Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—14

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers (*Teller*)

Noes—7

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. D. K. Dans
Hon. Lyla Elliott	(*Teller*)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.19 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 29th October, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (20): ON NOTICE

1. HOUSING

Koongamia

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many homes in the Koongamia area are allotted to the armed services for their personnel?

(2) How many of these homes are unoccupied and what is the length of time that they have been so vacant?

(3) In view of the acute shortage of homes for rental, would he make an approach to the authorities concerned with a view to their releasing homes that are surplus to their requirements and thus allow housing of other than service personnel in these homes?

(4) Would he supply the addresses and sizes of all homes allotted to the services in the Koongamia area?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Ninety-three houses.

(2) The management of these houses is not under the control of the commission, and this information is not known to the commission.

(3) Where the commission's attention is drawn to units vacant under this scheme, the commission notifies the appropriate Commonwealth authority. From time to time, where units under this scheme become surplus to the service requirements, they are returned to the commission control.

(4) This information will be directed to the Member by mail at first opportunity.

2. WESTERN TITANIUM PROJECT

Leeman: Water and Electricity Supplies

Mr CRANE, to the Premier:

(1) Is it the intention of this Government to provide water and electricity within the Leeman townsite to the Western Titanium developments only and to exclude established residents and facilities from these services?

(2) If not, will he advise when both mining and private interests may be serviced respectively?

(3) Is he aware of the good community spirit existing at Leeman?

(4) Does he appreciate that any preferential treatment to one section of the town will impede the successful and desirable integration of the two communities?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) Initially, services will be provided to an area being developed for the Western Titanium workforce as only company funds are being used for the purpose. The services will be extended progressively to the balance of the town as a part of the service department's normal programme for such works.

(3) Yes.

(4) The establishment of the company workforce in Leeman will permit the provision of services to the existing residents well in advance of that which would have otherwise been possible.

3. LAND TAX

Receiving Agency: Fremantle

Mr FLETCHER, to the Treasurer:

(1) Is a provision made for the payment of land tax to any office or agent in the City of Fremantle?

(2) If not, will such an arrangement be made for the convenience of people of that general area and for the purpose of saving in postage to and from the department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) No.

(2) The matter will be investigated.

4. POLICE

King's Park: Use after Dark

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Police:

(1) Is he aware that recently members of the public who have been walking on roads through King's Park after dark as a means of exercise have been stopped and questioned by police in a patrol car and actually warned against doing so again after dark?

(2) Are not these roads open to members of the public after dark?

(3) Why would such action be taken?

(4) What rights have individuals who are so warned by the police?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes and they are advised against this practice for their own protection.

(2) Yes.

(3) Complaints of prowlers in these areas and protection of persons and property.

(4) Once the individuals have been advised, no further action is pursued and they have the right to continue.

5. FAMILY COURT

Establishment

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

(1) Relative to the Bill for the Family Court Act, 1975—

(a) has an agreement yet been drafted under section 41 (1) of the Family Law Act, 1975;

(b) if so, will he table it?

(2) If (1) (a) is "No" what amount of the necessary funds for—

(a) the establishment of the Family Court of W.A.; and

(b) the administration of the Family Court of W.A.,

will the Australian Government be asked to provide and how is the said amount computed?

(3) What evidence is there to support the statement that "there is often a problem of demarcation" when jurisdiction is divided in relation to what may be generally described as family law?

(4) Where will the proposed Family Court of W.A. be located?

(5) Why is it stipulated that judges and counsel shall not robe?

(6) Where and how often will the Full Court of the Family Court hear appeals from the Family Court of Western Australia?

(7) Why have the classifications chief judge, senior judge, and judges of the Family Law Act, 1975 been departed from?

(8) Why does the Bill depart from the Family Law Act, 1975 as to the qualification of judges for appointment to the Family Court of W.A.?

(9) What is intended to be the "metropolitan region"?

(10) How many stipendiary magistrates within the said "metropolitan region" will be displaced by the establishment of the Family Court of W.A. and what will become of them?

(11) What is the approximate difference in salary between that proposed to be paid to judges of the Family Court of W.A. and that of the stipendiary magistrates presently presiding over the summary relief court in Perth?

(12) How many judges or acting judges of—

(a) the Supreme Court;

(b) the District Court,

will be appointed to the Family Court of W.A.?

(13) What are the amounts of the proposed salaries of the judges of the proposed Family Court of W.A. and of the judges of the Family Court of Australia which will be set up by the Australian Government in all of the other States, respectively?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) No.

(2) Entire amount.

(3) There are matters of jurisdiction in the Guardianship of Children Act, 1972 and the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act, 1965-1972, which will not be superseded by Commonwealth legislation and will remain as purely State jurisdiction; and it is intended that people will not be confused as to what court they will proceed in.

(4) The court will be located in Perth, with an itinerant programme throughout the State.

(5) The stipulation that judges and counsel shall not robe is intended to ensure that the court will reflect the philosophy underlying the Commonwealth legislation of being "a helping court", where people in distress over their family situation will find a sympathetic and friendly response.

(6) It is expected that the appeals will invariably be held in Perth, and as frequently as may reasonably be required.

(7) To avoid confusion between the two courts.

(8) The Bill seeks to reflect the qualifications of judges to the State Supreme Court and the District Court, while recognising the obligation under Commonwealth law to provide for retirement at 65 years of age.

(9) This matter has not been determined, but the suitability of adopting the definition of the metropolitan region as found in the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-1974, is being considered.

(10) Three magistrates engaged in the Summary Relief Court will be reallocated to other jurisdictions.

(11) Salary for judges of the Family Court of W.A. would be $29 150 per annum. Stipendiary magistrates presiding in the Summary Relief Court in Perth receive salary in the range $22 185 to $22 946 per annum.

(12) The question of persons to be appointed as judges of the court has not yet been considered.

(13) The proposed salaries of judges of the W.A. Family Court will be on the basis of present rates—

Chairman—$36 000.

Judge—$29 150.

The Family Law Act of the Commonwealth fixes the salaries as follows—

Chief Judge—$31 450.

Senior Judges—$29 250.

Judges—$25 000.

However, it is understood that these will be revised shortly to establish salaries which will be comparable to those proposed for the State Court, a senior judge being comparable to the chairman.

6. MINING BILL

Submissions

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is he aware of the article which appeared in the *Sunday Independent* dated 26th October, 1975 criticising the Government regarding the proposed new Mining Bill?

(2) If so, will he advise if it is the intention of the Government to delay this legislation pending receipt of a submission from the Country Party?

(3) Was the Country Party made aware of the provisions of the new Mining Bill prior to its introduction into Parliament?

(4) If not, what were the reasons for the coalition partner not being made aware of the proposed provisions of the Bill?

(5) Has the Government considered submissions from the Amalgamated Prospectors and Leaseholders' Association?

(6) If so, will there be resultant amendments to the Mining Bill?

(7) Has the Government given consideration to the Member for Mt. Marshall's contention that the present Mining Act should be retained and amended gradually over the next few years?

(8) If so, does the Government intend to take this line of action?

(9) When did the Government initially request submissions from organisations and the public regarding matters pertaining to the proposed Mining Bill?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The delay with the Bill is to coordinate all late submissions as I have announced earlier and not because of pending submissions from any party.

(3) Yes, its parliamentary wing was.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) and (6) Yes.

(7) and (8) All aspects have been considered but the action taken has been to draft and introduce a new Bill.

(9) August, 1974.

7. LAND

Eneabba Townsite

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Lands:

(1) Will he advise the area of land held by the Lands Department in and around the townsite of Eneabba?

(2) What restrictions, if any, have been placed on the sale of land to private persons for the purpose of establishing commercial businesses in the Eneabba townsite?

(3) Are private persons permitted to apply to the department for land in and around the Eneabba townsite?

(4) If not, what are the reasons for declining such applications?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) The area of vacant Crown land exclusive of reserves is approximately 105 hectares within the townsite.

"Around the townsite" is insufficiently definitive to enable an area to be given.

(2) None. Commercial sites will be released after services have been provided and as the demand warrants.

(3) and (4) Yes, private persons may apply.

8. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION AND STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Staff: Theft and Misuse of Funds

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Has he perused the article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* dated 26th October, 1975 which refers to the misuse of local purchase orders by an engineer of the State Energy Commissions?

(2) If so, will he advise what action has been taken to recover the amount involved?

(3) Was legal action pending prior to the engineer absconding overseas?

(4) If not, why not?

(5) Is the amount of $5 658 mentioned in the article the total amount involved?

(6) If not, will he indicate what is the anticipated amount involved?

(7) On how many occasions in the past three years have staff of the SEC been dismissed for either stealing or the misuse of funds of the commission?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The matter is in the hands of the Criminal Investigation Branch of the Police Department.

(3) Yes.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) and (6) Extensive checking is still being carried out and the amount mentioned is all that can be proven with reasonable certainty thus far.

(7) Five.

9. APPRENTICES

Living-away-from-home Allowance

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

(1) Is the Minister aware that there is concern in technical education circles that the payment of the living-away-from-home allowances to second year apprentices may be discontinued?

(2) Is the Minister able to confirm or deny this rumour?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) The Technical Education Division in Western Australia was aware of an announcement made at the Australian Apprenticeship Advisory Council of a proposed cut by the Australian Government in living-away-from-home allowances. However, due to approaches by the Department of Labour and Immigration, the allowances have now been maintained at the level originally established.

All applicants who were advised of the non-availability of the living-away-from-home allowances have been advised by the Department of Labour and Immigration to reapply.

10. ORELIA SCHOOL

Fire Damage

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

(1) With respect to the fire some months ago at the Orelia Primary School, is he aware—

(a) that damage caused by the fire has still not been fully cleared away;

(b) that the smell of burnt materials is therefore most prevalent throughout the school?

(2) When were (or will) tenders be called to restore the damage?

(3) Will all work be completed prior to the start of the 1976 school year?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) Yes;

(b) No.

(2) Anticipated to be called on 8th November, 1975.

(3) No.

11. HOUSING

Merredin

Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many houses have been built at Merredin in each year since 1970 for—

(a) the State Housing Commission;

(b) the Government Employees' Housing Authority?

(2) What is the proposed building programme for Merredin in 1976?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) (a) and (b)—

	State Housing Commission.	Government Employees' Housing Authority.
1970-71	10	2
1971-72	Nil	1
1972-73	3	1
1973-74	2	Nil
*1974-75	9	2

*A further 25 units programmed by the State Housing Commission in 1974-75 are either in course of construction or under tender negotiation.

(2) The State Housing Commission programme intention for 1975-76 is for 12 units of accommodation including the six new design type houses, which will be put under a practical evaluation programme; and the Government Employees' Housing Authority programme intention is for seven houses.

In addition the Industrial and Commercial Employees Housing Authority is building a house in Merredin for a key employee with a general engineering firm.

12. SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY

Deviation: Greenbushes

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

When will work on the deviation of the South Western Highway around the town of Greenbushes be commenced, and when is completion expected?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

It is hoped that work will commence before the end of November when resumption actions have been resolved and final arrangements concluded with the company, Greenbushes Tin N.L., and it is expected the deviation will be open to traffic about the end of May, 1976.

13. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Greenbushes Tin: Compensation for Highway Deviation

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) With how many residents of the town of Greenbushes has the firm Greenbushes Tin N.L. negotiated the matter of compensation in lieu of the deviation of the South Western Highway around the town?

(2) Are there any residents with whom a satisfactory conclusion has not been reached, and if so, how many?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) and (2) Following discussion with the representatives of the local authority, the company has given consideration to and assisted all those businesses that had expressed concern at the possible effects of the relocation of the highway.

14. CHIROPRACTORS

Qualifications

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

(1) Referring to question 8 of 21st August, 1975 and question 12 of 9th September, 1975 regarding chiropractors, are the views reflected in the answers given the views of the Minister or of the Chiropractors Registration Board?

(2) Have alterations to the Chiropractors Act been sought by the Board, the profession or both?

(3) Does the Chiropractors Act have control over who may practice manipulation of the spinal column as distinct from persons who may claim to be able to do this?

(4) Is the board satisfied that no breaches of the provisions of section 19 of the Act are occurring?

(5) If not, what is the incidence of breaches?

(6) What action is being taken to protect the public from persons other than qualified physiotherapists and doctors who practise chiropractic as defined, but do not call themselves chiropractors?

(7) Does the board keep informed of advances and changes in the field of chiropractic and, if so, in what manner?

(8) What moves are being made to assess Australian schools established or being established to teach chiropractic?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) The Minister.

(2) Both.

(3) No.

(4) The board has no evidence that breaches of the provisions of section 19 are occurring. If the board becomes aware of such breaches it will take appropriate action as in the past.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) This is not a function of the board and it has no power to act in this respect. There is no evidence to indicate that the public needs protection. If the Member has evidence that the public requires protection he should make this available.

(7) Yes, but only in the normal post-graduate activities of its members.

(8) An established school has been inspected and the board is considering a proposal for a new school.

15. HOUSING

Pensioner Units

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What are the criteria at present applying for a pensioner housing unit?

(2) Are such flats available to people living in the country who wish to move to the metropolitan area?

(3) Is there any pensioner accommodation at present vacant?

(4) If not, what was the number of applications outstanding at 1st October?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Single unit housing:

Criteria for an eligible single unit applicant is—

(a) a single aged or invalid pensioner; or

a Class "B" widow (aged 50 years or over without dependant children); or

a service pensioner.

(b) With income not exceeding the pension plus supplementary rent allowance ($41.00 per week) and having liquid assets not exceeding $600.

(c) Pensioner couples of pensionable age or wholly dependand upon a pension of any type, without dependant children and not the owner of a residential dwelling.

(2) Yes, providing the applicant meets the eligibility criteria.

(3) In the metropolitan area there are 17 units for pensioner couples and 34 units for single unit pensioners, currently vacant. These units are either under maintenance prior to re-letting or under offer to applicants.

(4) In the metropolitan area there are 344 pensioner couples and 869 single unit pensioners outstanding.

16. HOUSING

Research Into Planning and Needs

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What number of SHC rental accommodation units are currently available in—

(a) metropolitan area;

(b) country areas?

(2) Does the Government have any information about the number of private units available in both areas?

(3) By determining the number of units available through Government sources has any research been made by any Government agency or planning bodies in this area?

(4) If (3) is "Yes" could he advise which agencies or planning bodies did the research?

(5) Who are the persons on these research teams?

(6) Where did they get their information from?

(7) Should the answer be "No" to (3), why has not research been made to—

(a) enable proper planning for house dwelling unit construction;

(b) enable better planning of finance usage;

(c) ensure stability of employment in the housing industry due to more knowledge of needs and community requirements to be met;

(d) provide better source information to persons requiring housing?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) (a) Metropolitan area, 15 056 units;

(b) Country areas, 6 707 units.

Of these, 165 units in the metropolitan area and 285 units in the country areas are known to be vacant and they are either undergoing essential maintenance prior to re-letting or are under offer to eligible applicants.

(2) to (6) Yes, the commission is able to gauge the general level of private accommodation which is available for rental at prices within the paying capacity of applicants by frequent review of the number of applicants on the waiting list, the turnover of its own housing stocks, and the decline rate of offers made, as well as from information available to the commission through its regional branch offices, and other agencies —both metropolitan and country, with whom the commission has established channels of communication.

The commission also undertakes detailed investigations of particular areas and towns from time to time as the need arises—for example, where increasing work opportunity is evident, etc., or local authority draws attention to the need for further housing.

Also, for the past several years, the commission has adopted the practice of commissioners and senior officers undertaking, at least, two official tours of country regions each year on rotation basis, and meetings are held with each local authority during these tours.

(7) Not applicable.

17. PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETIES

Home Builders' Account: Funds

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Until two years ago, how much Home Builders' Account money had been allocated to permanent building societies?

(2) What were the names of those societies and what was the amount allocated to each?

(3) How many mortgage discharges have been effected in respect of these funds?

(4) If any, at what rate of interest and under what conditions has the money been re-allocated to home builders?

(5) If the money has not been re-allocated, at what interest rate is the society being charged and what is the Government's intention in respect of these discharge funds?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) and (2) The allocations of home builders' account funds from 1956-57 to 1972-73 were—

	$
British Building Society	120 000
City Building Society ..	444 100
The First Federal Building Society	389 000
Home Building Society	2 315 780
The Permanent Investment Building Society	348 500
Perth Building Society	11 384 230
Statewide Savings and Building Society	258 500
Swan District Benefit Building Investment & Loan Society (Permanent)	336 600
Town and Country Permanent Building Society	4 230 200
The West Australian Savings and Building Society	4 006 020
	$23 832 930

(3) No record has been maintained regarding mortgage discharges.

(4) Funds available from discharges are re-allocated to eligible applicants by the various societies under terms and conditions existing at time of re-lending, including interest rate of 5¾% per annum.

(5) An income geared low-start scheme whereby pre-1973 home builders' account funds derived from mortgage discharges is mixed with permanent building societies own funds is presently before the Commonwealth Minister for his concurrence. This scheme provides for a variation of the mix on annual reviews of borrowers' income, and will give initial assistance to a greater number of low income families.

In 1974 when the interest rates on mortgages were increased to unprecedented levels, an approval of the Mortgage Relief Committee permanent building societies injected low interest money from this source into mortgages to reduce monthly repayments.

18. HOUSING

Mt. Barker

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the total number of units of State Housing Commission rental accommodation in Mt. Barker under the headings—

(a) bed sitter;

(b) one bedroom;

(c) two bedroom;

(d) three bedroom;

(e) four bedroom;

(f) other (with details)?

(2) What rental applied in each case at—

(a) 1st January, 1975;

(b) 1st October, 1975?

(3) If further increases in rent are proposed what are the details?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) to (3) —

Type	Number of units	Rents Jan. '75 $	Oct. '75 $	Apr. '76* $
Bed Sitter	....	....	....	....
1 bedroom	2	7.10	10.15	11.60
2 bedroom	2	10.50	12.50	14.00
3 bedroom	46	8.80	15.70	19.80
	(Range)	14.70	17.30	
4 bedroom	3	14.00	20.50	25.60
Others	Nil	....	....	....

*The increase in April, 1976 represents the implementation of the second moiety of the overall rental increase.

19. RAILWAY CROSSING AND PEDESTRIAN OVERWAY

Ipsen Street

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

(1) With which Minister does the responsibility for the Ipsen Street railway crossing rest since it has been closed to vehicular traffic?

(2) Is it proposed to construct a pedestrian overway over the Ipsen Street crossing?

(3) If "Yes" to (2) when will construction commence?

(4) If "No" to (2), will he have an investigation of the need for a pedestrian overway at the Ipsen Street crossing carried out?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Hon. Minister for Transport.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by (2).

(4) No, but the situation will be kept under review.

20. FIRE BRIGADES

Metropolitan and Country

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Would he advise the number of fire brigades in the metropolitan area?

(2) Would he advise the number of country towns that have facilities provided by the Fire Brigades Board?

(3) What is the number of personnel employed in (1)?

(4) How many calls were received by fire stations in the metropolitan area and can he advise, in general terms, those calls for other than fire emergency between 30th June, 1974 and June 1975?

(5) Relating to country areas, will he give detail of the amount provided in each town during the current year by the board towards operating costs for the continuance of fire brigade services?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) The Metropolitan fire district—one brigade consisting of—

Headquarters

City Station

17 Suburban Stations

(2) 76.

(3) 544 officers and firemen.

(4) 6 028. Of these, 454 were for causes other than fire emergency.

(5) For details, see tabled sheet.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 505).

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

MINING BILL

Submissions

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) In connection with question 6 on today's notice paper, will the Minister confirm that the Opposition will be given adequate time to consider the Government's proposed amendments to the Mining Bill?

(2) If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, would he advise whether there will be adequate time to consider the amendments prior to the conclusion of the present session of Parliament?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) I will definitely endeavour to do what the Government always does; namely, that if amendments of a substantial nature are proposed to any legislation, to give the Opposition adequate time to study them. I do not think that, mutually, we have any complaint against each other in this respect.

(2) I am not in a position to provide an answer at this stage.

RESERVES BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL

Third Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

During the course of debate on the second reading of this Bill the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised the question of the possible effect of the Sale of Tobacco Act on the provisions of the Bill. He drew attention to section 10 of the Sale of Tobacco Act which makes it an offence to sell, give or supply tobacco to any person under the age of 18 years, and pointed out that it was possible for these persons to obtain tobacco from vending machines, which are subject to the provisions of the Bill.

As promised, I have had the matter investigated and I am advised that the provisions of the Bill and those contained in the Sale of Tobacco Act are not in conflict. Members will recall that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition invited the attention of the House and the Government to the provisions of an old Act which originally referred to liquor and tobacco

but which was subsequently—I think, in 1964—reduced to a reference to tobacco only.

The provisions of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Bill do not declare all sales by licensed persons to be lawful. On the contrary, the Bill provides, in this regard, that it is to be unlawful to sell tobacco unless the person has the appropriate license.

An analagous situation exists in the Liquor Act under the provisions of which a person has to hold a license to sell liquor, but the provisions of the same Act make it an offence to sell liquor to persons under a specified age.

Therefore, with the passing of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Bill, the legal position in respect of sales to under-age persons will remain in the same situation as it is today. In other words, the operation of the provisions of the Sale of Tobacco Act is not affected by the provisions of the Bill.

I should add that I have also had advice from the Commissioner of State Taxation who, in turn, conferred with Parliamentary Counsel, and that conforms to the advice I have now passed on to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do, however, thank the honourable member for his interest in the matter and the fact that he raised the point. At this stage I can only accept the advice that has been given to us that there is no serious conflict. However, if I recall correctly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did point out that although the legislation which is on the Statute book prohibited the sale of these goods to people below a certain age, he questioned the effectiveness of that legislation.

Nevertheless the main point at the moment is that there is no conflict between the legislation we are about to pass through the third reading stage and the existing legislation on the Statute book.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.42 p.m.]: I thank the Treasurer for having obtained the answer to the query I raised, but I draw his attention once again to one fault that appears to be in the advice tendered to him, and that is that this situation is not similar to that which arises under the provisions of the Liquor Act, because I know of no circumstances where any licensed premises selling liquor create a situation in which a person can obtain liquor automatically by placing money in a vending machine.

Under this legislation there is no protection that the Act will be upheld by the fact that a machine exists, and nobody is responsible for the machine whilst it is unattended. Under the Liquor Act, on all occasions, somebody must be responsible for the sale of liquor and therefore, as I say, the circumstances in this case are different. I can only say that the people who gave the Treasurer the advice he read to the House overlooked that aspect when the advice was being prepared for him.

Whilst I have no intention of going to the barricades in regard to this point, I think the Government should introduce a small Bill to overcome the problem, because we cannot uphold this law. The number of young people who smoke these days is very apparent when one is walking along the streets and to provide that a retailer of tobacco has to ask a person's age is not fair. Under the provisions of the Liquor Act a person has certain protection, but under this legislation presumably a person selling tobacco would have to judge whether the person who wishes to buy it is over the age of 18 years, or accept the onus of selling tobacco to a person who is under age.

However, that is just an aside. I thank the Treasurer for taking the trouble to obtain a determination from his advisers, but I suggest again that he should look at the aspect of automatic vending machines, because it is quite different from the situation that arises under the provisions of the Liquor Act, in spite of what his advisers have said.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [2.45 p.m.]: The points made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are noted, and I will refer this particular aspect to the Minister concerned. My immediate concern was to establish that the Bill we have before us is not defeated by any legislation on the Statute book. However, the point the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes refers to the efficiency or otherwise and the effectiveness or otherwise of the existing Statute.

I will certainly have that point referred again to the Minister for Justice because the advisers concerned were answering only the specific question I put to them; that is, whether there was any conflict between the Bill and the existing Statute.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

GRAIN MARKETING BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

VERMIN ACT

Disallowance of Regulations: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr Barnett—

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

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.46 p.m.]: It was early in July that a list of declared birds was published in the *Government Gazette*, placing them into three categories. Since then there has been a certain amount of activity in the various societies interested in aviculture and moves have been made in an endeavour to have these regulations amended. Regulations were gazetted after long consultations with various organisations and it was thought that, apart from reaching general accord with the organisations, the regulations, as gazetted, would be of great benefit to the rural industry.

In fact, this is a field that is being widely investigated throughout the world. The amount of damage done by pest birds is quite enormous in various parts of the universe and it was the desire of the Agriculture Protection Board to protect primary producers from such happenings in Western Australia.

In his speech on this motion the member for Rockingham described the four major categories into which birds had been placed—one of which, of course, was an exempt category—and there were categories 1, 2, and 3. Certain restrictions were placed on each category, and birds in category 3 were not allowed to be kept and this was accepted as being reasonable.

However, great discussion took place on the birds in category 2 and the regulations pertaining to the keeping of those birds. As a result of this I have had my department take another look at the regulations and we were able to come up with what I consider to be very much of a compromise on the part of the Agriculture Protection Board. I am sorry to see that this compromise had to be so drastic, because I think it has removed a great deal of the protection that was originally designed within the framework of the regulations.

Category 1 originally contained 10 non-indigenous species and seven species of Australian parrots, all of which are known to cause damage in the Eastern States.

Category 2 contained birds which, on the basis of extensive research, were considered to be potential major pests in Western Australia. The regulations were supported by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife which also had carried out extensive studies into the feeding habits of these birds and their destructive potential.

However, the lobbying and the pressure were so great that we had to succumb to a degree. There is one bird in particular which I would like to mention as being a good example of what can happen; and that is the monk parakeet.

I have before me an article from which, with your permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to quote. This is an extract from the proceedings of the Sixth Vertebrate Pest Conference, held on the 5th to 7th March, 1974, at Anaheim, California. It states—

> Small flocks of monk parakeets, Myiopsitta monachus, were recently sighted and reported in Southern California. This avian species, native to Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Bolivia, substantially damages grain, fruit, and vegetable crops grown within its native habitat. Overall crop losses in those areas range from two percent to 15 percent, with some as high as 45 percent annually. Because of its known ability to breed successfully in California and other states and to survive adverse climatic conditions, the possible effects of M. monachus on California's agricultural industry must be examined. This study evaluates the pest potential of this exotic avian species.
>
> Monk parakeets are capable of adapting to a wide range of environmental parameters. They are known to live and breed in New York State which temperatures range from —17 degrees to +106 degrees Fahrenheit. A wild population of 25 monk parakeets in Northwood, North Dakota, is reported to have bred successfully. Monks in Saxony, England, have adapted to climatic conditions and produced offspring.
>
> Observations of monk parakeets feeding in their native South America and of introduced monks in New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and California, indicate most fruit crops, vegetable crops, vineyards, and all grain crops could expect damage if monks were allowed to form wild populations. Their gregarious nature leads to the formation of large flocks capable of inflicting heavy immediate losses to fields and orchards.
>
> In South America . . . crop losses range from two percent to 15 percent with some as high as 45 percent annually. In the United States (excluding California) apples, cherries, grapes, pears, corn, mulberries, acorns, and the seeds of sunflowers, dandelions, pines, grasses, and mixed bird seed are consumed by monk parakeets.

It has been estimated that crops in California could suffer to the extent of $2 167 700 in one year, purely as a result of the destructive nature of these birds. That gives a fairly good indication of the reasoning behind the regulations introduced by my department.

Mr Barnett: If that bird is so bad, why is it placed in category 1 (a) and not in category 2?

Mr OLD: I do not think it will remain in that category for too long. The member for Rockingham made great play on the rights of the individual, and these are

acknowledged by myself and the Government parties because we champion the rights of the individual; however, we feel that the rights of the primary producer should also be protected, and those people have as much right to protection as have the aviculturists.

While the Government believes that the regulations as published are justified, it is prepared, in order to allay concern and fears expressed by aviculturists, to agree to amendments. This is done in order that we may have at least some control over birds with pest potential, by adopting the new regulations which have been laid on the Table of the House.

Members opposite have had plenty of time to look at the list of birds. I am sure they agree this is a very fair compromise.

Mr Barnett: No, it is not.

Mr OLD: Twenty nine species have been transferred from category 2 to category 1(a), and these include something in the order of 100 birds. Category 1(a) has been formed as a new category. It is the same as category 1, except that no more birds of the species mentioned in category 1(a) may be imported into the State. However, they may be bred by breeders and traded freely. Furthermore, they may be traded to people who are not currently engaged in aviculture but who may buy them on the acquisition of a permit to hold these birds.

The species at present in category 2 which have a record of accumulation in Australia include the white winged widow bird, black headed munia, Indian jungle fowl, red legged partridge, sand grouse, mallard, Canada goose, and English skylark.

Mr Barnett: Do you say the English skylark has a record of acclimatisation in this State?

Mr OLD: These are the species we are keeping in category 2. I think the honourable member will agree that is reasonable.

Mr Barnett: So far it shows you have not done a tremendous amount of research.

Mr OLD: Yes, we have. We have probably undertaken more research into these regulations than has the honourable member. The fees for categories 1(a) and 2 will be the same as the fees for category 1; that is, $2 per bird permit. This was an area of dispute in the original gazettal of the regulations.

As at early or mid September when the new regulations were being drawn up, as a matter of interest a total of 107 persons had taken out permits for category 2 birds. These permits covered 2 176 birds, of which the five species mentioned earlier by the member for Rockingham accounted for 243 birds.

The species acclimatised in Australia accounted for another 162 birds, leaving a balance of 1 771 birds which under the new regulations will be transferred to the new category 1(a). This is considered to be a reasonable estimate of what we can expect to occur.

The Government has gone a long way to acceding to the request of the aviculturists and bird societies. I feel sure that fair-minded people will agree that the regulations we have put forward are a very fair compromise. For the reasons I have given I oppose the motion.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [2.59 p.m.]: This debate revolves around the question of disallowing regulations, as a result of a motion moved by the member for Rockingham. It was moved after certain discussions had taken place between him and other members of Parliament who were made aware of the fact that some concern was felt by aviculturists as they considered their rights were being infringed upon by these regulations which are of a restrictive nature. That appears to be the position on the surface, and certainly on investigation. The hobby they had indulged in, not for two or three years, but for 40 years or more, was in jeopardy.

I might say I did not wait until such time as that occurred before I took an active interest. I would like to deal with some correspondence I received as early as the 6th May this year from the Avicultural & Wildlife Association. It was a circular letter adressed, "To all Members of the State Parliament", so I have no doubt that every member would be aware of what is in the circular if he or she read it. I took note of the attitude of some of those officers attached to the Agriculture Protection Board.

When I look at some of the remarks in the letter I become deeply concerned. If they are correct I find myself unable to sustain any sort of sympathy for the people concerned with the regulations.

I want to quote a short paragraph because it is important. In the first instance the circular referred to the fact that officers of the vermin branch of the APB had produced a list of rules which had never been approved by Parliament or published in the *Government Gazette*. The letter then stated—

> After some further conversation, including comment about the shooting of Long-billed Corellas, he was then asked what organisation he belonged to. When he replied, "The Avicultural and Wildlife Association", they said, "Oh yes! That bloody mob! We're going to sort that mob out after the new amendments to the Vermin Act are passed by Parliament. We will then have the authority to enter any property without a warrant be it private, residential, industrial, or what have you, and anyone who impedes us will be up for a fine of one thousand dollars. We are then going to Hartley King's place and rip him to pieces."

When an association writes to all members of Parliament in such vein—and no-one during the debate has to my knowledge mentioned that particular accusation—I feel the matter should be raised in the House because it is an accusation against public servants. Until such time as the Minister or someone else is prepared to say that such is not the case, I am accepting the word of the association that that is what took place.

The history of this rotten deal has continued over many years when we have subjected these people to a sort of vilification which is not in keeping with what should be done by a department and its officers who profess to assist not only those who may be in jeopardy as a result of the release of the birds, but also those who wish to keep the birds.

I would like to point out too, as I proceed, that some of the remarks of the Minister today are not correct, when we consider the actual history of the birds which it is said should not be kept in the State. In fact, the early suggestion was that they all ought to be killed off, or at least some of them.

I do not set myself up as a bird expert. Quite frankly, I would not know any more than two or three of the main species; but I am concerned seriously and sincerely with the right of people to engage in a hobby which for 70-odd years has not proved to be of any danger to the agricultural people in this State or in any other State. In fact, in Queensland, some of the species which we are told cause so much damage, are encouraged and are a feature of the tourist trade on Queensland's south coast, to such an extent that the birds are fed two or three times a day, and in one particular sanctuary, they come in their thousands to be fed in this way. In that State the Government goes out of its way to provide more and more reserves so that those birds can be protected; and apparently they are not doing the damage we are led to believe they can do. This applies at least in one State; that is, Queensland.

I did not waste any time after receiving the letter of the 6th May, because on the 9th May I endeavoured to ascertain the truth by ringing the APB. I spoke to an officer of that organisation and he was very courteous indeed to me. He gave me information. When I challenged him about what had been said against the board and the Minister, he referred to them as wild accusations and said he did not think they were correct. I suggested that unless he could come up with something more concrete I was prepared to assume that there was at least some substance in the allegations.

He went on to tell me of certain guidelines which had been laid down for some years on the keeping of birds. He sent me a lot of information on the 12th May together with a long letter covering 1½ foolscap pages in which he set out the then existing categories of birds which were X, A and B, C, and D. He then set out a lot of further information including a copy of the cross-reference index detailing the species of birds in the various categories. I have the document here and also a copy of the broadcast by the Chief Executive Officer of the APB concerning aviary birds.

Having looked at the attachments and the letter I felt there appeared to be reasons for our acting cautiously on the keeping of particular species of birds in Western Australia. However, again I did some research and about that time the regulations appeared in this House and they did not measure up to some of the things I had ascertained about certain birds.

Not being an expert, I did undertake some research in South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland when I visited the Eastern States. There did not seem to be a great degree of worry in those States about the release of these birds and the possibility of their becoming pests in those States. I am not saying there was no concern, but my investigation revealed that there was no great concern. I did not go into the matter in depth beause of a lack of time, but certainly on the south coast of Queensland there was no worry at all about the birds, some of which have been named as pests under our legislation.

Mr H. D. Evans: The south coast is the Gold Coast.

Mr SKIDMORE: I thank the member for Warren for the correction.

The Secretary of the Avicultural and Wildlife Association rang me on the 28th July to ascertain whether I could visit her regarding the regulations. She wanted to see me before Parliament resumed. I did not see her, but representatives of the association met various committees of the parties concerned which had shown interest in the pressure exerted on these people. On the 8th August another letter was sent "To all Members of the State Parliament" in which the association appealed to the elected parliamentary representatives to protect its members' hobby. This is what those on this side of the House are endeavouring to do.

I am not prepared to accept the words of the Minister for Agriculture who says that because there is a grave danger the regulations must be invoked. The reason he has given is that one species in America has caused devastation to crops. Because of one species having done this in America, we are now supposed to group all species in that category, forgetting the environmental impact to which they are subjected in their native land. I understand that the birds breed in South America, but if we transferred those birds to Australia is it logical to assume that those or any other species, subjected to a different type of environment, would be as dangerous as has been suggested?

When we consider the long diatribe of rubbish which has been issued over the years by the department on this subject, we find it belies that fact.

There are thousands of species of birds in the world and I have in my hand some 40 sheets of close typing which detail all birds which are supposed to be a danger. What documentation or proof have we been given to indicate that this is so? Not one shred. The Minister said that in California one species of bird has caused devastation and will cause the same devastation in Western Australia.

I would like to refer to an article in the *Australian Encyclopaedia*. Some 30 authorities contributed to the article but I will not name them all. They include J. Gould, "Birds of Australia" (eight volumes, 1840-69) and "Handbook to the Birds of Australia" (two volumes, 1865); S. Diggles, "Ornithology of Australia" (1866-70); R. Hall, "Key to the Birds of Australia" (1899), and so on.

Coming to more modern times and those involved in more modern research, I mention D. L. Serventy and H. M. Whittell, "Birds of Western Australia", and so the article continues.

The *Australian Encyclopaedia* accepted the words of wisdom of those people, and continues—

> Approximately 40 species of birds from other countries have lived in a free state in Australia from time to time and at least 15 of these species are well-established in certain parts of the Commonwealth. Some of the introductions have been effected through the birds being imported by acclimatization societies; others have occurred through specimens escaping or being released from aviaries or through domesticated birds wandering into the bush.

Incidentally in my own simple way I am aware that some of the species which are supposed to be pests in Australia are no more pests than our backyard fowls.

Mr Old: That is not the opinion of the experts.

Mr SKIDMORE: Well, the Minister should produce the evidence from the experts to illustrate that some of the birds which he mentioned have become pests to the agriculturists in this State.

Mr Old: Potential pests.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to refer to some of the species which have been released from time to time and failed to become established, according to the source I mentioned. They include Java and Chinese sparrows, the chaffinch, yellow-hammer, linnet, bullfinch, siskin-finch, English robin, ortolan, canary, and, among the larger birds, the partridge, guinea-fowl, Indian jungle-fowl, pin-tailed sand-grouse and Chinese horned owl. Those names do not mean very much to me and probably do not mean very much to other members in the House, but they are some of the birds which have been named as pests but have failed to become established.

The opinion of the department is not backed up by those people who have written the article to which I have referred, and who are considered to be experts. They are the same experts who were consulted by the department prior to the publication and the documentation of the birds I have previously mentioned. The report goes on to indicate that there is no great danger from those birds I have named.

Other domesticated birds which have gone wild include the turkey, the common pheasant, and the common fowl. Britain's mute swan also has bred in some areas, notably in Western Australia. The last named has not caused any great trouble. In fact, it is probably recognised as the emblem of our State by various departments. The same bird has even been sent by this Government to become acclimatised on the River Thames.

Mr Davies: That will make them happy.

Mr SKIDMORE: The article states that birds from other countries, which have become well established in Australia, include the house-sparrow, tree-sparrow, starling, blackbird, song-thrush, skylark, goldfinch, greenfinch, and the common munia, red-whiskered bulbul, Chinese spice-finch, Indian turtle-dove, and the cattle egret—all from Asia. The article goes on to say that some of the birds undoubtedly are acquisitions from the aesthetic viewpoint, and that the songs of the thrush and blackbird are, for example, refreshing.

I wonder whether aviculturists would want to keep those birds? I guess they would not have one of them. We are faced with the situation where we have to try to decide whether or not the association I have mentioned, and the local bird associations are receiving justice from this Government. I doubt very much whether they are.

The first set of regulations was so stupid it would really make one laugh. It was proposed that aviaries should have a double wire fence so that if a bird broke through the first wire it would be faced with a second wire. I am aware that many birds are able to eat their way through a wire fence. It could be suggested that an additional six wire fences should be provided because a bird which is able to eat through one wire mesh would be able to eat through another.

It seems that the wire mesh is not so much to keep the birds in, but to keep animals out. I know some dogs are fairly stupid but a dog would have to be extraordinarily stupid to try to push its way

through half mesh galvanised wire in order to get into an aviary. It seems that some sense prevailed and the Government has done away with that particular regulation. However, I have to refer to it because it is germane to the argument I am putting forward.

Not enough research has been done by the Government, or by the responsible departmental officers. Not one shred of evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the species of birds which have been listed, if released in this State—or in Australia generally—would become pests. The whole research which has been carried out has been based on the fact that similar birds, when released in their own habitat, have become pests; but that is entirely different.

We already have a number of bird pests in Australia, such as galahs and cockatoos, which cause considerable damage. It is well known that grape crops are badly damaged, particularly in the Swan Valley with which I am associated. Are we to assume that if those birds were transported to California they would become acclimatised there and, in turn, would become pests in the same way as they have done in this country? We are asked to believe that the aviculturists in this State suggested the amendments to the legislation. I believe that is a specious argument to put forward.

The department is telling the aviculturists that the species of birds mentioned will be considered to be dangerous until the aviculturists prove that they are not. Until that time the birds will not be allowed to be kept except under the restrictions proposed.

Mr Stephens: Is that not fair enough?

Mr SKIDMORE: Of course not. After spending some 10 years researching the matter the department has not come up with one valid argument to sustain the fact that the birds mentioned would become pests and dangerous if released. The department is telling the aviculturists that because it cannot prove the birds will be dangerous, they cannot be kept until it is proved they are not dangerous. Although the department has not been able to prove anything through its research the aviculturists will have to prove that the birds are not dangerous before they are removed from the list.

I well remember the Premier remarking that the State of Western Australia had been overcontrolled by Government departments.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Did he say that?

Mr SKIDMORE: He made that statement in a speech supporting the Liberal candidate for the Greenough by-election. It seems to be a tongue-in-cheek attitude because we are to be controlled and restricted by regulations which have no sensible base.

I, as an individual, will not in the future be able to keep the birds mentioned. I will not be able to enter the industry of breeding birds for my own enjoyment. The industry will be restricted to those who are involved in it at the present time.

Bird raising is a popular hobby. I admit my knowledge is limited but I understand, the same as is the case with cattle, dogs, and other species of animals, that unless new blood and new stock are introduced the birds will eventually die out anyway because of inbreeding.

Is this what the department wants? Is this its method of control? Is this the way it will go about destroying the hobby of people in Western Australia? It is not an inconsiderable hobby, I might say, and it brings a considerable amount of wealth to those in this State who produce the seed, grade it, and pack it, and those who supply the aviaries, the wire netting, the birds, and everything else. It is quite an extensive industry and it will be lost to Western Australia through these regulations.

The Premier has said we are overregulated. I could not agree with him more. I wish he would get the message across to the Agriculture Protection Board and the Minister for Agriculture, because they have not got it.

Mr Thompson: Is it not a fact that the previous Government was negotiating to bring in certain regulations?

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not mind answering that question. I am going to be honest enough while I am here to answer such questions. Of course it was. It was the subject of a report, and I will quote from it. In paragraph 9 of a report by Mr A. R. Tomlinson entitled "Notes on Reasons for the Vermin (Declared Birds) Regulations" it is stated—

> When agreement was reached, the details were submitted to the previous (Labor) Cabinet and received approval.

Had I been a member of this House when a previous Liberal or Labor Government brought in regulations of this kind, I would have protested; but I was not here then so I was not able to do so. A mistake made by a Labor Government is just as bad as a mistake made by a Liberal Government, and that does not take away anything from my argument. If a law made two years ago is considered today to be a bad law, that does not mean it was a bad law two years ago.

The evidence produced since the time the Labor Government looked at the situation has proved to my mind, beyond a shadow of doubt, that there is no need for regulations in the present form. The Minister said the departmental officers had gone a long way towards overcoming the objections of the aviculturists in this State. I say they have gone a short way and that they have a long way to go to achieve what the Premier suggests; that is, fewer regulations and more freedom for the people.

I have nothing further to say on this question. I am critical of the regulations and I find there is no validity in their intent. I am not convinced that any of these so-called pests could cause trouble if they were to escape.

Mr Laurance: If one of these species becomes a pest to agricultural industries and it costs millions of dollars to get rid of it, who will pay for it?

Mr SKIDMORE: That is the kind of argument the Agriculture Protection Board put up. When the time comes that it can be proved to me that a species of bird could become a pest in this country if released, I would agree to its being banned.

Mr Old: It would be too late then.

Mr SKIDMORE: The honourable member says they could cause damage costing millions of dollars. That is ridiculous because some of these species of birds have been in captivity for years. The documentation goes back to 1840-1869, when J. Gould wrote about the birds of Australia.

Mr Laurance: Who will pay the cost?

Mr SKIDMORE: Of a supposed incident? I do not know because the supposed incident has not occurred. I do not think it will occur because none of those birds has proved to be a pest in the last 70 years. None of these so-called pests, which have become acclimatised in this State or other States, has been released, other than the starling and the sparrow which were introduced and set free, not by the aviculturists but by the early settlers. So the argument that some species will cause trouble is not true. I appreciate the concern of the member for Gascoyne for the agricultural industries.

Mr Laurance: Skeleton weed cost $34 million last year in New South Wales alone. One pest—vermin or whatever it may be—can cost millions of dollars.

Mr SKIDMORE: We are aware of the evidence in relation to skeleton weed. We dare not abolish the Agriculture Protection Board's examination point at Norseman. It is quite right that cars should be pulled up and searched at Norseman to ensure they are not carrying any plants which could be detrimental to this State. My car was searched on four occasions between Brisbane and Perth. That is a good thing. I believe those inspectors should also look for imported birds; I do not quarrel with that. However, that is a different matter altogether.

Of course, I would be equally concerned if the honourable member could prove to me that one of the species of birds which are supposed to be a pest to agriculture in the Eastern States could escape into Western Australia and cause trouble. My argument is that it has not happened in 70 years and I doubt very much that it will happen in the next 70 years because of the rigid control aviculturists place upon their members. They are not irresponsible, as suggested by the Agriculture Protection Board. What would they do? Would they leave a cage door open and allow birds which have cost $10, $40, or $50 a pair to escape, when they can trade them and make a profit? If the profit enables them to obtain more birds, provided they are controlled by an association I believe they should have an unfettered right to indulge in a hobby as befits the people of Western Australia. In the words of the Premier, let us have less regulation.

In summing up I simply say no satisfactory proof has been given to me as a member of Parliament and as a representative of the people in my electorate who keep birds. I am concerned for them in a parochial way. I would be equally concerned for the people who grow vines in the valley if I thought for one moment that any of the birds in captivity could cause devastation of the vineyards. In that event, I would put the birds in category 7, if such a category existed, and have them shot, because there would be no place for them in Western Australia. But no shred of evidence has been produced to show there is any danger from these birds. All we have had is the browbeating of people, and it is to the credit of the Avicultural & Wildlife Association that its members have stood up to everything that has been thrown at them by the department and the officers concerned; and the Combined Bird Organisations has likewise stood up and said, "We don't want to cop it. We don't want it, we don't like it, and it is an infringement of the rights of the citizens of Western Australia."

A conscientious effort should be made to understand that the arguments put up by the departmental officers and the Agriculture Protection Board are specious. It will be a sorry day for the Government if it goes ahead with these regulations in the present form without making an effort to understand that the people in this State are entitled to indulge in a hobby which for 70 years has not been proved to be detrimental to industry or agriculture. Our indigenous birds would create more havoc in this State than the named species which have not escaped in the last 70 years. I condemn the regulations. I believe they are no good and should be rejected out of hand, and that the Agriculture Protection Board and others concerned should go back and talk to the people who have a right to keep birds in this State.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.30 p.m.]: My worry about the regulations we are discussing is that the department, acting as a watchdog on our behalf, seems to be unduly harsh. Over the years I have seen similar action in regard to legislation and regulations relating to what the department regards as pests. At one time we had considerable debate here about

German Shepherd dogs, but it was never proved to anyone's satisfaction that the dogs could do the damage that the departmental officers thought they could. No proof has been produced that German Shepherd dogs will cross-breed with wild dingoes. Even now the Department of Agriculture is conducting tests along these lines.

As the member for Swan said, insufficient research is undertaken before regulations are promulgated. Having spoken to some aviculturists, this appears to be the case with the regulations we are discussing. Usually after regulations are promulgated, the department undertakes experiments. It will probably be found that the birds which the department considers could be a danger to us cannot exist and propagate naturally in this State.

If we look at the pests we have—those which are requiring some effort to eradicate—we see that they were introduced here inadvertently. The fruit-fly, the Argentine ant, and others, were not introduced deliberately. I do not blame the department for taking some care in this regard, but its attitude towards people who keep birds as a hobby is far too harsh.

I have visited many aviaries. Keen aviculturists keep their birds in a far better condition than are those in the Zoological Gardens. In many cases the aviculturists are responsible for retaining a species that would become extinct otherwise. However, the department takes the view that many species of birds are our mortal enemies. I was an onlooker when a committee met with members of the department in this very building. There was the distinct atmosphere of antagonism between the two factions. While the aviculturists may be a little uncompromising—

Mr Old: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: —the department itself is a little uncompromising too.

Mr Old: That has not been demonstrated by the changes in the regulations.

Mr JAMIESON: The department has altered a few of them.

Mr Old: A few of them!

Mr JAMIESON: Just a few. From the tenor of the Minister's speech, one would have thought the department had brought down a completely new set to overcome the major objections.

Mr Old: Well, that is quite so.

Mr JAMIESON: Surely these matters could be discussed more fully before a final decision is made.

I mentioned before the controversy about the German Shepherd dogs, and members may remember also that the keeping of rabbits came in for its share of criticism. The only place where white rabbits are kept now is in the country—they are kept by the very people who objected to them. Pet white rabbits were taken away from children, and it is very doubtful whether any of them could have existed independently in our conditions. I believe far more research should be undertaken before a final decision is made. Certainly we cannot allow people to release these birds indiscriminately, and aviculturists would not do that anyway. If necessary the department could attach special conditions to the keeping of certain species. This course would be far more acceptable than a complete prohibition. I cannot see that these double-wired aviaries are necessary.

Mr Old: That provision has been repealed.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes. However, I am speaking of certain species which are still classified as being of special danger. Surely discussions could be held between the department and people who desire to keep these birds. We should not expect aviculturists to destroy certain species. Birds are a delight in the community.

Mr Old: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: I am referring to birds on the wing, rather than those to which the honourable member referred. However, I suppose they are a delight also.

Mr Blaikie: The birds on the wing are better than the ones that are not.

Mr JAMIESON: This depends on one's individual outlook. However, birds are birds whatever they are—

Mr Old: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: —and we should not object to people who wish to keep them. We should look into this matter in far greater detail.

When these regulations were under attack some years ago I undertook a fair amount of research in the matter. It was discovered that goldfinches were being cross-mated with other birds, and it was felt that the species should not be kept in captivity because they were a potential danger. The appearance of goldfinches in the metropolitan area at that time was the result of an accident at the Zoological Gardens when a fair number of them escaped. There were quite a few charms of goldfinches around the metropolitan area, but they did not seem to do any damage. Some people peppered their gardens with DDT, and as the birds fed on the insects, they ingested the poison and did not last very long.

Mr Old: That is a good example that the birds can breed outside.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, and it is delightful that they can breed outside aviaries. If it can be shown that certain species will be dangerous, we must endeavour to ensure that they will not breed outside aviaries. However, as the member for Swan pointed out, it has not been shown that they can breed outside. We may have an added delight with a few of these birds around. I am aware of all the objections raised

about sparrows and starlings in the Eastern States, but to hear them in the early morning is a pleasure, and nature has provided that they do some good. Probably we will never be able to boast that Perth is comparatively free of flies, but the situation would be much better with a few more birds around the place. The birds destroy insects and thus provide a natural balance. We have established a western city, but we do not let nature have its way because of our fear that the birds will cause problems. We are aware of the problem of birds to the fruit growers and in regard to general living conditions. As the member for Swan and others have indicated, the aviculturists are concerned only to keep species which are of interest to them in their hobby, and I think they should be permitted to do this.

There are ways to overcome any objections. For many years there were no restrictions, and I can recall Japanese nightingales and other species being introduced here in the 1930s. Many of these birds escaped, and I remember once inadvertently I let some of these nightingales escape from my uncle's aviary. However, this species is not now plaguing us. Probably the birds died or were killed by cats when they were released. People liked to keep Japanese nightingales just to hear them sing in the same way that they like to have canaries.

Mr Thompson: How old were you when you let your uncle's birds out?

Mr JAMIESON: My age at the time does not matter; however, I assure the member that I regretted it.

This is a problem which will be ever with us. Sure some birds may escape, but as the hobby of keeping birds is becoming more and more sophisticated I do not think there is any great danger that the people who spend money on securing and keeping birds for their own enjoyment are likely to let the birds escape. Maybe the odd bird will get away, but it takes two to tango and there is not much danger if an odd bird gets out, as long as they are not escaping in plague proportions. Even since virtually a whole aviary of birds of a species that could acclimatise themselves escaped from the zoo no damage has resulted. Those birds are a delight. Probably if anyone has small sunflowers growing in his garden the birds will be attracted to them in the summer months when the flowers go to seed, because this seems to be a natural attraction to them.

My personal observation is that the department is inclined to be heavy-handed in respect of these matters. It should take great care not only in respect of what it thinks could result in damage to agricultural industries or to the ordinary environment of the State, but also in respect of the damage which may be done to those people who have a love for the hobby of keeping birds and who have grown up with that hobby. I would be loath to be associated with any move that would disturb these people from their hobby, provided they play the game. I have not seen any evidence that they have not been prepared to play the game with the Department of Agriculture; but on the other hand my personal observation is that the department is heavy-handed.

For those reasons I support the motion to disallow the regulations.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [3.42 p.m.]: In view of the fact that the Minister concerned has made a speech in response to the mover of the motion and therefore cannot re-enter the debate, I would make some comment on his behalf in respect of the very vicious attack made most unfairly on officers of the Agriculture Protection Board. This is typical of the type of attack which does the movement which is seeking to get the restrictions relaxed no good at all.

It seems as though there has been very strong feeling on both sides in this matter, with the result that it is difficult—and the Minister in particular finds it difficult—to harmonise the views of all concerned in a way that would appear to be rational and sensible. The people concerned have been requested by the present Minister and by his predecessor to name the persons in respect of whom they have made allegations and to give details so that the officers concerned can be investigated and, if necessary, disciplined. The Minister and the board certainly do not want these sorts of officers around.

It is quite unfair for people to make allegations without naming anybody or giving facts that can be substantiated, and then have their statements used in Parliament as though they are facts, when the persons against whom the allegations are made cannot defend themselves. The Minister concerned cannot do anything to discipline the officers—if discipline is in fact necessary—unless he has the names and details. Therefore, I appeal to these people to name the officers concerned if their cases are genuine and to be prepared to give the necessary information so that the board and the Minister can take action.

Mr Skidmore: They took it up with the department; they took it up direct with the officers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not talking about taking up the matter with the department.

Mr Skidmore: What do you want them to do? Write you a love letter?

Sir CHARLES COURT: What I am saying is that the people who make the allegations should be prepared to name the officers concerned. I ask the member for Swan whether he is prepared to name the officers who have offended—

Mr Skidmore: I will give that information to the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —because in the correspondence I have seen some people have been prepared to say very harsh and, I believe, scandalous things about officers, but have never been prepared to name the officers concerned.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 p.m.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The point I was making before the suspension of the sitting was the desire of the Minister to be told by some of these people or by members of Parliament exactly who are these officers and under what circumstances have they said and done the things they are alleged to have said and done so that the board, the Minister, or both can take some action about it.

I believe that is a fair request and I make it on behalf of the Minister because he is as anxious as any of us to do something about the matter. One gets the impression that the only people who have any love for birds are those on the other side of the House; but there are just as many bird lovers on this side.

Mr Skidmore: They are conspicuous by their silence.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Some of the impassioned orations we have heard do not do the cause any good at all. The very same people—including the member for Swan—who have been so loud today in their criticism of the board, the officers of the department and the Minister would be the very people who would stand in this place with righteous indignation if one of these species were allowed to get out, and become a pest. I could almost write their speeches for them.

Mr Skidmore: Do not bother, Mr Premier; I prefer to write my own speeches, and I believe they would be much more valid than a speech you would be likely to write.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The simple fact is that one cannot be certain as to what is going to happen in any of these cases until it has happened. We do not want it to happen and the honourable member who moved this motion would not want it to happen. It would be too late then.

Mr Barnett: That is like saying that you may possibly commit a murder, and that just in case you do we will keep you locked up. That is a stupid argument.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The important thing is that the board keeps these matters under review. It is no good the member for Rockingham mumbling away. The fact is that the board has a responsibility in the matter and if it did not undertake its responsibilities seriously, members in this place would be screaming blue murder.

I know of at least three cases in the last 12 years where people have wanted to breed rabbits. They have come along and put forward the most extraordinary, complicated and comprehensive suggestions relating to security, and have claimed that not one single rabbit would ever get out.

Mr Skidmore: And join the other thousands of millions of rabbits running around the place.

Sir CHARLES COURT: They overlook the fact that small children and careless people will leave gates open; all sorts of things could happen and we could get back to the situation of 20 or 30 years ago. It is bad enough now, with the left-over rabbits starting to multiply again as they overcome some of the eradication measures such as myxomatosis and others, which were responsible for such a devastating annihilation of these pests. However, of course, like so many of these measures, eventually they lose their effectiveness, and something else must be used. No-one wants to keep any bird on this list unnecessarily.

Mr Barnett: Then take them all off the list.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am glad to hear the member for Rockingham say that because it will be very interesting at a later date to quote him. He apparently is quite prepared to take all the risks, throw everything to the wind and allow the entire rural industry of this State always to be subject to the potential menace these birds would represent.

Mr Skidmore: The birds have been here for all these years; they have caused no trouble under the old regulations. Why do we want new regulations to control the problem?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The member for Swan sets himself up as an expert on everything and a spokesman for everybody; he speaks with a very authoritarian air to which we have all become so accustomed. We know he is a member of that dying race which loves to make speeches and to hear itself talk.

I remind the member for Swan that some people have responsibilities which must be respected. A great deal of emotiveness has been generated in respect of this matter. If members were to read some of the letters I receive, they would see how emotive they are; people assume the authorities want to annihilate every bird, but of course that is nothing near the truth. It is time some of this emotiveness was taken out of the debate. Members of Parliament who adopt the attitude displayed during this debate do not help the cause.

I should imagine that if the Minister and the board reduced the list to as low as they could with reasonable safety, they are the people—that is, the board and the Minister—who would be castigated from one end of the country to the other if

there were any mishap in regard to these birds, because if we find ourselves with a pest, it is too late then.

My advice to those concerned is to have a little patience and if they find there is a bird on the list that cannot be justified, then for goodness sake let them take the necessary steps to have it removed instead of showing the emotiveness we have seen recently, because probably the board and the Government would be much more susceptible to a reasonable approach than this present abrasive one.

That is my main concern in regard to the motion and I hope the member for Rockingham will supply to the Minister and the board the names of the people who allegedly have made these statements and made the threats that have been quoted here today from the letters written to several members of Parliament.

Mr Skidmore: They have been sent to all members of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I know of two letters, and I have a copy of one letter, but there is no reference to any person. To make such dastardly allegations, but not say who the person is, is a cowardly act. That is all we are asking; namely, to find out the person who has said these things, and then some action can and will be taken.

The Minister assures me that both he and his predecessor wrote asking for names and information so that the necessary action can be taken, but he has had no response. That is the point I want to record.

MR BARNETT (Rockingham) [4.12 p.m.]: It is my lot to summarise what members before me have said on my motion which seeks to remove the discriminatory regulations about which we have heard so much.

The only shred of evidence that has come forward during the debate here or anywhere else of any control being placed on any bird of any type whatsoever has come from the Minister for Works who mentioned the "double-breasted mattress thrasher". That bird probably came from Kalgoorlie, where it is under some sort of control and causes no trouble whatsoever. It does, however, cause trouble in certain parts of the metropolitan area and I believe there is a Royal Commission investigating it at the moment. However, it is only in connection with that bird that any evidence has been brought forward to show that this sort of control is necessary.

When the Minister for Agriculture spoke to the motion he said that these regulations were gazetted only after long consultations and after many meetings between aviculturists and the APB. Only one part of that statement has any semblance of truth, and that is his reference to the holding of many meetings. I do not think consultation means the laying down of the law from one side, because the APB told the aviculturists, "This is what we will have".

Mr Old: Did you not attend some of these meetings?

Mr BARNETT: Yes I did.

Mr Old: And did you not make several suggestions that were placed in the regulations?

Mr BARNETT: Yes, I did make several suggestions.

Mr Old: Would not that be regarded as consultation?

Mr BARNETT: These meetings were not consultations, but constituted demands from the APB to the aviculturists that these were the regulations they were going to have; that they were, in no way, going to be changed. The statement that has been made on many occasions at the meetings that have been held by Mr Des Gooding of the APB is that there would be no amendments whatsoever.

Also during his speech the Minister cited several birds as examples; these being the reason for the regulations. One of these birds was the monk parakeet. From questions asked in the last couple of weeks, I know, and the Minister's department knows, that there are only two monk parakeets in this State.

Mr Old: If they are a mother and a father, that is enough.

Mr BARNETT: Yes, I agree. The Minister puts forward an argument that these birds are particularly dangerous in California—or "Californ-i-a" as the member for Swan says. At this stage I thank the member for Swan for his speech which lent support to my motion for the disallowance of the regulations. I also thank the member for Welshpool for speaking in support of the motion. I will not thank the Minister. I do not know who prepared his speech, but it is one of the poorest I have heard in this House, because it has no basis in fact. The Premier did not really touch on the subject during his remarks. He merely stated that we were going about the matter in the wrong way, so that is all I will say about the Premier's speech.

However, the Minister has said that these regulations are needed to control the aviculturists, and he cites the monk parakeet as an example of a dangerous bird. He has said that because it causes harm in California it could cause a great deal of harm in this State, and therefore we need regulations to control aviculturists.

Such controls have always existed, and the Department of Agriculture can control the import of birds into this State now. It could yesterday and it could last month. In fact, it has always been able to control the imports of birds. The department had sufficient control over aviculturists through the original regulations that were prescribed. It does not need these regulations

at all. The regulations in question have been drawn for one purpose only. They have been drawn specifically to keep in employment probably about three Government officers. Those officers have spent about 10 years drafting these regulations and what a farce they are. The only reason I can find for their being employed is that they drafted these regulations.

Mr Old: Absolute rot!

Mr BARNETT: I hope that in considering the matters that have been raised since I made my original speech members will give some thought to what has been said not only by me but by several other members of this Chamber. Members should certainly not give any consideration to what the Minister said and I hope they will not vote on party lines. I hope they will view the motion on the basis of the information that has been put forward to them in this House. If they do so they will have no alternative but to vote for the disallowance of these regulations.

From the amendments put forward by the Minister and the Department of Agriculture since I moved my motion, it appears that the APB has made considerable concessions. I said before that a senior officer had said there would be no change whatsoever. We have had no evidence presented to show that these regulations are absolutely necessary, but what have we seen in the last few weeks? We have seen the Government bring forward massive amendments to them. I do not dispute that they may be a step forward, but they are nowhere near the step forward that should be taken. The regulations should never have been drafted in the first place.

As pointed out in several speeches, the original regulations were submitted on the word of one man who will not, or cannot, put forward the evidence he has compiled to show that these regulations are really necessary.

We are asked to vote on these regulations without any evidence whatever to show that the APB is correct. We are asked to stand up and say, "Oh, yes, the APB says it is all right so it must be correct." However, it has been shown that the APB has made many mistakes in the past.

Mr Shalders: It will be interesting to see what a Labor Government will do with the APB.

Mr BARNETT: I do not know the exact words, but in an interjection made in an earlier speech it was said that the Labor Government was going to introduce these regulations, or was considering them. The interjection was made along those lines. I do not know whether such a suggestion came before Cabinet. I was not in Cabinet, of course, nor was I present in Caucus, but from reading the minutes I know it did not consider it. Had it come before Caucus, I am sure it would not have been passed. Had I been present at the Caucus meeting it would not have been passed. I am positive of that. I am now a member of Caucus, and it has not been passed.

Mr O'Neil: You are not in Government. That is the difference.

Mr Thompson: That is a different situation altogether.

Mr BARNETT: Members opposite have only a Cabinet; they are not allowed to make decisions. I suppose they will vote on party lines. During his speech the Premier said he felt it was cowardly to make any statements without using names to back them up. In this regard I want to quote a section of a report from the services branch of the Agriculture Protection Board. In that report the following appears—

> The regulations were based on the most extensive and intensive research ever carried out in the world, on the introduction of birds into different localities and the results of those introductions. The work has been vetted and approved by the most eminent professional ornithologists in W.A., at least one of whom is world renowned for his work and opinions. Yet this is in danger of being set aside as a result of the actions of a very few people who, as yet, have produced no evidence of any substance to support their case.

What a lot of rubbish that is! First of all the Agriculture Protection Board will not name its eminent ornithologist; and secondly it has the hide, the gall, and the audacity to say it is being frustrated by the actions of a very few people who as yet have produced no evidence of any substance to support their case. The APB has not produced evidence to support anything.

Mr Old: You supported it at the meeting.

Mr BARNETT: I asked a question in this House for the purpose of having the report which indicates the work this person has done for the APB tabled, but my request was refused.

Mr Skidmore: There is no report.

Mr BARNETT: There is, because I have read it. Permission to table it in the House was refused. The tabling of that report would have enabled the public to read its contents. I had to go to a great deal of trouble to find the person who had compiled that report, and to read it. I do not set myself up as an expert, but in my opinion there is nothing in that report to support these regulations.

Mr Old: Did you not attend any of the earlier meetings with the APB and agree that the regulations were necessary?

Mr BARNETT: I attended the first meeting between the aviculturists and the APB.

Mr Old: When was that?

Mr BARNETT: I will tell the Minister and the Premier what was said by one officer of the APB.

Mr Old: What did you say?

Mr BARNETT: That was years ago. I remember the circumstances very vividly. The statement was made by Mr Des Gooding after the meeting, "While I wish you luck, you will have a tough fight. You will have to fight me." That was a statement from a man who at that time knew nothing about aviculture and knows probably even less now.

Mr Old: Did you attend the meeting in 1973?

Mr BARNETT: The Minister wanted names, and he is getting them.

Mr P. V. Jones: Did you attend the meeting in 1973 with the Combined Bird Organisations, when their representatives met the APB, the fauna wardens, and the wildlife officers?

Mr BARNETT: No.

Mr Old: Then you must have been wrongly recorded in the minutes!

Mr P. V. Jones: The minutes also show you were in agreement with the suggested regulations.

Mr BARNETT: I beg to differ. Why did not the Minister quote them? It would be a terrific case for him to put up to counter my argument. Incidentally, I have all the minutes with me, and I could quote from them.

Mr Old: That will not be necessary. We know you were there.

Mr BARNETT: The APB has made allegations that these birds could become a menace. However, it has not put forward any evidence in support of its contention. The APB has merely said that the aviculturists must now show that what the APB has put forward is not correct. Under what system of law are we living in this country? If the Federal Minister for Labor and Immigration were here he would be looking for a "red" under his seat in view of the sort of regulations that we see before us.

We have succeeded in effecting massive amendments. There is to be a new category of birds, to be known as category 1 (a), in which, as the Minister pointed out, most of the birds in former category 2 are to be placed. Now it will be possible to keep those birds under the same conditions as are applicable to category 1 birds, the only proviso being that they are not permitted to be imported.

The only other changes that are to be made relate to the removal of double wiring requirements, the $2 permit fee, and the deletion of the words in the last two lines of the regulations which were published in the *Government Gazette*. The words are "NOTE: Forward a fee only if you do not already hold a permit for the category of declared bird now being applied for."

If any aviculturist wants to change his permit he will have to pay a fee of $1. Many of them buy one bird a week, so it will cost them $50 a year to change their permits, as a result of the deletion of the two lines I have mentioned.

Whilst I am aware the Minister will not change the regulations, I hope he will give consideration to replacing those two lines in the regulations. The Minister also said he would refund the money which aviculturists had already paid for their permits under the old regulations. There are over 300 people who have applied for permits, and I submit that a refund of $18 to each of those people would represent a fairly large amount which the department will have to refund. That is another nail in the coffin of the argument used by the Minister. This merely goes to show what is being done represents massive changes. These massive changes prove one thing: that the original regulations as gazetted were no good.

Mr Thompson: These unbending people in the department and in the Government have agreed to change them!

Mr BARNETT: If they were good they would not have been changed. If they were not good—that is evident because we now see hurried amendments being effected—is it not fair to assume that the amendments also could be no good? I submit that they are not good.

Mr Old: That is different from what you told me when I brought them in.

Mr BARNETT: The Minister submitted only half of the information to me and he asked me what I thought about the regulations. He wanted an answer straightaway. At the time I said that on the surface they appeared to be good. I agree that it is a step in the right direction, but it is only a small step.

It has been submitted by the member for Swan that the new amendments are not very good, because the birds in category 1(a) will die out. The Minister knows that to be true, and the officers of the department are smart enough also to know that they will die out. If no new blood is introduced to the birds in category 1(a) eventually they will die out. There is no question about that. There is no reason these birds cannot be imported under the old regulations or these regulations.

I am not quite sure but I believe the Constitution of Australia would provide for people in one State to keep birds, and not permit others in another State to keep the same species of birds. This proposal is discriminatory. The Constitution must contain some provision to allow for fair treatment of all Australians, and not to segregate Western Australians from New South Welshmen or Queenslanders.

Mr Hartrey: Is the honourable member suggesting that intercourse between birds from different States should be absolutely free?

Mr BARNETT: Yes, of an avian nature! From an examination of the regulations, and the proposed amendments, it is obvious that they were formulated by someone who did not have the slightest knowledge of aviculture.

First of all, the regulations list the Latin name of those birds which will be affected, and that is fair enough. They then list 10 different names by which the birds are known so that people can identify them. However, on almost every occasion the birds are mentioned firstly, secondly, and thirdly by names which are probably unknown to people in this State. If the person who drew up the regulations knew anything about aviculture surely he would have referred to the birds by their commonly-known names here. However, that has not been the case.

I want to refer to new category 2 in the amendments, and the first bird mentioned is the English skylark. I have no argument with regard to that particular bird. The second bird mentioned is the green finch, and I have no argument with that one either. The third bird mentioned is the white-winged widow-bird, and I will argue about that because I do not believe it should be listed in the schedule. The fourth bird on the list is the black-headed munia.

The list of birds in new category 1 (a) shows that seven birds are directly related to the black-headed munia, and yet the black-headed munia is listed in category 2. Also it has six second cousins, so there are 13 birds related to it in category 1 (a), and yet, as I have said, the black-headed munia is placed in category 2. It is also probably the hardest bird of the 14 to breed.

I will argue about the spice finch. I will also argue about the Java sparrow. Although I did not argue about that bird previously, I intend to do so now. From the evidence supplied by the Department of Agriculture it appears that the Java sparrow is kept in reasonably large numbers in Perth. It seems that in the very near future they will escape in large numbers and fly to Humpty Doo and eat the rice crops! That seems to be the only reason for the inclusion of the Java sparrow in the list. I submit that a Java sparrow would have to be a hardy type of bird to be able to fly to Humpty Doo.

Mr Old: It is possible that someone in Kununurra might keep the bird in an aviary.

Mr BARNETT: The next bird I wish to refer to in category 2 is the collared turtle dove. This is the most common bird kept by novice aviculturists, both junior and senior, while they learn to look after birds. I suggest this is another case of mistaken identity because I believe the department has mistaken this bird for a dove of a similar name that was released by the acclimatisation committee many years ago and, having become acclimatised, it is now flying around Perth and has become a menace. But they are not the same bird.

The Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife is ill-informed because he said that I was at a meeting of the CBO and the APB. I am not sure of the date he mentioned, but I am sure it was before the formation of the CBO. Yet, the Minister has said I attended a meeting of that organisation with the APB. I have the proof to refute that.

Mr P. V. Jones: I did not say you had attended the meeting; I asked whether you had attended, and I suggested it was in 1973.

Mr BARNETT: The Minister said I had attended the meeting but now he is backing out.

Mr Old: He is not backing out. Just continue to speak for another half an hour.

Mr BARNETT: I will speak for a little longer.

Mr P. V. Jones: Not too little; we will tell you when to sit down.

Mr May: Don't you know now?

Mr Old: Yes, we know.

Mr May: Then what do you have to worry about?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rockingham.

Mr BARNETT: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Thompson: I thought he had gone home.

Mr BARNETT: For the information of the Minister I would like to read portion of a letter I have in my possession. The letter was sent to this State by the liaison officer of the Avicultural Society of South Australia. The letter sets out the conditions under which birds in South Australia are kept, and reads as follows—

> I have read through the regulations as they apply in your case about half a dozen times and I am still left wondering why they are so complicated. I am at a loss to understand why this phobia about birds considered vermin, apart from the sparrow and starling which were introduced by the pioneers soon after settlement, the only species that since then has become established is the spice finch in areas of Queensland and northern N.S.W. The few green finches and goldfinches that are present in some areas possibly do more good than damage. At one time java sparrows were liberated in large numbers in parts of Queensland but they never survived let alone become established.

Mr P. V. Jones: They could be the ones which are flying to Humpty Doo.

Mr Old: Some could be sold to people living in Kununurra.

Mr BARNETT: To continue—

> Possibly some of the indigenous species existing in pest proportions are more destructive than introduced exotic species. Fortunately in the National Parks and Wildlife Service here we have some very knowledgeable people—

It is a pity we do not have some knowledgeable people here. To continue—

> —in fact a number are keen aviculturists and have their own collections so we get a lot of good support in matters that are of vital importance as far as we are concerned and conservation in general.
>
> I have forwarded to Mr Long—

He is the only person who has had an opportunity to look at the research which has been carried out, because the others who were concerned were frightened to show the results. To continue the letter—

> —a complete list of all birds kept by aviculturists here, this covered indigenous and exotic and no doubt he will get the message that restrictions are not nearly so severe here.

He did not get the message or, if he did, he was downtrodden by someone in the department. If people in the Eastern States are permitted to keep certain types of birds I see no reason why we cannot keep them in this State. Even though the regulations may not be the same, people in this State should be allowed at least to keep the same types of birds as are permitted in the Eastern States. However, people in this State will not be given that opportunity.

There is no point in the Minister saying that the amendments are of a temporary nature. He knows very well that the birds mentioned will eventually die out. The aviculturists of this State will probably want to shoot me for saying this, but the situation will be created where smuggling will become rife in this State. There may well be people other than aviculturists of a less reputable nature who will see no reason why they should not sneak across the border with a shoebox full of birds and flog them here. I guarantee that will happen if these regulations are not withdrawn. As I said before, obviously these amendments have been put forward in great haste.

I want to refer also to an interjection made by the Minister during the speech of the member for Welshpool. The honourable member referred to goldfinches and the Minister interjected to the effect that this was a good example of the need for the regulations. I do not think he even heard my original speech or read it.

Mr Old: The member for Welshpool?

Mr BARNETT: Perhaps the Minister did not read it, so I will paraphrase the comments I made. My motion will be put to a vote very shortly, so I would like members to consider this example of the goldfinches. These birds were released from the Zoological Gardens, not by aviculturists, but by the acclimatisation committee. As has been pointed out, goldfinches have not been seen for the last three years.

Mr Old: If you go out to the home of the member for Welshpool, you will see them feeding on the sunflowers.

Mr BARNETT: The only person who claims to have seen a goldfinch at all in the last three years—and he claims to have seen a goldfinch once only—is the author of this report I referred to earlier—Mr John Long. The Minister said that this species was a good example of the reason for the promulgation of the regulations.

Mr Jamieson: I did say that since DDT was introduced the birds have become less apparent.

Mr BARNETT: The member for Welshpool has not seen goldfinches in his garden for three years because he has been occupied as a member of Parliament.

Mr Nanovich: I can just about see Wanneroo through your ears from here.

Mr BARNETT: The stallion from Wanneroo rears his ugly head again.

Points of Order

Mr NANOVICH: I know that the member has made various comments before, and a similar comment of his appeared in *Hansard* at one time. I say that his remark is not appropriate or parliamentary—

Mr BATEMAN: On a point of order, Sir, what is the point of order?

Mr NANOVICH: I ask the member for Rockingham to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: What is the remark?

Mr NANOVICH: He referred to me as the Wanneroo stallion.

Mr Jamieson: Don't tell me you are not entire?

Mr T. H. Jones: The Wanneroo gelding perhaps?

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Rockingham to withdraw the remark.

Mr BARNETT: I have no hesitation whatsoever in withdrawing the remark.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have lost your title now!

Debate Resumed

Mr BARNETT: I wish to make two or three more comments before I sit down. I hope the Minister for Housing hurries up in his search for the paper he is trying to find, so then he can dispute what I have said.

Mr P. V. Jones: I am not looking for it.

Mr BARNETT: Aviculturists throughout the world have been responsible for bringing back a number of species of birds from extinction.

Mr Jamieson: I think you should say from near extinction.

Mr BARNETT: I will not list all these birds. Aviculturists are responsible people and they should not be restricted by discriminatory regulations. The Minister says things with a smile on his face, but his remarks are reported in *Hansard* without the smile.

Aviculturists were responsible for saving the turquosine parrot and the nene nene goose from Hawaii. This last specie was down to only 34 birds throughout the world. They are now bred in profusion by aviculturists and raised in large quantities. They have now returned to their natural habitat in batches of 500. The white crested ivis has received the attention of aviculturists in Japan where they were down to 11, but, its numbers are now building up.

Some members referred to the ring necked pheasant as a menace. In 1886 approximately two dozen of these birds were released on Rottnest Island by the acclimatisation committee. A visitor to Rottnest Island today would be lucky to count one dozen of these birds.

Mr O'Connor: The crows have a fair bit to do with that.

Mr Jamieson: That is the very point he is making.

Mr BARNETT: I will return to the comments I made earlier. No reasonable argument has been put forward by Government members to support the retention of these regulations. Ministers can refer to the supposed experts in the department before they prepare their speeches, yet we have heard no reasoned argument, no shred of evidence during this debate or in the Press to support the promulgation of the regulations. Nothing has been tabled in this House to support the arguments of the Minister.

I hope sincerely that now the time has come to vote on my motion, members will support it. I do not ask that the regulations be disallowed for all time, but I am asking that they be disallowed so that the matter may be discussed further, and that this time the discussions should be between representatives of the Agriculture Protection Board, the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, and aviculturists under the control of a world-wide accepted authority on aviculture. The fears of the department must be discussed to prove or disprove their authenticity. That is what I am seeking. I hope members will not vote along party lines, but on the evidence put forward. I assure them that if they do that the regulations will be withdrawn for a period so that they can be investigated properly.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—19

Mr Barnett	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr May
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr Moller
Mr Harman	*(Teller)*

Noes—24

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neil
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Carr	Mr Gibson
Mr Bryce	Mr Nanovich
Mr. J. T. Tonkin	Mr Coyne

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

MILK QUOTAS

Policy Alterations: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr H. D. Evans—

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

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [4.51 p.m.]: The Dairy Industry Authority has been the subject of a previous debate on a motion moved by the member for Warren. This motion is very similar to the previous one and, in the main, the arguments used in respect of the previous motion are still valid.

However, to recap, the dairy industry has received great publicity and has been the centre of attention of late because one of its sections—the manufacturing section—is in a parlous situation. This is recognised by the member for Warren, by members of the authority, and by members on this side of the House, and steps have been taken to relieve the situation in which that section of the dairy industry finds itself.

The member for Warren makes three points in his motion, the first of which is as follows—

> (a) the minimum daily quantity of a market milk quota be reduced;

Of course, this would refer to the minimum daily quota. It would appear that by reducing the daily quota we may possibly slightly improve the lot of some people, and bring others down to the stage where they would not be as viable as they are today. It is certainly not the intention of this Government to reduce the viability of one section of the dairy industry until it is equal to another section; rather, it is our intention to bring the disadvantaged people in the industry to a stage—

Mr H. D. Evans: How would my motion bring sections of the industry down?

Mr OLD: If we reduce the daily quota from its present level of 62 gallons, obviously we would bring down some people to meet others on the way up.

Mr H. D. Evans: But this does not propose reducing the existing quotas. I am talking about new ones.

Mr OLD: Item (a) states—

> the minimum daily quantity of a market milk quota be reduced;

If that were done, obviously the quotas would be reduced.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is a lot of nonsense. We are talking about new quotas, not existing ones.

Mr OLD: Item (a) can be read in only one way. The Dairy Industry Authority is of the firm opinion that the minimum daily quota to maintain viability should be 62 gallons; this includes a cream quota of approximately 13 per cent, which reduces the effective milk quota to 54 gallons. It is on this basis that the new scheme has been arrived at.

The effect of creating new quotas will provide a personal asset to the new quota holders of about $13 500 which obviously will make a great difference to this section of the industry. In addition, it will create a gross annual return of about $12 000 to $13 000. I say "gross" because obviously there will be added expenses to those who receive these returns. However, it is considered that this is the minimum required to ensure the viability of a dairy farm.

The quota asset, together with the farmer's regular income and the manufacturing milk he produces will provide him with a viable unit and make a tremendous difference to the dairy industry in general.

The continually increasing costs of farming, exacerbated by the withdrawal of Commonwealth subsidies are causing great concern; on this basis, we are quite sure it would be a retrograde step to reduce the minimum daily milk quota from its present effective level of 54 gallons; it would bring nothing but poverty to the industry and we do not intend to support this part of the honourable member's motion.

Part (b) of the motion states—

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

In the opinion of the authority, the implementation of a daily 30-gallon market-milk quota would be a disastrous move, for reasons I have already stated. I merely point out that a manufacturing dairyman who wishes to avail himself of the opportunity to obtain a quota, but who does not own a refrigerated bulk vat—I understand there are plenty of people who do not—would be up for about $6 000 to $8 000 to install such a vat and possibly an additional $2 000 to $4 000 to upgrade his dairy to the required standards. By the time he serviced this additional capital, which would detract from his gross income, a daily quota of 30 gallons would be quite unrealistic.

Such a dairyman would also be required under the present authority arrangements to supply milk on a 365-day a year basis; this would create additional expenses, as he would be forced to feed cows during the period when, normally, he is able to turn them out to fend for themselves. It would be an added burden upon the farmer to remain in production for 12 months of the year.

If a part-year quota system were introduced, I believe it would be fair to establish a two-tier price system for quota milk. The man who produces milk during the difficult summer-autumn period should be entitled to a premium for producing milk at a time when others elect not to continue production, for personal reasons or through lack of pasture.

However, the industry would not be keen to pay a premium on such production; therefore, it would be fair to say that those who produce milk only in the spring or flush part of the season in fact should receive a lower price than those who produce it during the difficult part of the season.

This once again would reduce their income to a totally unacceptable level, especially in the light of the fact that they would be operating with a quota of only 30 gallons. The Dairy Industry Authority is not interested only in production; its duties and responsibilities cover all facets of the industry and end not with the producer but with the consumer.

The policy under the new plan of the authority is to provide a better deal to both the producer and the consumer, in endeavouring to reduce the quantity of imported dairy products into the State. Currently the authority is issuing 181 new quotas. As is well known, 31 of these have been allocated; and applications have been called for a further 75 which will be issued in 1976 to be taken up by dairymen who are in a position to do so.

Recently when the member for Warren and I met some dairymen in the Manjimup area, we discussed this situation. In the main, the plan of the authority has been well received by the manufacturing producers. I know certain sections of the whole-milk industry have reservations, in view of the fact that they are required to surrender the cream portion of their quotas; but I am confident the industry will be able to adjust itself. With more market-milk producers coming into the industry and operating for 365 days of the year, and with more manufacturing milk being produced, the industry as a whole will progress, because I understand that the order of dairy imports has been $12 million annually.

If the gap can be narrowed or obliterated, and Western Australia can become self-sufficient in dairy products, we will have taken a great step forward. Not only will this improve the economic situation in respect of the consumers, but also the economic situation of the dairy factories which presently, owing to the seasonal flush of milk production, find themselves facing lean periods with resultant downturn in the factories and with a necessity to retrench staff or engage them on a part-time basis. It will enable the continuous operation of the manufacturing industry and the processing plants; that being the case it should benefit all sections by bringing more stability to processors in the industry.

The plan put forward by the authority contains some benefits for those who have elected to keep on with manufacturing-milk production or with the supply of cream, and who have of necessity to wait possibly for 12 months for the allocation of quotas. It is interesting to note the estimates which have been made of the number of dairymen who will require quotas.

Mr H. D. Evans: Has any provision been made to ensure pick-up facilities for the manufacturing producers?

Mr OLD: That aspect will be gone into by the authority. I think those people will be serviced. I imagine that amongst the manufacturing producers there are some who hold quotas. The position will be investigated, and when we have obtained a list of those who are interested in taking up quotas the authority will be in a far better position to assess the situation, and to gauge whether or not we have enough milk quotas through the surrender of the cream quota to satisfy the needs of those who desire to come into this section of the industry.

It has been said that the meeting of the health requirements is the province of the Dairy Industry Authority. This is a little misleading, because the control of quality and supervision is the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. I am merely putting this in as an aside, and it is not of great importance. Obviously the Dairy Industry Authority is interested, in view of the fact that it has asked the Department of Agriculture to make the assessment, and to report on it.

Paragraph (c) of the motion states that the purchase price of market-milk quotas should be reduced. We discussed this aspect when dealing with the previous motion on this very question. The Dairy Industry Act of 1973 automatically put a value on quotas by providing for the transfer of the quota on a property when the property is sold on a walk-in-walk-out basis. I think the dairymen have quite rightly demanded the right to assess the value of their quotas, as such quotas are assessed for probate duty purposes. The authority worked on the basis of the value being in excess of $200 per gallon. I understand the current assessment of the Taxation Department is around $220 per gallon for market-milk quotas with the cream portion included. The authority has arrived at a figure of $250 per gallon, and this is considered to be reasonable.

Since putting forward the proposition to take away the cream portion of the quota, the authority has requested and has been granted the power to increase the price of quotas from $250 to $285 per gallon, thus providing some compensation for the loss of the cream quota.

It is quite probable that the price of quotas will be reduced as more dairymen receive quotas, and as the demand for the purchase of quotas recedes. It is possible that when the beef industry recovers the demand for quotas will diminish. All these factors will have a very definite effect on the value of quotas.

If the purchase price of quota milk were reduced, the sale of quotas would be inhibited, because people would not be prepared to sell at a reduced price. Under the pricing principles of the Dairy Industry Authority we would find very few quotas coming onto the market from those who have to surrender the cream

portion of their quotas, and who wish to purchase other quotas. When those people have been satisfied it is the objective of the authority to build up the small quotas. It is therefore desirable that a reasonable price for quotas should be maintained in order to recompense those who have put capital into the dairying industry, and to ensure that quotas are placed on the market to satisfy people who require them.

To summarise the situation, I submit it would be wrong in principle to talk about reducing quotas in a mandatory way. This state of affairs will be achieved by the set of circumstances I have enumerated.

The motion in three parts seeks alterations to the existing policy of the authority when clearly this body is bound to work within the confines of the Act. There is no intention on the part of the Government to alter the basis and the principles at this stage.

I am quite convinced from my discussions with manufacturing dairymen and, indeed, with quite a large number of market-milk dairymen that the scheme as envisaged will bring about nothing but good for the industry in general, and certainly for the manufacturing section of the industry.

We are confident that we can maintain the sale of milk, and that through the amount of money to be spent on promotion we can increase the quantity of milk being consumed in Western Australia to a large extent, and thus increase the market-milk quotas.

In time the 1c which has been imposed to enable this scheme to be brought to fruition will be absorbed within the price structure, because as more quota milk is used, so the necessity to use the cream quota will be decreased. I submit the motion should be opposed in total, as I am sure the dairying industry in general stands to gain from the proposed alterations and, in fact, it will become a strong and viable industry.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [5.10 p.m.]: I wish to make some comments on the motion that has been moved by the member for Warren. At the outset I indicate that I oppose it. I want to recapitulate what the Minister has said so that the position can be clarified, because no doubt these comments will be used in the future.

I want to have it recorded in *Hansard* that at the time this motion was moved by the member for Warren the Dairy Industry Authority was moving to effect positive changes which would have a significant effect on the industry. I submit the motion has been motivated purely and simply by politics. Quite frankly, it does not contain any real concept of concern for the industry.

To recapitulate what the Dairy Industry Authority has done, it has reduced the cream contract of producers by some 13 per cent. If a producer has a base quota of 62 gallons, his entitlement is now to be 54 gallons. Those 54 gallons represent milk entirely. At the same time the industry and the Government have increased the price of the 600 milligram bottle by 1c, and this will return to the producer the full value of his 62 gallons. That is a very important principle, and one with which I agree thoroughly.

In point of fact the consumer is paying, and part of the additional 1c will go towards promotion. I have no argument with that, and I agree that the consumer should pay for some part of the promotion. Some criticism has been levelled in this direction regarding the consumers paying for promotion, but I would remind members that there is no article produced today for which the consumer does not pay the promotion costs.

If one takes into account the value of a pint of milk delivered to the door—maybe not in every suburb for six days of the week—at 19c a pint, in real market terms it represents one of the cheapest food commodities available today. I believe the price could and should be increased; in fact, it will have to be increased if we are to retain this industry. This is a total industry, when we take into account the producers, the processors, the distributors and the consumers.

In saying that there needs to be further price increases, I am looking at the position in the future. While I am well aware of the situation of the beef industry and the real tragedies that have occurred, to some extent these problems have brought about advantages in other areas. I believe they have brought some advantage to the dairying industry.

The deteriorated situation of the beef industry has taken away a prop from the dairying industry. In fact the dairying industry has to sustain itself basically on the price of dairy products, but virtually it has not been able to do that up to date.

The Dairy Industry Authority has determined that a number of quotas will be made available. In 1975 the number will be 75, and it is expected that in 1976 a further 75 will be made available. When one takes into account the 31 quotas already allotted in 1975, it will mean that some 106 producers will, in fact, share in the liquid-milk industry.

Under the decision of the Dairy Industry Authority it is also intended that some funds will be made available to producers without quota-milk licenses, who are dependent on the sale of butterfat. They will be given some price advantage as well. So the DIA has been very constructive in the moves it is making, and these are some of the best moves which the

industry has experienced since the group settlement era.

As I said, the motion has been an exercise in politics and unfortunately an attempt has been made to use the dairy industry as the pawn in this political intrigue.

When the motion was first moved a number of my constituents consulted me and asked me to support the motion because they thought it was worth while. When one considers the motion at its face value, one can believe that it has some advantage; but when one looks at it in depth one finds that it has no advantage whatever. The motion refers to principles of which this Parliament ought to be well aware.

Mr H. D. Evans: You as a Government had done absolutely nothing. It was only pressure which got this rolling, and you know it.

Mr BLAIKIE: Here the member for Warren goes again.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr BLAIKIE: He is trying to use the dairying industry for his own political connivance and advantage, and it is quite irresponsible of him to make a challenge such as that.

Mr H. D. Evans: I will have an opportunity to reply in a moment.

Mr BLAIKIE: I certainly hope the member for Warren will do so; but I have an opportunity now to say what I wish to say. The member for Warren has moved the motion for two reasons. Firstly, he has tried to seize an opportunity to drive a wedge between Government members, but in this respect he will fall flat on his face. Secondly, he is attempting to use the dairying industry for political mileage.

Mr Jamieson: Whenever you can you do so, too.

Mr H. D. Evans: Your Government was going to issue 15 quotas, and that was to be it.

Mr Shalders: The Government does not issue any quotas.

Mr BLAIKIE: How was the Government going to issue 15 quotas?

Mr H. D. Evans: That was the intention—to issue 15 new quotas next year through the DIA, and as far as the Government was concerned that was to be it. You know it, too. It was only the pressure which has got you moving at all—things like this motion.

Mr BLAIKIE: The accusations which are made ought to be treated with the contempt they deserve.

Mr H. D. Evans: They are not accusations, but statements of fact.

Mr BLAIKIE: I will repeat again that when this motion was introduced, discussions with the DIA had been going on for some time and the Government and the DIA had virtually resolved what was to be done for the advantage of the total industry. The honourable member seized on this subject merely in an attempt to gain political advantage, and for no other purpose.

Let us study the motion and see what it states and how it would be an advantage. I cannot see how it could be an advantage to anyone, but it certainly would be a disadvantage to the industry if, in fact, it were passed. First of all the motion states that in the opinion of the House the minimum daily quantity of a market-milk quota should be reduced. What this means is that every person in Western Australia holding a market-milk quota license will have the daily quantity reduced.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is rubbish. You have reduced the minimum qantity now—the 54—have you not?

Mr BLAIKIE: The price return to the—

Mr H. D. Evans: Have you not reduced the minimum quantity?

Mr BLAIKIE: The price return to the producer will remain the same. There is nothing in this motion to indicate that the producer would gain any compensation or any advantage. It states that the minimum daily quantity of the market-milk quota will be reduced but it does not say by how much.

Mr H. D. Evans: But you have just reduced the minimum quotas.

Mr BLAIKIE: The second part of the motion states—

> that in 1976, all manufacturing dairymen—

I emphasise the words "all manufacturing dairymen". To continue—

> —who are prepared to accept a daily 30 gallon market milk quota should be awarded such an entitlement on a year or part year basis provided they can meet the health requirements of the Dairy Industry Authority;

Let us analyse the motion a little further. It refers to all manufacturing dairymen who are prepared to accept the daily quota. From my reckoning I would say there are something like 400-odd such dairymen. So if we multiply the 400 by 30 gallons—

Mr H. D. Evans: Will they all be able to accept them? Of course not.

Mr BLAIKIE: The motion refers to all those who are prepared to accept them—

Mr H. D. Evans: And meet the requirements.

Mr BLAIKIE: The motion states that all who are prepared to accept them and

meet the requirements can have that entitlement. It does not set any qualification whatever. If a person—

Mr H. D. Evans: It sets two. He has to be prepared to accept them, and he has to measure up to the standard.

Mr BLAIKIE: This is how farcical and impractical the motion is, and this is what I am conveying to the House. If a person is prepared to meet the minimum health standard of the DIA and wishes to have a quota then, according to the member for Warren, he will be given a quota, and that is it. No recognition is paid to the amount of milk to be involved.

Let me tell the House this: if the motion were, in fact, passed, and we used the minimum figure which could apply, we would have something like 400-odd dairymen applying and being granted 30 gallons a day, because that is what the motion says. In that case we would have a figure of approximately 12 000 gallons of milk a day which could come from only one source; that is, from those who have it. This is the sort of theory we are expected to accept.

All this would do is tear down one section of the industry to offer appeasement to another section. The motion would do no good to anyone, but would in fact, wreck the industry in its entirety.

Let us follow another analogy, and I would like to know where members of the Opposition stand if they think this is a good sort of principle to follow. I wonder how they would react to a motion in the House to provide that waterside workers on a 27 or 30-hour week have their number of hours reduced in order to accommodate some of the sewerage workers threatened with dismissal. This is the same sort of principle members opposite are trying to apply to the dairying industry.

Members opposite would not have a bar of such a motion which affected those they represent. As I have said, this motion was purely and simply politically motivated and is an attempt to gain political mileage.

Mr B. T. Burke: So is the retrenchment of the sewerage workers.

Mr BLAIKIE: The same set of circumstances could apply to the potato industry. We could have a motion which would provide for the acreage of growers to be reduced so that any other farmer who wished to plant potatoes could be given the acreage he required. How farcical would that be? It would be as farcical as this motion.

I could continue to give examples of other industries, but I do not feel that is necessary.

Paragraph (c) of the motion reads—

> the purchase price of market milk quotas to be reduced.

The changes of policies the DIA has implemented and will implement in the short term will have a tremendous effect on the price at which quotas will be negotiated. It will be at a far lower rate because more people will have the opportunity to share in the industry. Therefore, that part of the motion will not apply.

In conclusion, I wish to say that if the motion were adopted by the House it would simply break down one section of an industry to offer appeasement to another section. It would be of advantage to no-one, and would totally disadvantage the entire industry. It would destroy the present viability and any future possible viability the industry might have. As I have said, the motion has been a smutty exercise in politics and I sincerely hope the House rejects it completely.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington) [5.27 p.m.]: I suppose it is not necessary for me to say at this stage that I completely oppose the motion because the member for Warren might well have guessed that. As I look at the motion quickly, I realise it is tantamount to saying that anyone can have a quota; he can produce when he likes; it does not matter how much milk comes to the metropolitan area, or when; and there is no guarantee to anyone that he will produce it at any time.

As the member for Warren is well versed in agriculture and knows full well the situation in the whole-milk areas, I am most surprised he would think anyone gullible enough to accept such nonsense as he proposes. The motion is clearly a political gimmick.

Mr Skidmore: They are strong words.

Mrs CRAIG: Indeed, it has gained him a great amount of kudos in his electorate because it sounds jolly good, and his constituents begin to think, because he has already told them, that great wealth accrues to one who produces quota milk. He does not bother to go into figures thoroughly and his constituents grasp onto his ideas rather quickly and believe that what he says is true.

The motion states that the minimum daily quantity of a market-milk quota should be reduced. Already a great deal has been said about that and I do not believe it is my place to say any more about it in financial terms.

Mr H. D. Evans: Has this not been done now?

Mrs CRAIG: That which has been done now—

Mr H. D. Evans: Is just that.

Mrs CRAIG: —has maintained the parity of income; and this was the important thing. That which has been done

was already in the process of being done before the motion ever came before the House, but the member for Warren was probably not aware of that fact. People concerned about the industry were indeed looking for ways by which the manufacturing-milk producers could be assisted, but in no way were they looking for ways to provide this assistance at the expense of those who were currently producing quota milk.

Mr Old: Hear, hear!

Mrs CRAIG: The DIA took a considerable time to evolve a scheme which would be suitable to all sections of the industry. I must admit that the quota-milk industry is conscious of the fact that it stands to lose on this occasion, but those involved recognised the fact that it is probably wiser to give a little at this stage in order that the industry might be maintained.

Mr B. T. Burke: The member for Vasse does not recognise that fact.

Mr Blaikie: Oh yes he does.

Mrs CRAIG: The member for Warren says a daily 30-gallon market-milk quota should be awarded on a yearly basis, or part of a year, provided the milk meets the health requirements of the Dairy Industry Authority. Why did he not suggest that those persons who previously acquired quotas—who either waited on a list for a considerable time or bought quotas—must produce on 365 days a year?

There was never any suggestion that those people did not have to meet the extra costs involved. They were expected to be able to do this in order to maintain a constant supply of milk to the metropolitan area, and it would be ridiculous to suggest people can now produce only on a seasonal quota basis, because every whole-milk dairy farmer has been longing to have a holiday in the summer for the last 20 years and if this system were to come about he would probably have his chance to do so. Next year he could decide he would produce in those months and get the premium payment, if in fact there was such a premium payment. We would have chaos in the industry; the Dairy Industry Authority would have difficulty in administering the scheme, and I am quite sure it would never come into being.

The last point in the motion is—

> (c) the purchase price of market milk quotas to be reduced.

When speaking to the motion the member for Warren suggested the purchase price be reduced to $50. How does he suggest we compensate those who have previously paid a greater amount for their quotas? Is it suggested that we disregard them, that it does not matter that they have paid high prices for the quotas available to the industry for many years? The honourable member will not concede that any good is done by them at all. Now that he sees some benefit to those persons further south, he simply suggests we forget all about the people who paid more and produce 365 days a year, and we give the quotas to others for $50 a gallon. I do not agree with the member for Warren and I oppose his motion.

MR SHALDERS (Murray) [5.32 p.m.]: I would like to indicate very briefly my opposition to this motion. On looking at it, I can well understand the reason that the Opposition party would very much like to see a reduction of 10 rural seats. If members of the Opposition keep coming forward with motions like this they will not hold any seats whatsoever in the country. Each member of Parliament naturally devotes some time and attention to trying to convince people he is the right person to support when an election comes along, but when the Opposition does that job for us so effectively I think the member for Warren should be congratulated on the effort he is making towards the re-election of Government members in the south-west.

As I said, I intend to speak very briefly, and the point I want to make is that the speech of the member for Warren when moving his motion covers many pages in *Hansard* but unfortunately his remarks are not related to this particular motion. He does not explain in any way how the milk would be produced on a seasonal basis and which he thinks would be the right areas to produce during the summer months. He probably thinks the areas in his own electorate would be ideal for production during the summer months. As the member for Vasse and the member for Wellington have pointed out, the member for Warren did not mention that there would be tremendous overproduction of milk which could be sold as market milk. I am certain the member for Warren deliberately spoke around this motion because in no way is he able to substantiate it and he certainly has not done so.

I hope when he replies to the debate, as is his right, the honourable member will answer some of the points made by me and other members. I would have thought someone who had held a responsible position in the past, as the member for Warren has done, would at least canvass the views he holds, which are shared presumably by other members of his party, in all areas where milk is produced.

I will grant that the producers in the Warren electorate probably believe the motion is sound, but I would have thought he would endeavour to seek support for it in the whole-milk areas because, as we know, Governments change and if the member for Warren were to become the Minister for Agriculture at some time in the future I cannot believe he would be

so irresponsible as to direct the Dairy Industry Authority to alter its policy along these lines. I certainly oppose this motion.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.35 p.m.]: At the outset I would like to say the handling of the dairy industry is probably the most shocking blot on the record of this Government up to the present time, and I will proceed to show why I say that. Let me just review the essential point, that when this motion was introduced the policy of the Government was to introduce 15 more quotas next year, and the devil take the hindmost as far as the manufacturing industry and those who stood any chance at all of remaining in it are concerned.

This is the year of crisis. Members opposite seem to have overlooked that fact, and had it not been for the pressure of this motion and the efforts generated in the country areas we would have had the *laissez-faire* policy of looking after the industry where it exists, feather-bedded a little more in some cases, and then allowing the manufacturing section to wither away.

Mr Blaikie: You are a capitalist.

Mr H. D. EVANS: According to the reasoning and point of view of members opposite, the sooner that happened, the better. There has been a total reversal of the Government's policy in relation to the dairy industry.

Sir Charles Court: Never!

Mr H. D. EVANS: We gave the Government the mechanism by which the dairy industry could be reformed. Had it not been for the Labor government there would not have been a Dairy Industry Authority; let us get that straight. We have only to read the debate when the Bill was introduced to realise that. With the additional 15 quotas proposed, the total number of quotas has been increased to 75, with the likelihood of another 75. The Opposition had something like this in mind all through, and for that reason the Dairy Industry Authority was introduced.

Mr Blaikie: You are drawing a long bow on that one.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Let us go a little further. I hope Government members will read the explanations when my motions are produced. The size of quota has already been reduced. Previously, the size of quota was fixed irrevocably at a minimum of 62 gallons. It has now been reduced, as suggested in my motion. Interference with existing quotas was never contemplated and has never been spoken of at all in the manufacturing section. Endeavours have been made to lift up the number of quotas, and that has been the concept right through. The distortion of the facts by some members in interpreting them in their own way does them little credit.

Mr Shalders: Why did you not explain this?

Sir Charles Court: That is what our members have been saying. Read your own motion.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Why did the honourable member not go down to listen to some of the manufacturing people?

Mr Shalders: I have been there.

Mr H. D. EVANS: This matter was discussed, and that attitude has been accepted right throughout.

Mr Blaikie: What is the attitude right now?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I will touch on the existing scheme which the Government has introduced through pressure. I will mention some interesting facets of it. In the first instance, the 15 quotas, as explained by the Minister and as we know, are to be supplemented by a further 75 in 1976, making a total of 181 in all. The fallacy in this is the Government would have got a great deal further if instead of ascertaining the requirements of the industry when assessing the number of manufacturing dairymen who would be left—not the 400 mentioned by the member for Vasse—it had found out how many dairymen are serious about taking a quota and then looked to the industry to see how many quotas could be furnished and the method and level of financing which would be required.

I am happy at the prospect of there being 181 quotas but the Government does not know how many quotas will be needed to maintain those who can be held in the industry, and it does not know the total cost of it. It is like going about making a suit by cutting out one leg of the trousers at a time and putting the pieces together, instead of marking out the whole garment and dealing with the material in that way. That is about the level of the organisation which has gone into this proposal.

Mr Shalders: It is the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The financing of the proposal will fall back on the consumers—unfairly so, because of the total lack of reorganisation of the industry.

Mr Blaikie: That is a lot of rot.

Mr Old: A survey is being carried out for the first time.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Let us look at the cost of production, which I have mentioned before. Of the total daily production of 69 317 gallons of market milk, 11 136 gallons come from the area north of Pinjarra, 55 766 gallons from the area south of Pinjarra, and the rest from Albany and Kalgoorlie. The cost of production at Pinjarra is 59.02c and at Busselton it is 37.12c.

Mr Blaikie: Very efficient!

Mr H. D. EVANS: So producers in this State are paying 22c a gallon extra on

11 136 gallons each day, which is effectively something like $2 449. For 365 days a year this comes to the frightening sum of $874 220. That is the extent to which that area is being feather-bedded by the producer at the present time. One-sixth of all the milk produced in this State is being produced at 22c a gallon in excess of the cost of production in other areas. This is the state of efficiency which the Government is perpetuating in its present policy, and the negotiability of quotas has perpetuated this particular aspect of the policy.

When we come to the subsidy which the consumers will pay, at 8c a gallon on the total of 69 317 gallons used daily we get the suprising figure of $2 124 056, plus the excess cost in the areas which have a high cost of production. The consumers will be up for a subsidy of $3 million a year, and that is the effect of the policy of this Government in relation to the dairy industry.

In addition, the Government has in no way undertaken a rationalisation of the industry. At the present time a tanker brings milk from Mt. Barker to Capel on six days a week. This is the kind of transportation cost which is incurred: the cost of a tanker would run out at something in the order of 8c a gallon. Instead of being used where it is produced, this milk is being transported unnecessarily some hundreds of miles because the structure of the industry has not been rationalised. At the same time there is milk in that particular factory—

Shalders: Would you wipe out dairy farmers north of Pinjarra?

Mr H. D. EVANS: What utter nonsense!

Mr Shalders: I am asking you whether you would.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I certainly would not.

Mr Shalders: You are saying your party is going to continue this subsidy to the producers.

Mr H. D. EVANS: At this particular factory a quantity of milk running into tens of thousands of gallons is being separated over the weekends. The cream is removed and utilised but the rest is allowed to run down the drains.

This is the sort of inefficiency that the dairy industry is currently perpetuating. This is a Government responsibility. If it is going to have a closed industry and is going to assure the producers a guaranteed income and that it will look after them—which is right and proper; there is no criticism or caviling about that as a concept and a principle—there is a reciprocal obligation to have industry efficiency so that the consumer, who is a captive market, receives the benefit of the most efficiently produced commodity possible. Under the attitudes and policies of the present Government this is not being done. That is the point.

Mr Blaikie: So it is not the producers you are concerned about but the consumers.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The consumer is an integral part of the industry; one cannot disregard the consumer just as one cannot disregard the producer. Any rural industry is so integrally woven that one has to have regard for the sum total, and that is not what this Government has done. It is giving the advantage to a particular section of the industry where it is possible to gain political advantage, and yet the member for "Gasse" talks about political connivance. Goodness me! I am just learning the term, and I am just learning how it has been applied by the Government.

Sir Charles Court: You will be really sorry you moved this motion, you know. For days and years this will be quoted against you.

Mr B. T. Burke: You say that about every motion we move.

Sir Charles Court: He is a great help to us; all we do is take his motions along with us.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The manufacturing section of the industry reached a crisis point this year for a number of reasons. The steep escalation of costs is only one aspect. However, this year funds have been made available under the Commonwealth dairy industry adjustment programme to encourage conversion to bulk pickup and to provide the opportunity to purchase bulk tanks with interest-free loans. Concessional interest loans were available, with the rate of interest being commensurate with the purpose to which the loan was put.

So opportunity was provided for manufacturing dairymen to move into the field of bulk production. This lasted for two years only; it would have extended to June of next year had funds not run out. This is the other pressure that is placed on the manufacturing dairymen; they have to convert to bulk and they have to do so at very considerable expense.

Furthermore, the factories indicated that the likelihood of pickup for cans would be terminated. There we have the components of the crisis that manufacturing dairymen were facing. Going back to the beginning of this year, absolutely nothing was done by the State Government. It made no move; it gave no direction, and it took no initiative. Nor did the dairy companies. The contribution of the Government through the DIA, was to say that there would be 15 new quotas available next year. That is not even a drop in the ocean in respect of resolving the problem of the industry and maintaining in the interests of the State the maximum number of manufacturing dairymen that could possibly be maintained.

With that as the basic policy and attitude at that stage, the manufacturing dairymen of the lower south-west could see the writing on the wall. They were to be left to their own devices without any initiative coming from the Government, for a start, or from the DIA.

Sir Charles Court: That is not so. The initiative came from the Government.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The initiative did not come from the Government.

Mr Old: Where did it come from?

Sir Charles Court: You talk to the DIA.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What initiatives did the Government suggest when it came to the crunch? It was on the matter of the dairy industry that the coalition floundered; this is how divided members opposite were on the matter of policy. Do not try to tell me that initiatives could come from a Government of that sort.

Sir Charles Court: You talk to the DIA.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Not only did the Government fail the manufacturing dairymen, but so too did the dairy companies. They stood around like crows on a fence waiting to pick up the crumbs. When the matter of bulk pickup became a major issue, having regard to the fact that many small pockets of dairy production would not receive a pickup service, there was no assurance and no examination of the position by the Department of Agriculture, the DIA, the companies, or by any other body connected with the Government.

It was on this basis that dairymen rightly recognised the crisis with which they were confronted. The only way to assist them to convert to bulk pickup at that stage was to increase their income. The only way to increase their income was to bring them into manufacturing-milk production. This could have been done in a number of ways; and implicit in the motion is the suggestion in this regard. This suggestion was presented before the policy which has been put before us now as DIA policy was presented. It goes back into the exploratory and pioneering situation when we on this side had less chance of coming up with the precise situation in the dairy industry than had the Government with all the resources which are available to it.

Implicit in the motion is the suggestion that the only way we can get a quota to these areas is to give it to those who are in a position to accept a quota and who would make sure their facilities comply with the requirements. The only way to do this this is to lower the existing level; and that is what has been done. The level has been dropped. I can well remember it was pointed out that previously the dairy industry would not listen to the suggestion of dropping below 62 gallons a day; it was adamant on that point. However, it has done it now, and this is the first component of my motion.

Mr Old: It was being put into train at the time the motion was put on the notice paper.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Then it was being done mutely; silently.

Mr Old: It was being done in consultation with the DIA.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It was being done only because of the pressure that was brought to bear by my motion, and because of the representations by the manufacturing sector of the industry, where the motion had its origin.

Mr Old: The motion was not on the notice paper then.

Mrs Craig: Are you saying there was not a 13 per cent cream component attached to the quota?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Not at all.

Mrs Craig: That was there; that was in fact production. That has been removed but the income parity has been retained.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I come back to my motion.

Sir Charles Court: He doesn't like having to answer these questions.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I will come back to that when I consider the finances of the industry.

Sir Charles Court: Shades of Bill Hegney!

Mr H. D. EVANS: The salient point about the reduction of quotas—and I have stated this in previous addresses and have reiterated the attitude of the manufacturing section—is that the existing quotas are not touched, but the negotiability has removed the opportunity to spread them in the way that was necessary. The golden opportunity was missed. When the Government allowed negotiability of quotas it threw away the chance of reorganising the dairy industry. It is doing it now, but the consumer is paying for its blunders.

Sir Charles Court: Don't talk nonsense! What were you going to do for money?

Mr Blaikie: You are more uptight about the consumers than you are about the producers.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I come back to the second aspect. The level of 30 gallons was taken as being a reasonable guess, having regard to the number of manufacturing dairymen who could possibly go into whole-milk production; and that figure of 30 gallons will probably be closer to 54 if it is to be done in the most economical way. However, we on this side were not able to do the research to assess each dairyman left in the industry to ascertain his functions and capabilities. Members opposite were in a position to do so, but did not. The Government still has

not done it; it is doing it only now but it still does not know how many dairymen can be retained, even though the number of quotas to be issued has been announced. It does not know how much quota would be required to keep them there. This is the sort of shoddy and bumbling organisation that has been brought to bear on the dairy industry.

Sir Charles Court: You had three years, and you did nothing.

Mr H. D. EVANS: We set up the DIA. This is basic to the situation. The motion was brought forward before the computations of the DIA had seen the light of day.

Do not let us fool ourselves in respect of the third aspect of negotiability. The principle of negotiability, of an intangible of this kind, cannot be justified or defended if a farmer comes into the industry, makes a capital outlay, and then for a reason not of his own making is compelled to leave the industry. It is fair enough that such a farmer should receive compensation, but I suggest that $50 a gallon is far closer to the mark than the $280 a gallon that is presently proposed or the $350 a gallon that has been paid. I know the reasons that are expounded, but these are rationalisations to explain away the situation. Nobody is suggesting that the entitlement to a crayfishing boat should be detached from the boat and the license number and become a marketable commodity. Perhaps the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife would be interested in following up that idea.

Mr Blaikie: What about potatoes?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Nobody is suggesting there should be a negotiable figure in respect of potato growing quotas, surely.

There is a principle here, and now that the member for Wellington has returned it is one that she should realise. Firstly, in respect of negotiability, the men in a position to buy quotas have been in the industry for some time, while the fellow on a low quota who is not yet established in the industry cannot afford to buy a further quota. It is only the person who is established in the industry who can afford to pay $350 a gallon; and these people are in areas where production costs are highest. This is against the long-term interests of the industry.

With regard to finance and the present situation, the total cream entitlement of the quota holder is to be used to finance the scheme that has been propounded by the DIA and is to be implemented. But no loss of income is involved because this is to be compensated by a levying of the consumer.

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr H. D. EVANS: This could have been avoided.

Sir Charles Court: How could it have been avoided?

Mr H. D. EVANS: In the same manner that we have been telling the Government for, oh, so long.

Sir Charles Court: You are so naive that you amaze me when it comes to arithmetic.

Mr H. D. EVANS: There were over 2 600 daily gallons negotiated; the Premier should have a look at his arithmetic.

Sir Charles Court: You have to get so much money, and you can't get it out of thin air.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Just listen. Quotas were available that could have been directed through the DIA to areas where they would have done the most good. Something in excess of 2 500 gallons were dispersed in areas where production costs are greatest. In addition, there is the entitlement that will be issued in the 15 quotas; something in the order of 1 500 gallons a day, and as the situation is now there will be an overproduction of quota milk.

Let us face up to it; there will be more quota milk next year than the State will be able to use. If we bring in the 75 plus 15 market-milk producers—the number about which members opposite have been yelling—there will be overproduction. We already have overproduction, and in the most uneconomical manner.

Mr Shalders: Tell us how you would pay for your scheme; we know how we will pay for ours.

Mr H. D. EVANS: In the first instance, one of the things we would do would be to use quotas that became negotiable rather than allow them to be transacted between farmer and farmer. There was a certain amount that could have been issued by the DIA—an amount of about 1 500 gallons. My suggestion of 30 gallons, while not being as desirable as the 54 gallons that is suggested and intended for next year, would not have had the impost which the industry is presently suffering. It is desirable to maintain the number of manufacturing dairymen.

Let me remind the House that last year, in the food industry, $400 000 was paid by means of a straightout subsidy to the apple growers of this State.

Mr Blaikie: How will you pay for your scheme?

Mr H. D. EVANS: And the year before a straightout subsidy of $800 000 was paid to the apple growers of Western Australia.

Mr Blaikie: Including the Manjimup canning works?

Mr H. D. EVANS: If the principle of paying subsidies to industries is accepted, as it has been by members on both sides of this House, it is defensible and arguable that a subsidy could have been paid to maintain the producers in the dairying industry until they were able to maintain themselves.

Sir Charles Court: It would still come back on the consumers, you foolish man!

Mr H. D. EVANS: No! Consumers alone should not pay. A consumer subsidy is different from a subsidy from revenue. A consumer subsidy was not designed for the benefit of the growers in the apple industry last year and the year before; it was paid for by the community in general.

Other financial aspects of this industry should surely include a rationalisation of savings. When something like $20 000 a week is involved in the operation of the one tanker to which I referred and that sum is multiplied to the extent that it is now, it comes to a very sizable sum. It would not have been possible through rationalisation of savings of up to half a million dollars to be achieved without lifting the price of milk. If we looked at the questions that have been asked by the member for Rockingham only recently, considerable savings could have been effected in regard to the price of milk used for choc-milk, yoghurt, and iced coffee, taking into consideration the prices paid for milk used in these products. There are savings that could be effected throughout the industry which the Government is not anxious to bring about because this would upset the existing companies and their operations.

Instead of the DIA taking a firm hand and directing the dairying industry to effect such savings, this Government has fobbed off, fiddled around, and interfered in this situation, but certainly it has not given any direction, taken any initiative, or sorted out the industry in the manner it should have done.

So I return to the point that the dairy industry is surely one of the areas where this Government should be called upon to answer for its mismanagement and maladministration. Because of its mistakes it has cost the people of this State—that is, the milk consumers and, in the main, they probably would be families who would be the least able to afford to be placed in this position—a great deal of money. However, there has been no suggestion of the Government rectifying the errors it has made—no suggestion whatsoever.

If the information I have obtained is at all correct, according to the answers that have been given to me, it would appear the feather-bedding that the Government has done in the country areas is costing the consumers a sum approaching $1 million a year, and the increase of 1c for the bottle will cost another $2 million a year. Therefore, that makes a total of $3 million which should never have been levied on the people of this State if the Government had taken the initiative to assist those engaged in the industry instead of fooling around with negotiability of milk quotas, especially in the area where production is the most costly. The Government is also guilty of feather-bedding and giving the golden handshake to those who have not really an entitlement. Had the Government not done all of these things the dairying industry would have been far better off.

Sir Charles Court: How did you function as Minister for Agriculture for three years?

Mr Jamieson: Very effectively.

Sir Charles Court: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should read his motion, then his speech, and then go down to the dairy producers.

Mr Skidmore: The yakity-yak Premier!

Mr H. D. EVANS: It must be borne in mind that my suggestions were brought to this House prior to the scheme proposed by the DIA and they were certainly the most practicable solutions for the benefit of the industry.

Mr Blaikie: In your opinion.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Without a shadow of a doubt it was the only opinion that was being expressed at the time. The member for "Gasse" was quite mute on that occasion.

Mr Blaikie: Why did you bring in the other motion about the negotiability of milk quotas? You brought that one forward first, and you brought this one forward only for political motives.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The two issues had to be segregated, because if negotiability were to be involved in that section of the industry—

Mr Blaikie: You forgot about that motion, did you not?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Rot! The terms of this motion were introduced at a time when there was no worth-while suggestion before the House. The scheme that has been propounded is an extension of the terms; it seeks to finance the industry by the cheapest method.

Although I still have the thought that 30 gallons would probably be a more practicable figure to maintain in the industry all the dairymen it is possible to maintain, they would have no surety of pickup if other individuals in various areas became engaged in bulk-milk production. We need to bring into this scheme all those who are in the industry now, and the Government does not even know how many dairymen are involved. It does not know the amount of bulk milk that would be necessary to maintain them; it does not know the cost because there has been no research. Instead of going about this task in the manner it should, the Government has nibbled and scratched and has been guilty of gross mismanagement.

At the time this motion was introduced to the Assembly the scheme proposed in it was the only one we had to look at. We could not turn to the Government, because there was no indication of any initiative, support, or any method of handling the

submissions by the industry in a worthwhile way. All we had before us was the suggestion of the Opposition, which was a sound one, and it still is; it is probably nearer the mark than the proposal brought down by the DIA, and probably it would handle the problems of the industry better than the proposal currently being put forward at the behest of the Government.

Mr Shalders: I would like to take the member for Warren down to Waroona so that he could tell the dairymen that.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Does not the honourable member like to hear facts? Some changes have been made since this motion was introduced; a proposal has been put forward by the Dairy Industry Authority, but because of the manner in which the intention of that authority has been propounded it will certainly not meet the requirements of the industry; that is, to give 75 quotas now and then, in 12 months' time 75 more, and have another look at the situation to see what else is required.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has three minutes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, that will be quite sufficient. Let members consider that proposition and see what remains after that. We gave the Government an opportunity to reorganise the dairying industry in a proper manner, but since the Government has been in office it has done nothing but—

Mr Jamieson: Muck it up!

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has certainly not taken advantage of the position in which it was placed. It has let the golden moment slip by, and is now calling on the people of Western Australia to pay for its mistakes. I commend the motion, as it stands, to the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—19

Mr Barnett	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr May
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr Moller
Mr Harman	*(Teller)*

Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Old
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Neil
Mr Cowan	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
Mr O Connor	*(Teller)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Carr	Mr Sibson
Mr Bryce	Mr Nanovich
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Dr Dadour

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

Sitting suspended from 6.14 to 7.30 p.m.

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill.
2. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND (DIOCESAN TRUSTEES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [7.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to implement, at the request of the Perth Diocesan Trustees and the Diocesan Council of the Diocese of Perth, a resolution adopted unanimously at the second session of the thirty-fifth synod of the diocese.

The preamble to that resolution indicates that the Perth Diocesan Trustees is, by the Church of England (Diocesan Trustees) Act 1888 as amended, a corporation with power *inter alia* to acquire and hold for the Church of England in Australia in the Diocese of Perth by purchase devise or otherwise, all lands tenements and hereditaments whatsoever of every tenure and also all personal estates.

The Perth Diocesan Trustees has power to take, hold, employ and invest all such real and personal estate as it shall deem advisable, but nevertheless only for the purposes of the diocese, and subject to the performance of any trusts upon which these lands, tenements, hereditaments and personal estate may have been acquired; and subject in all respects to the statutes, orders, directions and resolutions of the synod of the diocese of Perth.

The preamble to the resolution explains that the Perth Diocesan Trustees has for over 70 years, received reimbursement for all moneys properly expended by it, and, by way of commission charged against the income of the property, remuneration for its management.

However, some two years ago, doubts arose that the Perth Diocesan Trustees is entitled to remuneration as well as reimbursement, and entitled to recover such remuneration by way of commission. The Synod of the Diocese subsequently unanimously adopted the resolution seeking an amendment to the Act to resolve those doubts.

Historically, the decision to charge a commission was made by resolution of the Diocesan Council on the 15 November, 1897. The arrangements, which were confirmed by the first session of the tenth synod in 1898, and which have pertained ever since, were that a commission of 5

per cent would be charged on the gross income of properties directly managed by the church office, while a commission of 3 per cent would be charged on the gross income of properties otherwise managed.

The Perth Diocesan Trustees presently administers some 500 bequests and endowments. A few of these are large but the majority are quite small in value. It is obviously impracticable, and would be unnecessarily expensive, to maintain separate cost records for each of these trusts. The alternative, which is the long-established practice, is the charging of a commission on the income from its trustee operations.

In the 1974-75 financial year the income available to the Perth Diocesan Trustees from commissions charged in this way was approximately $79 000 derived substantially from three major properties. Expenditure by the Perth Diocesan Trustees in the same period with respect to trustee operations was approximately $66 000. The small surplus that is derived from its trustee operations is used for the purposes of the Church of England in the diocese.

The Bill before the House therefore seeks to confirm the practice of the last 78 years; and to establish that practice in statutory form in a similar manner to the power conferred upon The Perpetual Executors Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.) Limited and The West Australian Trustee Executor and Agency Company Limited.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [7.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is largely the result of a recent review of the penalties provided under the various sections of the Education Act carried out by the State Crown Solicitor. The Bill contains no controversial issue nor does it introduce any changes in policy in relation to education. It is rather in the nature of a tidying-up measure to bring up to date the various penalties provided throughout the Act, and to bring the Act into line with changes in nomenclature and practice in recent years.

In a number of sections of the Act penalties are provided but these have remained unchanged almost since the present Act was drafted in 1928. For example, the penalty in section 19 for a parent not producing a child in court when summoned is $1. The Government asked the Crown Law Department to examine the penalties in the Education Act in order to bring them into line with penalties in other Acts and to make them more realistic for the 1970s.

I now intend to explain briefly the purpose of each proposed amendment.

An examination of the amendments, as listed in the Bill, will show that the changes to sections 15, 16, and 17 of the Education Act—clauses 3, 4, and 5 of this Bill—relate to increases in penalties. It will be noted that throughout the amendments on penalties, the practice in the existing Act of sometimes providing a minimum penalty has been discontinued and the courts will be able to impose any penalty up to a stated maximum.

Part V of the Education Act sets out the provisions for compulsory attendance at school and the procedures and penalties relating to non-attendance and truancy. The sections of this part permit authority to be given to the department's welfare officers to make complaints and conduct prosecutions.

The amendment to section 17B(1) is really only of an administrative nature and seeks to amend the present situation whereby the written consent of the Minister is required before children on probation as a result of truancy convictions can be summoned before a Children's Court under the Child Welfare Act, should the Director-General of Education be not satisfied with the conduct of the child.

It is proposed to delete the words "with the consent in writing of the Minister" to enable the welfare officers to carry out their duties associated with the provisions of part V without delays that inevitably occur when referrals have to be made.

The amendment to section 18 is the result of a recent court decision whereby it was held that although the child concerned was absent more often than he was present he did attend school occasionally and therefore could not be said to be "constantly absent". As the present working of this section of the Act authorises prosecution of parents whose children are "constantly and habitually absent from school" it has become necessary to delete the words "constantly and" to enable welfare officers to continue prosecutions as in the past.

At the present time section 32A of the principal Act requires schools providing instruction up to and including the "Leaving Certificate examination of the Public Examinations Board of Western Australia" to be registered as efficient schools.

The Leaving Certificate examinations are currently being phased out in favour of the internal assessment by extending the scope of the Achievement Certificate up to year 12 level. Entrance to tertiary studies will be determined also on a combination of internal assessment and special scholastic tests. In this context the term "Leaving Certificate examination" will no longer be appropriate. Also the Public Examinations Board of Western Australia has now ceased to exist and a

new body known as the Tertiary Admissions Examination Committee has been established to undertake these functions.

As neither the examination nor the board referred to now exist, it has become necessary to include a minor amendment to the section to allow for the changing situation.

The final purpose of the Bill which I wish to mention briefly is only of minor significance and relates to a list of efficient schools published annually in accordance with section 13 of the Act. The Act presently requires the names of the heads of these schools to be included; however, the department has not done so for a number of years and it is not considered necessary to do so. Consequently the proposed amendment seeks to delete the requirement.

As mentioned previously, this Bill is of little consequence and contains no radical changes in policy in relation to education.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr B. T. Burke.

MURDOCH UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [7.42 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend sections 17, 24, and 29 of the Murdoch University Act, 1973, and contains no major matters of policy.

The university authorities have requested, and the Government has agreed, that legislation be introduced to amend the principal Act for two main purposes, both of which are straightforward. They relate to the making of by-laws and the university's lands.

I now intend to deal briefly with each of these matters in the order in which they are contained in the Bill presently before the House.

The university authorities have previously expressed concern over the validity and power to make and enforce certain by-laws relating to the control of persons and vehicles on university lands.

The proposed amendments to sections 17 and 24 of the principal Act are designed to clarify and where necessary extend the by-law-making powers of the senate.

Similar amendments were introduced in earlier sessions relating to both the University of Western Australia and the Western Australian Institute of Technology.

The other amendments contained in this Bill relate to the land held by the university. It has been brought to the Government's attention that the principal Act does not include provision for lands vested in the university to be exempted from rates and taxes as is normal with universities.

The proposed amendment to section 29 will ensure that "no tax or rate may be levied upon any property vested in the university for the purposes of providing facilities necessary or conducive to the attainment of the objects of the university and the performance of its function".

Members will recall that the establishment of Western Australia's second university was entrusted to a planning body known as the Murdoch University Planning Board.

An apparent oversight in the original legislation resulted in the exclusion of an appropriate provision to enable the transfer of all real and personal property vested in the planning board by virtue of the Murdoch University Planning Board Act, 1970, to the university upon its establishment.

The amendment to section 28 of the principal Act will effectively overcome this problem.

This Bill is simple in nature and purpose and I commend it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr B. T. Burke.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [7.45 p.m.]: The Bill now before us seeks to amend sections of the Industrial Arbitration Act by adding certain provisions to which I will refer. I find some of the amendments rather strange in their present form and I think the wording could be tidied up considerably.

Clause 2 will amend section 42 of the principal Act. The existing section 42 is virtually the same as the proposed new section 42 except for the addition of a new paragraph (b) which states—

> (b) if all the parties to the agreement agree that the provision be so cancelled, amended or varied by the Commission,
>
> . . . the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly.

Section 42 of the Act refers to the powers of the commission to vary an industrial agreement in certain circumstances. I suggest the intention of the amendment is very good. There have been occasions in the past when employers and groups of employers have agreed, by conciliation, to the commencing time of the variation of an award. However, on occasions it has been difficult to be able to get the Industrial Commission to accept such a proposition without putting forward substantial arguments as to why certain things should be done.

The intent of the amendment is to provide a directive. The provision has been in the Act for some time and, for the sake of clarity, I think I should read it to members. It reads as follows—

> 42. On the application of any party to an industrial agreement, the Commission may . . .

That is the important word—"may". The commission "may" or "may not" do certain things. The section concludes—

> and the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly.

Those concluding words are a directive to the Industrial Commission. I point out that at the commencement of the section the commission has the liberty to do certain things. The strange part about the section is that after all the parties to an agreement agree that a certain provision is to be varied, the Industrial Commission has no alternative but to agree. It seems to me that the word "may" should be "shall", in the first instance, or in the latter instance the word "shall" should be "may".

I understand this problem could be easily overcome by tidying up the verbiage of the proposed new section. I would like to refer members to the sheer simplicity of the wording of another Act which was referred to me by the member for Mt. Hawthorn—the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act. The concluding words of the section dealing with orders made by the Summary Relief Court states that certain things may be done based on the evidence before the particular court.

Subsection (3) of section 21 of the Act reads—

> (3) On hearing a complaint made under this section, the court may . . .

The court "may" do certain things. The section of the Act does not state that certain things "shall" be done. Subsection (4) reads—

> Where an order made under this section includes the variation of a provision for maintenance, the court may direct . . .

The section does not in any way give a direction and say that the court "shall" do certain things. There are other instances where similar words are used in our legislation.

I am unable to understand why opportunity was not taken by the Parliamentary Draftsman to tidy up the situation in the Bill now before us, because proposed new section 42 contains a complete contradiction. Certain things "may" or "shall" be done. We prefer that there should be a direction that certain things "shall" be done.

I would be alarmed if I had occasion to go to the Minister with an application agreed to by the Industrial Commission and, because of the provision that certain things "may" be done, have the application thrown out. Obviously, the reverse could be the case. I am concerned with the provision, as is the trade union movement, and I believe it could be tidied up. I trust the Minister will have a look at the matter.

Clause 3 of the Bill deals with a machinery matter, and will allow for the appointment of the senior commissioner. We do not quarrel with that provision.

Clause 4 merely corrects a grammatical error which has been in the Act for some time. That anomaly will be removed.

Clause 5 will amend section 92 of the principal Act. New paragraph (aa) is almost identical with the paragraph it will replace. The main words to be added to the paragraph are—

> (ii) such earlier date as the parties may agree; and

The new provision will allow for retrospectivity with regard to consent documentation between unions and employers. A problem has been that agreement has been reached between an employer and a union with regard to the commencement date for a wage increase, or for some variation. On taking the matter to the Industrial Commission it has been explained that discussions commenced some three months previously, but as the Act does not allow for a period longer than three weeks the unions have been disadvantaged to a great extent.

The amendment will allow the Industrial Commission to grant retrospectivity when the parties to an agreement agree that an earlier date should apply.

Clause 6 of the Bill will amend section 93 of the principal Act, and will make provision for proposed new section 98B.

Clause 7 contains the principal amendment to the parent Act, and it is a very good provision. The unions, collectively, feel there are several areas of award conditions which require general application. Those conditions could apply to annual leave, long service leave, or public holidays.

At present the unions have to do a considerable exercise in paper work when an application is made to the Industrial Commission, and this will be overcome if the Trades and Labor Council is able to make a general application, on behalf of the unions. Every union has to arrange for a full documentation to be served on each and every respondent. That action has to be taken by each union when an award is to be amended. In some cases this means posting out some 150-odd notices to employers. When that is multiplied by the number of unions in Western Australia, the waste of money and effort involved will be obvious to all members. The provision in the Act has been a thorn in the side of the trade union movement for a long time. Proposed new section 94A will allow the Industrial Commission, of its own volition or of its own action, or on the motion of

the Confederation of Western Australian Industry—which I believe is the new name for the organisation—or on the motion of the Trades and Labor Council or the Attorney-General, to make a general order in relation to all industrial agreements or awards.

There has always been a proviso that employers had to get their advocate, or a representative, to secure warrants which had to be presented to the Industrial Commission. It was an expensive operation, the same as it was for the unions. The proposed amendment will overcome the problem and allow the Trades and Labor Council to make a general application.

I feel it will be necessary for the regulations to be amended to provide that in the case of future applications the unions would still have the right to lodge documentation. I think we will find ourselves much better off with the amendment, which we consider to be a very good one.

The clause sets out the machinery, but the operation of the machinery will have to be done by regulation. I suggest the regulations should provide that unions still have the right to abide by the provisions where documentation is necessary. I have no doubt that the proposal has come from the Industrial Commission in consultation with the trade union movement and the Confederation of Western Australian Industry. I believe this is a step in the right direction and the unions will be more satisfied than they are at present.

Proposed new section 98B worries me, and also the trade union movement, a little. If I may, I will give a small illustration of a problem which occurs. Some unions have agreed, by consent, with Federal unions to forgo State rights and State awards. By agreement, the State registered unions do not interfere with the Federal cover. The workers involved are then covered by the Federal award, but by leaving the State award current the constitutional rights of the State union are protected, because if the Federal union decides to withdraw from the particular field, and the workers are left with no cover, a fight usually starts as to which union will cover those workers. The State protection has been left in some awards.

One instance well known to me is the AWU award which covers service station employees—those involved in selling petrol, the lubrication of vehicles, and the fitting of tyres. Those workers are now covered by the Federal award. If the Federal union withdraws from that particular field the AWU will cover those workers. Because of those circumstances it is necessary to make sure that the amendment will take care of all situations. It appears that will be the case and in sounding a note of caution I say I hope the commission will exercise its discretion with regard to the application of this provision. I hope the Industrial Commission will use some understanding.

There is opportunity, of course, for those concerned to take some action before an award is cancelled. I consider that in such a case it would be best to refer to the award as being redundant. It would be a good thing to remove such redundant awards from the register of the Industrial Commission, and it will tidy things up generally.

The arguments advanced by the Minister are, perhaps, a little flamboyant and, perhaps, a little glossy. However, I do not complain about it because I feel there is validity in the proposition. I hope the commission, when looking at these matters, will agree that under the circumstances I have mentioned the unions should be considered and the award should stand.

In regard to the other questions, of course a degree of protection exists within the proposed amendment because the parties may intervene, and before the cancellation of any award is made, or after it is made, all the parties to the award will be advised by the commission. Although perhaps my fears are unfounded I felt obliged to make the point.

I am sure that at all times the commission will act with due regard for the protection of the rights and constitution of the unions. If it does not do this, we will become embroiled in more disputation in the industrial field than ever the proposed amendment seeks to avoid. I do not want to be a scaremonger but I thought this matter should be raised.

I agree with the other clauses in the measure. Most of them provide merely for the change in name of the Employers Federation of Western Australia; it will now be titled the Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Incorporated). I must say I doubt whether the change of name gives the trade union movement any great joy, but it does mean that instead of having a go at the Chamber of Manufactures and the Employers Federation, the unions can now have a go at them collectively in the same application. So maybe the proposition has some merit.

Clause 11 is a very important one as it allows the passage of the already mentioned consent agreements to an earlier starting date under section 108J. This section refers to the date on which an order or an award commences to operate and it is most important. Of course, the people who prepared the legislation were aware of this fact, and the words to be added to the section are, "made, unless all of the parties to the proceedings agree that an earlier date be fixed".

I have indicated already to the Minister we agreed with the earlier proposition. Here again, the same protection will be given for the commission to be able to vary agreements with the consent of the parties. With those few remarks, I say that we on this side do not intend to oppose the Bill.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [8.03 p.m.]: As the member for Swan has pointed out very ably to the House, this is a machinery measure which makes certain amendments to our Industrial Arbitration Act in order to streamline procedures carried out under it. One would have thought that in such a year as this—International Women's Year—the Government would have taken the opportunity to remove from the Act some of the obnoxious sections relating to women. What astounds me is that although people in the community—and particularly women who have joined together in various organisations such as Women's Liberation, Women's Electoral Lobby, and other feminist organisations—presented a proposition to the Government in International Women's Year, the Court Government failed to act upon those requests. The Government declined to accept these suggestions and members will remember the events in this Chamber some months ago when the Premier decided he ought to do something about International Women's Year, but only after he was prodded by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Bertram: Very belatedly.

Mr HARMAN: Yes, very belatedly. The Government has demonstrated a complete lack of sympathy with the causes for women's liberation which are evident in the community. It is obvious on this occasion that various organisations in the community made requests to the Government for certain amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act as it relates to women, and the Government turned them down—it ignored their requests.

Mr Bertram: Shame!

Mr HARMAN: For my first illustration of this point, I do not need to pass section 6 of the parent Act which deals with interpretations. Under this section we see an interpretation of the word "worker", and it reads—

> "Worker" means any person of not less than fourteen years of age of either sex employed or usually employed by any employer to do any skilled or unskilled work for hire or reward, and includes an apprentice;—

And this is the essential part of the interpretation—

> —but shall not include any person engaged in domestic service, in a private home, provided that no home in which more than six boarders and/or lodgers are received for pay or reward shall be deemed to be a private home:

What happens is that a woman who is employed as a cleaner—that is, one who comes in to dust, vacuum, and do whatever else the employer requires—in effect is alienated from this Act. She is not a worker according to the Act.

Mr O'Neil: You ought to have a talk to the member for Cockburn. He and I had an argument about this a few years ago.

Mr HARMAN: I remember that back in 1973 we were trying to steer a Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act through this House. There was considerable opposition on that occasion when we endeavoured to delete that interpretation from the Act. I think it was the member for Scarborough who opposed most bitterly the deletion of the words. I do not know whether he has learnt from that experience.

Mr O'Neil: He argued that way because it would disadvantage women.

Mr HARMAN: This interpretation means that any woman in Western Australia who is employed as a domestic, perhaps on a pastoral station or in similar circumstances, is denied any of the benefits of our Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr O'Neil: She also does not suffer the obligations placed upon her by that Act.

Mr HARMAN: That was two years ago, perhaps at the beginning of the Women's Liberation movement. However, we are now in 1975 and I am sure the views of the community have changed significantly so that we would now all accept the proposition that a person who is employed as a domestic should not be excluded from the definition of the term "worker". That is what this Act continues to do. Despite requests made to the Government in this International Women's Year, it has declined to act.

Mr Barnett: Shame!

Mr HARMAN: I can say only that the Government, as on so many other issues, has its head in the sand. It is not prepared to make changes or to recognise that, say, a woman who comes in to clean the House of the Minister for Works—

Mr O'Neil: I only wish I could find one.

Mr HARMAN: —for several hours a day and so many days a week is denied the opportunity to be declared a worker under the Industrial Arbitration Act. What possible arguments could there be against such a declaration?

Mr O'Neil: I suggest you read the previous debates because it would not advantage a female domestic. Furthermore, the reference is not to a female domestic only.

Mr HARMAN: I have heard those arguments before—

Mr O'Neil: You have not read them carefully then.

Mr HARMAN: —and they are very weak. The Minister for Works knows this.

Mr O'Neil: They are not weak arguments.

Mr HARMAN: We are the only State in the Commonwealth that hangs onto this old tradition. Members know it is there because in our early days—

Mr O'Neil: How many States in the Commonwealth have an arbitration Act?

Mr HARMAN: —a number of Aborigines—

Mr O'Neil: You say we are the only State that has this provision. How many States have an arbitration Act?

Mr Skidmore: The other States do not need it.

Mr HARMAN: At least four States have industrial arbitration legislation and that legislation does not contain any definitions such as this one. It is a hangup from the old days when Aborigines worked on pastoral stations. They were regarded as second-rate citizens, and on that basis they were not regarded as workers. It is to the shame of this present Liberal Government in Western Australia that it has refrained from amending this interpretation in International Women's Year.

Mr O'Neil: Does it say only female domestics?

Mr Skidmore: No, it does not. It says "person".

Mr O'Neil: There is no discrimination.

Mr HARMAN: The interpretation says that women who work as domestics shall not be regarded as workers under the terms of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr Young: I think you have the wrong person when you refer to the member for Scarborough.

Mr HARMAN: Did not the honourable member argue this point?

Mr Young: I do not think so.

Mr HARMAN: If the member for Scarborough wishes to crawfish out of it, he can, but why does he not say whether or not he opposed our amendment in 1973?

Mr Young: I said that I would check it.

Mr O'Neil: I think you are in as much trouble as you were when you were Minister for Labour.

Mr HARMAN: I will speak for a few minutes, so the member for Scarborough can check this point.

Mr Young: All right.

Mr HARMAN: I have a copy of the debate here. I do not want to name the honourable member as the person who opposed our amendment if I am not right.

Mr O'Neil: You have already done that—you should have checked it first.

Mr HARMAN: I was relying on my memory, and it is usually quite good. Obviously the memory of the member for Scarborough is not too good, because he is not very sure.

Mr Young: Can you say it was me for sure?

Mr HARMAN: I want to move to the next point.

Mr O'Neil: It might be safer.

Mr HARMAN: I wish to refer now to section 124 of the parent Act,

Mr O'Neil: You are talking outside the Bill, you know.

Mr HARMAN: Section 124 states—

> 124. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act other than this Act or any law but subject to this Part, it is hereby declared that on and from the commencing day—
>
> (a) the basic wage to be paid to male workers and the basic wage to be paid to female workers under any award or industrial agreement that is for the time being in force shall be deemed to be an amount of thirty-five dollars forty-five cents in the case of male workers and twenty-seven dollars eight cents, in the case of female workers;

Representations were made to the Government to amend this section, but the Government refused to make any amendment.

The other point I wish to bring to the attention of the House is one that has been made on many occasions by people associated with the Women's Liberation movement. It is about time we appointed a woman as a commissioner to the Industrial Commission. I waited in vain for the Government to take such a step this year.

Mr O'Neil: Your Government appointed two members to the commission; why was not one a woman?

Mr H. D. Evans: It was not International Women's Year.

Mr O'Neil: Cut it out!

Mr HARMAN: I do not like to run away from the argument.

Mr O'Neil: How many commissioners have we appointed, and who are they?

Mr HARMAN: The Government has appointed two—Mr Martin and Mr Johnson.

Mr O'Neil: Replacements.

Mr HARMAN: The point is that the Liberal-Country Party Government has been in office for 18 months and has appointed two commissioners. I am not criticising that; however, I believe it is about time we thought about appointing a woman to the Industrial Commission of Western Australia.

Mr Bertram: The Australian Government did.

Mr HARMAN: The Australian Government has done so, as my colleague points out.

Mr O'Neil: Did they appoint her because she was a woman? Did they discriminate in favour of her, because she was a woman?

Mr Bertram: They appointed her because she was highly qualified.

Mr HARMAN: I am very interested in the Deputy Premier's comments because I vividly remember an occasion when he sat before an audience of women; it was prior to the 1974 election, and they made mincemeat of him.

Mr O'Neil: That is right.

Mr HARMAN: If he had had three handkerchiefs in his pocket, he could not have wiped away the perspiration on his face. He was so embarrassed he just sat there. He did not intend to give the women of this State one single thing.

Mr Bertram: Shame!

Mr HARMAN: It is to the Minister's credit that he is so consistent; all along the line he has been opposed to women becoming involved in government and community affairs. He does not want to see the women of this country involved in government.

In the light of those comments, I am astounded that the Liberal Party has even one female member in this House. When legislation of this nature comes before the House, one would assume that representations have been made to her to ensure that some consideration is given to allowing women to have the status they deserve in this community. However, it is obvious that whatever representations the member for Wellington may have made have been unsuccessful and have not resolved the situation in favour of the women of this State.

The Government has made a very bad mistake in not agreeing to do what the Labor Party has tried to do on many occasions; namely, to amend the definition of "worker" so that it includes the domestic workers, thus giving them the protection of the Industrial Arbitration Act. The other suggestions put forward to the Government by the various organisations representing women in this State have not been successful. Not one of the requests made has been accepted by the Government.

Finally, I make the point that this year —not merely because it is International Women's Year—the Government should have taken the opportunity to appoint a woman to the Industrial Commission. When one considers the number of industries and trade classifications in which women are employed today, it is difficult to see any reason to exclude women from the commission. I think it would have been a move in a direction which could have improved industrial relations in this State.

Mr Young: Before you sit down, I should like to say that I have checked *Hansard*, and you were right; I did speak to the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill in 1973.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.20 p.m.]: Firstly, I thank the member for Swan for his support of the Bill. He referred particularly to one or two clauses to which I will reply briefly. The honourable member suggested that new section 42 may be a contradiction but I believe if he has a second look at the section he will realise that this is not the case. New section 42 states—

> On the application of any party to an industrial agreement the Commission may, by order, cancel, amend or vary any provision of the industrial agreement at any time while the agreement is in force—
>
> (a) if, in the opinion of the Commission—
>
> (i) circumstances have arisen since the making of the agreement that at the time the agreement was made could not reasonably have been foreseen by the parties to the agreement; and
>
> (ii) those circumstances render that provision of the agreement no longer just; or
>
> (b) if all the parties to the agreement agree that the provision be so cancelled, amended or varied by the Commission,
>
> and the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly.

What we are saying simply is that the commission may, if it agrees, take a certain course of action; the provisions shall then be cancelled, amended, or varied accordingly. There is no contradiction in that.

Mr Bertram: Is there any need for the last two lines?

Mr GRAYDEN: It simply clarifies the situation. In other words, if in the opinion of the commission certain things have happened, the provisions may be cancelled. It is not a contradiction.

Mr Bertram: It is duplication.

Mr GRAYDEN: Perhaps it is unnecessary; however, it helps to clarify the situation. The member for Swan also referred to section 6 of the Act, and talked in terms of the regulations. I can assure him that the Government will study his comments and bear them in mind.

The member for Swan referred to the power of the commission to cancel awards, as laid down in clause 8. In certain circumstances, particularly when there was a possibility that the Federal award might fold up, or something of that nature, it was thought desirable to keep the State

award in effect. I would hope that the commission will be sympathetic in this matter, and realise the fairness of the argument put forward by the member for Swan; I certainly endorse his remarks.

The member for Maylands stated that there are certain obnoxious clauses in the Bill which relate to women, and then went on to say there is discrimination in the Act. I defy him to come forward with any specific instance of discrimination. I assure the honourable member that a number of women's organisations have made representations in regard to the matters he raised; no doubt, they made the same representations to him, and he was merely echoing the arguments they put forward.

I can assure the honourable member that I was most sympathetic to these organisations, and had the Department of Labour and Industry thoroughly examine each case raised by them. The department found that not one complaint was justified and this is the reason the Government has decided not to incorporate amendments along the lines suggested by the member for Maylands.

Mr Harman: I am sure the women's organisations in Western Australia will be pleased to hear that. Not one was justified!

Mr GRAYDEN: The organisations know precisely what is the position because they have received written replies to that effect. If their complaints had been justified, we would have told them so and would have considered introducing appropriate amendments.

Mr Harman: Could you explain why you did not take any action?

Mr GRAYDEN: It was because we had no good reason to take such action. The Department of Labour and Industry investigated these complaints and found they were not based on fact. If the honourable member has any specific complaints or submissions I will be happy to hear them.

Mr Harman: The organisations do not know the Government's decision because they have not heard from you.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is completely untrue.

Mr Harman: They do not know the reasons because the Government did not advance any.

Mr GRAYDEN: In the first place, the group to which the honourable member is referring probably came to see me and I explained why the Government did not propose to take any action in regard to their objections; subsequently, they were informed in writing of the arguments against their objections. One of their requests was that wherever the word "he" appeared in the Act, it should be accompanied by the word "she". It was pointed out that this would make no difference to the legal interpretation of a worker, because both were included in that term. To my knowledge, all the requests were in that category.

The member for Maylands discussed the interpretation of "worker" as contained in the parent Act. The definition is as follows—

> "Worker" means any person of not less than fourteen years of age of either sex employed or usually employed by any employer to do any skilled or unskilled work for hire or reward, and includes an apprentice; but shall not include any person engaged in domestic service, in a private home, provided that no home in which more than six boarders and/or lodgers are received for pay or reward shall be deemed to be a private home:

This definition is not in the Act accidentally; it is not an omission on the part of the Government that we have not amended the Act to correct this situation. This is done very deliberately, as the Deputy Premier pointed out earlier.

Mr Harman: Is it anti-feminist?

Mr GRAYDEN: It is done so that women will not be disadvantaged. If domestic workers were brought within the provisions of the Arbitration Act, they could be deprived of their employment.

Mr Harman: All you want to do is keep them in slavery.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is not a question of slavery, because people can come and go as they choose. If they do not want to work in domestic service they can leave.

Mr Harman: Would you prefer that?

Mr GRAYDEN: Certainly not!

Mr Harman: You do not want them to have a decent wage.

Mr GRAYDEN: If we include domestic workers in the Act we would disadvantage them and it is for this reason and for no other that the definition appears in this way. If this had been such an urgent requirement, one would have expected the previous Labor Government to make a move in that direction.

Mr Harman: We tried to; in fact, the member for Scarborough opposed it. The Legislative Council rejected our amendment.

Mr GRAYDEN: The previous Government did not try very hard. It was rejected because the arguments it put forward were not justified. This was typical of the Labor Party when in office; a great deal of its legislation was put forward with the object of having it defeated in another place. The domestics are excluded for one reason and one reason only.

Mr May: What a pitiful argument!

Mr GRAYDEN: It is no such thing. The member for Maylands also referred to the

possible appointment of a woman to the Industrial Commission. I can assure the honourable member that the Government has given serious consideration to this matter, and has had it in mind for a long time.

If a woman is appointed to the commission, it will not be as a result of a request by the member for Maylands because, as I say, the Government has had it in mind for a long time. I noticed the other day the Trades and Labor Council making a similar statement; no doubt, that prompted the member for Maylands to make his statement tonight, as though it were some sort of original suggestion. Of course it is not.

I repeat that when the time comes to appoint another commissioner to the Industrial Commission this aspect will certainly be taken into consideration. I do not think I have omitted to cover any of the points that have been raised; if I have I will cover them in the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 42 repealed and re-enacted—

Mr SKIDMORE: I am concerned with the reasons given by the Minister for the repeal of section 42 and for its re-enactment. I appreciate what he has said about the intention of the new provision in clause 2, but I am concerned with its drafting. In drafting the re-enacted section the draftsman retained the words, "and the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly".

If we read the existing section of the Act we find that after paragraphs (a) and (b) the same words appear. The re-enacted section in clause 2 appears to be worse. On the one hand it says the commission may order, cancel, amend, or vary any provision of an industrial agreement; and on the other hand it says "the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly".

If we take paragraph (b) into account we will find that it states—

> if all parties to the agreement agree that the provision be so cancelled amended or varied by the Commission,
>
> and the provision shall be cancelled, amended or varied accordingly.

If it is the intention that either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) shall be cancelled the wording in the clause should so specify. If it is not the intention that paragraph (b) shall be amended and that paragraph (a) shall be subject to the discretion of the commission through argument, then I would agree. This is the area about which I am rather concerned.

I would rather see the provision in clause 2 specify that the commission shall do these things, so that if what happens after the making of an industrial agreement that was not known to the parties at the time proves to be wrong and unjust—or should be amended as a result of wage indexation—it shall be a factor to be taken into account. In the circumstances such an industrial agreement should be altered.

The provision in clause 2 is drafted badly. There has been an attempt to rewrite section 42 by the addition of a new subparagraph which we think contains a contradiction in terms. I suggest the provision should be tidied up. If the provision is intended to be mandatory, then the word "shall" should be used.

Mr GRAYDEN: The intention in the clause is to use the word "may" and not the word "shall". There is no question about that. The clause should be read in its entirety, and if it is so read it will be found the provision is not contradictory. Both the Trades and Labor Council and the Confederation of Western Australian Industry have looked at the clause and have agreed to this wording.

Mr SKIDMORE: The fact that the TLC or any other organisation has looked at the provision does not make it right. I in my turn, as a member of Parliament, should be satisfied also. On many occasions in the past I have appeared before the Industrial Commission and put forward arguments violently. In some cases I was successful in pointing out that certain of the conditions were unjust, even though the other parties had argued that they were just.

On this occasion I am quite sure that my interpretation of the intention of the clause is correct. If my colleagues in the TLC disagree with me that is their right.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 14 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [8.40 p.m.]: I take this opportunity in the debate on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) to deal with a number of matters which are causing me concern. Firstly, I refer to the new Road Traffic Authority of Western Australia and to the problems associated with the Police Force.

On looking at the estimates for the various departments I notice certain alterations from the 1974-75 figures which are exercising the minds of members of the Opposition. I note that the amount that is estimated for the Police Department for 1975-76 is $25 846 000, and this represents a reduction compared with the expenditure for 1974-75 which amounted to $26 184 236. The reduction possibly reflects the transfer of police and other staff to the Road Traffic Authority.

I am concerned with the problems associated with the State so far as police control generally is concerned. I notice that the Premier in recent times has spoken about the incidence of rape and other offences which have concerned the Government.

It does cause me concern that there is a reduction in the estimate for the Police Department this year. The estimate for the Road Traffic Authority for 1975-76 has increased substantially from $3 441 808 in 1974-75 to $12 323 000. The estimate of the vote for 1974-75 was only $2 893 000.

It will be seen that the combined votes of the Police Department and the Road Traffic Authority for 1975-76 are estimated to be $38 169 000, as against the combined expenditure of $29 626 044 in 1974-75. I should point out that the vote in 1974-75 for these two departments was $26 260 000.

The increase in the combined votes of these two departments from 1974-75 to 1975-76 is about 30 per cent, and that is a very steep increase. We on this side of the House question why the increase should be so large. In this respect the combined expenditure of the Police Department and the Department of Motor Vehicles increased from $18 726 060 in 1973-74 to $29 626 044 in 1974-75: This represented an increase of 58.29 per cent.

Mr O'Connor: That is, in the two years?

Mr T. H. JONES: That is correct. I would like to hear the Minister comment on the decline in the strength of the Police Force. This decline might be attributed to the creation of the Road Traffic Authority. However, when handling the Bill on behalf of the Opposition I was given to understand that when the Government established the Road Traffic Authority, it would be a separate and distinct body from the Police Force of Western Australia.

If we look at the figures of the staff employed in the Police Department for the year 1974-75 we find the number was 2 546, of which 1 928 comprised sergeants and constables. In the same year the staff employed in the Department of Motor Vehicles numbered 344 of which 228 comprised clerks, typists, and assistants.

In the 1975-76 Estimates it will be seen that the staff of the Police Department numbered 2 176, or a reduction of 370 on the figure for 1974-75. I assume that the problems encountered in so many sections of police administration in Western Australia are so large in number that the number of employees in the Police Force should have been increased, in view of the increased incidence of crime which has been so evident in recent times. However, the Government might have other reasons for this reduction in staff.

It is most significant that on the one hand the Government says it is concerned with the increased incidence of crime, and on the other hand we see a reduction of 370 in the number of employees in the two years I have mentioned.

It is noted that the Government is concerned about road fatalities, and is instituting road blitzes. It was mentioned in a report tabled in Parliament that the cost of the road blitzes to the Police Force amounted to $1 719 395, which is $419 395 above the estimate. I have been wondering why the figure is so high. Possibly it is because of increased wages and the like.

I also note that apparently the Road Traffic Authority is not operating in the way it was intended to operate. I do not think it can be said that the Minister is happy with the results achieved so far, because if we look at his statements and also the statements of the Premier which have been published in the Press, it will be clear that there has been a very small reduction in the number of road fatalities since the Road Traffic Authority was established.

No doubt the Minister would be aware of a recent report by the Director of the Road Traffic Authority (Mr Court) when he indicated that the fatalities this year numbered 245 as compared with 279 for the previous year. I appreciate this is a reduction of 34 fatalities, and that is a good sign. I have been wondering whether the new Road Traffic Authority has been operating in the manner the Government intended it to operate.

The Minister is no doubt very concerned about this matter, because I notice that very shortly a big traffic blitz will be started. The reason might arise from the desire of the Government to reduce the incidence of speeding and drunken driving. However, I have my own reasons for the introduction of the blitz. It would be true to say that the Road Traffic Authority would have operated more efficiently and achieved better results, had it been under police jurisdiction. Whether or not it is, is arguable. I have my views, which I stated when handling the second reading. I said then that the police should have the control, and I still hold that view.

What concerns me is the question of spot checks in Western Australia. When I moved an amendment to the Road Traffic Bill the Minister gave an assurance that the Bill's provisions would not result in spot checks on our roads. I do not think he will deny that. However, in case

he cannot recall his assurance, I will refer him to *Hansard* No. 3 of 1974 at page 2836 where he said—

> Much comment was made by the member for Avon, the member for Kalgoorlie, and the member for Boulder-Dundas, regarding clause 66 which deals with what they claim is random testing. I do not believe it will provide random testing generally . . .

I have evidence that random testing has been carried out in a large way in Western Australia. According to what the Minister said when speaking to my amendment, the constable at that time had to suspect a driver or be of the opinion that a driver was driving in an erratic manner or was breaking the law before he could stop him. Now, of course, he can be tested, anyway.

On page 2989 of *Hansard* of last year, when speaking to my amendment, the Minister said—

> I intend to oppose the amendment moved by the member for Collie. First of all, at the present time it is necessary for a policeman to wait until a person who is obviously under the influence of alcohol commits a breach of the regulations or is involved in an accident before he can be apprehended. I believe that such a person should be apprehended before an accident occurs. This request came from the National Safety Council. It is a reasonable amendment and it is an attempt to prevent accidents from occurring.

Has the Minister put this theory into operation? I understand he has not. The Opposition believes that the police in Western Australia would be doing a better job if, instead of waiting outside hotels and other places to apprehend drivers, they spoke to a driver they considered was unfit to drive and told him he should not drive. This would be far better than the police setting up road blocks because they know people have been drinking in a hotel. When these road blocks are established, the officers check everyone who passes. This is what is occurring.

I have evidence concerning a road check at Grass Valley, just outside Northam. The sergeant of police in charge of the Northam office has indicated in correspondence that the road check was established outside Grass Valley on a night when a cabaret was being held, and all those coming from the cabaret were tested.

If the Minister is sincere—I am not suggesting he is not—he should put into effect what he told me he would do when I moved the amendment to the legislation when it was before Parliament. He should instruct the patrolmen or have Mr Court instruct them to put into operation the suggestion he made to Parliament. If he did this, the policemen in Western Australia would be rendering a much greater service than they are by the spot checks. They should say to a person outside a hotel or other places where drink is obtained that he should not drive his vehicle because he is not capable of doing so.

I am given to understand that this is not being done. Instead, road blocks are being established. Is this a revenue move on the part of the Government? I notice that revenue from traffic offences has increased. We all know the tactics of the policemen. They hide under trees, and such a procedure is not accepted by motorists in Western Australia. I noticed when coming from Collie recently that policemen were hiding behind trees at Armadale in order to catch motorists.

Mr O'Connor: In an effort to save lives.

Mr T. H. JONES: Maybe they are making an effort to save lives, but what are people saying? They are saying that we are rapidly becoming a police State. The Minister should be doing as he said he would do; that is, instruct the patrolmen to tell those not capable of driving that, as they have consumed too much alcohol, they had better not drive their vehicles. In this way they would be doing a great service for the motorists in Western Australia.

Mr O'Connor: They do that in many cases.

Mr T. H. JONES: I would like to know where. I know of all sorts of other things being done. I know that a club in the metropolitan area hires buses on a Saturday night to take patrons to and from the club.

Mr O'Connor: That lasted a fortnight.

Mr T. H. JONES: No, it is still being done. I am not talking about a hotel, but about a club which hires two vehicles each Saturday night to take patrons to and from the club.

Mr O'Connor: What is the club?

Mr T. H. JONES: The Fremantle Club in Bannister Street, because I rode in one of the buses.

Mr May: That is a familiar street.

Mr T. H. JONES: It might have been once, but it is not now. I did not go there for that purpose.

What has been exercising my mind is the assurance given by the Minister that the Road Traffic Bill would not lead to spot checking. The Minister cannot deny he gave that assurance because it is recorded in *Hansard*. Members opposite would be aware of the fact that spot checks are being made and this is contrary to the promise the Minister gave when I was handling the Bill on behalf of the Opposition.

People in Western Australia are saying that we are rapidly becoming a police State. I know we must consider the problem of drink and its association with fatal

accidents, but we must also consider the rights of motorists.

Many of us have attended cabarets and clubs in country districts. How many fatal accidents have occurred after such functions, especially in our age group? We would all have to admit that very few occur. Would anyone in the House deny that contention?

Mr O'Connor: I would.

Mr May: They are also outside wedding receptions.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister would be one of the few. I have made my point in regard to this important problem. I will not attempt to quote the fines collected. In view of the assurance the Minister gave me when I moved the amendment to the Road Traffic Bill that the legislation would not result in spot checking, he should indicate the present position. Has he changed his attitude in this matter?

Mr Laurance: Did you visit Sweden when you were overseas?

Mr T. J. JONES: Of course I did. If the member for Gascoyne had attended the CPA meeting when I reported on my overseas trip he would have known I did.

Mr Laurance: I had another meeting to attend.

Mr T. H. JONES: The next item I wish to raise concerns a promise the Minister gave to me in relation to the registration of massage parlours in Western Australia. I raised this subject in September of last year and the Minister promised he would study the legislation operating in other parts of Australia. I do not know whether he can remember giving me that assurance. In *The West Australian* of the 10th September appeared a report concerning the operation of pseudo parlours generally in Western Australia.

Mr Laurance: Did you check on the matter in Sweden?

Mr T. H. JONES: The member for Gascoyne can make his own speech. I am making mine now.

Mr May: I think you are rubbing him up the wrong way now.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Victorian Parliament has banned these parlours in residential areas in Victoria.

I have received in writing a complaint from a lady. In fact I have received numerous complaints regarding the activities of these massage parlours in Western Australia. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure there is no doubt in the Minister's mind, that they are a front for prostitution in this State. The number in Western Australia has increased dramatically. I pose the question: What are they opening for? Are they all carrying out massage, or are they opening for another purpose? I think members opposite know the answer as well as I do.

In view of the assurance I was given when I raised the matter last year that the Government would study the legislation in the other States—it is time we heard something about it.

Mr O'Connor: We have looked at it.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister has been quick to announce what he has done in other spheres, but he has said nothing in regard to massage parlours.

I wish now to refer to an important matter; that is, the mess which the transport industry is in in Western Australia. I am referring to owner-drivers generally. In his speech at the opening of Parliament on the 13th March, 1975, when dealing with the legislative programme of the Government, the Governor said—

> I now refer broadly to some of the Bills it is proposed to place before Parliament this session. These will provide for—

He then listed the items, among which was the following—

> rationalise the Road Transport Industry;

We were told we would have a Bill to rationalise the road transport industry, but where is it? I have not seen it. I am wondering whether it is one of the Bills we will have submitted to us before Parliament folds up. I understand that an assurance was given along these lines to the Road Transport Association of Western Australia, and I would like to know whether any positive steps have been taken to rationalise the industry in this State. I will prove in a moment what a mess it is in so far as the subcontractors and owner-drivers are concerned and the need for some positive action. Six or seven are going to the wall every month. Positive action could be taken by the registration of owner-drivers as is the case in Europe generally. The Minister would have ascertained this when he was recently overseas. I had the good fortune to make such a trip earlier. The Minister would know the licensing requirements in Europe, and if he studied the system in England he would know that licensing is necessary there also. There is good reason for us to study the problem in this State.

On the 17th February this year the Secretary of the TWU wrote to the Premier regarding seven points. One of these concerned the control of entry into the industry, but according to the secretary no action has been taken yet on this matter.

Then, on the 14th July, a submission was made to the Commissioner of Transport regarding the rationalisation of and the entry into the transport industry generally. With your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I will quote from a report which appeared in a recent issue of *The Wheel*, the official organ of the TWU, as follows—

> As most of you already know we are still pushing ahead to control entry into the transport industry. We are

also endeavouring to get permit fees abolished altogether, we are also hoping to obtain a substitute for the collection of road maintenance tax . . .

Debts totalling approx. $22 000 have been recovered by the TWU in just over 12 months. This is money that the Owner Drivers would never have received . . .

The reason behind this is the Al Capone attitude of a contractor in the outer metro area who sold numerous trucks with a contract and work, now he is being handed back the last truck he sold with work.

He goes on to say—

Having read the Road Transport Inquiry report from cover to cover, I find the report highlighting the problems of the industry without offering any solutions.

In fact, the compilers of the report make it quite clear that this is a report about the problems in the industry and it is not a function of the inquiry to offer solutions.

I think the Minister would agree with this. I refer there, as the article does, to the Sander report. On page 42 of that report the commissioner referred to the problem of the entry into the industry.

I must ask the question: what are we doing to control the problem which is so obvious to the Minister for Transport in Western Australia? It is not my intention to weary the House by reading any of the report. However, I have received numerous letters from owner-drivers who have waited months for payments from contractors.

Of course they are powerless to recover. Six or seven owner-drivers are going to the wall every month. I think it is time positive steps were taken to protect the operators involved in this very important sector of the transport industry. One owner-driver waited a month for $927, and he had to wait several months for $1 518.

What can we do? It is of no use my being critical if I cannot put forward something positive. These are my suggestions, which the Government should look at, as it said in the Governor's opening Speech it would. Firstly, there should be control of the industry generally. Secondly, there should be control as far as contractors are concerned. Thirdly, there should be control as far as owner-drivers or subcontractors are concerned.

There is a problem with forward loading rates. It is quite easy for a driver to obtain a forward load but it is not so easy to obtain a back load. Drivers have to wait for days to get a back load. In order to receive a back load they are cutting their rates, and from the investigation I have made this is why they are going to the wall. They have to get a back load at any price so that they can keep their trucks moving and remain operative.

In England and Europe there are licensed hauliers who have a sign on their trucks. If a sign is not displayed on a truck, it is not permitted to operate. The Minister would have seen this in his recent trip overseas. We should look at this matter speedily because, as the Minister would be aware every month owner-drivers are going bankrupt and some control must be exercised to protect the men in this very important industry in Western Australia. I hope the Minister will do something, in line with the promises contained in the Governor's opening Speech.

I notice that on the Minister's return from overseas he stated the implementation of the underground rail system was not warranted in Western Australia at the moment. There may be good reason for that, but he also mentioned fast bus systems for Perth. I had the opportunity to inspect the Nottingham system of feeder services whereby people are encouraged to park their vehicles in outer areas and commute to the city. Public transport has priority over general transport, and this brings about an efficient run for the buses.

I spoke to the Minister last night and we put our views on this point. I suggest to him that in conjunction with the fast bus services we should consider fast train services. It may be argued the trains are working at capacity now, but we should implement nonstop trains in conjunction with fast bus services on a trial basis. At the busiest times we should introduce nonstop trains between Perth and Armadale, Midland, and Fremantle. They would work in conjunction with each other. In my view, it is of no use increasing the number of buses into the central station for people who require railway transport when they are met with a slow train service. I understand a trial was carried out and it was found on the normal run a train takes 35 minutes to travel from Fremantle to Perth, but a nonstop service with a one-unit train covered the journey in 18 minutes. In these circumstances we would reduce the travelling time between Perth and Fremantle from 35 minutes to 18 minutes. If we had a fast bus service to transport people from the station, we would overcome some of the traffic hazards which are evident in Western Australia, generally.

Mr Mensaros: What about Collie coal?

Mr T. H. JONES: I will mention that. I will not let members down.

Mr Mensaros: I have to leave. I wonder whether you could talk about it now.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister would be disappointed if I did not. I will get around to it in good time. Perhaps the Minister will move an extension of time for me, if he is so interested.

Mr Old: Not likely!

Mr T. H. JONES: The next matter I want to deal with is coal. The Government or the Press has tried to fool the public of Western Australia. They might fool some people but they certainly do not fool me. During the past week numerous people have said to me, "I see you have another big order for Collie coal." When we have a look at the situation, we find the orders remain the same as they were previously. All that has been done, as the Minister would agree, is that the new contractual tonnages have been written into the contracts.

The conversion of the South Fremantle and East Perth power stations back to coal following the rise in the price of oil meant that an increased quantity of coal was required by the SEC. The Kwinana power station was the first to go off peak-load period and this increased coal burning at other stations. As a consequence, during the currency of the last three-year contract it was necessary to increase the orders for coal from Collie, but the tonnages in the contract were not increased. These huge orders began approximately 12 months ago.

Mr May: Who increased the three and five-year contracts?

Mr T. H. JONES: The Labor Party did, but there was no other alternative and the Government was compelled to do it. The Government had no alternative because it changed the power stations from coal to oil—the Minister cannot deny that—and because of the high cost of oil the Government has to spend millions of dollars converting the power stations back to coal burning.

Mr Mensaros: What is the alternative?

Mr T. H. JONES: There is no alternative. Had the Government done what I told it to do earlier, it would not have been in that situation. The Government is considering changing two 200-megawatt units at Kwinana back to coal. I understand a subcommittee has been appointed and that the changeover will cost in the vicinity of $25 million. That is a sizeable amount when we consider the cutbacks in expenditure: Not 1c will be spent on any school in the Collie district in the next 12 months according to an answer I received from the Minister for Education. Not 1c will be spent on schools in Donnybrook and a number of other towns in Western Australia.

I am not blaming the Minister for Fuel and Energy for this; I am blaming a former Minister of a previous Liberal Government. I have to say the unions at Collie were opposed to the Kwinana power station being built to burn oil when the rest of the world was going back to coal. The Government of the day pursued the policy of building the Kwinana oil-burning station, due either to its own stupidity or to the stupidity of the State Electricity Commission. The State is now paying the penalty.

Against the wishes of many people, the Government decided in 1965 to double the capacity of the Kwinana power station. Among the many specious arguments put forward was the argument that Collie had only 35 years left. Mr Joe Lord, of the Geological Survey Department, reported to a seminar on the 18th of last month that there are 390 million tonnes of extractable coal at Collie. *The West Australian* newspaper referred to this matter in its subleader yesterday. In 1970 I moved in this place for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the State Electricity Commission. I knew then from my research throughout the world that what we were doing in this State as far as our generation policy was concerned was contrary to what was happening in the other States and in other countries of the world.

Mr Mensaros: Your Government did not hold a Royal Commission inquiry, and I reorganised the SEC. Your Government did nothing. I did the reorganisation.

Mr T. H. JONES: It was not necessary for our Government to hold an inquiry. The Minister decided to extend Kwinana when he was faced with the increased price of oil. Someone told the former Minister for Electricity (Mr Nalder, now Sir Crawford Nalder)—and he fell for the bait—that there were 35 years left for Collie and that would be the end of the coalfield. The Labor Government had an intensive boring programme carried out by Peabody Coal of America and Western Colleries Ltd. which revealed that there are 390 million tonnes of coal at Collie. That demonstrates the lack of foresight of the Liberal Government. The taxpayers and consumers of power in Western Australia will now have to pay $25 million for conversion.

Mr Mensaros: Give me a better suggestion.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am not opposed to the conversion because there is no alternative. I am saying that not only did the Government build the Kwinana power station but it also doubled its capacity in 1965, when I argued on behalf of the unions—and it is on record—that what the Government was doing was against the policy adopted throughout the world.

Mr Mensaros: You have told us that 20 times.

Mr May: You must get the message sooner or later.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am just getting the record straight. The present Minister for Fuel and Energy was not on the scene as far as electricity was concerned in 1965. I am not blaming him, but I have asked this question before and I will ask it again for the last time: Who did what? Did

the State Electricity Commission say, "We will build a power station at Kwinana", or did the Liberal Government tell the SEC to build it? I have not been able to obtain the answer to that question. Someone has cost this State millions of dollars.

The subleader in today's issue of *The West Australian* states—

> . . . Collie miners now have a reputation for responsibility.

Mr May: What a shocking statement!

Mr T. H. JONES: People cannot stop attacking the Collie miners. The Collie miners have lost only one day's work since 1960. The worst strike in the history of the Collie coalfield took place in 1949. I refer to the "Red" strike, when Amalgamated Collieries wanted to take down a mine a horse which was not equipped or did not have pit sense for working in an underground mine. The horsebreaker could not break in the horse and the men went out on strike. Mr Justice Gallagher came over from the Eastern States after the city had been blacked out and he found in favour of the miners. The horse was sold to a greengrocer for £26. What was behind that strike? I have never been able to find out, but certainly the Collie miners cannot be blamed for it. That was one of the worst strikes in the history of the Collie coalfield.

If *The West Australian* wants to refer to these matters and say the Collie miners have now learnt to accept responsibility, I say they have been accepting responsibility since 1960. No other union has lost only one day's work in 15 years, and that stoppage was no fault of the miners; it was the cost-plus system and other factors which brought about that stoppage at Collie.

In conclusion on this subject, I say it is quite clear that the Collie miners have proved themselves to a "T". My reasons for wanting a Royal Commission in 1970 were proved to be right; and I was proved to be right on behalf of the miners and the people of Collie when in 1965 I opposed the doubling of the capacity of the oil-burning station at Kwinana.

The SPEAKER: The member has six minutes remaining.

Mr T. H. JONES: I said in respect of the Royal Commission that one day the chickens would come home to roost. Surely that has happened now, because the price of oil is currently $58 a tonne and there is a further 10 per cent increase just around the corner; whereas the price of Collie coal is $8 a tonne. We see the relativity when it takes 2.2 tonnes of Collie coal to equal the heating capacity of one tonne of oil. So for $20 worth of coal we get the equivalent of $58 worth of oil.

I am sure Kwinana will be converted to coal, because the Government has no alternative. It has been caught with its pants well and truly down. The blame for this situation can be laid fairly and squarely on the policies about which the Government was warned some years ago.

Mr Sodeman: What would happen if we had our own oil?

Mr T. H. JONES: That could be a different matter; but the fact is that we do not have our own oil. The member for Pilbara would not buy eggs if he had fowls that were laying eggs.

Mr Sodeman: What would you have done, not knowing what the position would be?

Mr May: What a ridiculous argument!

Mr T. H. JONES: Let the honourable member look after the Pilbara and I will do my best to look after Collie. I will allow my electors to be my judge. Let him look after the Pilbara, which he purports to know something about, and I will look after Collie, which I purport to know something about; and then we will get on well together.

I am very worried about the housing situation in Collie. As members would know, with the changeover to coal there are very few houses available. This is not an attack on the commission, because at one stage in 1960 we had 350 empty houses and 22 empty shops as a result of the action of the previous Liberal Government. Now, of course, things have changed and we have a great list of applicants waiting for housing accommodation. I am hoping the Minister for Housing will give some consideration to the building of additional homes in Collie to meet the requirements of the mine and railway workers.

Mr Rushton: Your shopping facilities have improved.

Mr T. H. JONES: Yes, but not as a result of the policy of the Liberal Government in 1960, when 22 shops were closed. Can the Minister imagine walking around a town with 22 vacant shops and 350 empty homes? Can he imagine the impact that had on the town? However, due to the changeover to coal—because the Government has no alternative—thank goodness we have seen a change in the town and our young people have the opportunity of employment. I do not want to see the previous situation occur again. It was one of the worst sights I have ever witnessed. I am referring to seeing a town close down overnight with 600 people thrown out of work; it is something I will never forget.

Mr Rushton: I helped you to open it up again.

Mr May: You were a bank manager then.

The SPEAKER: The member has two minutes left.

Mr T. H. JONES: Well, Sir, I have so much else to say; I do not know whether I could obtain an extension of time.

In conclusion, I would like to say I am very proud to see Collie moving forward and to see the power houses converted to coal-burning plants.

I hope the Minister for Transport will give consideration to the matter I raised in respect of transportation problems in this State. I am most serious in respect of this. The Minister is aware of the problems, and I think he would agree the Government has done little about the matter. In saying that I think it is fair criticism which should be levelled at the Government. I feel it is time the Government tackled this problem and held an investigation into the transport industry in Western Australia.

Mr May: Hear, hear!

Mr O'Connor: That is already being done.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [9.20 p.m.]: I would like to take the opportunity this debate affords to be a little parochial and to refer to some matters affecting my electorate. Before doing so, however, I would say I believe this Budget is a good one in the interests of the State as a whole.

Mr McIver: Which Budget?

Mr STEPHENS: The Budget we are now debating. It is a good one in the interests of the State as a whole. Possibly if the Budget brought down in Canberra had also been in the interests of the State and the Commonwealth as a whole we would not have the crisis we have there at the moment.

I am very pleased—I know this is not part of this debate, but I would like to make brief reference to it—that an amount of $500 000 has been allocated from loan funds to commence the water scheme announced by the Minister for Works. This is of considerable interest to me because in the 4½ years I have been in this place I have continually drawn attention to the need for water in the southern part of the State. On each occasion I have brought up the matter I have been told that the need is recognised but that it is a question of priorities having regard to the finance that is available.

The department had got to the stage of even surveying a pipeline from the Denmark River to Mt. Barker, but the project did not get off the ground. One of the first activities of the reformed Albany Zone Development Committee was to set up a water supply subcommittee. That subcommittee has done an excellent job, and I am proud and happy to recognise its work and to have my appreciation recorded in *Hansard*. The subcommittee has done a great deal of work in association with the officers of the Public Works Department. A great deal of co-operation has been experienced and we have seen that progress can be made as a result of the participation of interested parties in the area with the co-operation of the Public Works Department.

I must say that initially I was a little apprehensive lest it be just another plan we were discussing, and that we would continue to talk about a plan without seeing any action. For that reason I am particularly pleased to see the allocation of $500 000 in the Loan Budget because this will ensure the project will get under way. It is a project that is highly desirable and very necessary for the southern part of the State.

I would like also to pay tribute to the officers of the Department of Agriculture, with particular reference to Mr Jamieson, the viticulturist, who played a very prominent part in the development of what will be a very important wine-growing industry in the Mt. Barker and Frankland River areas. I believe the officers showed considerable foresight in the early stages by carrying out experimental work on five acres of land which the department leased. The first breakthrough in this experimental vineyard occurred back in 1972. That was the first vintage, and it showed great promise.

Of course, we all know it takes at least five years of bearing before the vines are normally considered to be of sufficient maturity to produce a full-bodied wine. However, the wines produced from grapes from the Mt. Barker and Frankland River areas showed promise virtually right from the beginning and have won medals when exhibited at the Royal Show.

There is, of course, a degree of rivalry between the Mt. Barker and the Frankland River regions, which is only natural. A vintage from one area in one year has been a little better than the other, and in the next year the contrary has been the case. However, in 1975, which is only the third vintage from these areas, the wine from Mt. Barker had the edge and won gold medals in Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, and Brisbane; and in three of those places it was acclaimed as the best white wine in Australia. I am referring, of course, to the Riesling. The Frankland River area also was successful in winning one gold medal and three silver medals. I am sure members will agree this is a notable achievement for an area which has been producing wine for only three years.

I mentioned that these areas have been producing wines, but actually they have been producing only the grapes and the wine has been vintaged in the metropolitan area. I think all members would agree it is absolutely essential that a winery be established in the area where the grapes are produced. This would be a means of decentralisation, and would also be a great filip to the tourist industry; there would be a rub-off in respect of the people who would visit the area to see the winery and who would, naturally, buy a certain amount of wine.

Mr Skidmore: You will have the member for Swan interjecting soon.

Mr STEPHENS: I think the member for Swan would be very fair and would acknowledge that the wine from this area is worth talking about.

Mr Skidmore: Absolutely!

Mr STEPHENS: We need a winery in the district. I realise eventually we will have one, but the sooner we get it the better it will be for the district and for the wine industry in the region. Therefore, I was a little disappointed at the attitude of the Department of Industrial Development. I do not think the department has been flexible in respect of assisting the efforts of a particular grower in the area to develop a winery. This grower is associated with an English backer, and has established vines; but unfortunately as a result of the financial situation in England money cannot be taken out of that country, and the local grower has been thrown back onto his own resources. Approaches were made to the Department of Industrial Development without success.

I am prepared to concede that possibly the proposition put forward did not come within the normal, accepted guidelines of the department. This is where I feel the policy of the department is not sufficiently flexible. I have given a brief resume of the potential of this wine. Its potential cannot be questioned, yet the department does not appear to be prepared to take any sort of risk whatsoever in respect of this industry.

The industry is absolutely assured. We must bear in mind that in normal circumstances it takes some four years from the picking of the grapes until a cash flow is achieved. Therefore, it is essential to obtain some finance on a long-term, low-interest basis. This was not forthcoming. So we have a man in the region who has been thrown back onto his own resources.

I give him full credit for the fact that he is still making some endeavour and is producing some wines; but it would have been far better for him had the department been prepared to take a risk and assist with the financing of this venture for the benefit of the district as a whole.

I refer to another local industry. Just outside Mt. Barker there is to be found a building stone known as Mt. Barker building stone. This stone is relatively soft when first quarried, but oxidisation takes place after exposure to the air, and the stone hardens. It has been used in buildings in the area for something over 90 years. It has not been used in a great number of houses, but nevertheless it has been used for 90 years.

In perhaps the last 14 years or so further development has taken place and a growing number of houses have been built from this material. The stone is fairly light in weight and also has good insulation qualities. It has the advantage of being relatively cheap.

However, there appeared on the scene a very efficient building inspector. He noted this stone was not approved as a building material by the Building Advisory Committee. Therefore the stone was submitted to that committee for approval as a recognised building material. Unfortunately, that approval was not forthcoming. The stone has a compression test of something like 570 to 630 pounds per square inch.

In that regard it is very similar to the Mt. Gambier stone which has a compression strength of 770 pounds to the square inch. In South Australia permission was granted to build three-storey buildings of Mt. Gambier building stone, but in Western Australia it can be used only in single-storey construction provided the material is not used in any lead bearing situation. That is the difference between the two States. In South Australia the material can be used for the construction of a three-storey building, but in Western Australia it can be used only as a veneer, and even then only when it is not subjected to any load.

Several years ago I spent a great deal of time trying to have this decision reversed through the Building Industry Advisory Committee, but to no avail. It is considered locally—and I am a little inclined to agree—that perhaps some of these decisions may have been made because some of the brick companies may be afraid of competition in regard to price.

The size of a brick manufactured with this material is 18 inches by nine inches and it costs 37c. At this price it represents only about half the cost of the ordinary brick that is used for brick construction. Further, when consideration is made of the fact that bricks of this size can be laid more rapidly than bricks of the conventional size, the cost of constructing a building up to roof height is even less. The material used for this brick is light and it has insulation properties. I know it is inclined to be a little porous, but there is a product that can be used to seal these bricks and that will overcome any problems in regard to moisture.

As there are a number of houses in the area that are now about 12 or 14 years old, I request the Minister for Local Government, who has jurisdiction over the Building Industry Advisory Committee, and the Minister for Industrial Development, to review the situation and perhaps have an architectural engineer check the houses that have been built for a number of years with a view to revising the decision so that this brick can be approved as being a suitable building material. If this were done it would prove to be of considerable benefit to local enterprise.

The construction of a hostel at Mt. Barker is another matter that concerns

me. About three years ago during the debate on the Budget, or on the Address-in-Reply, I brought to the notice of the House the need for the high school in the Mt. Barker district to be raised from a three-year to a five-year high school. I was very pleased that the Minister for Education at that time—the member for Kalgoorlie—took note of my remarks, which proves, of course, that sometimes the statements members make during such debates are given careful consideration, because I am now happy to report that the Mt. Barker High School is on the way to becoming a five-year high school. This year it is a four-year high school, and it will become a five-year high school next year.

Immediately the decision was made that the Mt. Barker High School would become a five-year high school a local committee was formed and became active with a view to having established a hostel which would meet the requirements of a five-year high school. That committee came forward with the idea that a hostel could be conducted on a four-nightly basis. The members of the committee considered that this would be an economical way to conduct such a hostel because the excessive cost of paying for weekend labour would be avoided. It also had the added benefit that children would be able to go home at the weekends to enjoy the comforts of their own homes.

At that time it was considered by those in authority that such a proposition was not viable. However, not long after this the Minister for Education, whilst making one of his country tours, suggested that one of the ways to overcome the problem of providing a hostel would be to have it conducted on a four-nightly basis. So at last it has been accepted that a hostel conducted along these lines is a viable proposition. The Mt. Barker committee progressed a little further by approaching the authority in charge of high school hostels for some assurance of financial assistance. However, the many approaches that have been made have been without success. The reason given at the moment for not being able to grant financial assistance is that the Albany hostel has surplus accommodation. A similar position obtains also at the Katanning hostel and therefore any children who attend the Mt. Barker High School could find accommodation at either of those two hostels.

Personally, I do not think this is a valid argument. Surely the children from the Mt. Barker district should not be disadvantaged by not being able to have their own high school hostel. This situation does not apply at the Narrogin High School, because in the Loan Estimates I understand that something like $232 000 has been allocated to construct additional hostel accommodation at that centre. The distance from Narrogin to Katanning is no further than the distance from Mt. Barker to Katanning. In view of this I think some consideration should be given to the people of Mt. Barker being granted permission to build a hostel to meet the needs of a five-year high school.

The attendance at the Mt. Barker High School at the moment is only about 350 students. This number is considerably less than the number of students attending the Albany High School, which accommodates about 1 300 students. Most parents realise that at a smaller high school the children are regarded more as individuals and not merely as cogs in a system which, hopefully, turns out educated children.

Another problem in my electorate is one that has been with the nation virtually since its inception. This is a matter which the member for Avon touched on the other evening. I am speaking of the Aboriginal question. I know that nobody could argue that with the advent of white settlers to Australia this led to the destruction of the Aboriginal culture. Most Australians consider Aborigines have been treated with indifference, and I think that possibly, on an individual basis, Australians have been indifferent to the plight of Aborigines. Nevertheless I do not think this could be said of State and Commonwealth Governments, and more particularly State Governments, because until recently Aborigines were the responsibility of State Governments.

Our State Government has always had a firm policy in regard to Aborigines and if a check were made through past debates recorded in *Hansard* it would be seen that Aborigines have been under discussion virtually ever since the first State Parliament assembled. Those debates, of course, did not produce any worth-while results.

There were two reasons for this. Firstly, the policies of the State Government in themselves were not particularly sound and, secondly, usually the State Government lacked the necessary finance to implement these policies. So the combination of those two reasons led to very little progress being made. Now, of course, as a result of the referendum that was held throughout the Commonwealth Aborigines have become the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. Legislation to put this into effect was introduced in 1973, and became effective in 1974.

If in the past money was a problem in the implementation of policies in regard to Aborigines, I do not think that argument can be put forward today. According to the figures in publications issued by the Commonwealth Government, direct Commonwealth Government expenditure on Aboriginal advancement amounted to $117

million. A breakdown of this total was as follows—

	$ million
Welfare	35.5
Housing	27.0
Education	21.0
Health	13.0
Community amenities	11.5
Sundry items	9.0
	117.0

In addition to this expenditure the States were allocated another $32.2 million for Aboriginal welfare, making a grand total of some $149 million that has been spent on the Aboriginal population.

If my mathematics are sound this amounts to about $1 300 per head of the Australian population. Further, these figures are exclusive of the amounts that are paid in social service benefits, such as unemployment benefits, relief payments, and child endowment. These payments can be quite considerable. This is borne out when I indicate to the House the money that several families in my electorate are receiving. One family consisting of a husband and wife and including their own children and some foster children has a total of 13 units. That family is receiving $8 600 a year in social service payments. All this money is tax free.

Another family—which is a deserving case—consists of a mother and seven children. She is receiving social service payments totalling $7 400 a year. These amounts that are being expended are in addition to the very large sum of money I referred to earlier. So I think we can agree that the amount of money being advanced for Aboriginal welfare in accordance with our policies is quite considerable.

In the Albany region there resides a total of 614 Aborigines. Unfortunately it cannot be said that the policies that are being pursued and the money that is being spent have brought any successful results in that area.

Mr Harman: Why not?

Mr STEPHENS: If the honourable member will only wait I will explain. In making this point I am not casting any direct reflection on the Aboriginal population. This is a matter that involves both the white and coloured population. I say the current policies and the amounts that have been expended have not been particularly successful in the areas of welfare, housing, education, and health. As a result of inquiries I have made and discussions I have had with people in the area the attendance of Aboriginal children at the school has fallen. The level of employment is very low and the health of the Aborigines in the Albany area is very poor.

Mr Harman: What are you doing about it?

Mr STEPHENS: What is the honourable member doing about it? The Aborigines are being housed, but of course, once again, there are problems in regard to maintaining the houses they occupy. Also, the Aborigines themselves are causing considerable trouble in the areas where they are occupying houses.

I had no intention of making this a searching inquiry, but from inquiries I have made and as a result of general discussion with people in the district, I have reached the conclusion that the VD rate in the Albany area among Aborigines is very high. The illegitimacy rate is also high among these people.

Mr Skidmore: The VD rate throughout Australia among both black and white people is high.

Mr Bertram: Is that the illegitimacy rate among Aborigines? How does it compare with the illegitimacy rate among whites?

Mr Harman: Who is responsible for the high rate of VD?

Mr STEPHENS: I am not trying to blame anybody. I am only just making a statement of the situation as I understand it in that area. I believe that no girl after attaining the age of 14 years has not had a child or is not pregnant. This is the problem which affects the whole community. As I said earlier, I do not want this to be taken as an attack on the Aborigines. I raise the matter because I believe—

Mr Harman: You are singling out a section of the community that this appertains to.

Mr STEPHENS: That is right.

Mr Harman: If you can argue that it appertains to that section—

Mr STEPHENS: We are all involved in this, and it is a part—

Mr Skidmore: Not in the pregnancy, surely!

Mr STEPHENS: If the honourable member wants to continue to interject, I will ignore him. He is twisting what I am saying.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order! The member for Stirling.

Mr STEPHENS: Have members opposite finished?

Mr Harman: I have finished you.

Mr STEPHENS: All I am saying is that in respect of the money being spent, the policies being pursued are not effective, and that this is a problem which concerns all of us. It is a problem in which we should all become involved in an effort to find a solution. That is what I am saying.

Mr Harman: I agree with you.

Mr STEPHENS: That is the reason I have raised the matter. I am supported in my views by Labor politicians. I will not bother to quote from the various cuttings I have here, but we all know Senator Cavanagh said that he believed the problem was one of money, but that he now realised this was not so; and I would agree with him.

I mentioned the health aspects in my area. However, there are quotes in the paper concerning comments that the senator made on his tour of the north and he referred to the serious health problems there.

In the past we have sat back and allowed the policies to be developed and administered by departmental officers. Once again, I do not intend to criticise those officers; but we have not solved the problem by leaving the matter to others. I repeat the point I am making which is that this is a problem in which the whole community should be involved in order to find a solution because obviously the policy being pursued at the moment is not effective. I would like to leave that thought with the House. Perhaps members could become involved and meet with those responsible for administering the policy. They should also meet the coloured people as I have done. I have discussed the problem with them and asked if they had a solution. However, they did not have one, but somehow one must be found.

Mr Harman: You as the member provide a technique by which these people and all the other people in your electorate can get involved and make a decision.

Mr STEPHENS: I do not profess to have the answer, but collectively perhaps we could find one. I am not being critical of any particular aspect. I am making a statement so that everyone will be made aware of the problem.

Several members interjected.

Mr STEPHENS: It is something which must be done by all Governments and all people. I do not agree with the member who interjected and said we must sit back and leave it to the Government. We should all become involved as individuals.

Mr Harman: You develop a technique and we can all get involved.

Mr STEPHENS: Those were a few of the issues I wished to raise concerning my electorate because I felt they should be recorded in *Hansard*, and, where necessary, brought to the attention of the appropriate Minister.

In conclusion I would like to refer to the situation in Canberra. Quite a few members have done so. As seems to be the usual pattern in a debate of this nature, one point is mentioned more than others.

Mr Skidmore: I hope you use the hackneyed expression "reprehensible".

Mr STEPHENS: The Prime Minister is trying to make great capital out of statements to the effect that democracy is being attacked. I believe it is being attacked, but not by any Liberal-National Country Party Government. It is being attacked by Mr Whitlam himself.

Mr Barnett: Did you refer to the Liberal-National Country Party Government?

Mr STEPHENS: That is right.

Mr Barnett: Is that what they are called?

Mr STEPHENS: It is what they have been called for a long time, but of course I appreciate that the member for Rockingham is not *au fait* with current affairs.

In a previous debate I made a comparison of the present Commonwealth Government with the rise to power of Hitler. I traced its history and I believe the pattern for socialism in the Federal Government has been modelled on the pattern of Hitler in his rise to power and the socialising of Germany because the programme being followed is comparable.

In the dying days of the present Federal Government I thought Mr Whitlam was continuing the pattern. We all know that after Hitler realised he was well and truly beaten he was prepared to drag the German nation down with him. I believe that in the current situation Whitlam should realise he is well and truly beaten; but by refusing to face the facts and the people, and by allowing the whole nation to grind to a halt because of lack of money, he is trying to bring about a state of anarchy and is dragging the whole nation down with him as Hitler did 30 years ago.

Mr May: It sounds like Western Australia.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [9.52 p.m.]: According to the Premier last year's Budget was a $1.5 billion Budget. If that statement was correct, then this year's Budget is approaching a $2 billion Budget, but it is possible for the Premier to balance it. If there is one thing which emerges clearly from all this, it is the extraordinary generosity of the Australian Government to the Western Australian Government—

Mr Barnett: Hear, hear!

Mr BERTAM: —notwithstanding the attitude of blocking, attack, and noncooperation exhibited by the Western Australian Government towards the Australian Government.

Mr Rushton: Is that not tedious repetition?

Mr BERTRAM: The $2 billion Budget balances and of that $2 billion the revenue from the Australian Government by way of grants anticipated for the year ended the 30th June, 1976, is $488 477 million. Let us have a look at those figures. Last year, leaving out the thousands because we are

dealing with big money here, the Commonwealth grants totalled $298 million while this year they total $488 million. Those figures alone reveal why, in the present inflationary situation it is anticipated the Western Australian Budget will balance.

What I am unable to balance is a reference the Premier made when introducing the Budget. I think it was at page 17 that he referred to an expected amount of $376.5 million. I think there has been a slight slip there because the figure is more like $375.6 million.

Another item I have not been able to reconcile, although I have not studied it closely appears on page 19 of the Estimates where the total Commonwealth grants is listed as being $299.193 million. This does not reconcile with the appropriate figure for last year, but I believe it should.

What has occurred is that the contributions by the Australian Government to the Western Australian Government in recent years have skyrocketed. I will give some figures in a moment to make that fairly obvious to members.

Let us look at page 19 which refers to the special purpose grants. Those grants have increased from $21 465 318 to $111.930 million. That is the jump in one year. It is worth while noting that in 1973-74 the comparable figure was $6.1 million. So, within a couple of years the special purpose grants to Western Australia from the Australian Government, appearing in our Consolidated Revenue Fund have increased from $6.1 million to $111.930 million. That figure of $111.930 million would have been even greater had the Premier and his Government co-operated with the Australian Government in respect of Medibank instead of delaying and thereby forfeiting for this State another $2 million or more.

The general revenue grants, as distinct from specific purpose grants made by the Australian Government to the Western Australian Government in 1974-75 amounted to $293 377 631. The expected figure for 1976 is $376 547 000. So, once again, it will be seen that there is an extraordinary increase—something like $80 million.

When introducing the Budget, the Premier referred to specific purpose grants but, unlike last year, he omitted this year to mention specific purpose grants coming into the State and going direct to a target, and not being reflected or accounted for through the Consolidated Revenue Fund. So far I have been speaking about general purpose grants, and specific purpose grants going through our Consolidated Revenue Fund. In addition to those grants, untold millions of dollars are coming into this State and going direct to targets, and are not being accounted for or recorded anywhere in the accounts.

Quoting from page 14 of the Premier's financial statement, he said, last year, that the list does not account for all specific purpose grants. He said that amounts provided to the States for disbursement to independent schools, and suchlike, are paid directly and do not pass through the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

That seems to be an unsatisfactory position. I repeat what I said last year: I believe the people of Western Australia are entitled to a complete account of all Government moneys received and spent, whether it be money raised by the State and spent by the State, or money received by the State through the revenue of the Australian Government, or whether the money goes direct from the Australian Government to a recipient in the State—not going through the State revenue fund.

Perhaps at this stage it is appropriate to quote from the 1975-76 Budget paper, No. 7. It is headed, "Payments to or for the States and Local Government Authorities, 1975-76". Table 177 of the publication, at page 274, lists various payments under the heading, "Specific Purpose Payments, Recurrent Purposes".

It is very difficult—if not impossible—to trace all the payments into the Western Australian Budget that are listed under that heading. Some are traceable—the heading and the precise amount—but others are not. However, I think the figures indicate the extraordinarily huge sums of money that are coming into Western Australia from the Australian Government. They started, slowly, to be paid to the Western Australian Government by the Australian Government as long ago as 1963-64. They started to build up about 1970 and now they are greater than ever before in variety and, certainly, as to amount.

In order to have placed on the record some of the payments—which I think is thoroughly desirable in order that people listening and people reading *Hansard* will be able to draw their own conclusions—I will quote a few of the figures. First of all, I will give the 1972-73 figure for each item and, secondly, I will give the estimated figure for 1975-76.

Referring to universities, the figure for 1972-73 was $5 683 000. The figure for 1975-76 is not available at this time, but for last year it was $27 978 000. There was an extraordinarily huge jump there. Coming to colleges of advanced education, the figure for 1972-73 was $4 015 000. The expected figure for this year is $34 435 000.

The figure in 1972-73 for technical and further education was nil, and the expected figure for this year is $3 282 000. For schools, the 1972-73 figure was $2 903 000 and for this year it is $25 703 000. For preschools and child care, the figure for 1972-73 was nil and for this year it is not yet available. However, last year the figure was $2 316 000. For child migrant education, a sum of $138 000 was made available in 1972-73 and this year the sum will be

$236 000. In 1972-73 the amount available for Medibank and public hospital running costs was nil, and this year it is $78 million. That figure could well have been greater, as I pointed out. It is true that the Premier, in his Budget remarks, said that certain figures had to be set off against that amount. That may be so, but it is interesting to observe that he did not provide the figures which were to be set off. So, I think it is reasonable to assume that a very large proportion of that $70 million is a true improvement on any money which this state has previously received under that type of heading.

Coming to the school dental scheme, the amount granted to Western Australia in 1972-73 was nil, and for this year it is $1 946 000. The amount for health education, in 1972-73, was $49 million and this year it will be $84 million. For the home dialysis scheme, in 1972-73, the amount was nil and this year it is $228 000. Blood transfusion services $134 000 as against $328 000 for this year; health planning, for 1972-73, nil, and for this year, $110 000. The amount for Aboriginal advancement for 1972-73 was $1 377 000 and for this year it is $7 497 000. The amount for sewerage in 1972-73 was nil, and we all realise that sewerage has been terribly neglected by the States. This year, the figure is not available, but last year it was $155 000. The amount made available to the Local Government Grants Commission in 1972-73, was nil, and this year it is $7 524 000. Leisure and recreation in 1972-73 was nil, and this year it is $97 000. The amount for agricultural extension services in 1972-73 was $380 000 and this year it is $617 000.

That gives a rough idea of the huge sums of money which are pouring into this State from the Australian Government—they are unprecedented in their dimensions. The Premier, of course, instead of expressing a great joy at that fact—which I suggest any other person would do—grudgingly acknowledges the fact that the money is coming in but complains that instead of having specific purpose grants made available to the States, the States should have the actual say.

One can imagine the position if the boot was on the other foot—heaven forbid this should be so—and the Premier was doling out the money in Canberra. I am sure he would be dictating, in that situation, where, how, and when the money would be spent.

The Australian Government is the custodian and has the care of our money. It has the responsibility of spending those moneys and the Prime Minister has made it abundantly clear—as I think any so-called Liberal Prime Minister would do—that if he makes money available to the States he will have some say in the manner in which it is to be spent. I understand that in every walk of life everybody else takes that view. The person responsible for collecting the money wants to have the predominant say in the spending of it.

The only person I have heard disagree with that theory is the Premier. Therefore, it is absolutely important that we get on to the record the extraordinary generosity extended to this State by the Australian Government, not just because I happen to be mentioning it, but because of the evidence I have provided, which is available to anybody who wants to take the time to, first of all, look at the Western Australian Budget for this year and compare it with the Budget for last year and, secondly, anyone who cares to look at the Australian Government Budget paper No. 7, to which I have referred.

Unfortunately the States, by their own ineptitude—and because of their wandering around and their being years behind the times because of the succession of conservative Governments over a number of years since the war—are so far behind that the Australian Government, of whatever political persuasion, has very little confidence in the State Governments. If the States were competent and performed up to standard it could well be that the Australian Treasurer would adopt a different attitude.

The Premier has complained that the Australian Government has moved into areas which are constitutionally the province of the States. The inference to be gathered from that statement is that the Australian Government is acting unconstitutionally. Well, we all know that the Australian Government is not acting unconstituionally. It should be evident that it has a perfect right to spend the money which it spends. That should be evident to everybody.

Members can rest assured that if the Australian Government were making huge payments to the States for specific purposes, unconstitutionally, something would have been done about it in the High Court long before this.

There is one virtue in the Australian Government making these specific purpose payment grants. At least the Australian Government is in office on numbers calculated as a consequence of one-vote-one-value elections, whether it be for the House of Representatives or whether it be for the Senate.

Therefore, if it comes to the question of the most democratic way to administer money, the Australian Government has a very long lead on Western Australia. We do not have an electoral system of one-vote-one-value, and we are out of step with other comparable countries in the world. It is interesting to note that within the last week or so in South Australia, the principle of one-vote-one-value has become the law of that State by reason of support given by the Liberal Movement to a Bill introduced by the

Dunstan Labor Government—of course, the support did not come from the conservative so-called Liberal Party.

I said last year, and I repeat it again now, that since so much lip service is given these days to the idea of open government, and since we are told that the debate we are currently involved in is the most important debate of the Parliament each year, we should make it our business at least to publish the Estimated Revenue and Estimated Expenditure accounts, as well as other appropriate material in the Press in order that the whole population knows precisely what is going on. This would not be a very costly exercise, and as I have already said, I believe the people would understand it readily. Precautions could be taken to see that it did not become some sort of party political exercise. In pursuit of this ideal of open government, it is long overdue that we should take the people into our confidence. They are the shareholders in this State, and the shareholders of public companies receive published accounts.

The Premier takes the view that the public would not understand the figures. I suppose the same argument could be used in respect of company accounts and balance sheets which are distributed to shareholders because the laws in the State require it. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

I repeat the proposition that I advanced last year in this debate: we should publish in the Press details of our Budget and other relevant material in understandable form. This would not be a difficult process, and certainly not an expensive one. As I said last year, what we should have and what we must work for until we do have it is a total accounting of all government moneys coming into this State, whether from the Consolidated Revenue Fund or money going directly to a target from the Australian Government.

I would like to spend a few moments on one or two other matters which I feel are worth while recording. Members will recall that the Government came here on the proposition it would put things right. We have waited patiently but there has been very little evidence of the fulfilment of that promise. Some people will be surprised about this, but the majority of the public are not really surprised at all. Let us look at some things the Government has achieved and some areas it has neglected over the few short months it has been in power.

The Government has established the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, but the only way in which the commission can operate properly is with tame Parliaments; in other words, Parliaments which do not function in the manner in which they were intended to. As I pointed out recently, the effect of the ICAC is that we on this side of the House, who represent something like 300 000 Western Australian people more or less, simply do not have a say in respect of matters which come to this Parliament via the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission or the ministerial council. In fact, those 300 000 Western Australians, more or less, are disfranchised whenever Bills of this type come before Parliament. If that is not a tragedy, and a travesty of the parliamentary system, then I wonder what is.

To illustrate my point, two recent Bills come to mind very quickly—the first measure was to amend the Companies Act, and the second was the Securities Industry Bill. The Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission is made up no doubt of efficient officers, but certainly not elected ones, and we know not who they are. The ministerial council is composed of four Ministers—one from this State who is not even a member of this Chamber. I leave it to members to conclude how Western Australia shapes up in the voting when one considers that three Ministers are from the centralised Eastern States.

We have gone from what could be called conventional centralism to this federalist centralism, which is far worse.

Bill after Bill has been introduced here—I cannot name them because there are so many of them—containing provisions for price-fixing, and introduced by a Government which went to the people on the basis that it was opposed to price-fixation—whatever that may mean. I believe the people were supposed to understand from that statement that Governments should not fix prices. However, our Government has no objection to anyone else—such as nonelected bodies—fixing them, its objection is to the fixing of prices by Governments. If I understand the position correctly this Government probably has fixed more prices in the last 18 months than any Government which preceded it.

If the Government wishes to practise that which it is said to be very much opposed to, and which some people describe as evil —and I am referring to socialism—instead of this Budget merely balancing, we could have had a huge surplus for the State this year. However, the Government does not practise what it preaches.

If members look into this Liberal Government's Budget which we are debating, they will find in it one-million-and-one examples of clearly socialist activities—socialist within the ordinary accepted use of the word in this State. Millions of dollars will go to socialist activities, and to others which are merely tainted with socialism—this evil thing!

It is the practice of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to stand up and acknowledge pieces of socialist legislation introduced by this Government. During the last three or four weeks he has risen on quite a few occasions. In due time the public will comprehend that this Government uses the words "socialist" and "socialism" without any real sincerity.

I now come to the matter of legislation introduced without a mandate. Certain legislation does not need any mandate, but measures such as the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill needed a mandate and had none. The Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill clearly needed a mandate. Parliament thinks so seriously of this type of legislation that an amending Bill does not become law unless it is passed by an absolute majority. No mandate for this legislation was sought at the last election, and certainly none was given.

The Constitution Acts Amendment Bill was another important measure. Once again, the Constitution Acts cannot be amended without an absolute majority in both Houses, and this fact illustrates the significance of the legislation. We had an amendment to that Act earlier this year to enable the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet. The Government had no mandate from the people for this action—it simply amended the Constitution Acts for that purpose.

Currently before this House is yet another amendment to increase the Ministry from 12 to 13 Ministers. There was no mandate for that action, and the measure was introduced here within four or five months of the previous amendment.

Let us look at some of the actions of the Government. Currently three Royal Commissions are either under way or are about to commence. Instead of facing up to the situation, the Government backed off, fumbled, and would not make a decision, but ultimately it had to agree to these Royal Commissions. The Laverton inquiry has been in progress for some time. Another Royal Commission to commence shortly will deal with prostitution, but unfortunately the terms of reference—as set out by the Government—will render the whole inquiry a waste of money. The real purpose of that Royal Commission should be to determine once and for all what action should be taken in regard to prostitution in this State, and to obviate the cause of difficulties within the Police Force rather than to run around endeavouring to find out what is happening in it. Difficulties arose within the Police Force because of SP bookmaking. Legislation was introduced to establish the TAB and this matter is no longer a cause of concern to the police. It may be that the only solution to the problems in the Police Force in regard to prostitution will be to amend the law in some way which is acceptable to the public generally.

Over the last 18 months the Government has set a record with increases in all sorts of fees, charges, and taxes. Some of the increases have become known because legislation has been passed to effect them. However, all sorts of increases are effected by regulation and therefore they escape the immediate eye of the public. Some of these have been extraordinary increases.

Then we had the spectacle of the abortive attempt by the Government to tag onto the apron strings of that other notable Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, in Queensland.

Mr Davies: We didn't follow him with daylight saving, did we?

Mr BERTRAM: Mr Bjelke-Petersen endeavoured to see that the Australian Constitutional Convention would fall through.

Unfortunately for Bjelke-Petersen and this Government, the Constitutional Convention did not fall through, but was a success.

It is absolutely imperative that something be done about the Australian Constitution. I think there have been something like 32 attempts to amend it, only five of which have been successful. It is hopelessly out of date; the capacity to alter it is extraordinarily limited and thoroughly unsatisfactory.

Yet here we have for no real reason this State, led by the present Government, trying to defeat the Constitutional Convention and render it either impossible of proceeding or unsuccessful. Its attempt in that direction was abortive.

It will be interesting to know what is intended now, and whether the Government intends to allow this State to participate in the next meeting of that convention, which I believe is to be held about October next year. I think the people of Western Australia are entitled to know, and know quickly, whether this State again will refuse to participate in the convention.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

Mr BERTRAM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. At the time the convention was being held in May, the so-called Liberal Premiers and the Federal Leader of the Opposition met to talk about a new taxation system, and I hope before we are very much older the Premier will spell out exactly how Western Australians will fare under this new system.

Mr Jamieson: Not too well!

Mr BERTRAM: That is precisely the case; Western Australians will get butchered under such a surcharge proposition, and I believe the Government should spell out precisely what is involved so

that the people will know what is in store for them.

If I had a little more time at my disposal I could talk at length about the so-called constitutional crisis in Canberra; I suppose that is a reasonably accurate description of what is going on over there. As a matter of fact, in my view, it is simply a case of some spoiled brats—that is to say, members of the Liberal and Country Parties—performing because they have been denied the right to govern for a couple of years and do not take too kindly to the thought.

They are scraping around, knocking a hole through the bottom of the bucket looking for some sort of excuse to remove the Australian Government. They are not at all concerned that what will happen is that the people of Australia will have elections at six-monthly intervals, at extraordinary cost. But since I do not have sufficient time available to me, I do not propose to go further into that matter.

It is interesting to note however that just as the so-called Liberal Party of this State stuffed the electoral districts of Western Australia, so their colleagues stuffed the Senate seats in the Australian Parliament. We had a dud member nominated to replace Senator Murphy, now Justice Murphy, and another dud member to replace the late Senator Milliner; by that process of course the Opposition sought to steal power from the Australian Government in the Senate.

Mr B. T. Burke: They have perverted the Constitution.

Mr BERTRAM: Precisely! Now we have Master Fraser endeavouring to place the knife in Whitlam as I believe he attempted to place the knife firmly into Holt and which, according to Gorton, he did to him. I do not know what he did to McMahon; perhaps he did not have to try. However, Fraser certainly put a swift one over on Snedden, and blatantly deceived him.

Mr Blaikie: He has Whitlam running scared now.

Mr BERTRAM: On each of those occasions he had almost the universal backing of the Australian Press but on this occasion the Australian Press is not backing him to the same extent. In addition, he has gone from dealing with poor old opponents, with the possible exception of Gorton, and is now in the big league. He is bumping up against Whitlam and as things stand at the moment he is being thoroughly mutilated and beaten.

MR WATT (Albany) [10.35 p.m.]: In spite of the lateness of the hour, I should like to address a few remarks to the Budget debate. Firstly, I make a few general comments about the Budget which, quite frankly, was particularly well received in my electorate of Albany. I believe it is a good Budget for country people.

Mr Davies: How?

Mr WATT: If the honourable member allows me to make my speech he will find out. Many measures contained in the Budget will be of considerable benefit to country people. I know that when the matter was canvassed to a fairly wide cross-section of the Albany community, the reaction was favourable. It is my opinion that this Budget will benefit not only the people in my electorate, but country people generally.

One such provision is the increase in spending on education, which will benefit children in country and remote areas. Increased living-away-from-home allowances are to be provided for trainee teachers, and this has been particularly well received as many young country people find it difficult to meet the cost of living in the city while they undertake their studies. Additional assistance to local governments to help finance recreational and community projects has been welcomed.

Mr Harman: Another intrusion by the Australian Government!

Mr WATT: I am hopeful that the Government will be able to assist in the further decentralisation of government administration as quickly as possible. I do not need to tell members where I hope the next expansion of that activity will take place. One particular item of interest to the Albany area is the increased assistance to be made available by way of financial grants.

Mr Harman: From the Australian Government.

Mr WATT: As the member for Avon once said, "Would somebody give him a bait?" This will provide a subsidy for approved voluntary water rescue services. A very enthusiastic and hard working group already provides such a service in Albany. As members know, Albany has a fairly treacherous coastline and experiences many emergencies which call for such a service. This group is particularly grateful for the finance it is to receive.

I am also pleased that the Budget provides for increased assistance to recreational and cultural activities. Such activities have been lacking in country areas for some time and I hope some of the finance to be made available will find its way to country regions. For example, I know that cultural shows and this type of activity are brought to country regions, usually at a loss and it is pleasing to note that the Government intends to keep the costs within realistic limits for those who must pay to attend these types of functions.

I would not imagine the Premier is overjoyed at the summary of results of some of the business undertakings of Western Australia. The Port of Albany incurred a loss of about $138 500 and we would very much like to see an improvement in port trade so that there would not be an operating loss on this

undertaking. I will deal with that more fully later in my remarks.

However, the result which concerns me is that of the State Government Insurance Office which, after a series of moderate profits has incurred a loss this year of almost $7 million. Members of the Opposition frequently tell us what villains the insurance companies are, but the SGIO generally has tended to be regarded as being apart from the private insurance companies. I hope members opposite who frequently criticise insurance companies will see from the loss which has been sustained by the SGIO that it is going through extremely difficult times.

Mr Skidmore: That is because it is not allowed to enter other fields of insurance.

Mr WATT: That is just not so. Last night the member for Murchison-Eyre was discussing with me a Press clipping dealing with the trading result of the Commercial Union Assurance Company, which probably is in the top five insurance companies in the world and very close to the top in Australia.

Mr Harman: Who owns it?

Mr WATT: It makes absolutely no difference who owns it; do not draw red herrings across the trail. The point is that it lost something like $42 million in the last two years.

Mr B. T. Burke: Is that a mutual society?

Mr WATT: The company retrenched approximately one-third of its staff last year in an endeavour to retain profitability, obviously to little effect. This does not include the number of jobs which became vacant and which were not filled. Members can see that the insurance industry is in a poor state.

This leads me to canvass a matter which I discussed last year and I intend to pursue further now. I refer to the method of financing the Fire Brigades Board and the difficulties this financing causes not only to insurance companies but also to the local authorities which are forced to contribute.

Mr B. T. Burke: Some people pay twice and others do not pay at all under the present system.

Mr WATT: I thank the honourable member for helping me. If at the conclusion of my speech I have missed anything perhaps he can interject then.

Mr B. T. Burke: I would be here all night.

Mr WATT: Firstly, I should like to refer to the costs being borne by local authorities. Earlier this year, I wrote to some of the local authorities asking them to supply me with details of the increase in their contributions to the Fire Brigades Board and also their increases in revenue.

The City of Perth's contribution increased by $115 000 or 78 per cent over last year while at the same time its revenue increased by only 19 per cent; the Shire of Belmont's contribution increased by 76.6 per cent and, in a letter the shire sent to me it explained that the new amount is the equivalent to a Fire Brigades Board levy of $4.18 for each of the shire's 11 627 ratepayers. As the member for Balga said a moment ago, that is not the only way in which they contribute.

The contribution by the Town of Kalgoorlie increased by 60.07 per cent while revenue increased by only 35 per cent; the contribution of the Town of Geraldton is up by 48 per cent.

Mr May: What was its revenue increase?

Mr WATT: I do not have those figures. As I say, the local authorities did not provide me with comprehensive figures. The Town of Bunbury's contribution increased by 44 per cent, while its revenue increased by only 18 per cent. Albany's contribution increased by 37 per cent, and its budget revenue increase was only 7.5 per cent.

Mr Harman: How much did the insurance companies' premiums increase?

Mr WATT: I will come to that in a moment. I appreciate the help members of the Opposition are trying to give me, but I would prefer to make the points as I go along.

In the case of Port Hedland the increase was 24 per cent, although its contribution was not very large; and in the case of Northam the increase was 23 per cent, and its contribution was not very large either.

Mr Davies: You left out the last figure, and said it was not very much.

Mr WATT: I have not left any out. These are all the letters that I have received. It is of no great significance, because in the case of Port Hedland the increase amounted to only $399, and it paid $2 066. In the case of Northam the increase was $178, and the contribution estimated this year is only $950. The other amounts are in thousands. I did give the percentages.

Mr B. T. Burke: I do not think it is legal to show the amount contributed to fire brigades on an insurance premium.

Mr WATT: What they show is the component of the premium which must be paid to the Fire Brigades Board. It is not expressed as a separate premium or levy. They show it as a premium, and that part of the premium which must be paid statutorily to the Fire Brigades Board.

Mr Harman: What is your problem?

Mr B. T. Burke: The money must come out of Consolidated Revenue.

Mr WATT: The second point which relates to insurance companies is that the extra cost they must bear includes a tremendous amount for administration in playing the role of tax collectors. That

is what they are doing when they collect this levy. I have worked in insurance companies, and I know how much time and extra staff are required to administer this. It is unfair that they should be expected to do so. My main concern is the effect on the clients.

The Fire Brigades Board designates certain areas as approved fire districts according to the provision of fire services. For example, the metropolitan area of Perth is best provided for, in that it has the best equipment and the best reticulation services, etc. It is classified as an "A" district.

Larger country towns such as Geraldton, Albany, Bunbury, and others are well equipped, but not as well as Perth is. These towns are classified as "B" districts.

Smaller towns like Katanning are classified as "C" districts. Coming to the smaller towns where no fire services are available, these are classified as "D' districts.

The rates vary from town to town, according to the classification. Members will no doubt agree that this is a fair system. The better the provision of fire services and fire protection, the cheaper should be the premium. This means that people who are prudent enough to insure have to pay for the cost of fire brigades in three different ways.

Firstly, they pay because they contribute through their insurance. The estimated percentage which they will pay this year is a little over 67c in the dollar. Last year it was 59.24c in the dollar, and the rate has been rising rapidly. In fact, over the last 10 years the rate has increased by almost 500 per cent.

The second way in which they pay is through their rates to the local authorities, bearing in mind that local authorities must contribute 12½ per cent of the cost of maintaining the fire brigade services.

The third way in which they must pay is through taxation to the State. The State must also contribute 12½ per cent to the cost of maintaining the fire brigade services.

Frankly, the people who choose to insure in the interest of self-protection are being taken for a ride. They are being charged in three different ways, whereas those who choose not to insure at all do not pay, with the exception of the small portion of contribution they make through their local authority rates and their taxes to the State Government.

Mr B. T. Burke: It is not the insurance companies which are taking them for a ride!

Mr WATT: No. Let me develop my argument. Maybe the honourable member can help me to sort out the answer.

Mr B. T. Burke: I am interested in the fire brigades.

Mr T. J. Burke: Can you explain why it costs one-third of the premium that is charged by the private companies to insure with the State Government Insurance Office?

Mr WATT: That is a separate argument. I am prepared to discuss this matter with the honourable member privately, but I do not have the time to develop the argument tonight.

On the question of the overall finance, the cost of the fire brigades last year was $10.1 million. This year the cost is estimated to be $13 million, and this represents an increase of $2.9 million. Of that amount, $2.3 million is for increase in wages; so, we can see where the additional cost comes in. The insurance companies face a very difficult situation in these highly inflationary times. The premiums are quoted on an actuarial basis to cover the cost of the risk and a certain amount of profit, as well as an amount for the fire brigade levy.

In case anyone thinks the fire insurance companies are making excessive profits I would suggest that he acquaints himself with the average underwriting profits being made. In all the areas of insurance with which I have been associated I find the average is something like ½ per cent profit. Indeed, in the last couple of years far more losses have been sustained than profits have been made.

Mr Skidmore: In that particular section of insurance?

Mr WATT: In respect of fire and general insurance.

Mr Skidmore: You could have fooled me!

Mr WATT: Perhaps the honourable member is easily fooled. If he were to check on the position he would find that I am right.

Mr H. D. Evans: You are not prepared to hand over this class of insurance to the SGIO!

Mr WATT: Last year the SGIO lost $7 million, so it will not do much better.

Mr H. D. Evans: There was a reason.

Mr WATT: There were many reasons. There is one area relating to the method of funding fire brigades that concerns the Federal Government. In this regard I refer to a booklet entitled "Fire Brigades: The Fourth Arm of Defence". This is by Walter Spratt, who appears to be well qualified to write on this topic. He makes the point that the Australian Government, including the Commonwealth Bank, is not liable for council rates and States taxes. However, the Federal Government does pay council rates on an *ex gratia* basis. This means an indirect limited contribution is made to fire brigade costs.

He points out further that even that limited contribution has now been eroded, because of the reduction in contributions

from councils. It might be recalled that the percentage contribution was recently reduced to 12½ per cent. The author of the booklet went on to say—

> Secondly, the Australian Government (including the Commonwealth Bank) does not insure its own property. It does not therefore see the burden transferred to its insurance premiums.

None of the properties of the Federal Government are insured. This means that the Australian Government is enjoying a privileged position at the expense of the people whom I described as being prudent enough to insure.

The Defence Service Homes Insurance Scheme is another scheme operated by the Federal Government. It would probably be the biggest insurer in Western Australia, because it is involved with some 200 000 units. This trust pays no pay-roll tax, no Government stamp duty, and no State land tax. Furthermore, it is not subject to the Trade Practices Act.

Mr Skidmore: Its rates are very low.

Mr WATT: The interest rate?

Mr Skidmore: The rates payable for insurance.

Mr WATT: Of course, they are. I am explaining the reasons. That trust enjoys an extremely privileged position in the insurance field. I am sure that if the private insurers and the SGIO could enjoy the same privileges they would be able to reduce their premiums.

Mr Skidmore: This is in favour of the insurance scheme of the Federal Government?

Mr WATT: Who would pay for that?

Mr Bertram: Have you seen Judge Heenan's report yet?

Mr WATT: The Defence Service Homes Insurance Scheme obviously enjoys a privileged position in the insurance market. This means it is not bearing its fair portion of the costs of the fire brigades. I could quote a few examples where people are being ripped off in that way.

The matter is examined in the booklet I have mentioned, from a different point of view, to prove the point that Mr Spratt makes: that he considers the financing of the fire brigades ought to be a responsibility of the Federal Government. He makes a considerable number of valid points concerning the type of equipment used, the standardisation of equipment, and the rationalisation of the fire brigade services.

He quotes some very good examples. For instance, when the Townsville disaster occurred which burnt out a sugar factory in 1963, and an endeavour was made to bring in equipment from outside, it was found that the couplings were different and there was no standardisation in that equipment. This meant that the equipment brought from elsewhere was useless. The same situation occurred in 1967 when Tasmania faced its disaster. Mr Spratt develops the argument that there should be standardisation of equipment and services right throughout Australia. I think there is some validity in that argument.

Another area in which an unfair situation exists is in the insurance of motorcars. Obviously if motorcars catch fire they are protected by the fire brigade services; yet, no contribution is made in this State by that class of insurance.

Another area where an unfair situation obviously exists is referred to in the annual report of the Fire Brigades Board. It is stated that of the 8 085 calls made, 4 309 were for grass and rubbish fires and that represented 53 per cent of the calls. Surely a grass or rubbish fire may endanger a property that is insured, but it also endangers other properties. Once again, the protection afforded by the fire brigades is a community service, and the cost ought to be borne by the community as a whole. I believe the whole situation in this regard is most unfair.

On the question of disadvantage to decentralised industry, the member for Wellington told me recently about a situation in her electorate which demonstrates my concern. A particular industry had been outside an approved fire district until fairly recently. Once that industry came into an approved fire district its premium ran into many thousands of dollars extra. I have it on good authority that this is part of world-wide organisation, and its premiums were dropped to a dangerously low level. Some members do not appreciate what is involved in accepting big insurance risks.

When the area in which the industry was established was annexed to an approved fire district it was necessary for the company to pay an additional premium, in excess of $40 000. This places decentralised industries at a distinct disadvantage as compared with industries established, for example, in the metropolitan area of Perth which is an "A"-class district and attracts lower premiums. I think the member for Wellington could well enlarge on that problem at a later stage in this debate.

Before I get off the subject of the fire brigades I want to pay a tribute to the work of the voluntary fire brigades. In the country areas in particular they play a very vital role in providing protection to the communities.

I note with interest in the annual report of the Fire Brigades Board that there are 1 788 volunteer firemen in Western Australia, of whom 59 are in the metropolitan area and 1 729 in the country. I believe those figures in themselves are a tribute to the work those volunteer firemen do and

I would like to go on record as expressing my appreciation of it.

Mr B. T. Burke: You have not quite arrived at the solution to the problem of inequity.

Mr WATT: I did say I believe the cost should be borne by the total community. I would prefer that the cost be carried by the Federal Government.

Mr May: Naturally.

Mr Harman: That is all taxpayers.

Mr WATT: All taxpayers enjoy the benefits of the fire protection services.

Mr Davies: Not all taxpayers.

Mr WATT: There are two main reasons why I believe the cost should be carried by the Federal Government. One is—

Mr Moiler: Why should the Federal Government carry that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WATT: If the honourable member will let me give my speech he will learn something. The two main reasons are firstly that the facility is enjoyed by the total community and the cost should therefore be borne by the total community, and secondly the need to standardise and rationalise all plant and equipment throughout Australia so that in the event of a national emergency it will be interchangeable between cities.

Mr B. T. Burke: The surest way to minimise the fire risk is to have adequately protected buildings. So you are suggesting the uniform building by-laws be national by-laws as well; otherwise you might have appliances which will not work in one State and will not be interchangeable.

Mr WATT: The honourable member can talk about that when he makes his speech. I have been mainly concerned about cost and the people being disadvantaged by the present system.

I now want to speak for a few minutes about education, especially technical and further education. As members are probably aware, the Partridge committee has been calling for submissions on technical and further education. There is a history which goes back to 1966 when the Jackson committee was appointed to look into this matter and it recommended the development in regional country centres of external study facilities which could provide a wide range of tertiary and further education which is not readily available at present. On statistics alone it could not be justified, but a solution was recommended based on the community college concept which could take advantage of other community facilities such as high schools and technical schools which are already in existence.

Mr B. T. Burke: I am in favour of a university in the Pilbara; so is the Premier.

Mr WATT: The Jackson committee recommended that a pilot scheme be established in Bunbury, and that was in fact done—not with the blessing of the people who live in my electorate, but one cannot win them all. It was suggested the proposed regional education centre should come under the control of the Western Australian Institute of Technology and be a branch of that institute; and it was also suggested that further similar centres should be established in the future at Albany and Geraldton. The Partridge committee probably aimed at seeking ways to implement the extension of that project.

The students who would be served by and would be in a position to take advantage of these community colleges differ from those in the normal educational situations in primary and secondary schools. They are usually students who are wage earners and studying part time. The voluntary basis of their attendance and their age and economic independence make their needs different from the needs of those who are participating in education in the conventional sense through the primary and secondary schools.

The Town and Shire of Albany have an Open Tertiary Education Committee which made a submission to the Partridge committee and I am hopeful that when the recommendations of the Partridge committee are made known in the not-too-distant future they will support the submission made by the Albany Open Tertiary Education Committee. The committee pointed out in its submission that 38 per cent of the population lives outside the major urban area of Perth and that those people are disadvantaged as far as facilities for post-secondary education are concerned.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Tonkin Government did a great deal for Albany.

Mr WATT: There is a technical school in Albany which has recently been enlarged, and centres such as Albany, Kalgoorlie, Bunbury, and Geraldton enjoy a better position than some of the inland towns. The technical school at Albany is being developed on a regional basis so that the people in the region will receive an advantage.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Tonkin Government was responsible for the extensions to the technical school at Albany.

Mr WATT: They were in fact initiated by the previous Liberal Government and happened to be completed by the Tonkin Government.

Mr B. T. Burke: You must admit the Tonkin Government poured a lot of money into Albany.

Mr WATT: I am not entering into that argument; I am correcting the honourable member's inference that the technical school was implemented by the Tonkin Government. It was already committed and had to be financed by somebody. Had the boot been on the other foot, we would

have done the same thing. Albany is grateful that it does have a modern technical school, and I am sure it would have been provided whichever Government was in power.

Professor John Dennison reported on the community college concept and its application to post-secondary education in Australia. This style of institution was seen as being particularly useful for the education of post-secondary students in Albany, and the Open Tertiary Education Committee made a number of recommendations and explained the whole range of subjects which would and should be covered and how such a college should be implemented. The particular emphasis in this type of scheme is on local involvement in the administration, and I think where there is local involvement and interest a scheme like this is more likely to be successful.

Mr B. T. Burke: That is the basis of the Australian Assistance Plan.

Mr WATT: One of the problems some people see is in the administration of the Education Department. It was recommended by the State School Teachers' Union that the technical and further education sections of the department should be split off to form a new department. I have had a close look at this suggestion, and some very good arguments were presented by both sides. At this stage I do not favour the split. I think it would probably be better if those sections were maintained under the umbrella of one department but perhaps with a greater degree of autonomy within the existing framework.

Mr Moiler: You are a typical Liberal State politician.

Mr WATT: I will not be so rude as to say what the member for Mundaring is typical of.

The Kalgoorlie School of Mines provides an interesting contrast which shows—

Mr B. T. Burke: Half the country hostels are empty now.

Mr WATT: —that spending is not necessarily directed to the areas of greatest need. Recommendations for funding in the coming triennium were made by the Commission on Advanced Education, which is the Federal Government's committee, and some of the items were—

	$
Extension of chemistry building—Kalgoorlie	991 000
Land acquisition—Kalgoorlie	115 000
Geology building—Kalgoorlie	781 000
Library and student amenities building—Kalgoorlie	577 000
Minor works—Kalgoorlie	363 000
Additional equipment—Kalgoorlie	434 000

I have here figures which show the actual enrolments at the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie have been gradually falling, and it seems to me there could be some rationalisation between the School of Mines and the Kalgoorlie Technical School. I should explain that those recommendations were not accepted because of the Federal Government's cutback in spending on education.

Mr T. H. Jones: Why are you so interested in Kalgoorlie when you represent Albany?

Mr WATT: I am simply making the comparison. Recommendations were made for all that money to be directed to one institution in Kalgoorlie which has two areas of post-secondary education with falling enrolments, while other centres like Albany have dramatically increasing enrolments which would increase considerably more if the range of courses were available. In Kalgoorlie there is the School of Mines and the Technical School which are working against each other. If they could be rationalised a considerable amount of money could become available for development of the community college concept in areas like Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, and perhaps Kalgoorlie as well. That is the point I am trying to make. I believe there should be rationalisation so that money is not wasted and the needs of other communities are considered.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Federal Opposition has been pushing for these cutbacks and when they are made it starts to scream.

Mr WATT: The honourable member can read in *Hansard* what I said, and he will see I did not criticise the Federal Government for the cutback in expenditure. What I criticised was the priorities; I believe they are all wrong.

Mr H. D. Evans: What would you cut back?

Mr O'Neill: The member for Warren, for a start.

Mr B. T. Burke: You have already—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member should ignore the interjections and speak to the Chair. The member has four minutes left.

Mr WATT: In those few minutes I want to refer briefly to the recently released Hartley report which has been awaited for some time with considerable interest, not only by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself but also by various groups of community-minded people in Albany who are concerned at the fall in trade through the Port of Albany. The recommendations contained in that report interest me greatly. Time does not permit me to go through them in any detail, but I hope when Cabinet has the opportunity to consider this report it will see its way clear to implementing most, if not all, of the recommendations made.

Mr Jamieson: You would have to be lucky. They pigeonholed all the other reports I had commissioned, so you would be lucky to get something out of this one.

Mr WATT: Then I hope I am lucky, but only time will tell.

A final matter I wish briefly to mention is the telephone charges which have been recently increased. I refer specifically to Albany in this context. I believe there must definitely be some rationalisation of these costs between the urban areas and country areas. The cost of a trunk call from Albany to Perth during daylight hours has increased from $1.38 to $1.80, and that is a terrific burden on country people. For example, it is absolutely necessary for those people running small businesses to make frequent phone calls, depending on the nature of their businesses, to the metropolitan area.

I am sure members on both sides of the House, if they are honest, will agree with me that as a result of the disadvantage of remoteness in country areas, and because of the distance people must travel for essential services, the connection of a telephone is much more important for them than it is for city people. The increase in the service connection fee from $80 to $160 is most unrealistic and most unfair to country people. I am a little disturbed to find the Australian Telecommunications Commission has budgeted for an increased profit from $100 million to $153 million. Obviously the commission is endeavouring to finance capital works from the revenue it obtains, and this is to the detriment of country people. In my opinion this is a most unfair situation, but I rather doubt that the Federal Government will listen to any cries from the wilderness I may make. However, I certainly make my protest known.

With those remarks, I support the Budget.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies.

House adjourned at 11.18 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 30th October, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. TOWN PLANNING

Scarborough: ALP Signs

The Hon. S. J. Dellar for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Further to my question 7 on the 16th October, 1975, regarding town planning appeals—

(1) What action did the Minister take to verify the statement that A.L.P. signs were also located on the site owned by Twenty-Seven Properties Pty. Ltd.?

(2) Is the Minister aware of photographic evidence that shows the statement to be incorrect?

(3) Is the Minister also aware that this incorrect statement has been repeated in a letter to *The West Australian* newspaper and published on the 29th October, 1975?

(4) Will the Minister make a statement—

(a) correcting the information given in his previous answer; and

(b) disassociating the Government from the statement made by the Liberal Party Member for Scarborough?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(1) By viewing photographs.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) (a) and (b) See answer to (1).

2. NORTH WEST COASTAL HIGHWAY

Bridge and Bypass

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) When is it planned to complete the construction of the bridge over the Harding River at Roebourne on the North West Coastal Highway?

(2) On present planning, when will the Roebourne townsite by-pass road be constructed?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

(1) Subject to availability of funds under future Commonwealth legislation, it is proposed that the Harding River Bridge at Roebourne would be completed during the 1977/78 financial year.

(2) It has not yet been decided whether the bypass would be built at the same time as the bridge or at a later date.

3. TOWN PLANNING

Scarborough: Pizza Hut

The Hon. S. J. Dellar for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) In upholding the appeal in favour of Twenty-Seven Properties for the construction of a Licensed Restaurant-Pizza Hut in Scarborough Beach Road, to what extent did the Minister require the