answer is as follows:—

The Government is fully aware of the Commonwealth policy of assisting States to finance drought relief measures, and will submit an application when a reasonable estimate can be made of the cost of the relief measures already commenced by the Government.

2. WOOL EXPORTERS ROYAL COMMISSION

Position of Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Ltd.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it a fact that at some stage of the Royal Commission into Wool Exporters Pty. Ltd. the then State Manager of the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Ltd. (Mr. J. H. Wilson) attended the Royal Commission?
- (2) After such an attendance, would not this fact be sufficient to subpoena him at any future sittings?
- (3) Would it be a fair assumption that his transfer from this State after this attendance was designed by the bank to prevent his giving evidence if subsequently called upon by the commissioner at any future sitting?
- (4) Would not the preceding questions indicate contempt of the Royal Commission by the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Ltd.?
- (5) In view of the Royal Commissioner's comments and criticism of this bank, as detailed on pages 72 to 77 inclusive of the report, has the Government power to take action against this bank—
 - (a) on behalf of all the creditors involved in the failure of the particular wool company concerned; and
 - (b) if not, could the Minister indicate why, and what recourse is open to the said creditors?