

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Manners has talked about their not being influenced because they are represented. Any selected representative of the Local Government Association who did not put forward proposals about which the association felt strongly would not be on the list recommended on the next occasion.

Point of Order

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: On a point of order, Sir, I would ask whether Mr Claughton is not infringing Standing Order 89 which relates to tedious repetition.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. R. J. L. Williams): I feel the ground has been well and truly covered and canvassed.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This is a breach of privilege. It may start a chain of events which the Government may not be able to stem. Having appointed a direct representative of one group why should we not then appoint a representative from the developers' institute, the real estate institute, the architects' institute, the institute of surveyors; indeed, why should we not appoint one from the whole field?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What about one of the ratepayers?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Something entirely different is being brought in; none of the arguments advanced has wanted this sort of change. I appeal to members of the Opposition who are vitally concerned with the future of town planning in the State that they do not support the Government proposal; they should instead support the amendment before the Chair.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: With very great respect I would point out that certain reference has been made to me in the course of the second reading speech which suggested I was canvassing the subject on a committee level. We have certainly covered a tremendous amount of ground in the course of this Committee and in relation to the proposal before us. I would like to bring the thoughts of members back to what in fact we are proposing to do if the amendment moved by Mr Dellar is to be considered.

Consideration of clause 3 of the Bill will show the effect of the motion before the Committee is simply to delete reference to a person to be selected from the panel of three names to be submitted to the Minister and to add a fifth representative to the Town Planning Board. We expect that if the amendment is carried it would be with a view to substituting an alternative which, again, is on the notice paper. Reference is made that it will be a person having knowledge of and experience in matters appertaining to local government. That is the basis of the Government's argument.

If there is any confusion in the people's mind all I can do is remind Mr Claughton, who has accused the members of the Opposition of being confused, that they clearly are. There is certainly some confusion in Mr Claughton's own mind.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know I am confused.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Claughton endeavoured to make the point that the form of the Town Planning Board should not be changed even though it was first introduced in 1928, and yet he is promoting the idea that there ought to be a change and that there should be a fifth member on the board; which in itself is a change.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is not a change of the principle of appointment.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I have made my point and I am sure it will help the Committee if I allowed it to decide the proposition before the Chair.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

House adjourned at 9.00 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 4th September, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (49): ON NOTICE

1. POLICE

Children in Parked Cars

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Because of the shocking accidents that have happened to children left in cars parked outside hotels for long periods of time, together with the fact that small babies can easily dehydrate in a closed car if left too long especially during the summer months, is he intending to introduce legislation to make it an offence for parents to neglect their children in this way?

- (2) If not will he direct his department to launch an all-out campaign warning parents of the dangers which can occur to children left in parked cars especially during the summer months?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Existing provisions in the Child Welfare Act allow any departmental officer authorised by the Minister or any Police Officer to apprehend without warrant any child appearing or suspected to be neglected. One definition of neglect in that Act refers to a child who "is found in such circumstances as to indicate that the mental, physical or moral welfare of the child is likely to be in jeopardy".

This has application to a child found in the circumstances the Member outlines. It requires, however, that an application for neglect be lodged with a Children's Court and a court hearing. While this course of action is appropriate in some cases in other situations it could be extreme.

It is anticipated that amendments to the Child Welfare Act will be introduced during the first part of the session next year. One proposal will seek to formally allow police and departmental officers to apprehend any child in danger and either take the child home or if the parents are not available put the child in a suitable place. If the officer is satisfied that the matter should not proceed to court then no further action need be taken, otherwise a neglect application may proceed. This would be applied to children left in cars under certain circumstances, children in danger at sporting events or young children wandering on busy highways and other situations.

- (2) Publicity should be given to the matter at the time amendments are introduced.

2. INTEREST RATES

Perth Building Society

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has an official approach been made to him by the Perth Building Society to raise interest rates on mortgages arranged through them for money subsidised to them from the State Housing Commission?
- (2) If "Yes" by what amount did he allow Perth Building Society to increase the interest rate?

- (3) Are there any regulations covering the interest rate building societies can charge on Government subsidised moneys?

- (4) If not, why not; if "Yes" what are they?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) In July 1974 the Western Australian Permanent Building Societies' Association, of which Perth Building Society is a member body, requested a review of the interest rate charged to borrowers under an interest rate subsidy scheme initiated by the Brand Government in 1969.
- (2) Approval was given for an increase in the basic interest rate under the scheme from $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ to $10\frac{1}{2}\%$. The subsidy presently is the difference between the repayment on a loan at $11\frac{1}{2}\%$ and that required on a loan at $10\frac{1}{2}\%$.
- (3) No.
- (4) The scheme is only applicable to an agreement in respect of \$10 million advanced by approved lenders as a once only operation and the State Housing Act as amended in 1969 empowers the Minister to determine the conditions under which such a scheme would operate.

3. PINJARRA HIGH SCHOOL

Enrolments

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

- (1) How many students can be accommodated at the Pinjarra Senior High School in the existing accommodation?
- (2) What is the anticipated enrolment at Pinjarra Senior High School in the years—
- (a) 1975;
- (b) 1976;
- (c) 1977?
- (3) Do the anticipated enrolments in (a) to (c) above take into account the extra workforce to be engaged by the Alcoa company at its Pinjarra site; and if so, what is the total anticipated workforce increase between 1st September, 1974 and 1st January, 1977?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) There is no absolute figure for the accommodation of a school. It varies according to the distribution of students between upper and lower school, the courses selected and the options available. The present enrolment of some 700 pupils is well catered for.
- (2) (a) 1975 (February)—780
1976 (February)—800
1977 (February)—780-930.

- (3) Yes. The Planning Branch of the Education Department maintains close liaison with companies involved in major industrial developments. The above forecasts are based on information which Alcoa of Australia (W.A.) Ltd. has provided on a confidential basis.

4. MANDURAH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Storage Space and Acoustics

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

- (1) (a) Have alterations to provide extra storage space at the Mandurah primary school been commenced as yet;
- (b) if "No" to (a), can the Minister advise when a commencement will be made;
- (c) if "No" to (b), will the Minister give an assurance that these alterations will be completed during 1974?
- (2) (a) What recommendations have been made to overcome the acoustic problems existing in certain rooms at the Mandurah primary school;
- (b) when is it anticipated that action in respect of the recommendations referred to in (a) above will be implemented?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) Both matters are currently being assessed. Finance has been allocated for the store-room from the 1974-75 school buildings improvement item, but until a full study has been completed of the acoustical problem, no indication can be given of the action which will be undertaken.

5. RAILWAYS

Kalgoorlie-Boulder Loop Line

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

- (1) Has there been a definite decision made to remove the narrow gauge railway line known as the Kalgoorlie-Boulder loop line?
- (2) Have representations been made for preservation of this line in the interests of promotion of tourism in the eastern goldfields?
- (3) If not, would he be prepared to receive such representations?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Yes. Representations have been made to the Commissioner of Railways by the Town of Kalgoorlie and the Golden Mile Loop Line Committee. These

organisations have been advised that removal of the rail will be delayed for a short period, following closure of the line, to enable council to examine the matter. However, this decision is without prejudice to the Railways Department taking action to remove the rails at some future date.

6.

TEACHERS

Recruitment

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

- (1) How many teachers have been recruited by the Education Department during the last 12 months and placed in Western Australian schools?
- (2) Are any of the above teaching in primary schools, and if so, how many?
- (3) How many eligible and available Western Australian trained teachers are still seeking teaching positions in our schools?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The general concept of recruitment of teachers relates to the securing of services of teachers from outside the State. Such recruitment could be as the result of planned campaigns or it could be as a result of personal initiative on the part of teachers. The indications are that approximately 200 teachers joined the department during the last twelve months under schemes initiated and sponsored by the Education Department. It is not possible to estimate the indirect forms of recruitment.

- (2) Approximately half of these teachers have been appointed to primary schools.

- (3) The Education Department has published many notices advising qualified teachers of vacancies. Any estimate of available Western Australian teachers can, thus, only be based on the response to the advertisements.

The number of available teachers is subject to rapid variation in which, at some times, there are a number of unfilled vacancies whilst at other times, there may be a small surplus of approximately twenty teachers.

7.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Kalgoorlie Office

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

- (1) When is it expected that work will commence on construction of the new Mines Department office in Kalgoorlie adjacent to the courthouse?

- (2) When is it hoped that the building will be completed and occupied?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Subject to availability of funds, tenders will be called during November, and construction should commence in January, 1975.
- (2) A construction period of nine months will be incorporated into contract documents.
- It would be greatly appreciated if the Member would use information given to questions of other Members (in this case question 22 on 20/8/74) which would avoid duplication of answers.

8. SALES TAX

Rail Freights

Mr OLD, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that sales tax is being charged in some instances on freight and cartage to rail on goods being dispatched to country areas, thus increasing the financial burden already being experienced by rural residents due to freight increases?
- (2) If so, will he take the matter up with the Federal Treasurer in an endeavour to have the anomaly rectified by having sales tax applicable at the point of supply?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) I understand this is the position in certain cases, and, as a result of representations received from other areas, and particularly from the north-west and Kimberley Members, I am having studies made.
- In this regard, I would appreciate specific instances from the Member which will assist in the studies.
- (2) Past representations do not appear to have been very successful, but I shall be only too pleased to have the matter taken up with the Federal Treasurer when the current studies are completed, and a suitable case established.

9. BIRD DEALERS

Licensing

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Referring to question 9, Wednesday, 14th August, and answer thereto in connection with the licensing of bird dealers—

- (1) (a) Under what circumstances were two licenses transferred during the past 12 months;

(b) was it in connection with the sale of properties covered under the licenses?

- (2) From whom and to whom were the licenses transferred and did the vendor receive financial consideration for the license?
- (3) Would he provide a list showing the location of the 31 presently licensed bird dealers in the State?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) (a) These two licenses were transferred on application from persons who wished to purchase businesses.
- (b) I understand that in one case the sale of property was involved.
- (2) Mrs M. Hayward sold the business at—
 Aquarium World,
 Rockingham Road,
 Hamilton Hill,
 to Mr N. Rowe.
- Mr M. Wheat sold the business at—
 Shop 5, Shopping Village,
 Kelmscott,
 to Mr J. Theobald.
- I have no knowledge of the financial consideration received by the vendors.
- (3) List as follows—

Bird Dealers as at 4/9/74

Name; Address; Expiry date;
 License No.

R. H. Barrett & Co.; Rear 868 Albany Highway, East Victoria Park, W.A.; 18/6/75; 075.

M. C. Barrett; 208 Varden Street, Kalgoorlie, WA; 29/6/75; 083.

M. Pavisich; L/83 Dunholme Street, Osborne Park, W.A. 13/8/75; 079.

R. L. Weir; 2251 Albany Highway, Gosnells, WA; 10/6/75; 078.

E. Davis; 153 Armadale Road, Rivervale, WA; 7/9/74; 053.

C. McGinnis; 5 Harkins Way, Balga, WA; 22/9/74; 054.

Fremantle Pet Care Centre; 34 High Street, Fremantle, WA; 7/9/75; 087.

J. Gregory; Master Mike Pet Shop, Shop 45, La Plaza, Bentley, WA; 6/9/74; 052.

G. J. Swallow; 755A Canning Highway, Applecross, WA; 13/9/74; 055.

R. K. Clarke; 3 Gosnells Road, Gosnells, WA; 5/11/74; 080.

K. Mart Aust. Ltd.; 20 Collier Road, Morley, WA; 16/11/74; 059.

- J. Marshall; 205 Second Street, Wonthella, Geraldton, WA; 12/11/74; 067.
- H. Bozuwa; New Growth Plant & Bird Nurseries, Welshpool Road, Wattle Grove, WA; 2/12/74; 064.
- G. Ross; 21 Edward Street, Bedford, WA; 9/1/75; 066.
- B. Alder; 2A Flinders Lane, Rockingham, W.A.; 17/1/75; 082.
- L. & K. Jeffries; 82 Morley Drive, Morley, W.A.; 31/1/75; 069.
- E. C. Ashworth; 8 Beddingfield Road, Pinjarra, WA; 30/4/75; 073.
- H. O. Reidinger; 829 Beaufort Street, Inglewood, WA; 11/4/75; 074.
- Mrs B. Budd; 159 Varden Street, Kalgoorlie, WA; 6/4/75; 071.
- P. J. Marchand; Pet & Aquarium Centre, 169 Marine Terrace, Geraldton, WA; 13/5/75; 072.
- J. Theobald; Shop 5, Shopping Village, Kelmscott, WA; 3/6/75; 081.
- David Jones Ltd.; Garden City, Booragoon, WA; 28/8/75; 084.
- Kambalda Pet Supplies (L. J. C. Barnett); Kambalda, WA; 10/10/74; 057.
- Mrs Kane; Karrinyup Shopping Centre, Karrinyup, WA; 6/11/74; 061.
- "Fish and Pets" (M. J. Wheat); 181 Sevenoaks Street, Queens Park, WA; 8/11/74; 062.
- N. A. Spalding & T. E. Taylor; Lot 31 Hale Road, Wattle Grove, WA; 12/11/74; 063.
- E. Symonds; 845 Hay Street, Perth, WA; 11/9/75; 086.
- N. Rowe, 41A Rockingham Road, Hamilton Hill, WA; 24/1/75; 068.
- S. T. Lawn; 32 Townshend Road, Subiaco, WA; 1/3/75; 070.
- V. Bowery; Mandurah Pet Shop, Smart Street, Mandurah, WA; 1/7/75; 076.
- M. Kane; 51 Walter Road, Dianella, WA; 3/7/75; 077.
- A. Fazekas (issued 15/8/74); 210 Varden Street, Kalgoorlie, WA; 15/8/75; 085.

10.

HOUSING***Inquiries and Appeals: Members of Parliament***

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Would he advise the number of inquiries on housing matters referred by Members of Parliament

to the SHC through the Parliamentary Liaison Officer for each of the months, January, 1974 to August 1974 inclusive?

- (2) Would he also advise the number of like matters referred on appeal to him as Minister for Housing for the months April 1974 to August 1974 inclusive?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Recorded inquiries from Members through the Parliamentary Liaison Officer for each month from January 1974 to August 1974 (inclusive) were as follows—

January—64;
February—138;
March—276;
April—248;
May—319;
June—310;
July—352;
August—358.

Total for the eight months period: 2 065.

Note: These figures are the total of the recorded inquiries but some of the telephoned inquiries which are answered immediately are not recorded. Inquiries from ex-Members of Parliament are not included in the figures supplied. That includes members who either retired from Parliament or were defeated at the election.

Mr Taylor: Or Federal members who also applied.

Mr O'NEILL: I understand there is no need to keep records of those members who are no longer with us. Once the department is satisfied that it has no further use for the records, they are destroyed.

- (2) Recorded inquiries from members referred to the Minister for Housing for each month from April 1974 to August 1974 (inclusive) were as follows—

April—42;
May—52;
June—51;
July—42;
August—39.

Total for the five months period: 226.

Note: These figures include all approaches made by members direct to the Minister for Housing and do not necessarily represent appeals against previous decisions, records of which are not kept separately.

11. **LESMURDIE SCHOOL***Additions*

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

- (1) Is he aware that major additions to the Lesmurdie primary school, which were to have been completed before the start of the 1974 school year, later promised by the Tonkin Government to be ready by the end of second term, are no further advanced now than they were when the Government changed?
- (2) Will he state the reason for the delay?
- (3) What is the present expected date of completion?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The major problem was that the contractors were placed in the hands of a receiver. This problem has now been determined and work is to continue.
- (3) Occupation is not anticipated before the end of the 1974 school year.

12. **SCHOOL***Carmel*

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

What is the future of the junior primary school at Carmel?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

As with all small schools in old buildings the future is under frequent review. There are no intentions of any early closure.

13. **WATER SUPPLIES***Catchment Areas: Policy*

Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the Metropolitan Water Board and/or the country town water supply section of the PWD a firm policy regarding the use of catchment areas for recreation purposes?
- (2) If so, what is the policy?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) For the protection of catchment areas, the by-laws of the Metropolitan Water Board and Country Towns Water Supply section of the Public Works Department prohibit camping, shooting, fishing, sailing and other activities likely to result in pollution of catchment areas, tributary streams and stored water.

- (2) The policies of the Water Board and Public Works Department are to ensure that these by-laws are observed by members of the public and other users of catchment areas.

14. **CONSUMER PROTECTION***Ready-mixed Concrete*

Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that—

- (a) many persons who regularly use concrete supplied by batching plants in the Perth metropolitan area consider that the reputed quantity of concrete (sold by cubic measure) supplied during wet months of the year is considerably less than comparable quantities in other months;
- (b) one contractor has stated that because batching is effected by separately weighing the sand, aggregate and cement the resultant mix when the sand and aggregate material is wet will be less in cubic content than when the same material is dry?
- (2) Will he have the matter investigated and, if there is any discrepancy, take steps to protect the contractors involved?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) No.
- (2) Concrete companies supplying pre-mixed concrete in the metropolitan area are aware that the basic materials of sand and aggregate carry more moisture in winter than in summer. They regularly test this and make allowance for it when assessing the weight of the aggregates needed to fulfil the cubic requirements of the ordered concrete.

Concrete quality is controlled by the "slump" and "developed strength", both of which are effectively reduced as the water content is increased. To reinstate this reduction, it is necessary to increase the cement content—the most expensive commodity in the mix. Therefore, it is in the best interests of economy for the company to see that minimum total water is included in the final mix.

It is to be noted that small, dimensional errors can produce a considerable effect on the final volume of concrete required, i.e. in a house slab floor of 50 feet x 20 feet, where the excavation is 4½

inches instead of 4 inches, the volume required is increased to 13 cubic yards instead of 12½ cubic yards.

15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Libraries: Amalgamation

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

As the Government has indicated its intention to involve the public more in education than has been done in the past, will the Minister give consideration to combining the libraries operated by local authorities with those modern units which are provided at the Government high schools?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Community libraries are established by the State Library Board under an Act of Parliament. School libraries are established and financed under quite different conditions.

Previous investigations have shown that the fundamental purpose, standing, nature of the book stocks and usage are so different as to make integration difficult.

16. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Westerly and Easterly Routes: Completion and Cost

Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What is the expected date of completion of—
 - (a) the westerly;
 - (b) the easterly,
 route of the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line?
- (2) If both lines are not to be completed and commissioned at the same time, will he state why there has been a change from the previously stated condition that both lines were necessary so as to provide security of supply?
- (3) What now is the estimated cost of the completed lines?
- (4) Has there been an increase in the price originally negotiated between the Commission and EPT; if so, by what amount and for what reasons?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) 31st March, 1975.
(b) 31st August, 1975.
- (2) There is no change from the previously stated condition. Both lines will be available when the first 200 MW generator at Kwinana Power Station is cleared for continuous full load service.

(3) \$12 million plus land.

(4) There is no increase in the price originally negotiated between the commission and the EPT. The price was based on a schedule of rates which included normal provision for escalation.

17. MINING ACT

Amendment: Submissions

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What method is being used to obtain submissions from the industry and others regarding the proposed review of the Mining Act?
- (2) Is an independent committee comprising private industry and Government officials to be set up to review the submissions?
- (3) Is it intended to introduce a new Bill in lieu of amending the present legislation?
- (4) What is the deadline for the presentations of submissions?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Invitation through the Press.
- (2) Another committee is not contemplated at present, but there will be the widest range of consultation with interested parties.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) 8th November, 1974.

18. STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Chairman: Successor

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) In view of the forthcoming retirement of the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission, has his successor been appointed or recommended?
- (2) If so, will he advise the name of the new chairman?
- (3) Because of the necessity for continued close co-operation between the SEC and the Fuel and Power Commission, has consideration been given to the appointment of the Commissioner for Fuel and Power to the State Electricity Commission?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) A successor to the chairman has been recommended.
- (2) The appointee will be announced when approved by the Governor-in-Executive-Council.
- (3) Consideration has been given to the widest possible circle of people eligible in order to arrive at an appointment which is in the best interests of the SEC and the community it serves.

19. FARMS AND PASTORAL LEASES, KIMBERLEY

Foreign Takeover

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

- (1) Is the report contained in *The West Australian* newspaper of 23rd August, 1974 that two Middle East countries have made offers worth a total of \$30 million for shares of a company that owns seven irrigated farms and cattle stations in the Kimberleys, correct?
- (2) Which Middle East countries are involved, and what is the name of the company concerned?
- (3) Are any irrigated farms at Kununurra included in the offer?
- (4) What is the total number of cattle stations located in the Kimberley region?
- (5) How many of these are held by a controlling overseas ownership interest?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No approach has been made to the Lands and Surveys Department in this matter.
- (2) In view of (1), I am not in a position to name the Middle East countries referred to in the newspaper report. The controlling interest in the cattle stations mentioned in the report is held by the Australian Land and Cattle Company Limited.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) 102.
- (5) The department has no way of knowing when companies become controlled by overseas interests. On the basis of company share transactions notified to the department, it is known that 17 stations would come into this category. Although the department is not aware of the information requested, I am quite sure it would be available from other departmental sources.

20. WHOLE AND MANUFACTURING MILK SECTIONS

Work Force

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many people in Western Australia were employed in the whole milk industry including carting, treatment plant and delivery operations in—
 - (a) 1968;
 - (b) 1973?
- (2) How many people were employed in the manufacture of dairy products in Western Australia, in-

cluding cartage and dairy factory operations in—

- (a) 1968;
- (b) 1973?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

This information is not immediately available. An endeavour will be made to obtain same and I will advise the Member direct.

21. *This question was postponed.*

22. PENSIONERS

Taxi Fares Concession

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

What assistance is being given or does the Government intend to give to pensioners who by reason of physical disability cannot travel by bus or rail transport and take advantage of the existing concessions to pensioners but must travel by taxi and incur the heavy expense associated therewith?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No alternative scheme is available to pensioners who by reason of physical disability cannot travel by bus or rail transport and take advantage of existing concessions and must travel by taxi.

However, individual cases of physically handicapped pensioners suffering severe financial hardship due to the necessity to use alternative transport may apply to the Department for Community Welfare for special and individual consideration.

The member may care to suggest to the pensioner group concerned that they put their case to the committee which the Government intends setting up in the near future to inquire into concessions and fringe benefits available to pensioners.

23. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Projects under 50 Per Cent Australian-owned

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Which are the major industrial projects in Western Australia which are less than 50% Australian owned but will be 50% Australian owned by 1980?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The Liberal Party policy document for 30th March State General Elections read as follows on this particular point:—

"We will negotiate for majority Australian ownership, either in the short-term or the long-term,

wherever Australians are willing or able to contribute the funds. Our initial objective will be a majority Australian ownership in all major W.A. projects by 1980.

It will be by sensible negotiation, and not by statutory or arbitrary direction."

Already negotiations have been commenced in selected cases towards achieving this objective.

For reasons which I would hope would be obvious to the Member, I am not prepared to nominate the specific industrial projects involved.

24. LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Revenue and Expenditure

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Local Government:

For the year 1972-73 and for each local government district in Western Australia, will he table the following information—

- (a) the total sum of revenue (excluding electricity and loan);
- (b) the total amount assessed as rates;
- (c) the unimproved values of property;
- (d) the annual values of property;
- (e) the costs of general administration;
- (f) the total loan indebtedness;
- (g) the amount paid in interest on bank overdrafts;
- (h) the amount paid in interest on loans by local authorities;
- (i) the total loan redemption?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Yes. As soon as the detail requested can be obtained.

25. TOWN PLANNING

Shire of Wanneroo: Scheme No. 7A

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

- (1) Is he currently considering Shire of Wanneroo town planning scheme No. 7A?
- (2) If so, when is it expected that he will make his decision in respect to it?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Wanneroo Town Planning Scheme No 7A is currently being examined by officers of my department, in consultation with officers of coun-

cil, prior to the submission of the scheme to the Town Planning Board.

- (2) Depending on the successful conclusion of discussions being held with council, it is anticipated the scheme will be presented to the board in 4 to 6 weeks. I will then be in a position to make a decision.

26.

HEALTH

Arteriosclerosis: Treatment

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

- (1) Is the treatment of arteriosclerosis as promoted by Dr Moeller of Germany now being used in this State at any Government hospitals?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) where is it used;
 - (b) when did it start;
 - (c) what local expertise is available;
 - (d) how many patients have received the treatment;
 - (e) is he able to indicate a measure of its success?
- (3) If not, what is the reason for the delay?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No delay has occurred in the preliminary testing of a machine which was acquired by the Government from Dr. W. Moeller in July. Extensive mechanical tests have been necessary to establish the levels of performance and safety of the machine under different conditions. These tests are still in progress, but it is anticipated that a controlled clinical trial of suitable patients with peripheral arteriosclerosis will be able to commence in approximately one month.

27. CHILD WELFARE ACT *Amendment*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

Is it anticipated Parliament will be asked to consider amendments to the Child Welfare Act this session?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No. It is hoped to introduce amendments to the Child Welfare Act during the first part of the session next year.

28. HEALTH

Kerosene: Colour

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that blue-coloured wines are currently on the market?
- (2) Does the Minister acknowledge the possible danger to children through confusion with kerosene?
- (3) Will the Minister consider amendments to the Poisons Act regulations or the Food and Drug regulations with a view to preserving the previously distinct appearance of kerosene?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There is a possibility of danger to young children of non-discriminating ages when hazardous substances, including kerosene are placed within their reach.
- (3) The Poisons Act Regulations were amended in 1971 to require containers of distinctive appearance and shape for kerosene purchased in household quantities.

9. CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOLS

Abrolhos Islands

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

Will the Minister detail the extent of Government assistance to the private correspondence schools operating on the various Abrolhos Islands during the crayfishing season?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The Education Department is not aware of any private correspondence schools operating on the Abrolhos Islands. A number of pupils living in that area are enrolled with the WA Correspondence School conducted by the department and the parents of these pupils are eligible to receive a basic Commonwealth allowance of \$200 for each full-time pupil and a further allowance of \$150 per annum per pupil as a reimbursement of approved educational expenditure.

30. PREMIER

Personal Explanation on 14th September, 1972: Comments

Mr JAMIESON, to the Speaker:

Is the matter contained in question 29 on 6th August, 1974 still subject to the *sub judice* rule of Standing Orders?

The SPEAKER replied:

Unless the Member has firm information that the writ referred to in the Member for Mt. Hawthorn's previous question has been withdrawn, or otherwise finalised, it is my intention to continue constancy in the application of the *sub judice* rule.

31. INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENT

Cockburn Sound

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Is it a fact that whilst the Garden Island causeway has not changed the flushing rate of the water in Cockburn Sound, the production of industries centred on the sound has increased appreciably since the building of the causeway?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) by what amount has production increased;
 - (b) has this had the effect of increasing the effluent discharge into the sound;
 - (c) what action does the Government propose to remedy the situation?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) and (2) No. From an environmental point of view, reports received do not indicate any deleterious consequence which can be directly related to any change of production of industries near Cockburn Sound since the building of the causeway. The Environmental Protection Authority is currently preparing guidelines for a comprehensive study of the effects of the various effluents on the ecosystem of Cockburn Sound with a view to developing a sound management programme for the multi-purpose use of the area.

32.

QUOKKAS

Rottneest Island

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Is it a fact that quokkas are taken from Rottneest Island for the purpose of research?
- (2) If so, will he please advise how many quokkas have been taken and by what organisations for each of the last ten years?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The following numbers of quokkas have been taken under license by the University of Western Australia for research purposes—

1964-65—420
 1965-66—235
 1966-67—42
 1967-68—47
 1968-69—108
 1969-70—131
 1970-71—157
 1971-72—63
 1972-73—66
 1973-74—101

33. KATANNING POLICE STATION

Upgrading

Mr OLD, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has he plans to upgrade the Katanning police station?
- (2) If so, when will upgrading take place?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 1976-77, subject to funds being available.

34 to 36. *These questions were postponed.*

37. ROAD TRANSPORT

Fruit and Perishables: Perth and South-west

Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Following representations made to the Minister regarding road transport of fruit to Perth from south-west areas and the road transportation of perishables from the metropolitan area to south-west towns, would he advise of any decision to date?
- (2) If "No" when is it anticipated a decision will be made?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No decision has yet been made.
- (2) A decision will be made as soon as possible.

38. LAND

Reserves: Controlling Authority

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

- (1) Under the provisions of the Land Act, 1933, which authority approves of the establishment of reserves?
- (2) Is this Act subservient to the operations of the Mining Act, 1904?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The Governor, by virtue of section 29 of the Land Act.

- (2) Section 4 of the Land Act provides that nothing in the Act shall affect, or be construed to derogate from the operation of the Mining Act.

39. MINERAL CLAIMS 1002 AND 1024

Objections

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

- (1) What objections had been lodged in regard to applications concerning MC 1002 and MC 1024?
- (2) What were the mining warden's recommended conditions in regard to approval of these applications?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) MC 1002H—No objections lodged. MC 1024H—Objection 788H/70 lodged 3 pm on 30/6/70 by Shire of Busselton. Withdrawn by leave 15/8/73.
- (2) MC 1002H
 - (i) Survey.
 - (ii) The complete excision of any portion encroaching on Sussex Locations 220 and 238.
 - (iii) The terms and conditions expressed in a certain Indenture dated 31st January, 1967 between the applicant and the Conservator of Forests.
 - (iv) A simultaneous method of mining and back filling being employed.
 - (v) No excavation approaching closer to the boundary of any road reserve than a distance equal to twice the depth of the excavation.
 - (vi) All mining excavations and slime dams being progressively back filled and contoured to the satisfaction of the Mining Engineer-District Inspector of Mines.
 - (vii) Top soil to a minimum depth of six inches being removed ahead of mining operations and stockpiled for replacement after back filling is completed, such replacement to be carried out progressively as mining advances.
 - (viii) Rehabilitation being kept as close as practicable to the mining excavations and the rehabilitated areas being replanted with suitable grass, cereals, shrubs or other suitable vegetation, and where considered necessary by the Mining Engineer-District Inspector of Mines, brush fences or other means to prevent sand drift and dust nuisance being provided.

- (ix) Provision being made to prevent the discharge of tailings, slimes, pollutants or overburden into the surrounding country, water courses or lakes.

MC 1024H

(i) Survey.

- (ii) The terms and conditions expressed in a certain Indenture dated the 31st January, 1967 between the applicant and the Conservator of Forests.

2028H—Objection 1128H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2030H—Objection 1103H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2031H—Objection 791H/70 lodged 30/6/70 by Shire of Busselton.

Objection 1105H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

70/10692—Objection 652H/72 lodged 12/10/72 by Conservator of Forests.

70/11448—Objection 31H/73 lodged 13/2/73 by Conservator of Forests.

70/11683—Objection 539H/73 lodged 11/12/73 by Conservator of Forests.

- (2) No hearing dates have yet been set.

40. MINERAL CLAIMS

Ludlow Tuart Forest: Objections

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

- (1) What objections have been lodged in regard to other mineral claims in the Ludlow tuart forest that have not yet been approved?
- (2) What dates have been set for hearings in the warden's court?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) 1000H—Objection 761H/71 lodged 8/10/70 by Conservator of Forests.

1001H—Objection 762H/71 lodged 8/10/70 by Conservator of Forests.

1025H—Objection 786H/70 lodged 30/6/74 by Shire of Busselton.
Objection 763H/71 lodged 8/10/70 by Conservator of Forests.

1026H—Objection 764H/71 lodged 8/10/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2011H—Objection 1089H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2012H—Objection 1125H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2013H—Objection 1122H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2015H—Objection 140H/70 lodged 3/3/70 by F. T. & C. C. Tucker.

Objection 789H/70 lodged 30/6/70 by Shire of Busselton.

Objection 1127H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

2022H—Objection 143H/70 lodged 3/3/70 by F. T. & C. C. Tucker.

Objection 790H/70 lodged 30/6/70 by Shire of Busselton.

Objection 1107H/70 lodged 3/8/70 by Conservator of Forests.

41. MINERAL CLAIMS 1002 AND 1024

River Pollution: Safeguard

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

(1) Is the Mines Department aware of references made to wetland pollution in Dr T. Riggerts' report on Swan Coastal Plain wetland (1966)?

(2) Which rivers pass through or are close to mineral claim Nos 1002 and 1024?

(3) Have any conditions been laid down in granting these claims to prevent pollution of streams and estuaries specifically?

(4) Will he table all conditions imposed in regard to the granting of mineral claims 1002 and 1024?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) No.

(2) Ludlow River passes close to mineral claim 1002H.

(3) MC 1002H—Yes.

MC 1024H—No.

(4) Conditions of approval are tabled herewith.

The conditions of approval were tabled (see paper No. 210).

42. CONSERVATION THROUGH RESERVES COMMITTEE

Technical Subcommittee

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

- (1) Who are the members of the technical subcommittee of the conservation through reserves committee?

- (2) When was the subcommittee formed and on how many occasions has it met?
- (3) What areas of the State has it visited?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Professor R. T. Appleyard, Professor of economic history University of Western Australia. (Convenor);

Dr A. A. Burbidge, Senior Research Officer, Fauna Research Branch, Department of Fisheries and Fauna;

Mr A. S. George, Western Australian Herbarium, Department of Agriculture;

Dr B. W. Logan, Reader in Geology University of Western Australia; and

Mr J. H. Lord, Director, Geological Surveys Branch, Mines Department.

- (2) The subcommittee was formed in August 1972. It met once per fortnight between that date and July 1973, then between August 1973 and November 1973 members were seconded to the Department of Environmental Protection and met for three full days per week. Between December 1973 and August 1974 the subcommittee met once or twice per week.
- (3) Despite the members extensive knowledge of the State gained in their various professional capacities, light aircraft inspections were made of the north-west as far as Port Hedland, the Pilbara, the Murchison, the northern coast, Cape Naturaliste-Leeuwin area, the wheat belt and the area from Albany to Esperance. Ground visits were made to various areas where more detailed inspections were considered appropriate.

43. LUDLOW TUART FOREST

Ilmenite Mining

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

- (1) Further to the answers given to question 12 on 12th August, considering that a large part of the Ludlow tuart forest has been pegged for ilmenite for some time, has the Environmental Protection Authority invoked section 55 of the Environmental Protection Act in this regard?
- (2) If so, on what date?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

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

44. PASTORAL APPRAISEMENT BOARD

Membership and Functions

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

- (1) Who are the members of the Pastoral Appraisal Board?
- (2) What is the function and duties of this body?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) J. F. Morgan—Surveyor General—Chairman.

E. N. Fitzpatrick—Director of Agriculture—Member.

W. G. Henderson—Deputy-Surveyor General—Member.

E. F. Broad—Pastoralist—Member.

- (2) To advise the Minister for Lands on matters pertaining to pastoral leases with particular reference to lease rentals, granting of rent relief, development and stocking of pastoral leases.

45. PASTORAL LEASES

Total Area

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

- (1) What was the area of pastoral leases in the State as at 30th June, 1974?
- (2) What was the area of the above in 1970?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) 97 950 768 hectares.
- (2) 97 433 000 hectares.

46. TOWN PLANNING

Carnarvon-Cape Arid Coastline

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

- (1) Would he list, under locality and type of development, currently proposed residential and/or tourist complex developments that are coast-oriented between Carnarvon and Cape Arid and which have been submitted to his department since 30th June, 1972?
- (2) Which of these have been approved and on what dates?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Development applications are handled by local authorities. The detailed information which the Member seeks is not available within the Town Planning Department.
- (2) Answered by (1).

47. UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES

Coastal Plain

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

- (1) What is the known or estimated volume of unconfined underground water on the coastal plain—
 - (a) between the Swan and Moore Rivers;
 - (b) between the Swan River and Peel Inlet?
- (2) What is the known or estimated annual recharge rate of both the above?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) A conservative estimate is 1 500 million cubic metres of water in storage. The through-flow is estimated at 40 million cubic metres per year.
- (b) As a rough estimate, one-fourth to one-third of the Swan-Moore River area.
- (2) Swan-Moore River area—
Equivalent to the throughflow quoted above, about 40 million cubic metres per year.
- Swan River-Peel Inlet area—
Not yet known, possibly a third of the volume given for the Swan-Moore River area.

48. UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES

Gnangara Mound, and Evaluation

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

- (1) What are the basic characteristics of the Gnangara Mound?
- (2) Is there a similar structure south of the Swan River?
- (3) Has any overall evaluation yet been made of Perth's underground water resources?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Sands and silty sands extending from natural surface to a maximum depth of about 50 metres with little or no surface drainage. The area is charged with low salinity (potable) shallow groundwater, recharged by direct downward percolation from local rainfall. It is considered a very important prospective source of domestic water for the metropolitan area, and should be carefully protected from contamination.
- (2) Yes, but more limited in extent, and not so valuable a prospective source of domestic water, although

it will be quite usable. Investigations are not complete. The saturated thickness is only 10 to 30 metres.

- (3) Intensive work has been under way for a number of years, but is not yet complete.

49. EMERGENCY BUFFER FUEL COMMITTEE

Function and Recommendation

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is the emergency buffer fuel committee appointed by the Tonkin Government still operating?
- (2) If so, will he advise the dates of the last four meetings?
- (3) Did this committee make any recommendation to the Government that emergency legislation should be introduced into Parliament?
- (4) If not, on whose recommendation was the current Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill 1974 introduced?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes, under the name of Emergency Fuel Supplies Committee. This change of name took place in 1973, under the Tonkin Government.
- (2) 15th July, 1974.
1st July, 1974.
29th May, 1974.
24th April, 1974.
- (3) The task of the committee is to advise the commission. In this capacity it was aware of and indeed perused the Cabinet minute which my predecessor submitted to the Tonkin Cabinet. As our Government continued the policy recommended by this Cabinet minute there was no further action or advice necessary by the committee.
- (4) Answered by (3).

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE

Arming

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

- (1) What is the policy or practice followed by the Police Department in allowing its officers to go armed in public?
- (2) Was there any incident involving armed police in Great Eastern Highway on the night of the 25th August or early in the morning of the 26th August?
- (3) What was the cause of any such incident?
- (4) What did the incident involve?
- (5) Were any shots fired?

- (6) If "Yes", who fired the shots?
- (7) Were the shots fired in the lawful exercise of anyone's duty?
- (8) Did any member of the public draw any such incident to the notice of the Police Department?
- (9) What action was taken with regard to any report received?
- (10) Was any action taken to prevent publication of the details of any such incident?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (10) I have no personal knowledge of the incident referred to but inquiries are being made and a reply to the honourable member's question will be furnished as soon as possible.

AUSTRALIAN ASSISTANCE PLAN

Implementation in South-West: Grievance

MRS CRAIG (Wellington) [5.08 p.m.]: It is my wish to bring to the notice of members today some information about the Australian Assistance Plan of the Social Welfare Committee, a pilot programme in the south-west region.

I do not know how many members have read the paper which I now hold in my hand; it is, indeed, only a discussion paper on the Australian Assistance Plan. Might I say that if any member has read it he would not be very clear with regard to the pilot plan because the paper is purely an enunciation of philosophy and does not lay down any clear guidelines at all.

I thought it might be of interest to those members who have not been involved in the pilot project to know something of the way in which it has been implemented. When the discussion paper was published two members of the Community Welfare Department put together a submission which was put to the Australian Assistance Plan Committee suggesting that the south-west region might be a good area in which to set up a pilot project.

The area which they defined was vast: It stretched from Mandurah to Pemberton, to Albany, to Ravensthorpe, to Lake King, to Katanning, to Wagin, and back to Mandurah. The area has a population of some 120 000 people. The scheme was supposed to provide \$2 per head of population, and the money was to be made available to be spent in the region—or so we were informed.

One of the officers of the Community Welfare Department was co-opted by the Social Security Department to act as a consultant to the pilot project. She is now a member of another place in this Parliament and I must say that she worked very hard indeed to try to get across to people what she understood at that time to be the plan.

She enlisted aid from local government to call meetings of the people within the various shires. I have knowledge of only four meetings which I attended, but from inquiries I have made I understand that additional meetings followed much the same pattern as those I attended. The worker from the Social Security Department made it clear to everyone that we were to be involved—that the Government wished the people of the south-west region to be involved—at the grass roots level of the scheme. She asked each shire to set up a local committee and suggested that the categories to be represented should include education, community projects, sport, medical, youth, general welfare, and geriatrics.

Each committee was to draw up a constitution, and then collate all the information available from within its particular area. After the collation of the information the committees were to recommend that assistance be given to those applicants in order of priority who would be of greatest benefit to the community.

The next step was for each committee to choose two delegates who were to attend meetings of the subregional committee. After the submissions had been considered by the subregional committee, that committee appointed delegates to the Southern Region Social Development Board. The board then elected delegates who finally handed the submissions to the Western Australian regional council of the Australian Assistance Plan. From that committee the recommendations were passed on to Canberra.

So it will be seen that it was not a direct method and it was not surprising that so many of the submissions were lost on the way. We put many questions to the consultant who presented the scheme to us. We asked: Why cannot a local committee be formed? Why cannot the shire be granted the \$2 per head, and why the local committees, which were appointed, could not allocate the funds? No administration costs would have been involved and the money would have been kept within the area concerned. However, that could not be done.

We also asked if there was not a danger that the submission with the best advocate would be the one to get the greatest grant. The consultant agreed that there could be some danger of that occurring but she hoped that fairness would prevail. We then asked if Canberra was the best place to decide whether Dardanup should have a new basketball court, or whether Yarloop should have new toilets for its hall. We asked if it would not be better for those things to be decided locally rather than in Canberra. The consultant seemed to believe that Canberra was the place to make the decision.

It was very difficult to ferret out how much money it was planned to spend on administration of the scheme. We were

not able to obtain an exact figure but, in fairness, the consultant said the whole plan was experimental, but she firmly believed that the amount of money she had suggested should be put aside was far too great. However, it turned out to be \$10 000 too little.

We also suggested that it would be better to try to involve all the voluntary workers in the already existing organisations—with their complicated set-ups—throughout the whole of the region. We asked: Could we not take the source of manpower which is already available and distribute the moneys through that source? However, that was not to be allowed. It seemed that it was intended to do away with local or voluntary involvement. So the scheme went ahead.

So that members do not believe this is just my own grizzle, and that no weight has been added to this grizzle, let me outline what happened to the plan.

It must be remembered that we set out with \$240 000 to be spent in the south-west region. It must also be remembered that we were carefully instructed as to the areas in which we could obtain grants. We find in *The West Australian* of the 3rd September an announcement that the Western Australian regional council of the Australian Assistance Plan has been allocated \$22 000 for community welfare work and \$40 000 for administration expenses. That is a bit hot! The article goes on to say exactly what I have already said—

One southern region was entitled to about \$240,000, at \$2 a head as the scheme proposed. Another \$40 000 was set aside for administration.

However, when the application for assistance was submitted, only \$22 000 was granted because few of the suggested projects qualified under the plan.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes more.

Mrs CRAIG: Clearly, the criteria were changed after the submissions were made. In the *South Western Times* of the 22nd August this article appears, under the heading "Disillusionment at Capel over assistance plan"—

Cr J. Kitchen who represents the council on the committee told the last council meeting that applications for grants to foster junior sporting activities in the district had been turned down . . .

The Capel committee had been optimistic when the plan was outlined by officials initially and had acted in good faith by trying to help sporting bodies.

But optimism had now turned to disillusionment . . .

He said that another criticism was that officials administering the plan had indicated that organisations which had helped themselves would receive favourable consideration . . .

Cr Kitchen said he could not see why the committees should have to "crawl" to the Government for the distribution of taxpayers' money.

I have here many other newspaper cuttings which are in much the same tone. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to read them out.

RAILWAYS AND ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Electrical Workers: Grievance

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [5.18 p.m.]: My grievance relates to what appears to be a very dangerous practice that has grown up within the railways, and it impinges upon the State Electricity Commission Act and the regulations made under the Electricity Act. On page 3 of the regulations an electrical worker is defined, and among other things the definition says—

"Electrical Worker" means any person engaged on electrical work if such is connected to or is to be connected to a pressure not exceeding 40-volts . . .

Under the special rational provisions in the railway award, No. 38 on page 55 classifies those workers in the signals and telecommunications branch who are legitimately covered by the definition of "Electrical Worker" in the Electricity Act. This classification was formerly assigned to people who were electrical fitters.

Another interesting point is that regulation 29 of the Electricity Act regulations allows the State Electricity Commission to permit anyone to do any work provided the appropriate work permit is granted to the person making application. To my mind, that is a provision which has been placed in the regulations to allow people engaged for a specific function—which might be a function that arises only once during any given period—to perform that function. However, my information is that four employees of the WAGR, who are properly classified, according to their award, as safe-working technicians, are actually unlicensed and, indeed, unqualified to work on pressures exceeding 40 volts.

The situation appears to me to be a very dangerous one and although I have not been able to locate instances in the recent past of dangerous situations resulting from this practice, I am aware that in July, 1969, one of these unqualified safe-working technicians, while working on a pressure exceeding 30 volts, installed a rectifier supplying a battery used essentially for signalling at the Perth terminal. I understand this safe-working technician connected a phase wire to the earth, and employees narrowly missed being involved in a nasty accident.

I speak in no way in criticism of the present Government, because I understand this practice has continued for several years and results really from the change in voltages with which these men normally work. The change has been a natural development within the WAGR. However, if this situation is persisting, and it is a dangerous one, whichever Government is in power has the responsibility to investigate the matter and put a stop to it.

I also understand that of the four people who are at present working as safe-working technicians on pressures exceeding 30 volts, at least two have refused to sit for examinations which would have enabled them to obtain licenses to work on these pressures.

That, Mr Speaker, is my grievance.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Transport) [5.20 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to notice. As far as I know, it has not been brought to my notice by members of unions or anyone else. However, I will confer with the Commissioner for Railways and if the problem does exist we will discuss ways of overcoming it.

WHEAT MARKETING

Deferred Payments: Grievance

MR CRANE (Moore) [5.21 p.m.]: The grievance I wish to bring to the notice of members of the House and the public concerns the financial hardship which is being felt throughout Australia but which particularly concerns all sections of the community in Western Australia. The hardship is being brought about because of the irresponsible action of people who hold responsible positions. I refer to the deferment of the wheat payments for the 1973-74 harvest, one of which was to be made in August of this year and the other one in October-November. The deferment of these payments has brought a considerable amount of hardship not only to the wheat producers themselves but also to every person in the community, because that money would have flowed freely to everyone in the State.

Quite early this year announcements were made that 20c a bushel would be paid in August and another 25c a bushel towards the end of October or early November, making a total of 45c a bushel. As Western Australian wheat producers last year delivered a record harvest of 148 million bushels, the total amount of money involved was \$66.6 million. Farmers were encouraged by their bank managers to budget for this money, and they did so.

The reason the payments were not made, and the reason for my grievance, is that there was industrial unrest in the Eastern States which caused delay in the loading of the vessels which were to ship the wheat to other countries. The wheat had already been sold, and that money was needed by the Australian Wheat Board to

pay the balance of the overdraft which met the first advance of \$1.20 to producers. After this \$1.20 had been repaid, as the first requirement, the second advance was to be paid to the growers.

Because the ships were not loaded and the bills of lading were not signed, this money was not available to the Australian Wheat Board. The industrial workers who were on strike were tradesmen, electricians, technicians, tug masters, pilots, and water-side workers. Industrial trouble also occurred with the New South Wales Grain Elevators Board, and the combination of these troubles resulted in ships at Newcastle and Sydney not being loaded.

The August payment to Western Australia would have amounted to \$29 million, which of course is a tremendous amount of money which we all need at this particular time when credit is so restricted. Not only did we not receive the money because of the industrial action but added penalties were also incurred. I remind members that \$1.5 million was lost by what we call despatch, which means that had the ships been loaded in time when they came into port this money would have been paid as a bonus. But worse still, a sum of \$500 000 was incurred for demurrage. So we incurred a debt of \$2 million, which can only be paid by the wheat producer himself.

Because we were not able to pay our first advance loan on time, we have incurred an additional 2½ per cent interest with the Reserve Bank, because an interest penalty was brought in recently. Lost sales of this wheat when prices were high mean another loss of money to us because some of our orders were lost. If wheat is not sold by the end of December it becomes old season's wheat and therefore does not command as high a price. So here again we have incurred another penalty.

The carryover this year was expected to be low—in fact, only 500 000 tonnes. We now find the carryover is expected to be 1.7 million tonnes. This will incur extra expense for storage of the grain and the additional fumigation for weevil control which will be necessary.

One bright light on the horizon, perhaps, is that we were told on the news this morning there was a record shipment of wheat from Western Australia. This is very good news and it might in some way enable a second advance to be paid earlier; but I doubt very much that it will be paid.

We are now told we will receive 7c a bushel in October, instead of the 45c we were to receive. That will be worth \$10.3 million, so it can be seen Western Australia will lose \$56.3 million on the whole deal in the latter half of this year. The lack of flow-on of this money through the normal trade and commerce channels will be disastrous, and at a time such as this when the credit squeeze is of concern to us all, this industrial action is more distasteful. It is not only the rural areas

which are suffering but, as I said earlier, this money would flow through to everyone. The man in the street would have received his proportion of the money.

In the rural areas businesses are being very hard pressed because of the lack of finance. I know of the case of one machinery agent who, because of the announcement of the wheat payment, has let out on credit \$85 000-worth of machinery, 25 per cent of which was to be recovered in August, another 25 per cent in late November, and the balance after harvest. He has received only \$2 500, and he is placed in a very serious position.

Banks are not sympathetic. It is not possible to get carry-on finance even for food in some instances. This matter has been brought to my attention as I have moved through my electorate.

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

Mr **CRANE**: Farmers cannot now, because of lack of finance, take advantage of the superphosphate subsidy of \$12, which will expire on the 31st December; so here is another loss to them. They feel desperate; they have nowhere to turn; and it is very disappointing that the people who provide a great deal of our export earnings and our food are being hit in such a vicious manner.

I conclude by saying it is indeed a mongrel dog that will bite the hand that feeds it.

AUSTRALIAN ASSISTANCE PLAN

Implementation in South-West: Grievance

THE SPEAKER: Order! Before proceeding with grievances, I understand the Premier wishes to reply to the grievance of the member for Wellington. I think it is desirable that the reply be given immediately after the grievance, but that is not essential. Therefore, if the Premier wishes to reply, he may do so.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.30 p.m.]: Thank you, Mr Speaker; you called on the next speaker rather more quickly than I anticipated, and I missed out.

I want to comment only very briefly, and in the interests of expedition I will comment on both the speeches; that is, that made by the member for Wellington and the one made by the member for Moore.

So far as the Australian Assistance Plan is concerned, the State Government is most concerned about the developments which have taken place. We were most concerned when the plan was originally announced, because we found it extremely difficult to ascertain exactly what was intended. When I say "we" I am referring to the time when the scheme was announced and we on this side of the House

were in Opposition. We made inquiries far and wide in an endeavour to ascertain just how effective the scheme would be and, as was predicted by many of the people in local government, the results have proved to be very misleading and far short of what was put forward by the advocates of the scheme.

I think many people approached this scheme with souls full of hope that some money would be available to local communities—money which previously was denied to them and they could not raise through normal local government revenue or voluntary contribution. However, as the member for Wellington explained, the results that have now been disclosed have proved to be—to say the least, and to put it in the most generous way—a damp squib.

Mr T. D. Evans: It is better than nothing. They did not get anything like that from former Liberal Governments.

Sir **CHARLES COURT**: I hope the member for Kalgoorlie is not proud of this. We are talking about an expenditure of \$40 000 for administration, and only about \$22 000 for approved works. Any Government which, or any supporter of a Government who, is proud of that would be proud of anything.

Mr T. D. Evans: It is better than nothing at all.

Sir **CHARLES COURT**: I want to convey to the honourable member that the State Government is very concerned about this; and I also want to say to the House that other State Governments are equally concerned, and practically all local authorities in Australia are even more concerned, because they can see this as a definite attempt by Canberra to bypass local government. I would like to assure the member for Wellington that the matter is under consideration and that we intend to make representations to see if we cannot get something better put into operation; something less costly so far as the taxpayers' money is concerned, and something which will produce better practical results. I see the member for Victoria Park is carrying on; his record will not turn off.

Mr Davies: Western Australians are the ones who are harmed by your attitude.

Sir **CHARLES COURT**: They are harmed by the attitude of the project. We are talking in terms of \$40 000 being spent on administration, and only \$22 000 being spent on projects; and there is not very much more to come. People are completely disillusioned; they have not the faintest idea of what the schemes are intended to do. The member for Victoria Park can continue to try to defend his brethren in Canberra for as long as he likes, but that does not alter the fact that this is a complete and utter fizzle.

Mr T. D. Evans: The administration cost is a once-only cost.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The member for Kalgoorlie is making a gallant attempt, out of sheer loyalty, to defend his comrades in Canberra. However, the simple fact is that this plan is indefensible, and as soon as the Commonwealth Government is prepared to get back to a scheme under which local people have a chance to obtain access to money and to take full advantage of it—and with minimal administration costs—the better it will be.

May I refer briefly to the comments of the member for Moore. The announcement of the deferment of this payment came as a great shock to everybody. The delay in the payment was in itself a great shock. I know the Deputy Premier was most concerned, and has himself taken a very vigorous interest in trying to obtain some redress. The situation is that the reasons for the delay are even worse than the fact that there is a delay. I think most members are shocked at the fact that farmers cannot obtain access to this money at a time when they badly need it, and serious industrial trouble has caused this.

If it were only a question of the money being held up, that would be bad enough during the present time of the credit squeeze and dear money, and when farmers must borrow to pay for machinery instalments and other capital needs. But the worst feature is the consequential costs which flow from the situation. As the member for Moore effectively explained, once the ships are held up certain demurrage and other charges and penalties are incurred, and orders which were hard won are lost. There is a deterioration in quality in practical terms, so far as grain selling techniques are concerned, as a result of the delay. This is written into the contracts; it applies automatically when the seasonal time schedule cannot be adhered to.

What is worse, the whole country suffers due to the loss of our reputation. It is well known that if we do not get the grain to the market on time we run the risk of it deteriorating or becoming contaminated. If as the result of delays the grain deteriorates or becomes contaminated, then our reputation suffers.

I want to assure the member for Moore that the Government is making strong representation in conjunction with producer organisations in this matter.

MASSAGE PARLOURS

Investigation: Grievance

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.36 p.m.]: My grievance is directed against the attitude of the Government towards massage parlours.

Mr Nanovich: You need oiling; you are getting rusty.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Did he speak?

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker: where did you get him from?

My grievance concerns the matter of massage parlours and the inquiries which were promised by certain members of the Government when on the hustings. The Minister for Works uttered some well chosen words saying that as soon as the election was over we would have an inquiry into this matter. We have had God knows how many questions in respect of this, disclosures have been made by Inspector Daniels, and all sorts of statements have been made. The answers we have received to our questions could best be described as being not straightforward; it appears the Government is trying to cover up.

Only the week before last the Premier, in reply to a question I asked him in respect of this matter, said—

- (1) and (2) Since the change of Government on 30th March, we have had the opportunity of examining the matter much more closely, and have been in receipt of police reports relative to the activities of massage parlours and the like, which have led us to believe that the surveillance by the police of these places is adequate in all the circumstances, and the need to set up such a committee at the present time is not as urgent as it appeared to be when the statement was made.

It is all very well for him to make statements like that in order to endeavour to avoid his responsibility to do something concrete.

I suggest that everybody in the community who is at all alive is aware that fleshpots exist in and around Perth, and that people indulge in the use of these places. That does not concern me so much; what I am concerned about is the fact that genuine masseurs in our community are now finding it difficult to operate because some people expect them to provide services other than massages in their parlours; and they find themselves in an awkward situation.

I know of a recent instance where a woman attended a physiotherapist, and he suggested she should receive regular massage. Her hair nearly stood on end when he suggested that. He saw the look on her face and said, "I will see that you go to a recognised practitioner who will do this massage for you."

It is not good enough that the Government should tolerate this situation. A great deal has been written about it in the Press. We have had Inspector Daniels making many statements, and many questions have been asked in the House. I think the last question asked in this place

in regard to prostitution was a question without notice directed to the Minister for Police by the member for Collie only last Thursday. He asked—

In view of the statement made by the Commissioner of Police in today's edition of *The West Australian* newspaper on prostitution in Western Australia, will he table the report in order that Parliament can be fully informed on the question?

However, the Minister replied that he would not table the report, but that if the member wished to see the documents they would be made available to him in the Minister's office. Of course, this is just a cover-up.

I have heard suggestions around the corridors and in other market places that the matter is being covered up because members on both sides of the House are involved in or associated with this situation. We even saw a large heading in a week-end newspaper which said "Madam in the House". I do not know what was the purpose of that heading. The member for Balga asked questions in this place, and it was suggested that some pressure was applied to Liberal members of Parliament.

Mr Grayden: What do you mean "Liberal members of Parliament"? Were not Labor members interviewed?

Mr JAMIESON: That was the question asked on this occasion, and it was suggested two members were involved.

Mr Grayden: Wasn't the Leader of the Opposition interviewed?

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No, he was not.

Mr Grayden: I thought you were.

Mr JAMIESON: I understand the members involved were the member for Subiaco and the Hon. R. J. L. Williams. I do not know what was discussed at the interview; that is their business. I do not know why the matter should have been taken up in the newspaper on the basis that it was taken up. However, people are suggesting that something smells with regard to members of Parliament. Members on the Government side are going around saying quite clearly to members on this side, "You ought to ease up because some of your fellows could be involved." I do not know whether they could be involved or whether they are involved; but they are all over 21 and they must look after themselves. They are in public life, and if they have become involved in these seamy activities, then they should have known better and they will have to look after themselves.

What I do know is that one member of the present Ministry was involved in 1973, and reference to the appropriate police report by the Premier would soon uncover that.

Mr O'Connor: Come on, name him.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not suggesting that person was visiting a massage parlour for the benefit of his electors when the police intervened; I would find it difficult to stretch my imagination that far. The fact that this incident could be uncovered might be an embarrassment to the Government; but I think it is high time it was brought out in the open and the newspapers were able to gain access to all the facts. It is high time members of Parliament were able to put forward whatever facts they desire to put forward to a Select Committee or commission of inquiry established by the Government. This matter should not be swept under the carpet.

I am broad-minded enough to recognise that there are prostitutes and people running such institutions around Perth. I have no objection to that if madams are running these places, because it is a poor job that cannot afford a couple of foremen. But if men are living off the proceeds of prostitution that is a different proposition, and it introduces many problems into the community.

The fact that members of Parliament are being tied up with these activities is not good for the Parliament of Western Australia; and the suggestion all along the line that a massive cover-up is going on is something which should be cleared up. I do not want any cover-up on my behalf. If I am at fault in any of my actions then, as a person in public life, I must take what is coming to me. Everybody else in this Parliament should be in the same position.

If people are being procured for parties, and documents are coming into the hands of the Premier—as they have on various occasions—and it seems as though the allegations are factual, then I think the matter should be investigated.

The SPEAKER: You have two minutes more.

Mr JAMIESON: I suggest it is high time we stopped running away from the facts associated with this matter and came out into the open by holding an inquiry into the situation. It is time recommendations were made to the Government so that those who are genuinely in the business of massage may be protected.

They are being tied up, or involved in a very seamy manner, with those who are conducting sexual massage parlours and the like. This has been obvious in the community. Also, even according to the statistics made available by the Police Department, these establishments have been increasing in number. It is of no use saying that such places do not exist; they do exist. Something should be done about the matter and if Ministers and also members on this side of the House are involved they will have to face up to whatever may be coming to them. In saying that I would point out that all of us have to face up to these responsibilities.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Police) [5.46 p.m.]: Judging from the way the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has spoken one would think that this problem is something new in the community. However, quite frankly, if it exists now it also existed when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a member of the previous Government, and, indeed, existed even prior to that. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicated that there was something sinister in connection with this matter, but he knows full well that the police have taken action wherever possible in regard to prostitution in this State.

Mr Bertram: How would he know that?

MR O'CONNOR: How would the honourable member know?

Mr Bertram: I don't.

MR O'CONNOR: A person could say, "What about Kalgoorlie? Prostitution has been conducted there for an even longer period." All members know that prostitution is practised in the community. I think that some degree of tolerance has been shown in regard to this matter, although the police have, wherever possible, conducted prosecutions. Every Government faces some problems in regard to the matter, because if a Government clamped down hard on prostitution it could be open to the accusation that it was responsible for a girl having been raped while walking down the street. However, as I have stated, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicated there was a sinister side to this question.

I have contacted all members of Parliament who may have been involved in this matter in any way. I found that two members of the Liberal Party and two members of the Labor Party were involved, but I do not intend to name any of them unless the House directs me to do so, because the matter is of such a minor nature that I do not think I should.

Mr Davies: How are they involved?

MR O'CONNOR: If the honourable member keeps quiet, he will find out.

Mr Grayden: The Leader of the Opposition was one of the four involved.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police is on his feet.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What is the Minister for Labour and Industry talking about?

MR O'CONNOR: The point is—

Point of Order

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Mr Speaker, I understand that the Minister for Labour and Industry made an interjection—

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to raise a point of order?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes. I ask for a withdrawal of the remark. I understand that the remark the Minister made was that a person who is supposed to be a pros-

titute was one of those who came to Parliament House and interviewed members, and that I was one of those members.

The SPEAKER: When did he make this interjection?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Just a minute ago.

The SPEAKER: I heard him say this some time ago.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: He interjected a couple of minutes ago.

Mr O'Connor: I hope, Mr Speaker, that this time will not be taken off the time I am allowed to make my speech.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I give an emphatic denial to that statement and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Did the Minister for Labour and Industry make this remark? I am afraid I did not hear it. However, the Minister has been asked to withdraw the remark.

Mr GRAYDEN: I am sick and tired of all these innuendos. I certainly said that there were two Liberal members and two members of the Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not permitted to make any speeches on this matter.

Mr GRAYDEN: What am I supposed to withdraw?

The SPEAKER: According to the Leader of the Opposition, you have been asked to withdraw the statement you made that this person approached the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GRAYDEN: I understand this is the truth; this is what I have been told. This is so. I ask the Leader of the Opposition: Was he approached in the House or out of the House?

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear the Leader of the Opposition again.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The interjection made by the Minister for Labour and Industry is offensive to me—

Mr Grayden: It is true.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —because there is no basis for it. I have never been interviewed here by any person of the type referred to.

Mr Grayden: Was it outside the House, then?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I ask that the imputation against me be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition finds the interjections of the Minister offensive to him, and therefore, according to precedent, I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark.

Mr GRAYDEN: If I have said that the Leader of the Opposition was interviewed in the House I certainly withdraw the remark, but obviously he was interviewed outside the House.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I ask that that statement be withdrawn. It is offensive to me, because there is no basis for it.

Mr GRAYDEN: I withdraw the statement, even though it occurred.

Mr Davies: Why is the Minister so worried?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Grievance Resumed

Mr O'CONNOR: If I can, I will explain, because I think this needs some brief clarification.

Several members interjected: Hear, hear!

Mr O'CONNOR: If Opposition members will give me an opportunity I will explain.

Mr Skidmore: I have not said a word yet.

Mr O'CONNOR: The situation is much better when the honourable member does not. I was saying that two members from each side of the House were involved and in such a minor way that it was ridiculous for the Press to publish an article on the matter in the way it did. I have conferred with three of the four members involved in regard to this matter which arose as a result of a Press article with prominent headlines to the effect that a person known as Dorrie Flatman had been interviewed by members of Parliament in Parliament House. From the information I gained I ascertained that a particular member was requested by one of his electors to see a person and that person presented herself, and she happened to be Dorrie Flatman.

There is nothing wrong in a member seeing such a person. However, two Labor members saw her in regard to the same matter and they had a discussion with her in the course of their duties. There is nothing to indicate that these members were doing anything wrong.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The Minister says that they were Labor members and I ask him: Was I one of them, because he is free to say so?

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not believe I should name any member. I am free to say whether the Leader of the Opposition was one of them, but the Leader of the Opposition himself could say whether or not he was one of those members.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I say I was not.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the Leader of the Opposition says he did not see this particular person in his office we have to accept that as being correct.

The position has been closely followed in many ways by the police and, wherever possible, convictions have been brought against such people. However, it must be realised that recently a magistrate ruled that a woman, working on her own as a

prostitute, could not be prosecuted because the house she was occupying could not be regarded as being a brothel.

Mr Jamieson: What has this to do with massage parlours?

Mr O'CONNOR: It has something to do with the whole problem and the honourable member will agree that this is so. In regard to such cases the police are trying to find ways and means whereby legislation can be drafted and introduced to solve the problem.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised the question of massage parlours. On this issue, also, steps are being taken to endeavour to introduce legislation but this is extremely difficult. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition himself could introduce legislation of this nature if he so desired.

Mr Jamieson: I did not make any statements and therefore I do not have to take any action following on what I said.

Mr O'CONNOR: This shows how inactive and how insincere the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is, because he could bring forward the type of legislation in regard to which we have been conducting investigations.

Mr Jamieson: You have a responsibility as a Minister; do not scurry from under. You stand up to your responsibilities!

Mr O'CONNOR: I will, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is squirming in his seat.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bertram: You would not support any measure introduced by us.

Sir Charles Court: We would be grateful if the member for Morley would give the Speaker the information he was asked for, following his question.

Mr O'CONNOR: This issue has been highlighted for the purposes of publicity only.

Sir Charles Court: We would have had that parliamentary privileges matter dealt with and could have cleaned the matter up in a week by obtaining public information.

Mr O'CONNOR: From our point of view we have been looking at the matter and, following the receipt of reports, we have been considering the possibility of bringing down legislation to ban massage parlours. However, this is not as simple as one would think.

The Commissioner of Police submitted a very lengthy report in connection with prostitution generally and it was accepted. When it is realised that this year some 60-odd convictions were recorded it shows that the police are being active in this regard.

Mr Jamieson: It either shows that, or it shows that there are more.

Mr O'CONNOR: It shows that the police are a little more vigilant under our control in obtaining convictions against these people, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is implying that there is still a large number who have not been prosecuted.

Mr T. H. Jones: You will not even table the report. If you have nothing to hide, why not table the report?

Mr O'CONNOR: If there was anyone who would not table a report it was the Government to which the member for Collie belonged. What about the issue concerning the TAB at Dampier? The honourable member's Premier at that time would not table the document and I know the reason that he would not. Therefore it is of no use the member for Collie complaining that we will not table the report on this situation. That is so much eye-wash. I wonder what the honourable member is trying to achieve?

Mr T. H. Jones: It is a hot potato.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have not shelved the matter, but it has been indicated to me that the issue is not as great as was originally thought. The Commissioner of Police has submitted a very voluminous report on the matter, and so far as we are concerned we have been looking at the possibility of introducing legislation to control massage parlours, but it is not an easy problem to solve.

The SPEAKER: Grievances have been noted.

BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill.
 2. Hire-Purchase Act Amendment Bill.
 3. Wheat Marketing Act Amendment and Continuance Bill.
 4. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.
- Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

JUNIOR FARMERS' MOVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL

Third Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [6.01 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Question put.

The SPEAKER: To be carried, this motion requires an absolute majority. I have counted the House; and, there being no dissentient voice, I declare the question carried.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

EDUCATION POLICIES

Condemnation of Government: Motion

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [6.02 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should be condemned for having enunciated certain education policies at the hustings and now some six months later is:—

1. Unable to provide any significant rationale or meaningful detail by way of answers to Parliamentary questions as to the implementation of these policies, that is, in relation to:—
 - (a) lowering the admission age of children into the primary school;
 - (b) transferring children from the primary to the secondary school at the end of the year in which children attain the age of eleven years;
 - (c) limiting student numbers at high schools to 1 000 and at senior high schools to 400;
2. Endeavouring to reconcile patent conflict between certain key essentials in policy of the two coalition parties constituting the Government;
3. Unable or unwilling to state clearly and fully the criteria upon which it is expected to proceed with these policies without first having demonstrated the educational merits of the changes inherent therein and having failed, when asked to name those professional educationists, whom were or should have been consulted before enunciation of these policies;
4. Refusing to indicate the expected costing of implementation of each and all of these policies.

I intend to embrace the principle that he who asserts a proposition should be required to prove it conclusively. I regret the Premier is not here as I propose to indicate that in adopting this principle I am following a road that more often than not the Premier ignores.

As a basis for the case I intend to present I wish to preface my remarks by indicating that the brief of this motion depends largely upon recourse to parliamentary questions and answers and to certain educational authorities. So, with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I intend to make frequent but brief quotations from the documents concerned to illustrate the points raised in the motion.

The first aspect I wish to stress is a part of the Government's policy concerning the entry of the five-year-old into the primary school scheme, and to establish a basis for the examination of this part of the policy I quote from the official Liberal Party policy enunciated by the Premier on the hustings. He said—

The age of admission to schools be lowered to the year in which the child turns five.

It is interesting to study the corresponding part of the policy enunciated by the then National Alliance, but I will come to that a little later.

The Minister for Education is reported as having said that this part of the policy is in fact endorsed by the recommendations of the Nott report. I will endeavour to demonstrate that whilst the Nott report does recommend the ultimate entry of the five-year-old into the education system, as far as I can understand the Government's policy, and as far as others outside the Government circles are able to comprehend it, it is not in keeping with the Nott report at all. Dealing with early childhood education, Magistrate Nott says on page 15—

Perhaps from a long range point of view a case could be made for the inclusion of early childhood education within the framework of the Education Department. Without further evidence and research, I would not be prepared at this stage to endorse this suggestion.

Let us now turn to the recommendations made by Magistrate Nott with regard to the five-year-old. On page 43 he states that the present formula for subsidising the association should be replaced by a formula which would provide two things. He distinctly contemplates the retention of an organisation known as the Kindergarten Association or its successor, the Pre-School Education Board, because he refers to a formula for the subsidy of the management body. Paragraph (b) of his recommendation reads—

For the Government (through the Education Department) to extend

downwards present school services by taking full responsibility for the education of children in their fifth year by providing—

Here comes the vital difference.

—a compulsory transition year for these children within the present school structure. As an interim measure the Government subsidy should be aimed at making available at the earliest possible date free—

I emphasise the word "free". To continue—
—pre-school education for all children (whose parents desire it) in their fifth year. . . .

Let us be quite fair about this. In connection with the entry of the five-year-old into the primary school, as announced on the hustings—I emphasise the words "on the hustings"—it was clearly not intended that existing school rooms in primary schools would be used to provide a form of kindergarten teaching or pre-school education. The electors were invited to believe, and it is reasonable to assume that many did believe—

Mr J. T. Tonkin: And still do.

Mr T. D. EVANS: —that five-year-olds would be admitted into the primary school for primary school education and not for a form of pre-school education which had previously been the custom.

Mr Clarko: They did not read our policy then. Do you believe in compulsory education for a child in its fifth year?

Mr T. D. EVANS: I will come to the member for Karrinyup. Instead of hiding his light behind a bushel, he should endeavour to hide himself behind the curtains.

Mr Clarko: It would be easier for you to hide than for me. Do you or do you not believe it should be compulsory?

Mr T. D. EVANS: The member for Karrinyup appears to have broken down. Perhaps someone will ring a wrecker and have him towed away!

I will come to the point. Having demonstrated that the assertion of the Minister—that is, that the policy of the Government relating to the five-year-old is endorsed by the Nott report—is, in fact, not correct, as the recommendations provided in the Nott report prove—

Mr Clarko: Are you against it?

Mr T. D. EVANS: —I now make the point that—

Mr Clarko: What are you for?

Mr T. D. EVANS: —the general public and members of Parliament in particular have been denied the answers to questions asked in this Parliament, both here and in another place. Those questions were directed towards seeking information as to how the Government's policy was to be implemented. One question which springs

readily to mind is, "What type of education is to be imparted in primary schools to five-year-olds?" Another is, "Is it to be a form of pre-school education or a normal primary school education?"

Mr Clarko: It was explicitly stated in the education policy.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The member for Warren asked—

- (1) (a) Has the Pre-School Education Board selected pilot schools for the acceptance of children in their fifth year;
- (b) If so, will he enumerate them?

This question was directed to the Minister in this Chamber representing the Minister who sits in another place. The next portion of the question reads—

- (2) (a) What is the basis of selection of these pilot schools;
- (b) Will the selection of pilot schools be carried out by the Pre-School Education Board, the Education Department, or the Minister for Education?

I do not intend to read all the question. The Minister's answer is as follows—

- (1) (a) No.

At that time no schools had been selected despite the fact that five months had elapsed since the policy had been announced. The answer to (1) (b) was, "Not applicable". This was because the Government had not made up its mind. The answer to (2) (a) is as follows—

The Minister for Education has appointed an expert committee to advise on the implementation of the scheme.

Surely this is a revelation. Policies were announced some five months previously. This question was asked and answered in a sort of a way and then we were told that the Minister had established a committee to advise him on the implementation of the policy.

Mr Shalders: You would have been better to do that on the free textbook scheme.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Obviously at the time of the enunciation of the policy, no evidence existed as to the educational merit inherent therein, because the Minister admitted this. Then he set up a committee some five months later.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I attempted to demonstrate, and I believe I succeeded in doing so, that the alleged claim by the Minister for Education to this part of the Government's education policy—and I referred to the entry of the five-year-olds to primary schools—was on all fours with the recommendation in the Knott report. I then began to develop the theme that the Liberal Party section of the coalition Government, having announced this part of its

policy on the hustings, had failed to demonstrate what the position actually was; indeed all evidence suggests that the party and probably the committee advising the party were not sufficiently assured of the educational merits of the proposition before it was enunciated.

I had referred to a question asked by the member for Warren which related to the selection of pilot schools for the justification of this policy in a limited way. The answer given by the Minister representing the Minister for Education was given some five months after the enunciation of the policy, so the Government had not determined then whether there would be pilot schools. The Minister went on to say that the Minister for Education had appointed an expert committee to advise on the implementation of this scheme and he added that the recommendations of the committee were not yet available for the Minister's decision.

Mr Sibson: That has been determined.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I will now pass to another section which will clearly continue the theme on which I commenced. The member for Morley asked 13 questions of the Minister relating to this part of the policy. I will not relate them all but I would like to show that the questions are pertinent; that they are questions on which members of this Parliament and members of the public—some five months after the policy was enunciated—have good reasons to expect clear and decisive answers given them.

I would like to quote one question which reads as follows—

- (1) What steps have been taken to implement the attendance at primary school of four and five-year old children and when will the scheme commence?
- (2) Will such children be admitted during each term or on a half-yearly basis?

There were 11 other questions to which the Minister for Industrial Development, on behalf of the Minister for Education, replied as follows—

- (1) to (13)

I ask members to note how the issue was evaded; the questions were all grouped together and a composite answer was given. The answer states—

The Minister for Education has appointed an expert committee to advise on the implementation of the policy on a phased basis.

It is little wonder when answers such as this are given to questions which greatly concern the public—and I speak from personal experience—

Mr Young: You would, because you used to give the same sort of answers.

Mr T. D. EVANS: —and when pre-school education is a very sensitive area as it concerns parental control and the children involved, that members should receive letters such as I have received—one of which was from the Thornlie Kindergarten (Inc.) dated the 13th August, more than five months after the enunciation of the policy and which reads as follows—

At the last delegates meeting on 15th July, it was stated that it would be the parents of 5 year olds who would choose whether they wished their children to start school at the age of 5. However, if this is the case, and the pre-school board centres are catering for 3-4 year olds, then this leaves no other alternative for the 5 year olds? In other words, parents who do not want their children to attend school until they are six will have no other choice but to keep their 5 year olds at home. It will only be in areas where there are very few 5 year olds, that they will be able to continue at the Kindergartens.

The letter continues in that vein indicating the concern of the persons one would normally expect to be associated with and vitally interested in this most sensitive part of the educational spectrum.

Mr Clarko: What do you think about—

Mr T. D. EVANS: A little before the tea suspension I tried to act as a modern-day good samaritan but I fear my efforts went unheeded. It appears as though the member for Karrinyup has broken down and I suggest that someone rings the wreckers to have him towed away!

Mr Young: You are the only one in this Chamber who is not prepared to answer interjections.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many members interjecting.

Mr May: Don't you talk; you are the best sit-ter-down I have seen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. D. EVANS: If I might interject now, Mr Speaker, I would point out that a few weeks ago a public meeting was called on a Sunday at the East Fremantle Town Hall and the speakers who were invited were eager to attend this meeting. I will refer to the names of the speakers and the topics on which they were listed to address the gathering, which again indicates the concern of the people at the Government's reluctance to make public what it had in mind. I will emulate the example of the Premier and quote not only the names but the qualifications of the speakers who were to address the gathering. They are as follows—

Dr D. L. Gurry, M.B.B.S., M.R.C.P., M.R.A.C.P., F.A.A.P., *Pediatrician*: "Child at Risk".

Mrs Brenton Coward, B.A., Dip. Soc. Wk. (Unl of W.A.) *Social Worker*: "Deprivation".

Mrs Julia Solomon, B.A. Dip. App. Psych., M.Ed., T.C. (N.S.W.), Dip. K.T.C., M.A.Ps.S., M.A.C.E. *Pre-school Adviser*: "Development of 4-5 year olds".

Mr D. B. Wignall, B.Ed., M.A.C.E. *Headmaster*: "Are the 4+ ready for School?"

Mr J. Hill, M.A., B.Ed., *Guidance Officer*: "Intelligence, Attainment and Date of Birth".

I was not able to attend the meeting in question but I was told on very good authority by those who did attend that the main concern and the obvious intention of those who attended was to obtain some clarification of what the Government had in mind and to know whether this policy would get off the ground.

Mr Sibson: Who was the headmaster?

Mr T. D. EVANS: I have here a letter I received from one of the delegates who attended the statutory meeting under the Pre-School Education Act. If I am called upon to lay the letter on the Table of the House I will do so, but I will make the point now, because the person concerned wishes to remain anonymous for the time being. I would point out that I have removed his name and address from the letter, so I do not want to be told later that I did this after reading the letter and before tabling it. The letter is very illuminating; indeed it is about the only thing I find illuminating in the whole matter. The letter reads—

I will outline the developments to date and then some areas of question. I will assume that you can obtain a copy of the Liberal Party document.

I assume he refers to the Liberal Party policy speech, a copy of which I have. To continue—

since this policy was announced various groups of parents have met and expressed grave concern about the implementation of the policy. I have attended the following meetings—

28th April: Pre-School Board Delegates Meeting.

3rd May: Delegation (from above) to Mr MacKinnon.

7th May: Parents meeting Hollywood High School.

25th June: Parents meeting Carline High School.

15th July: Pre-School Board Delegates Meeting (Mr MacKinnon in attendance).

At this last meeting Mr MacKinnon made the following points in reply to questions.

- (1) He would expect the committee—

I assume the reference is to the expert committee he formed—

—to make recommendations along the following lines—

- (a) The informal year should be similar to a kindergarten year—

This is the point on which I commenced. I pointed out that when the policy was announced it was reasonable to assume—and I feel that many people did believe—that the policy as enunciated would be implemented. I will read it again—

We will lower the admission age to the primary school for the five-year-old to the year in which the child turns five.

This is given under the heading relating to primary schools, and the people believed that the children concerned were going into the primary schools and were not there to receive a kindergarten-type education. The Minister further advised the committee to recommend—

- (b) That the buildings should be similar to kindergarten buildings.

What about the existing primary schools? They are not the same. To continue—

- (c) That teachers should be similarly trained to kindergarten teachers.
(d) That numbers of aides should be similar to kindergarten aides.
(e) That class size and hours of attendance be similar to kindergartens.

- (2) Pilot schemes would probably start in 1975, be extended in 1976 and that an informal year should be generally available in 1977-8.

Mr Sibson: That is correct.

Mr T. D. EVANS: To continue—

- (3) That playgrounds for this group would have restricted entry.

So we are going to practise segregation at the primary schools. To continue—

- (4) That the conventional Grade I type classroom would generally be unsuitable.

As I have said, the policy announced was—

We will lower the admission age to the primary school for the five-year-old to the year in which the child turns five.

Arising from this letter, a fundamental question is posed because it refers to the basis of the whole scheme; that is, the present kindergarten system. We must bear in mind that the Pre-School Education Act stipulates that standards adopted and set by the Australian Pre-School

Association are to be followed at the pre-school centres. This is indicated in the Minister's own words—and I have not heard them disputed—and he mentioned it also in a letter he wrote to the Editor of *The West Australian* to which I will refer later. If the new scheme is to be so closely allied to and based upon the kindergarten system in regard to hours, standards, equipment, programme, staffing, etc., why the change?

Mr Young: Did anyone say it was to be exactly the same as the kindergarten system?

Mr T. D. EVANS: The policy reads as follows—

The age of admission to schools be lowered to the year in which the child turns five and that admission to school be either on a term or half-yearly basis.

This appears under the heading, "Primary Education".

Mr Young: Haven't you any imagination at all?

Mr T. D. EVANS: The Liberal Party misled the people.

Mr Young: You are misleading the people.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The primary school scheme—

Mr Young: You haven't read the document.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I have studied it carefully. I will show that the concern of parents and others goes further than public meetings and the writing of letters. Individual people want to ventilate their feelings—

Mr Young: All the way to the Teachers' Union.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Just as well the member for Scarborough did not have a bet on the Hannan's Handicap on Saturday—he would have done no better than I did.

Mr Young: Make your point.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I will quote from the letter to the Editor of *The West Australian*, and we can see that the Minister himself shares the honours. I would like to refer to Dr D. K. Wheeler—I will mention him again when I come to the Dettman report on secondary education—who is a reader in education at the University of Western Australia. As late as the 20th August of this year, he wrote—

I wonder why the Liberal Party wants children to start school at five. The fact that they do so in England is a historical accident—

Mr Sibson: We want to give them the opportunity.

Mr T. D. EVANS: To continue—

—linked with the 19th century demand for cheap child labour.

Mr Young: The fact that this happens in every State of Australia must be sheer coincidence, too.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Starting school at the age of five is the subject of another letter to the editor on the 28th August, 1974—

Mr Young: Don Dunstan must be a nut, too.

Mr Clarko: Everyone who has been to one of his lectures knows that Wheeler is a maverick. He may be right in this case, but everyone knows he takes an unusual view.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The former Minister for Education in the Brand-Court Government did not think so.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. D. EVANS: He would have higher educational qualifications—and that is obvious by comparison—than the member for Karrinyup. He would have a far greater experience in the kindergarten spectrum than the member for Karrinyup is ever likely to have.

Mr Clarko: That might apply to you also.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Dr Wheeler was twice President of the Kindergarten Union and a member of the Council of the Kindergarten Teachers' Training College and as such he speaks with some authority in this educational spectrum.

I mention this to show Dr Wheeler is far from a maverick. I will make the point later on that Mr Lewis did not agree with the allegation made by the member for Karrinyup because Dr Wheeler's views also influenced to a large extent the findings of the Dettman committee on Education.

Mr Young: He also did not read our policy.

Mr T. D. EVANS: We now come to the Minister for Education who shares in the honours with the people who bothered to write to the editor on this important subject. In *The West Australian* of the 21st August the Minister makes this point—

The Government programme will start these children in a school kindergarten—

That is a new term.

Mr Clarko: That is what they have in Victoria.

Mr T. D. EVANS: To continue—

— in the year in which they turn five.

This will extend the benefits of kindergarten to all children in the State, whereas at present kindergartens are available for only some children.

I agree with the Minister that at present kindergartens are available only for some children, but is he not aware of the findings of the Fry committee relating to pre-

school education? He should certainly be aware of the impact of the Karmel report on education in Australia.

Mr Young: Isn't everybody?

Mr T. D. EVANS: The Fry committee has already demonstrated that the Australian Government desires to make at least one year of pre-school education available freely to all children whose parents desire that they attend.

Mr Clarko: You rejected that report as you rejected the Nott inquiry.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I did not reject the Nott report, I initiated it.

Mr Clarko: You refused to carry out its recommendations.

Mr T. D. EVANS: We set up a statutory body—that was the key recommendation of the Nott report.

Mr Young: You took all the administration of the Kindergarten Association and dumped it under a different board. You did nothing at all—just changed its name.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The Minister has not been averse to using other forms of the media—not to throw any illumination on the subject, but to continue to spread doubts and confusion. In the 22nd August issue of Charlie Carter's paper, *Living Today*, the day after the Minister's letter appeared in *The West Australian*, the Minister is reported as follows—

He discounted claims that too little information had so far been made available to the public on the proposed implementation of the scheme.

Mr MacKinnon said he had disseminated to the people most concerned, including teachers, all the information he had received from the committee.

This demonstrates that before the Minister set up this committee he did not have a clue, and neither did the committee. If the committee was well informed, it did not do a very good job in briefing the Minister.

Reference is made to the State School Teachers' Union, because Mr Trevor Lloyd complained about the scant information that had been provided. I do not need to read any further because this clearly demonstrates that the public generally—and I refer specifically to parents—and members of Parliament in particular, even at this late stage, are not fully informed as to whether this scheme will provide pre-school education for five-year-olds within the primary school stream, leaving those centres administered by the Pre-School Education Board for the sole use of three-year-olds and four-year-olds. We do not know whether moneys which will be made available by the Australian Government to provide at least one year of free pre-school education will be distributed solely to the Pre-School Education Board or

whether some of this money will find its way to the Education Department, presumably to provide a type of pre-school education within the environment of the primary school, despite the fact that the Minister is alleged to have said, at a meeting of delegates, that he believed existing buildings were unsuitable.

I will come to the question of costs later on. As a result of all this confusion, doubt, and lack of information, is it any wonder that at the earliest opportunity the school teachers discussed this issue—and I refer to this now for the education of the member for Scarborough—at a meeting of the State School Teachers' Union.

Mr Young: I had a feeling you would get around to them soon.

Mr T. D. EVANS: This was the first opportunity the teachers had to meet collectively as the annual conference of the union was held during the August school holidays. The meeting passed a resolution that it would not have a bar of the Liberal Party policy, and the headline in *The West Australian* of the 24th August reads, "Teachers to bar children under five".

Mr Clarko: Do you support that?

Mr T. D. EVANS: One of the main reasons for the resolution was that the Government had failed to demonstrate to those vitally concerned, the inherent principles of its policy.

Mr Young: Who would write your education policy—the Teachers' Union?

Mr T. D. EVANS: No.

Mr Young: All right, and they did not write ours either.

Mr T. D. EVANS: However, if we wished to initiate a radical policy, although we may not have been influenced by the union we would have demonstrated our courtesy by consulting with those concerned most vitally with this field of education.

Mr Sibson: Who did you consult about the textbooks?

Mr Jamieson: The other States think they are all right.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I now come to the other part of the Government's education policy announced by the Liberal Party section of this spare-part Government. Again the policy appears under the heading, "Primary Education" although it relates to the age of transfer from primary schools to secondary schools. The policy reads as follows—

We propose that the transfer from primary to secondary schools will occur at the end of the year at which the child turns eleven.

Again I make the point that the Government has failed to give any significant rationale of its policy, or any meaningful detail by way of answers to parliamentary

questions touching on this very important part of the educational programme. Very soon after Parliament met—in fact at the first opportunity members of Parliament had to exercise the privilege of asking parliamentary questions—the member for Morley asked this question—

- (1) When will 11-year-old children attending State schools be admitted to high schools?
- (2) What steps will be taken to provide for co-ordination in this respect between Government and non-Government schools?

And the honourable member asked in all nine such probing justifiable questions. Again the Minister grouped the questions together, dodged the issues involved, and answered—

- (1) to (9) Priority has been given to implementation of the policy with regard to children in their fifth year of age.

Heavens above—the Minister said, "priority has been given". After what I have said, I doubt that the priority is worth very much. I am glad that this part of the policy enjoys no priority at all.

His answer was—

Preliminary discussions only, have been held with regard to the 11-year-old students. It is thus not possible to provide, at the present time, the detailed information requested.

I asked a question on the same subject, seeking to establish whether this was part of a policy of polarisation and whether the introduction of five-year-old schooling was to be on a voluntary or a compulsory basis. If it is the intention of the Government to introduce five-year-old schooling only on a voluntary basis, clearly this polarises the situation. Probably, it was intended by the Government that the transfer from primary to secondary school at the tender age of 12 years would be compulsory. I then asked whether this policy was intended to apply to non-Government schools and I was advised that non-Government schools are autonomous; they can please themselves what they do, provided they maintain their registration as an efficient school.

Mr Clarko: That is right.

Mr T. D. EVANS: In other words, the Minister dodged the issue. One could be excused for believing that this part of the Government's policy will be compulsory when implemented in Government schools and optional in non-Government schools.

Mr Clarko: Do you not believe that a student over the age of 11 years can handle secondary school?

Mr T. D. EVANS: On the 7th August I asked a further question touching upon this matter.

Mr Clarko: Do you not think they can handle it in Victoria, or elsewhere? What about John Nicholls for example? He must have been 6' 3" at 11 years.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Perhaps the member for Karrinyup should not endeavour merely to hide his light under a bushel but should hide himself in shame behind a curtain.

Mr Clarko: On which issue?

Mr T. D. EVANS: My question of the 7th August related to a committee of which, presumably, the member for Karrinyup was a member. I do not know whether he was a very profitable one.

Mr Clarko: No, there was no profit in it at all. I gave my time for nothing.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I do not think the committee profited very much by his presence. My question stated—

- (1) Why was the recommendation of the Dettman Report on Secondary Education rejected by the enunciation of that part of the Government's policies on education relating to the transfer of a child from the primary to secondary school at the end of the year in which the child attains the age of 11 years?
- (2) What other comparable education authority (with appropriate references to printed reports, etc.) can he cite to support this part of Government policy?

Mr Speaker, I am sure that, with your educational background, the answer to the question will astound you. I know that you would have studied carefully and been most impressed by the Dettman report when it was issued in February, 1959. Part (2) of the answer stated—

The decision is consistent with current practice . . .

In other Australian States. My question also sought information relating to education authorities which supported the Government's policy, but the Minister ducked that part of the question. I received the answer that this practice is consistent with that adopted in some parts—not all parts—of Australia. Why was the Dettman report, specially brought down at the request of the Hon. E. H. M. Lewis, the then Minister in the Brand-Court Government and prepared by an eminent educationist and former Director-General of Education rejected? The answer I received was that the practice is comparable to that carried on in other parts of Australia.

However, when I asked the Minister to cite educational authorities, I was referred to page 18 of the Education Department Annual Report for 1965. So, I went eagerly seeking out this document and it transpired that the annual report addressed to the Hon. E. H. M. Lewis, the then Minister for Education, was the last effort of the then Director-General of Education, the late Dr Robertson.

While I pay great respect to the memory of this great educationist, I find as I read a very small reference in this report relating to the transition from primary to secondary school that one of his comments intrigues me and somewhat surprises me. He states—

It is considered by some—

Unnamed and unnumbered—

—that with improved techniques and the introduction of decimal currency (which should result in a considerable saving of time) that the primary school be covered in six years and that the secondary course would also be of six years . . .

What the change to decimal currency had to do with it is beyond me.

Mr O'Neill: If you do not know that, you obviously have never been a teacher.

Mr T. D. EVANS: This was the only reference supplied by the Government in answer to my question which stated—

- (2) What other comparable education authority (with appropriate references to printed reports, etc.) can he cite to support this part of Government policy?

Dr Robertson said that there are some; he did not identify himself as one of those, but merely claimed that there are some—unnamed and unnamed—and that is the authority upon which the Government depends.

Let us have a look at the Dettman report. I have made the point that this part of Government policy has been enunciated in rejection of the recommendation brought down by the Dettman committee. The front page of this report is addressed to the Hon. E. H. M. Lewis, M.L.A., Minister for Education, and is dated the 3rd February, 1969. I will quote only part of it. It states—

Dear Mr Lewis,

I am pleased to present to you the Report of the Committee which you appointed in June, 1967 . . .

Members should bear in mind that the Education Department Annual Report for 1965 probably became available some time in June, 1966. I assume it would follow the characteristics of most Government reports. Its birth certificate would have been a little delayed before it reached this Parliament and, indeed, it may have been delayed before it reached the Minister. However, let us assume that it incurred a modest delay and was available some time in June, 1966. In other words, only 12 months elapsed between the receipt of that report and the setting up of an expert committee by Mr Lewis. In his report, Mr Dettman, the chairman of the committee of inquiry, referred to an investigation of adolescence which was being specially prepared at the request of the committee. Probably, the member for Karrinyup would

be familiar with the name of the person requested to carry out that investigation. I refer to Dr D. K. Wheeler.

Mr Clarko: I did not question that. I was questioning the point you were making at the time.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Let us have a look at the members of the committee. Its chairman was Mr H. W. Dettman. I will not weary the House or embarrass the member for Karrinyup with his educational qualifications.

Mr Clarko: You are not going to embarrass me.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Other members were Mr J. H. Barton, the Deputy Director-General of Education; Monsignor J. E. Bourke, who was then Director of Catholic Education in this State; Mr N. R. Collins; Miss U. Mitchell; Dr D. Mossenson, who was Director of Secondary Education; and, Mr P. M. Moyes, who I believe is headmaster of Christ Church Grammar School. Another member was Mr J. Paul; then there was Professor C. Sanders, who I believe is still the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Commission.

Mr Clarko: Set up by the Liberals.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: And improved by Labor. Another member was Mrs M. Williams. I make the point that this Mrs Williams, as distinct from the former member for Bunbury, is a Bachelor of Arts.

Mr Jamieson: The former member for Bunbury was a Mrs, was he?

Mr Hartrey: That is quite a unique distinction, of course.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Another member of the committee, Mr S. W. Woods, was the Director of Special Services, and the last member to be listed, Dr R. R. Bovell, was the District Superintendent of Education.

Mr Clarko: Where is the Teachers' Union representative on that? I thought you were in favour of that.

Mr T. D. EVANS: This is an expert committee on education. I will come to the Teachers' Union in a moment.

Mr Clarko: I thought you would; I just thought I would encourage you.

Mr T. D. EVANS: What did this committee recommend? At the risk of being repetitive I should like to mention again that, probably after the receipt of the 1965 Education Department Report, no more than 12 months elapsed before Mr Lewis set up this committee. The committee made a recommendation on the age of transfer from primary to secondary school. Reference to this is to be found at page 96 of the report. It states—

The Committee of Inquiry considered the question of the point of transfer from primary to secondary schools and reported that it did not feel justified at that time in recommending any

alteration to the existing pattern, but indicated that a closer investigation was needed . . .

By way of question, I invited the Government to indicate what other comparable education authorities supported the Government's policy but the Government failed or refused to answer my question. Perhaps I am being petty; perhaps the Government was not able to answer.

Mr Clarko: That is not the only way to make changes.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The report of the committee went on to state—

In recent years detailed investigations into the age of transfer from primary to secondary schooling have been made in Scotland and in England. The report of the committee set up by the Scottish Council for Research in Education was published in 1966, and a year later in England the matter was reported on by the—

The member for Karrinyup probably would be familiar with this body—

—Central Advisory Council for Education (the Plowden Report). In Scotland, where the age of transfer is twelve, the report concluded:

The answer to the question "what is the appropriate age of transfer" must be that there is no one correct age . . .

The Dettman recommendation was as follows—

The age of transfer from primary to secondary schools should continue to be twelve plus as at present.

Mr Mensaros: You want the Government to be condemned, but one report says one thing and another report says another. I do not understand how you reconcile these two things, and I would like you to help me.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Having heard the argument in its entirety, the Minister can then assess the situation and reply. If he does anything less than that, he will not do justice to the position he holds.

Mr Mensaros: I am just trying to be clever and comprehend what you are talking about.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Because the Government did not bother to demonstrate to those who, naturally, were concerned with the educational merits inherent in these radical changes, what do we find?

I shall not weary the House by reading all the references I have before me. However, a report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 17th August under the heading of, "Opposition to school change". This opposition came from high school principals. In *The West Australian* of the 26th August a report appeared under the heading, "Age plan opposition increases". This time the opposition came from the annual conference of the Council of State School Organisations.

In a report which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 21st August, under the heading of, "High school plan not understood" the opposition came from the Secondary School Principals' Association. If the high school plan is not understood, whose fault is it? I suggest it is the fault of the Government.

I asked some very interesting questions to ascertain whether the Government had in this, as well as in other matters of its educational policies, bothered to determine beforehand what impact such policies would have and whether the changes would be beneficial, or to apprise itself as to what detrimental effect to the welfare of the most important part of the education machine—I refer to the child—would result.

If the Liberal Party section of the Government has taken these steps then surely it would have regard to the children living in the country areas. I am referring specifically to the transfer of children from primary to secondary education at the tender age of 11 years plus, or 12 years minus.

I wonder what members of the National Alliance have to say about this, because many letters have been written to the Editor of *The West Australian* by parents of children who have had to board away from home, as no suitable education at the secondary level was available near their homes. Concern has been expressed at the tender age at which a child will be tugged away from its parents, and sent to a secondary school.

If the Government had decided to test the impact of such a policy it would have referred this question to the Country High School Hostels Authority. The Government would also have sought to ascertain the enrolments in the high schools for this year; the contemplated enrolments for the foreseeable years; the capacity of these schools; and whether they would be able to cater for the influx of the new class of children of 11 years plus. It would also have sought information on the number of new hostels which are contemplated to be built, and the extensions to be made to existing hostels.

Apparently the Government did not seek this information at all, but I did by asking a question in this House on the 28th August of the Minister representing the Minister for Education. I also sought to find out the number of students who were attending hostels conducted beyond the auspices of the Country High School Hostels Authority, so as to form an estimate of the total number of children who at the present time might well be living away from home in order to gain an education at the secondary level. I did that to enable me to make a forecast, which the Government did not make, of what the situation would be if this part of the Government's education policy

is implemented. I wished to ascertain how many additional children at the tender age of 11 years plus would be living away from home to obtain secondary education.

This was a question in respect of which I had difficulty in obtaining an answer, but finally it was answered. In his answer the Premier grouped the first, second, and third parts of my question. This is a popular dodge that is adopted by Governments, and I am not saying that the present Government has a monopoly on this practice. The reply of the Premier was—

If I could give the answer exactly that way it would put the mind of the honourable member at rest, and also provide the information which he seeks.

I personally do not know of a specific approach.

Apparently the Premier did not know of any specific approach that had been made by the other part of the present Government, before it became the Government, to the Country High School Hostels Authority. I make the point that the National Alliance did not announce or even endorse that policy. I shall come to that point a little later.

The Government has failed at the grass roots level before enunciating these policies to demonstrate it had come to grips with the situation, and was fully assured of the educational changes and of whether there was likely to be any detrimental or beneficial effect on the child inherent.

Is it any wonder that we have the member for Mundaring seeking an explanation of why a high school which had been promised for his electorate, and in respect of which preliminary work had commenced, was deferred by this Government? That is the proposed high school at Swan View. Presumably the Government has done this in an endeavour to conserve funds to enable it to put into operation its extravagant promises.

Is it any wonder that in this climate of doubt and confusion the people of Swan View have despaired, and we find letters such as the one I am referring to being written to *The West Australian*? This letter was addressed to the editor from the staff of the Balcatta Senior High School, and was dated the 8th August. By that I do not mean the letter appeared in *The West Australian* of that date. In the letter the staff of the Balcatta Senior High School stated that they noted with considerable concern the statement by the Education Department, reported in the north section of that newspaper of the 7th August, that no definite date could be given for the provision of high schools

in any of the areas in the Wanneroo Shire. Six areas were named. The letter went on to state—

This school serves most of the Northern Corridor west of Wanneroo Road and is already overcrowded. Eleven pre-fabricated so-called classrooms are in use this year. It is certain that more of these unsatisfactory rooms will be needed next year.

Mr Clarko: Is Balcatta High School overcrowded?

Mr T. D. EVANS: The first part of the Government's policy was to limit student numbers at high schools to 1 000, and at senior high schools to 400. If anything was destined to make people throw up their hands in horror it would be that part of the policy. We all know that whilst over the years education has rightly commanded the largest part of the State Budget, not nearly enough—even assuming that every Government has endeavoured to obtain full value for every dollar spent on education—has been available for education.

So, in that atmosphere high schools which have been promised have been deferred. The people in my own electorate waited a long time for a senior high school, and they are still waiting for the completion of stage 2. Is it any wonder that people throw up their hands in horror when they see a policy such as this which limits student numbers at high schools to 1 000? I might add that I find little to complain about in this policy. However, it is the second limb of the policy limiting the number of students at senior high schools to 400 with which I am concerned.

Mr Clarko: The recommendation in the Dettman report was very similar.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I was strongly tempted to ask a question as to how many new high schools would be required, in accordance with the policy to limit the student numbers to 400, and what the cost would be. However, the member for Morley did ask this question, and he was told the Government was giving priority to the five-year-old children, and was unable to answer the question.

I should point out these questions were asked six months after the election, and I would have thought the Government would be eager to answer them in Parliament. The Government's attitude shows a contempt of Parliament. On the question of costs, before the election the Press was alive with allegations and counter allegations coming from both political parties. I do not intend to dwell very long on that aspect. Here is something else which the Government announced prior to the election, but it seems to have gone into the land of limbo since then. This is the Liberal Party's proposal for a school lease-back scheme. We have not heard anything more about that.

I have newspaper cutting after newspaper cutting showing the promises made by the Liberal Party before the election. One report appeared in *The West Australian* under the heading of, "Lab. accused of false costing". The Liberal Party put up an estimate of the cost, but the Treasury put up a much larger estimate of the cost of the Liberal Party's promises. The Premier claimed that if the Treasury officials had taken the opportunity to contact him he would have put them right in regard to this costing. He said that in that event the Treasury officials would have come up with a far more reasonable estimate of costs. That was before the election.

Now, six months afterwards, we are told that the Government is giving priority to the five-year-olds, and it cannot tell us how much the cost will be. I think the Government's attitude is in contempt of the people of the State and of this Parliament.

I have charged the Government for failing in several respects, as outlined in the motion before us. I have endeavoured to be specific, and I have referred to the Liberal Party section of the Government. However, no longer can I excuse the members who form the other part of the coalition, be they of the Country Party, the National Alliance, or a combination of those two names.

On the 15th August I asked an interesting question of the Minister representing the Minister for Education as follows—

Would he please indicate whether the education policies enunciated by the Premier at the hustings as the programme of the Liberal Party, have now been endorsed by both the Government coalition parties?

The reply was—

Whilst in the written policies there might be minor differences in emphasis and definition—the short answer is yes.

I followed that up by asking the following question of the Deputy Premier on the same day—

- (1) Did the National Alliance prior to 30th March, 1974 General Election announce any specific policy or policies relating to education?
- (2) If (1) is "Yes" is the announcement in printed form and may a copy of same be made available to me?

I am glad to say that the Deputy Premier obliged, and appeared to oblige willingly. So, this is part of the policy announced by the National Alliance, and it pays a tribute to the then Labor Government because the printed form commenced by stating—

The party pledges full support to the continued improvement of education in Western Australia.

Then it goes on to state specifically that the party will do certain things. *Inter alia* we find the policy of the National Alliance contains this undertaking—

The compulsory commencing age for formal school should be the year in which the child turns six . . .

Another undertaking is—

Special attention will be directed towards—

(a) Secondary education for all to commence in their thirteenth year.

This is in direct conflict with the Liberal Party's policy.

The National Alliance announced different policies, and now that part of the Government has to eat humble pie and bow to its masters, the Liberal Party.

Mr Clarko: Not on the question of starting school.

Mr T. D. EVANS: For the benefit of the member for Karrinyup I will refer again to paragraph 4. For five-year-olds the compulsory commencing age for formal schooling should be the year in which the child turns six.

Mr Clarko: We are talking about voluntary attendance.

Mr T. D. EVANS: We are talking about transferring children to primary school when the child turns five. I feel I have clearly demonstrated the reason for each of the allegations set out in the motion. I believe the Government should be condemned; that the dimensions of the debate, with its cogency and the depth and width of consideration of the issues involved, have clearly shown the Government at fault. Six months after the election it is largely inactive. The Minister for Education—and I feel strongly for him—finds himself in an educational no-man's-land. For political motives, he has been thrust there by persons, who have come up with such ridiculous changes untested either before or after the event.

Mr Clarko: Like thousands of children in Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Unfortunately, debates such as this, whilst put forward for consideration in the dimension of debate, are not tested by the same method; they are tested by the counting of heads. I know what the fate of this motion will be; be that as it may, I believe that this will go on record for all time. In the future many people will see, as they now see, that they have recourse to the old maxim, *res ipsa loquitur*—things speak for themselves.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [8.37 p.m.]: I find myself in considerable difficulty in replying to this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I formally second the motion.

Mr MENSAROS: As I said, I find myself in considerable difficulty in replying to the member for Kalgoorlie. When I read his motion I was in complete darkness in trying to understand why he really wanted the Government to be condemned. Is the Government to be condemned for enunciating its policy on education? Is it to be condemned because of its policies on education? Is it to be condemned because, according to the allegation made by the member for Kalgoorlie, it is unable to provide meaningful details by way of answers to parliamentary questions regarding some policy matters on which the member elaborates in part 1 (a), (b), and (c) of his motion? I do not think any of those allegations would create a state of mind in any member—no matter to which party he belonged—to inspire him to condemn the Government for having initiated its policy. The Government has initiated its policy and I think that is fair enough, and commendable. If the Government has not supplied enough information to the honourable member, by way of answers to parliamentary questions, I do not know that that reflects more on the reply or on the questioner.

Mr T. D. Evans: There was more than one question.

Mr MENSAROS: I was hopeful that the honourable member would give enough information for me to comprehend his motion which, quite frankly, I am unable to do. Unfortunately, he did not supply the information and the position is no clearer now than it was before he rose from his seat.

Mr T. D. Evans: Are we to receive the benefit of a considered reply from the Minister for Education after he has read the entire debate?

Mr O'Neil: The Minister for Education happens to be in another place.

Mr MENSAROS: That question does not throw more light on my problem, either. Does the honourable member imply that he did not expect a reply from the Minister representing the Minister for Education?

Mr T. D. Evans: I expected a considered reply to be given by the Minister representing the Minister for Education, at least after the Minister had had an opportunity to advise the Minister making the reply on this occasion. The Minister for Education has not had that opportunity at all.

Mr MENSAROS: I am in the process of trying to reply, if the honourable member will allow me. I have unlimited time during which to reply but I do not intend to speak for too long; it will depend on the behaviour of members opposite. We have put

forward our policy and I do not think this is something for which we should be condemned. On the contrary, I suggest that the member for Kalgoorlie—and possibly the other members of his party—has some form of chip on his shoulder. His speech proved that. However, the honourable member has not come forward with a comprehensive policy on education, nor has any other representative of his party.

Mr Jamieson: The Labor Party has done more for education than the member opposite will ever do.

Mr MENSAROS: Members opposite have introduced education into politics. I reject very much the final words of the member for Kalgoorlie when he introduced this motion. It was our party which wanted to divorce this question from politics. I consider this is one field which should be divorced from politics; it simply does not belong there.

Mr Jamieson: That shows how unreal is the mind of the member opposite.

Mr McIver: Is he able to sleep at night-time?

Mr MENSAROS: Is that all?

Mr Skidmore: If the member waits a while longer I could send him some more interjections.

Mr MENSAROS: I tried to follow the thoughts of the member for Kalgoorlie when he condemned the Government because, as he claimed, our policy is not based on the Nott report. At a later stage of his speech he claimed that our policy was not based on the Dettman report. The member is perfectly right because we did not take any particular report on which to base our policy.

During the very long course of building our policy which, as the member for Kalgoorlie implied, is very comprehensive, we took into consideration many reports and many suggestions from a tremendous number of people.

Mr McIver: Nobody wants it.

Mr MENSAROS: The member for Kalgoorlie then questioned the validity of some of the answers he received to parliamentary questions. I do not want to deal with this matter because although you, Mr Speaker, were very tolerant with him I do not think that what he said had much to do with the motion, whether the answers were right or wrong. The honourable member complained that the replies to questions indicated that some investigations were being carried out regarding the implementation of our policy. I would like to remind members—in case the member for Kalgoorlie does not understand—that two different matters are involved. There is a policy enunciated in principle, and in a very practical and understandable way, and there is the implementation of that policy.

I think the member would condemn the Government—and rightly so—if the Government were to try to implement and introduce a policy without any further investigation and without any further research into the practicability of its policy and how it should be implemented. That is exactly what the Government has done, for which any fair-minded person would commend the Government and not condemn it.

The member for Kalgoorlie went on to complain that the Minister for Education—and he started to go into detail—had said something about the admission age, and that the first year would be similar to attendance at a kindergarten. He related this point to his motion and complained bitterly about it. Again, I cannot understand exactly what the complaints are. If he suffers from some sort of lack of comprehension I am quite prepared, with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, to read to him the part of our policy which makes the position quite clear. To my mind it could well be expressed by saying that the first year will be similar to a kindergarten because the Liberal Party education policy dealing with primary education states—

We believe that the basis of a sound education is developed in the early years of a child's life. We therefore advocate that—

- (a) The age of admission to schools be lowered to the year in which the child turns five and that admission to school be either on a term or half-yearly basis.
- (b) The programme for the first year of school be of a semi-formal nature to provide a sound basis for the development of formal skills.

I do not think the member for Kalgoorlie could express that better, and I do not think he can complain because the Minister compared this, or referred to this, as something similar to kindergarten. So, I cannot effectively reply other than that to the question.

The member for Kalgoorlie went on and complained that we had, or had not, consulted certain people, and he named them. He asked why we did, or why we did not, agree, or disagree, with their contentions. Incomprehensible as is the first part of the motion, I tried to understand it for the benefit of the member for Kalgoorlie. He wishes to express the fact that he does not understand our policy, and he does not understand the answers he received to his questions. The answers were supplied according to the questions.

Mr T. D. Evans: What about other members who received similar answers?

Mr MENSAROS: For the benefit of the member for Kalgoorlie, and in answer to his interjections requesting elaboration on

certain aspects, I have obtained a statement from the Minister for Education which reads as follows—

The value of suitable educational experiences in early childhood is so well attested in research and committees of inquiry both here and overseas that its provision is virtually beyond debate.

The undoubted benefits to be derived in intellectual and social emotional development are such that few would argue the merits of the incorporation of less structured, less formal approaches below the limits of the present age for compulsory schooling.

While few would disagree with the merits of providing these educational experiences there would be considerable opposition to any attempts to rigidly formalise the experiences to be gained or to force parents to have their children participate. The present State policy in recognition of this fact is based on a voluntary part-time approach consistent with established theoretical and practical applications of early childhood education.

To state that the admission age of children in primary schools will be lowered is not to infer compulsion or rigid formalisation.

As has been stated previously, this is not simply a programme for five-year-olds but a provision for voluntary educational experience in the year these children turn five.

Mr T. D. Evans: That is not in accordance with the recommendation of the Nott report.

Mr MENSAROS: That might well be so. Had the honourable member been listening to me, he would have heard me try to convey to him, firstly, that we do not claim our policy is based entirely on one or the other report. We claim that we considered as many reports and as much information as we had available to us.

Mr T. D. Evans: The Minister for Education is reported as saying that part of the policy is endorsed by the Nott report, but that is not so.

Mr MENSAROS: Secondly, whether or not the Minister for Education said this or something else does not affect the validity and the merit of the educational policies of the joint Government parties, which I will go into at greater depth than did the honourable member who posed the question. I do not understand whether the honourable member condemned the policy or just complained about certain things.

However, I will continue with the explanation the honourable member wanted. The Minister says—

With the direct participation of the Education Department, this provision will eventually be available, in some

form, to all children in all parts of the State, without cost to parents. I would stress that this development is proceeding with co-operation between the Education Department and the Pre-school Education Board, who will continue to work side by side.

Such a development within the Education Department, when widely established, will allow the board greater freedom to become more deeply involved in the establishment and co-ordination of voluntary subsidised programmes for children who are younger still.

The programme being developed will obviously involve considerable planning modification, as does any worthwhile educational programme. For this reason, a phased development, involving the piloting of a variety of situations, will be attempted.

In all of this, however, the standard of the Australian Pre-school Association will guide the development with respect to equipment, staff, group sizes, parent involvement, time of attendance, and the like.

A second aspect of Government policy—which is referred to in paragraph 1 (b) of the motion—has involved a reorientation of the articulation between primary and secondary schooling. The false dichotomy that has tended to develop between these two areas has been a matter of concern to educators for some time.

Various approaches have been suggested—the middle school concept, for example, is directed in part to this question—and some criticism has been made of early attempts to formalise and specialise secondary schooling.

In this State, the first year of high school has long been seen as an adjustment period; in North America the junior high school concept attempts to allow room for exploration and choice before educational directions become more formalised. This present policy is an attempt to provide educators with the opportunity to rethink the programmes associated with the last year of primary schooling and the first year of secondary schooling, in order to provide opportunities for—

- (a) A blending of primary-secondary approaches to ensure a less troublesome transition by students and a reduction in the impersonality of high schools;
- (b) a deferment of subject specialisation and the opportunities for pursuit of child interest and the development of interests;

- (c) a deferment of decisions with respect to ultimate study goals and career selection;
- (d) a more integrated approach to learning, and opportunities for the explanation of centres of interest;
- (e) a broadening of senior primary opportunity to cater for the exceptional child.

It is clear that a single year is not a sufficient period in which to effect the above-mentioned objectives.

The combination of the last year of primary and the first year of high school will provide the opportunity to combine the best attributes of both programmes and thus allow a greater opportunity to benefit from the offerings of further secondary education. Obviously such a major rethinking of educational policy cannot be achieved within a short period. The principles have been drawn; the alternatives need to be examined; many need to be involved and consulted.

The approach is broad in its application for it offers the district high school a unique opportunity to develop the concept. The district high school is one situation where primary and secondary grades are contained within the one building, and it is here that administrative arrangements and curricula reorientation can be examined and piloted with a view to a wider acceptance within the State. Such an approach developed by teachers can ensure that the further implementation of the concept has a strong grounding in practice and can be modified where necessary to suit conditions within the State.

A third matter of policy—to which the honourable member referred in paragraph 1(c) of his motion—which is related to the above is the administrative restructuring of secondary schools. The recent discipline report highlighted the social emotional differences that emerge between age levels as children progress through the secondary school. These differences reflect, in some measure, those that are found in educational aspiration and orientation. Even to the unskilled observer, there is a considerable physical and mental separation between the child entering high school from primary school and the near adult who is in the fourth and fifth year of high school.

Recognition of these differences can be seen in developments such as the Tasmanian matriculation college, and they can be seen in proposals that examine the concept of the school within a school.

Few would argue the disadvantages that accrue to large size. Again, the discipline report comments on the impersonality that can be found in large high schools. One of its recommendations was specifically directed towards this problem and to measures that would enhance student/administrator contact.

Mr T. D. Evans: The Dettman report made another significant recommendation which you have rejected.

Mr Skidmore: Do not interrupt the lesson.

Mr MENSAROS: That may be so. I was asked by the honourable member to clarify the policy which he could not understand despite the fact that I think it is clearly stated here. I continue—

Another recommendation strongly emphasised the need for the differential treatment of upper and lower school students with respect to the use of physical facilities, the planning of social and recreational activities, and the compilation of school rules.

Separation in high schools can occur in a physical or an administrative sense and, clearly, if any limits are to be set for size or if any attempts are to be made at physical separation, considerations of cost and of human and material resources must be taken into account. Such considerations, however, should not blind us to the ultimate goals set down.

Obviously, implementation will proceed slowly and in full consideration of any possible disruption to the system. In one case, existing buildings may allow for physical separation under separate administrations; in another, a concept of a school within a school will allow the adoption of new approaches and philosophies.

Where new schools are to be built, there should be no service problems as far as buildings are concerned. The expression of the policy, however, may depend on such factors as total numbers of students or other local considerations. The policies are there to guide our developments. We will need to be pragmatic in putting them into practice.

Mr Skidmore: Here endeth an inspiring lesson.

Mr MENSAROS: In answer to the interjection by the member for Swan, I repeat that it was not my ambition to teach members on the other side. I am replying to a motion which was not quite comprehensible—to me, at least. Perhaps it was comprehensible to the member for Swan and he will get up and explain it much better than the member for Kalgoorlie did.

Mr Skidmore: Do not challenge me.

Mr MENSAROS: I wanted to oblige; hence, by courtesy of the Minister for Education, I supply this answer.

I now come to the second paragraph of the motion, which is even more interesting and less understandable. The honourable member apparently wants to condemn the Government because it is—

Endeavouring to reconcile patent conflict between certain key essentials in policy of the two coalition parties constituting the Government;

That might be a basis for condemnation but, again, I wonder which member would support it. It is a fact of life that a coalition of two different parties exists. It is a further fact of life that each of those parties has a different policy which is developing in a different way, despite the fact that in the given circumstances their philosophies—and particularly their anti-socialist philosophies—are the same. They have developed their two different policies and formed a coalition, and naturally, almost by compulsion, they endeavour to reconcile the differences in their policies, if any. If anyone can explain to me what is wrong with that and why it is to be condemned rather than commended, I will be very happy. I will read that paragraph of the motion again. The Government should be condemned for—

Endeavouring to reconcile patent conflict between certain key essentials in policy—

Mr T. D. Evans: There would not be any conflict had you done your homework before announcing the policy.

Mr MENSAROS: To take this the other way around, which one should be able to do, the Government should not reconcile policies and should try to implement something in which there might be a conflict. I am at a loss. However, the Minister for Education has again supplied some information. Perhaps he can understand this reason for condemnation better than I can. He says—

The second point of the motion has to do with alleged conflicts between the two coalition parties. Specifically, each party supports the attendance at pre-primary centres on a voluntary basis, so there is no difference on that aspect.

The matters along which agreement had to be reached were minimal. In any group of people, whether they belong to one party or two, one arrives at a consensus and proceeds in this action.

There is every indication that coalition parties in government in Western Australia are having far fewer difficulties than the Australian Labor Party.

I think the Minister for Education is very right in those remarks. I come now to the third paragraph of the motion.

Mr T. D. Evans: That has nothing to do with education; you have brought it down to the level of politics.

Mr MENSAROS: Yes, exactly; but my remarks were in accordance with the contents of paragraph 2 of the motion. That paragraph is purely political and has nothing to do with education. Now the member for Kalgoorlie is complaining because I have taken the stick that he offered me and replied to him in the vein of his motion. What should I do? Should I just sit down and not reply to the honourable member's speech? Irrespective of his comments I shall continue with my reply.

In the third paragraph of his motion the member for Kalgoorlie canvasses the criteria for our policies. He says that certain criteria have not been developed. I would suggest quite earnestly that again the sentiment expressed is that because the Liberal Party offered a comprehensive and sound educational policy before the election, whereas the Labor Party continued with the same old stock, perhaps waving the Karmel report—which was not of its doing—now the Labor Party is jealous of our policy and seeks to accuse the Government of being unable to state its criteria. I think the criteria are self-explanatory; but, of course, we would never say that a formulated policy is entirely faultless, especially when viewed in retrospect 10, 20, or 30 years later. If we were to claim that we would look stupid. However, we did say that our policy was created on the best ground, and it will stand the trial which of necessity it must stand.

In respect of the third point of the motion the Minister for Education said that it contains some most unusual verbiage. He has supplied the following explanation—

Dealing first with the apparent necessity to name the professional educationists who are involved in looking at the policy: This of course, is a matter for their own personal wish. It has nothing to do with the Opposition. Nor is the Government in a position to enforce these people to disclose their names if they do not wish to.

Some names—indeed quite a few—have been given, some have not. So what? As I have said earlier, there are a great number of independent authorities who have recommended the procedures which have been adopted by the Liberal Party as its policy.

We are dealing here with a matter, the final proof of which will be shown when the children now entering the education system have reached the age of 25, or thereabouts.

In short, there is a considerable amount of theory involved. For the practical effects we can look to other countries which have introduced many of the procedures suggested. Such examination indicates that there is every chance of success in the proposals adopted and, indeed, of an improvement on the present standards.

I come now to the fourth point of the motion, which simply seeks to condemn the Government because it refuses to indicate the expected costing of the implementation of each and all of its policies. Of course, I have tried to explain that there is a difference between a policy and the implementation of that policy; and in this case the implementation of the policy cannot of necessity be carried out in six months, one year, or even two or three years.

Mr T. D. Evans: If that was the case, how was the Premier able to come out and give an alleged costing to the electorate?

Mr MENSAROS: In this regard the Minister for Education says—

The final point in the motion deals with the costing of the implementation of each and all the aspects of the policy and there has been more nonsense spoken about this particular aspect than about any other.

For example, I know of no Government in Australia which has not promised at least one full year of pre-primary education for every child in the country. This being so, what difference can there be in the cost if the construction is built on presently existing school sites or on separately purchased sites? The latter would be the most expensive.

It follows, therefore, that the Liberal Party's proposal would be the least expensive and money would be saved.

Mr T. D. Evans: Tell us how much.

Mr MENSAROS: The Minister for Education continues—

Again, the speed with which the proposal is completed markedly affects the cost involved. If one were to attempt the impossible—to build all the pre-primary centres in, say, two years—the cost would be exorbitant indeed.

This will not be done. The whole programme will be phased in gradually and the cost will, therefore, be manageable. The price can be worked out on last year's costs if that would mean anything; but it just seems a pointless exercise. The same situation, of course, applies to other aspects of the policy.

Everyone seems to forget that X number of children require X number of seats, and a classroom for every 30 X.

The monetary cost of transferring seventh-grade children into high school in all the district high schools where the primary school is on the same campus is a round sum of nothing.

If, as a high school needs to be built an upper college is constructed, with fourth and fifth year moved from adjacent high schools into that school, it then follows again that the cost of moving the seventh grade into the high school scene is negligible.

Children need a challenge. It is a happy fact that they also love a challenge.

The policy outlined by the Premier at the last election is a challenging and a rewarding one. It will be to the grave disadvantage of the children of this State if the Government is inhibited in pursuing its clear responsibility in implementing its policy by obstructionism for any of the following reasons—

- to score cheap political points;
- to preserve existing areas of authority; or
- for imagined industrial disadvantages.

The Premier outlined a policy; the electors returned his Government. That Government has a clear responsibility and the necessary authority from the people to pursue that policy.

I do not think I can say much more in respect of this motion. I repeat it is hard to comprehend—if indeed anyone can comprehend it.

Mr May: I'll say it is.

Mr MENSAROS: Certain parts of the motion are entirely contradictory. I repeat: in our opinion education is the last subject which should be connected with politics, because it least belongs in that sphere. We have a comprehensive policy which is a very good one. It is a well thought out policy. The Labor Party has not such a policy; hence its jealousy and hence this motion which, of course, I oppose in its entirety.

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

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Appointment of Standing Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 28th August, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

That in the opinion of this House there should be established by it as soon as is practicably possible, a standing committee on conservation and the environment.

MR CARR (Geraldton) [9.09 p.m.]: The member for Morley moved this motion, and I formally seconded it. In speaking to the motion, I want to present my remarks in three main parts. I would like firstly to outline the case for standing committees, generally; secondly, I want to discuss the importance of conservation and environment issues, generally; and then, thirdly, I want to tie up those two points to establish the desirability for the appointment of this particular standing committee.

Speaking firstly in connection with committees generally, the member for Morley said last Wednesday that he had been consistent in his attitude towards standing committees. This was acknowledged by the Minister when he replied to the honourable member. In the three years that the member for Morley was in the Government back bench, he supported the committee system, and now, while in Opposition, he also supports the committee system. I am in a position of being here in just one of the two roles—in Opposition—and I support completely the committee system. I hope when the time comes and I am sitting on the Government bench I will still support the committee system.

Mr Shalders: That will be a long time.

Mr CARR: Is that "electoral fiddle" going through after all?

Mr Shalders: You have seven seats to make up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CARR: Returning to the topic of standing committees, firstly I would like to dispel the main argument put forward by the Minister in opposition to standing committees in this House. He pointed out that we have 51 members only and he said this number was too small to operate a committee system. I point out to him that a committee system works very efficiently in the Australian Senate. On a number of occasions these committees have presented valuable reports, and the Minister is aware, of course, that there are only 60 members in the Senate. So the comparison between this House and the Senate is a fairly valid one.

Mr Stephens: Of the 60 members in the Senate, how many hold ministerial positions?

Mr CARR: Eight to 10 I would suggest.

Mr May: They have more daylight over there!

Mr Grayden: We are getting a bit off the track!

Mr CARR: I make the point also that there is no reason the system should be confined to this House, although the motion refers to the Legislative Assembly. The Government has the numbers in both Houses, and if it saw fit to act on the motion, the membership of the committees

could be made up of members of this House and of another place. That would give us 81 members to participate in these committees.

Mr Grayden: But you want to see that House abolished.

Mr CARR: That is a fairly irrelevant comment.

Mr Bertram: We would like to see you abolished!

Mr CARR: I would like to discuss the involvement of back-benchers in the debates in this House. Although I have been here for a very short time it appears that most of the debates centre around the front benches; that is, the Ministers and the shadow Ministers, and after them the Opposition back-benchers. It seems to me that the members who have the least opportunity to participate in debates are the Government back-benchers. I imagine that in a committee system the Government back-benchers would make up the major representation on the committees. I presume that the Government would insist on a majority representation, and as the Ministers are very busy, they would probably join a committee which was directly concerned with their portfolio only.

My second reason for advocating a committee system is that it will provide members with the opportunity to specialise and to gain expertise. No member could have knowledge of all the subjects discussed in the House, and certainly he could not research every subject in the desired depth. A committee system would provide a vehicle whereby each member could concentrate on a particular subject area and he would gain considerable expertise in this area. The committee could call upon public servants to discuss aspects of particular developmental projects, and also, of course, the committee would receive submissions and representations from individual experts in the community. This then gives the added advantage of increased community involvement in the decision-making process.

Another argument for the committee system is that it would provide the opportunity for ongoing attention. The committee would operate throughout the year, and thus members would have access to information at times other than when Parliament is sitting. The present position is that when Parliament is not sitting it is much more difficult to acquire information from departments and Ministers than it is when we are able to direct questions to Ministers in the House.

The elected representatives would have the opportunity for greater involvement in decision-making. The trend is established whereby civil servants have an increasing say in government, and this is due firstly to the increasing complexity of government, and also to the fact that more and

more expertise is being marshalled within the Civil Service. A committee system would help to bring decision-making back to the actual representatives. By creating a group of four or five people to concentrate heavily on one particular field of legislation, we will find that members develop sufficient expertise to give Ministers a second avenue of advice. At the moment a Minister receives advice from his department, and on most occasions that is the only real source of information available to him. With a committee system he would have a group of parliamentary representatives whom I believe would be aware of the wishes of the people. This committee would also be able to make comments and representations to the Minister and give a second opinion.

Mr Stephens: If the Ministers do not come close to the wishes of the people, you have a change of Government.

Mr T. J. Burke: What about the mess in between?

Mr May: What about the fuel Bill?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order!

Mr May: Does that mean you are going to be defeated soon?

Mr CARR: My suggestion for a committee system is not meant to be an attack on the Government, on any Government, or on Governments in general.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr CARR: I point out that the Government of the day would have a majority representation on each committee. We should also acknowledge the fact that Governments do not have a monopoly of knowledge. To illustrate that I make the point that at times Governments need to amend their own legislation, and this indicates clearly that other avenues of expertise and of information are needed. If we had a committee of parliamentary members making submissions to Cabinet, perhaps we could avoid some of these amendments.

Turning to conservation, this is a most important problem. To some extent conservation is at the crossroads because it is discussed either in an atmosphere of emotionalism or rationally. Recently the emotionalists have had more than their fair share of the stage and an example of this is the so-called "special writer" in the *Sunday Independent*. On Sunday, the 25th August, he wrote an abusive, destructive article which he was not prepared to sign.

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr CARR: The whole attitude of this fellow is development for development's sake; what is big must necessarily be good, and what provides more money must necessarily be better, or some such logic which I am afraid I do not comprehend completely.

Mr B. T. Burke: He is an insult to journalism.

Mr Davies: He should be brought before the Bar of the House.

Mr CARR: I might say that the House needs to override this type of emotionalism and to give a lead in mature discussion. We must get away from those people who worship the god of development and scorn the people whom they refer to as "eco-nuts".

Similarly, we should be wary of those people who are negative environmentalists. There is a danger that some people will advocate conservation for conservation's sake, and I will quote one example which has come to my attention recently.

It was planned to demolish a building, not a particularly old building or one of great historical or architectural merit. However, this building was to be demolished and the conservationists lobbied on the basis that the staircase in the building should be preserved. This sounded fairly reasonable until I realised that the planned development to utilise the staircase was a single-storied building, so we would have shades of "The Fiddler on the Roof", with a "staircase leading nowhere just for show".

When conservation is discussed, the argument is expressed frequently in terms of industry and development on the one hand and conservation on the other.

Although I am a keen conservationist, I am prepared to acknowledge the capacity of industrial development to provide employment and human betterment. However, in saying that, I must repeat my definition of "progress" to ensure that I am not misunderstood on that point. I define progress in human terms. It is something that advances the welfare of the whole community and enables people to live better and happier lives of their own choice. If a development provides 100 jobs and fouls up the life style of the community or the ecological balance of the area with pollution, that is not progress.

I think we as responsible elected representatives should look at the past and learn lessons. I am going to refer in particular to the development period in Western Australia during the 1960s. In doing so, I am not attacking any Government or anything like that; I am trying to make a couple of constructive comments. Considerable benefits have accrued from these developments. For example, we have improved living conditions in the isolated north-west towns. We have an increased industrial and economic stability and diversity in our economy. However, considerable fallings have followed this development era and this was largely due to a lack of experience. We went into a development era unprecedented in Western Australian history.

One of the failures was that we managed to receive only small returns. This has been improved recently and we must commend the Australian Minister for Minerals and Energy for his part in this. The second failing was that the people of Western Australia outside the areas being specifically developed received fairly limited benefits in terms of education, health, housing and recreation facilities.

The third major failing of that development era was pollution such as, for example, at Kwinana, which of course is the obvious example. This is a place where pollution not only is obvious but also is serious in some forms. One has only to drive down the coast road to notice sulphur fumes in the air, and the smog that lies across the factories. The air pollution at Kwinana is very clear and obvious. Other forms of pollution are not so obvious. In particular, I instance water pollution and the effect on marine life in Cockburn Sound which increasingly is being drawn to our attention by concerned people.

The problem of pollution needs extensive, rational discussion and research to ascertain the extent of the damage and to take the necessary action and I believe the committee proposed by this motion would be a step in that direction. Blame for what has happened at Kwinana and other polluted areas has been variously allocated. Some people have said it was because we did not know as much about conservation then as we do now. Other people have said a business Government was in office at the time and was more concerned with development than with conservation. However, I am not particularly concerned about allocating blame for what has happened in the past. I am much more concerned with developments that will take place in the future. It is a fact that environmental concern is increasing in the community today and has been increasing for a number of years. I think it can reasonably be hoped that each succeeding Government will be more concerned with the environment and conservation than was its predecessor. Certainly, this was so with the Tonkin Government which quite certainly was the most environment conscious Government this State has known and was rather more environment conscious than its predecessor, the Brand Government. I seriously and sincerely hope that, given the three-year term it has in office, this Government will turn out to be an even more environment conscious Government than the Tonkin Government.

Mr Grayden: You can be sure of that.

Mr CARR: There is nothing that would please me more than to have the Minister's prediction take place.

Mr Grayden: That is a nice sentiment; you just wait and see what happens.

Mr CARR: While we are discussing political parties and the environment, I should like to make one last comment.

This is too important an issue for political parties to adopt party attitudes. It is so important that the parties must adopt a common approach and tackle the problem as one. Certainly, a parliamentary standing committee composed of members of all parties would be one move towards that objective.

I said a moment ago that pollution at Kwinana was obvious. However, one of the dangers is that many pollution problems are not obvious, even to the people who are most closely affected by them. For example, walking down the street in the central business district of Perth, I rarely notice pollution or see smog and I do not generally smell petrol fumes and so on. However, if we talk to a group of country school children who have returned to their classrooms after a holiday in Perth or to people who have been to Perth only a couple of times or who have made their first trip to Perth they will tell us that they can see the smog over the City of Perth and how concerned they are about the petrol fumes they can smell in the central business district of Perth. We must recognise the problem that many of us become accustomed to something to which we should not become accustomed; we should be more concerned about this matter.

Hopefully, we have reached the stage where the development and the environmental lobbies must acknowledge each other's existence and compromise. In 1974, industrial and developmental interests must consider all society when they make future decisions. Some, of course, are dying hard. We have the example of Mr McNeill of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited who made that infamous and disgraceful statement that he did not see that a company had any need to consider the social and community effects of its decisions.

Mr Grayden: Who said that?

Mr CARR: The Managing Director of BHP.

Mr Grayden: That is a shocking statement!

Mr CARR: It is a shocking statement.

Mr Grayden: I agree with you.

Mr Bertram: The Premier does not agree with you.

Mr CARR: Another example of this attitude dying hard is that literary lout we referred to earlier who writes in the *Sunday Independent*.

Mr Bertram: Lang Hancock!

Mr CARR: I should like to make a couple of comments in relation to environmental impact statements. If we accept the need for rational study, we must have environmental impact statements for all future developments—that is, the preparation by competent independent authorities

of a report along prescribed guidelines of the impact upon the environment of a particular industry. These reports must be tabled so that they can be studied and made available to the public for discussion and analysis. I would hope that the standing committee proposed in this motion by the member for Morley would be instrumental in drawing up guidelines for these environmental impact statements and also in examining those statements and making recommendations to the Cabinet and to Parliament.

However, I am a little concerned at the attitude of the Government towards environmental impact statements and, for that matter, to reports generally. Last Wednesday, the Premier said that Western Australian environmental impact statements were of a high standard but when challenged by the member for Morley, the Premier could not give one example. To me, it is a matter of concern that the Premier has such an ill-informed opinion on this question.

Mr Grayden: What are you talking about? What sort of example do you want?

Mr CARR: The Premier stated that Western Australian environmental impact statements were of a high standard but could not quote one to support his argument. That indicates to me that he is not too sure of his thinking on that point.

Mr Grayden: Can you think of one situation where, for instance, mining companies have desecrated the countryside?

Mr H. D. Evans: Yes, at Greenbushes.

Mr Grayden: How long ago did that occur?

Mr H. D. Evans: It is still going on.

Mr Grayden: Good gracious me! That is a skeleton in the cupboard.

Mr CARR: Having dealt with the Premier's comment, I would refer also to the answer given by the Minister to a question asked by the member for Morley on the 21st August. At that time the Minister, when replying, said he would not have guidelines prepared for environmental impact statements. I hope the Minister will have a second look at this question with a view to changing his mind on it.

Mr Grayden: What are you talking about? We have guidelines already.

Mr CARR: The Minister said he would not have guidelines prepared.

Mr Grayden: You know perfectly well there are guidelines.

Mr B. T. Burke: You mean guide dogs!

Mr Grayden: I do not mean anything so far as you are concerned.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The member for Geraldton.

Mr CARR: I am a little concerned that the Government, instead of having impact statements prepared to assist it in arriving at a decision, may decide to take a half-way step by making a decision on some project and then referring to a so-called report without tabling it by saying, "The environmental impact statement has shown that the project is quite all right". I am a little concerned about a Government that refers to reports which I would like to see tabled, but which, in fact, have not been tabled. We have had instances where the Minister for Police, instead of tabling a report, has only alluded to it. We have also heard of a report being made by a Public Service inspector concerning missing files. Reference has been made to this report, but no steps were taken to have it tabled.

I hope that when the Government receives impact statements on the environmental aspect of certain projects we will have tabled reports along accepted guidelines.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr CARR: I would like to comment on a couple of Bills which Parliament may be called upon to vote on sooner or later. For instance, I know nothing of the environmental implications of the Alwest project. All I know is that an environmental impact statement has not been made on it. I would hate to vote on any Bill relating to that project without being aware of the contents of an appropriate environmental impact statement.

Before members were asked to vote on such a measure I would like to see tabled in this House an impartial, authoritative report along the accepted guidelines of such a project, so that I could study it to my own satisfaction. Of course, I would prefer that if an environmental impact statement was prepared it would be referred to the proposed standing committee so it could make a recommendation to Parliament.

Mr Sibson: In the 1972 report by the Environmental Protection Authority it is stated that the resting of Alwest at Worsley was in the best interests of all aspects relating to the project.

Mr CARR: I appreciate the statement made by the member for Bunbury, but at the same time I would not accept that as being an environmental impact statement.

The second example I would like to cite is the Northern Mining Company which proposes to erect a steelworks at Geraldton. This project would be of considerable benefit to the town of Geraldton, because it would give impetus to the town to develop into a growth centre. This, of course, would result in an increase in the size of the town which would mean that more service industries would be established and so the residents of Geraldton would enjoy a better lifestyle.

Although it would appear to a layman like myself that such a project would probably not harm the environment, that is not good enough. Before the agreement for such a project comes to this Parliament for ratification an environmental impact survey would have to be made along accepted guidelines.

Mr Laurance: The finance would have to be found, too.

Mr CARR: I think the cash could be provided for an environmental impact survey to be carried out. The Northern Mining Company has been negotiating with Robe River Limited for Australian finance, and I have been led to believe that the prospects for this project are quite good.

Mr Skidmore: Why don't we take steps like they have in the United States of America? Before any industry becomes established in that country steps are taken to ensure that pollution will not occur. I understand that one steelworks project spent something like \$3.5 million on such work.

Mr CARR: I would now like to put forward a number of points to show that a standing committee should be appointed so that it could meet to discuss this particular issue specifically. The first point I make is that the subject is of a technical and complicated nature. I think all members have noted the questions that have been asked in this House over the last month or so by the member for Morley, and the answers that have been given to some of them. The information we have gained is sufficient to show that they are complicated issues, and I think all members will agree that there are no experts on the subject of environment in this House.

Mr Stephens: You are going to set yourself up in order to direct the experts, are you?

Mr CARR: If a standing committee were appointed, we would have five or six members of this House who would be better informed to debate environmental issues.

The second point, of course, is the question of giving attention to environmental matters while Parliament is not sitting. Consideration of such matters by a standing committee would also help to ensure that correct decisions are made by representatives of the people on environmental matters. I said a while ago that too many decisions are made by bureaucrats. If a standing committee were appointed, the Parliament would have the benefit of the knowledge gained by members of that committee. The members of the standing committee would gain that expertise by specialising in the subject of environment and therefore they could usefully contribute to any debates on this topic.

Lately, some concern has been expressed that the Commonwealth Government has shown considerable interest in the subject of the environment, and I know that some

members are concerned that the Australian Government will take over and make all decisions on the environment. We do not want this to happen and so we must show that we can handle capably this question ourselves.

Mr Stephens: I am pleased to hear you say that you do not want the Commonwealth Government to take it over.

Mr CARR: If we cannot handle the environment ourselves, I would like to see the Australian Government take it over.

Mr Stephens: We have certainly performed a better job of handling it than the Commonwealth is doing in handling the question of keeping our north-west coast clear of Indonesians.

Mr Jamieson: They have been landing on that coast for centuries.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The member for Geraldton.

Mr CARR: I would like to draw the attention of the House to the major tasks which I consider would fall to the lot of a standing committee. One of its tasks would be to prepare guidelines for all impact statements. Also, committee reports on such statements would have to be considered by the House before any legislation was introduced. Another of the tasks of the committee would be to scrutinise all legislation that comes before the House in order that a decision could be made on the environmental implications. I have mentioned the possibility that members may be required to vote on legislation that is introduced for the establishment of the the Alwest project in the future. This type of project would be considered by the standing committee before the legislation was passed by Parliament.

Another example of legislation that could be considered by the standing committee would be the Kwinana Freeway extension. If it were decided to proceed with that proposal the standing committee would have to review the environmental implications. It would investigate any matters referred to it by the House. The House could, at any time, decide that the committee should consider the guidelines for, say, new national parks, or new historical museums. The committee would investigate any matter brought to the attention of its members. It could also consider matters that were brought to its attention by the public. For example, it could be called upon to consider such questions as: What is happening to the Swan River or Cockburn Sound?

In conclusion, I make the plea that this issue is too important to ignore; I consider it is too important to consider emotionally, and I believe the House should establish machinery for the rational consideration of the problem of conservation and the environment by appointing a standing committee.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [9.39 p.m.]: I congratulate the member who has just sat down for making a very fine speech. He has given the matter a great deal of thought and I am sure no-one would doubt how genuine he is when he considers that this very important matter is sometimes given too scant consideration by too few people within the community.

I have to admire the consistency of the member for Morley in bringing forward once again the need for the establishment of parliamentary committees. During the last session of Parliament he did some very commendable work in promoting this idea, and he brought down a good report.

By the same token, I cannot congratulate the Minister on his scant reply to the motion, because he dealt with this matter very superficially. He said we should be satisfied with what we have; that we should not rock the boat; and that we should not stick our noses into environmental protection matters, and least of all should the Parliament do this. To be fair, he stopped short of saying that, but he made it quite clear this was no business of Parliament.

I was rather surprised at the Minister's attitude. I thought that in accordance with its policy speech enunciated before the last election the present Government would promote open government, and would welcome this type of parliamentary committee which should have very wide investigatory powers and could prove to be of great benefit not only to Parliament as a whole, but to the people of the State, and in particular to the department under whose guidance environmental matters are governed. I was particularly surprised at the Minister's comments, especially when we consider the remarks that were made last year when the question of the establishment of parliamentary committees was under discussion.

The Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, participated in the debate on that motion and his remarks are recorded at page 2109 of the 1973 *Hansard*. He referred to the protection which people had from Parliament, and drew attention to the fact that matters cannot be kept private without the Press taking them up. He seemed to think this was a good feature, and I agree with him. He went on to say—

I must add that in the main the media has the happy knack of putting its finger on items of crucial public interest. When something contentious arises, it is not too long before someone is on the phone, appearing at our door, or writing letters to us.

The then Leader of the Opposition made the point that we could always appoint a Select Committee, a parliamentary committee, or a Royal Commission to inquire into a particular matter on which the Press had put its finger.

That is very different from the attitude adopted by the Government when it was given the opportunity not so long ago to appoint a Select Committee. On this occasion the Premier decided that although the Press might have put its finger on a point, there was no need to appoint a Select Committee because the Opposition had generated some antagonism towards the Government's legislation. Here again we have the Government adopting a double standard.

If the present Government goes down in history as being famous for anything, it will be as being famous for adopting double standards. In the debate in 1973 the then Leader of the Opposition pointed out that we could always have a Select Committee; however, when there was an opportunity and a need to appoint one he did not take advantage of the opportunity. The fact is that the Government will take whatever stand it needs to take on a question, according to how it feels at the time.

I believe that questions affecting environmental protection are important; but if anything has to go then as far as this Government is concerned environmental protection will go. We have only to look at the Government's record to realise this. It is true that a Government of the political complexion of the present Government was the first to introduce legislation dealing with environmental protection, but the legislation was not in that name. It was curiously named. However, that Government did establish a department, and appointed a highly respected and very talented Director of Environmental Protection. He is a person for whom I have the greatest admiration.

The Act under which the director had to work was tremendously limiting in its powers, and we as the succeeding Government had to pass an amending Bill which greatly expanded those powers, much to our chagrin in one later instance. However, we did that. In matters concerning environmental protection, everything else becomes secondary; and no stone should be left unturned to make certain that the powers lie where they should lie.

We as the previous Government committed a grave omission in amending the Act. We did not try to make the legislation retrospective in respect of the need for industries, particularly those established at Cockburn Sound, to comply with directions. The then Government as much as the then Opposition was to blame for this, because we as the Government accepted the amendment put forward by the Opposition. The Government decided that it would not make the legislation retrospective; that the agreements which had been made should stand; and the Act forthwith should have no application to established industries.

Mr Grayden: You know perfectly well that all parties have equal concern for the protection of the environment. It is only in recent years that the people have become concerned with the environment.

Mr DAVIES: I made that point some time ago, but now I am dealing with another matter. I regret the Minister has not caught up with me. The point I now make is that we, as the previous Government, made a bad omission in amending the Act, and we were as much to blame for this as was the Opposition on that occasion, because we accepted without any debate the deletion of a clause which had the effect of exempting the Environmental Protection Act from existing agreements.

Because we failed to make the Act applicable to existing agreements at that time, the companies now can thumb their noses at the Government if they so desire. I am not saying the companies are doing that; all I am saying is they are not making the effort they could have made if we had the whip hand over them, to clean up some aspects of the pollution of the environment. I refer to what is being discharged into Cockburn Sound; in particular to the discharge of gypsum. If the amendment to the Act to which I have made reference had not been accepted by us as the Government, today we would be able to do something to prevent such discharge.

Mr Stephens: I think in that regard you are wrong. I have answered a question along that line. The matter is being investigated.

Mr DAVIES: If the Minister had been listening closely he would have heard me say that the company concerned is trying to do something about the discharge of gypsum, but I do not think it is moving as fast as it would move if we had something with which to prod it along. The fact is we have nothing with which to prod it along. The Act does not apply to that company, and it enables the company to do what it likes in accordance with the terms of its agreement. This provides for the discharge of gypsum into Cockburn Sound. If we had something with which to prod the company it might be able to find a solution.

The discharge of gypsum into Cockburn Sound has been going on for several years, and it is a matter of great concern to everyone who cares for the future of Cockburn Sound. Probably, it is also of concern to the Minister, but the fact is he has no power under the Act to stop the company from discharging gypsum. If he has the power will he tell us, so that I can press for the power to be applied? I repeat it was a bad mistake that we as the Government made in 1971; and for this the Government as much as the Opposition is to blame in accepting the amendment.

Mr Stephens: Do you agree that the Fremantle Port Authority might have some power in this regard?

Mr DAVIES: I agree it could try, but there is no power under the Act for action to be taken.

Mr Stephens: That is, under the Environmental Protection Act.

Mr DAVIES: I am not talking about the Environmental Protection Act, but about the deletion of a clause which the Government in 1971 accepted. I cannot give the Minister a recipe for afternoon tea biscuits or anything like that, but I would ask him to listen to what I am saying and not attempt to put me off the track.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Will the honourable member address the Chair?

Mr DAVIES: The fact is the company has been discharging gypsum into Cockburn Sound for several years. Many people are worrying about this, but it seems no-one can do anything, although efforts are being made to get the company to co-operate with the Fremantle Port Authority.

Mr Jamieson: It is doing that under the agreement.

Mr DAVIES: We are getting back to this point, but the Minister will fix it up for us. When he does, I will give him three cheers, because it is of great importance to everyone concerned about the future of Cockburn Sound. Enough reports on the sound have been made over the years.

Let us study the function of the committee and the experience we have had with those appointed. Of course, Select Committees have operated from time to time and have achieved their objectives within the ambit of their powers, but a Select Committee is charged with the duty to look into one subject only. It does not have any wide-sweeping powers such as has the Public Accounts Committee which has operated successfully for something like two years. Although I am not certain of the date on which it was appointed, I think that it was some time in 1971 that it first operated. That committee is not directed to inquire into any particular aspect of government or any specific item. Of its own motion it can inquire into matters under its charter or alternatively it can inquire into matters as a result of a motion in the House. This is the first great difference between a Select Committee and a standing committee. A standing committee can receive its directions in two ways and it has wide-sweeping powers.

The Public Accounts Committee has worked very well. It was agreed to by the previous Government rather reluctantly I thought but that was one of its better decisions. Although its establishment was agreed to reluctantly, no-one can say it has been an interfering busybody. In fact,

everyone, including myself who, as a Minister, had experience of it, would say that it has been a very efficient committee. For various reasons its personnel changes fairly often, but there has been a continuing sequence of members who have been able to pass on the knowledge gained previously. It has submitted 10 reports, none of them big, but all dealing with matters of importance.

As Minister I was very pleased that the Public Accounts Committee was able to study the question of the Government Health Laboratories. I am only sorry that it did not occur to me to refer the matter to the committee before I entered into the agreement, because I was not happy about it at the time. The fact remains that the Public Accounts Committee did deal with the subject and submitted recommendations which gave me the impetus I needed to have the matter inquired into. Although it has not yet been drawn to a successful conclusion, we are much closer to achieving the integration of the laboratories than we were before the committee made its inquiry. I was grateful to have its help and, as I have said, I only wish I had thought of referring the matter to it myself beforehand.

The committee has, of course, dealt with other items too. I know it has inquired into methods of accounting on which the Auditor-General reported. These involved matters under my control at one time and the procedure adopted had been followed for years. Apparently on a number of occasions the procedure had been queried, but nothing had been done about it because, with the pressure of work, it had not been considered important and had been overlooked. The Public Accounts Committee noted the criticism in the Auditor-General's report and spoke to the people who were able to give it good advice. As a result the committee ascertained that in one instance the criticism was not justified, while in the other it was believed the accounting methods could be greatly improved.

So, from the two experiences I as Minister had of the committee I was grateful it had been established. I do not regard it as an interfering busybody, but as a very responsible committee of Parliament which was able to do some work for me for which I either did not have the time or was too lazy to do myself.

We can request the committee to inquire into matters particularly relating to the Estimates, public accounts, and so on. We can do this by way of a motion or we can ask one of our members on the committee to suggest that it would be a good thing to inquire into a certain item. It is functioning well and has submitted various reports. No arguments have occurred. It is fortunate that it has a good secretary, our Sergeant-at-Arms, who has kept its work flowing and as a result the committee has a very high standing in Parliament.

Its function is set out in a book published in 1971 and headed, *Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly*. This sets out the ambit of its duties and the method by which it can operate which is under the Select Committee system. A close analogy exists between Select Committees and parliamentary standing committees; but the fact remains that there is that one great difference in that the standing committee can initiate action of its own accord without being directed by Parliament, although it still can be directed by Parliament.

I do not know how many members have read the reports of the Public Accounts Committee. I must confess that before this motion was moved I had read only four of them, but they are well worth studying to appreciate how concise they are and how they omit any unnecessary verbiage. They get to the point of the problem very quickly. I do not know just how long it takes, but the report indicates that it is fairly quickly. After it has made its recommendations it is then up to the Government to take any necessary action.

When replying last week, the Minister was at great pains to explain how the member for Morley had not dealt with a committee on the environment in the report of the Select Committee on the parliamentary committee system which was established last year. The Minister said that the action the honourable member has taken on this occasion demonstrates his inconsistency. The Minister seemed to believe that because that report contained no recommendations concerning an environmental protection committee, a need did not exist for one.

Mr Stephens: I did not say that.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister implied it.

Mr Stephens: Not in that way. I made the point that last year he thought of all the committees necessary. I think there were five of them, but he did not include anything to do with environmental protection. Now, 10 months later, he wants an environmental protection committee. His priorities have altered.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That was a Select Committee of which I was only a member.

Mr Stephens: I am sorry you misunderstood the point I made.

Mr DAVIES: I am glad the Minister interjected because he is saying exactly what I stated he said. He seems to think that it is a terrible thing that he took no action then, but now feels that it is important to have an environmental committee. The Select Committee report reads—

Therefore, we recommend that there should be five such Committees.

- (a) One should be the Public Accounts Committee (already existing).
- (b) Another, a Subordinate Legislation Committee.

If I had a choice I would rather have a subordinate legislation committee than an environmental committee, but that is not the subject under discussion. The report continues—

Because of the changing legislative emphases, the Select Committee hesitates to prescribe the areas to be dealt with, but suggests the following—

- (c) Development and Works Committee.
- (d) Education and Community Affairs Committee.
- (e) Rural and Local Government Committee.

It is because of those recommendations that the Minister seemed to think it was terrible that the member for Morley had not mentioned at that stage the need for an environmental protection committee.

However, the Minister then adopted an old trick. I would like to give some advice to the new members, although from what I have heard from members opposite I am convinced they know all the tricks. However, I advise them to research if anyone quotes something. They should always obtain the quote and see what was omitted, because in this case the Minister omitted an important paragraph which reads—

However, it is likely that this suggested arrangement will be varied from time to time according to the changing needs of Parliament.

I think that is important. The honourable member may have felt that way at the time, but members should keep in mind that that was a majority report and he probably went along with the majority.

The minority report said parliamentary standing committees should not exist, although it is not specifically stated in those terms.

Mr STEPHENS: The member is not being fair to me because if he reads my speech he will see that before I could make that point the member for Mundaring butted in and beat me to the point.

Mr DAVIES: I am sorry but the Minister did not tell me he was going to make the point before the member for Mundaring butted in. I cannot read the Minister's mind.

Mr STEPHENS: I do not ask the member to read my mind, but to read my speech.

Mr DAVIES: I have read the Minister's speech and I intend to quote a few sections from it. I did not know what the Minister was going to say. Goodness only knows what he intended to say but perhaps I should ask the member for Mundaring not to interrupt because he spoils a good train of thought!

Mr STEPHENS: He did not spoil a train of thought at all; he was over-anxious.

Mr DAVIES: The fact remains that no action has been taken on the report and, despite the emphasis on open government, we do not expect any action to be taken because there was a minority report from the member for Scarborough, the Minister for Mines, and other members. I am sorry, I do the member for Scarborough wrong.

Mr STEPHENS: As I said earlier, the member cannot read.

Mr DAVIES: The reference was not to Mr R. L. Young, but to Mr W. G. Young, and we know what happened to him. The other minority report was from the present Minister for Mines and we know what he thinks about open government. We have seen him in action and when given an opportunity to prove what he stands for he certainly does not deal with open government.

If the Government desired to act in this regard it could have appointed a development and works committee because I am sure such a parliamentary standing committee could find plenty to inquire into, with regard to environmental matters. If a committee is to inquire into public works it will also inquire into the environment because public works will affect the environment.

I have been invited to deal with the speech made by the Minister when he replied to the debate, and I have two or three matters to which I will refer. At the commencement of his speech he went off at a tangent and raised false hopes in me when he said—

I support the contention that we should keep Parliament fully informed, and also that we support the involvement of the public in our decision-making.

Of course, a parliamentary standing committee would be an excellent avenue through which to keep the public informed, and through which to involve the public. However, as I have said, we have already seen examples in this House of the reluctance of the Government really to do this.

I became more disappointed as the Minister continued his speech because he brought up the same old arguments which we have heard previously: One has his democratic rights; one can rely on the newspapers; one can bring matters up in Parliament; and one can have a Committee of the Whole House. As a matter of fact, he said that if a Bill is introduced a member has the opportunity to contact people actively concerned in the area relating to the subject matter of the proposed Bill. He said this research usually enables a member to obtain a wealth of practical experience.

When a Bill is introduced it might be debated three, four, five, or 10 days later. Does the Minister suggest that during that time one can obtain a wealth of experience,

and not only a wealth of experience, but a wealth of practical experience? One cannot obtain that kind of information in such a short time; by going to others and suddenly finding that he is qualified and has obtained a wealth of practical experience. The Minister went on to state—

Also, of course, there are the specialists who may be involved in the administration of that type of legislation and approaches can be made to these people. I have always found them to be most helpful and co-operative in outlining the various problems that may be associated with this particular industry or that particular field. I also found that if an approach were made to the various departmental officers they would be co-operative in advancing the technical type of information that sometimes is required.

Of course, if one is dealing with technical information one needs somebody to assist in assessing that information. I know that I have been bamboozled at times by some of the questions asked by the member for Morley. I thought I had a good general knowledge but some of those questions have been above my head.

Mr McPharlin: The member must have been reading some books.

Mr DAVIES: No, I do not do that; that is dangerous! The Deputy Premier should know that reading books is dangerous.

Mr Grayden: What about files?

Mr DAVIES: Or files! The fact remains that if one has an entrée to a department one can pick up some information here and there. I can recall that last year you, Mr Speaker, wrote to the Swan River Conservation Board seeking information on legislation dealing with waterways. You received some very good advice from the officers concerned. That can be done on some occasions but there is also a reluctance on the part of some departmental officers to talk to Opposition members. That is understandable because an officer working under a vicious departmental head, or a vicious Minister, could find himself in serious trouble. He could be charged with giving away official secrets. We know what can happen in such a case, with the police being called in and all kinds of inquiries being made. I do not think it is fair to say that we have this entrée as suggested by the Minister. Even though we might have the entrée, we do not always have the time or the capacity to assess the technical information which may be required.

The Minister went on to say that in his opinion the House can work quite effectively as a Committee of the Whole. How does the occasion arise for it to work as a Committee of the Whole? Are we now working as a Committee of the Whole? Could we now call on people to come

forward and give advice? Could we ask departmental officers to get out of bed and come to Parliament to give advice?

Mr Grayden: How many times has the member asked the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole?

Mr DAVIES: The Minister and I seem to agree tonight. It is very true that on many occasions I have asked the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole. However, I am once again ahead of the Minister because I am now asking what such a committee would be able to do. Could it call people before it to give evidence? Could it question departmental officers? Could it call in outsiders to give advice? We cannot ask the Under-Treasurer, or the Director of Environmental Protection, to come to the House because we are discussing a certain matter, and then tell him that after dealing with that matter in general debate we might want some information from him when we dissolve into a Committee of the Whole.

To suggest that a Committee of the Whole is in any way comparable to a Select Committee or a parliamentary standing committee is utter rubbish, and nothing else. They are not comparable or compatible in any way. The word "committee" is the only thing in common.

Mr Grayden: Nonsense. Members have all the opportunity in the world to discuss matters while in Committee.

Mr DAVIES: If a Committee of the Whole could call officers before the House, question them, seek advice from them, and then send them away and ask them to return when required, I would agree.

Mr Grayden: You are saying 81 members of Parliament can be brushed aside and a committee of five is of much more consequence?

Mr DAVIES: I am saying the committee would seek expert advice and do for me that which I am either incompetent or too lazy to do, or have not time to do—and time is one of the main reasons.

The Minister also said—

—the Labor Party has always contended that its legislation is best.

I mentioned that earlier. He went on to deal with the powers of the Environmental Protection Authority. These are very wide; with the exception of the one I mentioned, but the authority can and does appoint all kinds of committees.

The Minister spoke about the Committee for Understanding the Environment—CUE—of which Miss M. Knowles is Chairman and Sir Thomas Wardle a member, and which is doing a very good job. It is not an inquiring committee; it is an educational committee. The Minister cited this as one of the committees of inquiry which could help us here. CUE was not meant to search out and advise. It

was meant to educate and was not created for a particular reason. There are plenty of other subcommittees—as far as I am concerned, there are too many of them.

Mr Stephens: So you want to increase the number?

Mr DAVIES: Dr O'Brien does not govern Parliament. The Speaker is in charge of Parliament. The fact remains that Dr O'Brien's department is grossly overworked. I could be to blame for that because as Minister I tried to keep it a very small department. I checked up on the Estimates for last year and found the staff numbered 13 and there was to be no increase in 1973-74. When I was Minister I adopted the attitude that inquiries which needed to be made should be made, generally, by outside bodies and that we should go to the best sources available for a particular point of view. We should go to private consultants or to universities; or, if the best sources are within Government itself, we should go to the Government. That is why the department has been kept very tight and close-knit.

I think it is a very good policy. It may be a little more expensive for a one-up report on a subject from a private entrepreneur, but it is much cheaper than trying to keep specialists in the various fields under the control of the Government. This is another reason that Dr O'Brien is weighed down with all kinds of inquiries. At one time I think he had between 20 and 30 separate inquiries going at the one time.

The Minister then made mention of the work done by the Environmental Protection Authority, which comprises three very highly-qualified, very capable, and, most importantly, very busy men. Dr O'Brien is the chairman. Phil Adams, a lawyer well known to the Liberal Party, is a very competent member. Professor Main, the other member, is in the air more often than on the ground. I do not say that disrespectfully.

Mr Hartrey: So is the Opposition.

Mr Stephens: You are dead right.

Mr Grayden: So is the member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr DAVIES: The fact remains that Professor Main's expertise is so highly regarded throughout Australia that he is constantly commuting between Perth and the Eastern States. By the same token, he does an excellent job as a member of the Environmental Protection Authority. I think we are very lucky to have those three excellent people. I was almost afraid Professor Main would say this was one of his less important jobs and he would like to resign from the authority, but I am very pleased he has remained there. Mr Adams had some sadness when his wife

died and he was naturally distressed, and I thought he might quit at that time; thankfully, he did not. Dr O'Brien carries the weight of the whole department.

These people are already overloaded, and this is another reason why many matters could be dealt with by a parliamentary committee, which would give the back-benchers who are interested in this subject an opportunity to do some research, talk to people, and direct their inquiries to a specific question. It is all very well to say they can do this as single individuals but one does not have the same incentive to do things as when one is working with a committee. This is the type of matter where the committee system is invaluable. But the House as a whole must agree that the committee system be used.

I have made the point that if an individual member wants to inform himself he can do so by reading books and literature which are available at the department. I think it was Disraeli who said young members should specialise.

The Minister said—

I cannot see how a standing committee comprising members of this House, irrespective of how well intentioned it might be, will substantially improve the situation so far as conservation and the environment are concerned.

There are very many aspects of environment and it is a very important facet of life these days. It is important enough for the United Nations to have held a world conference on it. We cannot possibly appoint enough committees to inquire into all the matters that need to be inquired into.

The fact remains the department is doing as much as it can. I do not see how we can escape expanding the department. It already has too many committees with which it is trying to gather together all the strings and relate them to each other. I believe it is using to the best advantage the available expertise. By the same token, there are many avenues for which it would not be worth setting up a special outside committee to consider, yet they could be considered by a parliamentary committee which could advise the Government and, more importantly, the Parliament about what needs to be done.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes more.

Mr DAVIES: It requires the will of the whole Parliament to make the parliamentary committee system work. Despite what the Minister for Labour says, I cannot help feeling that the concern of the present Government for the environment is not as great as it should be.

I cannot help but feel that in times of economic hardship if costs are to be pruned, the first department to be affected will be the Department of Environmental Protection.

I congratulate the member for Morley on his research, and the matters he has raised in the House. By the same token I express the fear that as far as this Government is concerned, environmental protection is expendable, otherwise it would have supported the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 5th September, 1974

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

1. MARGARINE

Ingredients: Labelling

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

Do Western Australian labelling regulations for margarine require a precise statement of ingredients and whether animal or vegetable fats are used?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Labelling regulations for margarine do not require a precise statement of all ingredients. However, table margarine must be composed of vegetable oils only.

Cooking margarine must contain over 90% of total animal fats and animal oils such as beef fat and/or mutton fat.

Manufacturing margarine must contain 75% to 90% of total animal fats and animal oils such as beef fat and/or mutton fat.

A statement to this effect must be printed on each package containing cooking or manufacturing margarine.

2. MARGARINE

Quota and Imports

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What is the Western Australian quota for margarine manufacture?
- (2) What is the actual quantity manufactured in this State?

- (3) What quantity of margarine was imported into Western Australia from other States in the latest statistical period for which figures are available?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) The quota for table margarine is 1 423 tonnes. There is no quota for cooking or manufacturing margarine.
- (2) The quantity of table margarine produced in 1973 was 1 422.96 tonnes. No cooking or manufacturing margarine is produced.
- (3) 753 tonnes of table margarine in 1972-73 and 979 tonnes in 1971-72. 2 242 tonnes of cooking or manufacturing margarine was also imported in 1971-72. Figures for 1972-73 are not available.

3. FUEL, ENERGY AND POWER RESOURCES LEGISLATION

TLC Meeting

The Hon. V. J. Ferry for the Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Has a Cabinet Minister or any informed Government officer been invited to address the Trades and Labor Council on the 5th September at the meeting advertised as "Law of the Jackboot" on page 35 of *The West Australian* newspaper dated the 4th September, 1974?
- (2) (a) If so, who will be in attendance;
- (b) if the answer to (1) is "No" who will explain the amended Bill to the trade union representatives so that misinterpretations expressed by the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council in the advertisement may be corrected?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) No, not to my knowledge.
- (2) (a) Answered by (1).
- (b) Presumably no-one. If only opponents of the Bill are invited and will be present, the meeting will be used to air only one-sided views and on past experience—having also regard to the advertisement to which the Hon. Member has referred—it will be a propaganda campaign—based on misrepresentation—

The Hon. R. Thompson: How do you know?

The PRESIDENT: It is hardly fair for the honourable member to interject whilst the Minister is answering a question.