

Enquiries at the W.A. University this year revealed that 28 students are studying a First Year Vet. Science qualifying course for Queensland and Melbourne Universities. There may be one place available at Melbourne, and five places have been reserved at Queensland, to be shared by S.A. and W.A., so our students have little chance of doing this course. The W.A. Department of Agriculture is not offering any Cadetships this year, which would allow perhaps two W.A. students to attempt the course, if they can finance their effort.

It would seem appropriate to hasten the start of Murdoch University to create employment first and secondly fill the need to train our own students, who would possibly return to their own environments and be content there, a point overlooked with many professional migrants.

As I have said, I have received several letters of this nature, a fact which shows that people in the country are most anxious to see a school of veterinary science established where students from Western Australia might be trained and, as stated, subsequently they could return to the part of the country from which they came where, in all probability, they would be quite happy to practice forever more.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The present Government does not seem keen to hasten this along.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: If the Government is encouraged it may look in this direction. Everybody must know that if we hasten the start of the Murdoch University we will have a better chance of promoting more work and saving more stock in country areas. There is not a veterinary surgeon within 100 miles of where I live.

To get a veterinary surgeon down is time-consuming and costly, because one must pay for mileage as well as the treatment of the animals. In many cases people allow their sheep to die rather than get the "vet" in. I know on several occasions in the past I have wanted a "vet" but the time factor has been too long. Sometimes it is necessary to wait a week to enable the "vet" to fit in a visit with everything else he has to do and, in the meantime, one continues to lose more sheep. I think the establishment of a veterinary school is something we should seriously consider and foster as much as we possibly can.

As I have nothing else to worry members with I shall support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police).

House adjourned at 8.07 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 28th March, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (24): ON NOTICE

1. VETERINARIANS

University Courses and Cadetships

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What universities in Australia have schools of veterinary science?
- (2) Have Western Australians the opportunity of entrance to any of them?
- (3) Are cadetships available to Western Australians?
- (4) How many applications for entrance have been made from this State in 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972?
- (5) How many were successful and to which universities were they admitted?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Melbourne, Sydney and Queensland.
- (2) Very limited entrance today.
- (3) Cadetships have been available but it is understood that none is being offered this year.
- (4) and (5) Reliable information can be obtained only from the universities of Melbourne, Sydney and Queensland.

2. THOMAS STREET AND WINTHROP AVENUE

Median Strips

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Works:

Is it intended to improve the aesthetics of Thomas Street and Winthrop Avenue by the planting of shrubs, trees, etc., in the median strip?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Thomas Street and Winthrop Avenue are the responsibility of the local authorities—the Perth City Council and the Subiaco City Council.

In 1968 discussions took place between representatives of these councils and the Main Roads Department with the object of preparing an improvement plan for the median strips on both Thomas Street and Winthrop Avenue. It was agreed at the meeting that a plan would be prepared by the Perth City Council, but this has not yet been done.

3. MINERAL CLAIMS

Number and Acreage

Mr. GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Mines:

How many mineral claims were in existence in Western Australia as at 31st December, 1971, and what was the total acreage involved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

The information requested is at present being compiled but will not be completed before 30th April, 1972.

As soon as the figures are available the Member will be advised.

4. SHIPPING

Oil Pollution

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Adverting to my question 22 on Wednesday, 22nd March, does the Fremantle or other Western Australian port authority provide—
 - (a) a lighter, barge or other vessel; or
 - (b) a wharfside mobile road tanker, into which berthed or anchored ships can pump oil residues from bilges?
- (2) If not, will provision be made for such a purpose with a view to removing prospects of oil pollution of our harbours or coastline?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Fremantle is the only port providing such facilities on the Western Australian coast.
- (2) The matter will be referred to the appropriate authorities for their consideration.

5. HOUSING

Police Building Society

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

- (1) To which building society was the allocation originally made to the Police Society transferred?
- (2) What was the amount of the allocation?
- (3) What criteria of eligibility for advances is set by the Police Society which would occasion "a lack of demand from persons eligible for advances"?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Westland Number Fourteen.
- (2) \$77,000.

- (3) Prospective borrowers from the Police Union Building Societies must be members of the Police Union. The Registrar of Building Societies and the Secretary of the Society do not know of any reason why there was a lack of demand by union members eligible for advances.

6. WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Examining Committee

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

- (1) Has a committee representative of Government, management and labour, similar to that set up by the previous Government, been appointed to examine and propose amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so, would he detail the composition of the committee?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes—a committee known as the Minister for Labour Advisory Committee has been appointed to advise the Minister on all such matters within the general area of industrial relations. The matter of workers' compensation is one of these aspects.

- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) The composition of the Minister for Labour Advisory Committee is as follows:—

Mr. J. W. Coleman, Secretary, Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. F. S. Cross, Director, Employers Federation Inc.

Mr. H. A. Jones, Secretary for Labour.

7. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Charges

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Will he please lay on the Table of the House the full details of the changes in Department of Agriculture charges covered by his answers to my question 23, 15th March, 1972 and which he only answered in a general way without details of the financial impact, etc.?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The information requested is submitted for tabling.

The reply was tabled.

8. EDUCATION

High Schools; Disciplinary Committee

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was it correctly reported in the *Sunday Independent* of 6th February, 1972 that a special schools' disciplinary committee formed to attack deteriorating standards of discipline in high schools has held its first meeting?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what are the terms of reference of this committee;
 - (b) who are its members;
 - (c) to whom has the committee to report;
 - (d) when is the report to be expected;
 - (e) will he publish the report and/or Table it?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) (i) To determine the nature and extent of disciplinary problems occurring in Government secondary schools in this State.
- (ii) To ascertain the basic causes of these.
- (iii) To recommend appropriate remedial measures.
- (b) Education Department—

Mr. H. W. Dettman (Chairman).

Mr. J. H. Barton.
Mr. H. Loudon.
Dr. D. Mossenson.
Mr. C. Fitzpatrick.
Dr. A. N. Stewart (Secretary).

Teachers' Union—

Mr. F. R. Evans.
Mr. J. Nolan.
Mr. W. Streat.
Mrs. J. Wheeldon.
Mr. R. Darragh.

Principals' Association—

Mr. A. Jones.
Mr. G. Watkins.

Parents and Citizens' Federation—

Mr. H. P. Jensen.
Mr. K. Lockhart.

Principal Mistresses' Association—

Miss J. Goodram.
- (c) To the Minister for Education.
- (d) It is hoped to have it completed by June, 1972.
- (e) No decision has yet been made.

9. WEMBLEY SCHOOL

Resumptions for Extensions

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are there any actions at present or any plans for the next few years for resuming properties around Rutter Park in Jersey or Alexander Streets, Wembley, or in the vicinity of these streets for extensions of the Wembley primary school or any other purposes?
- (2) Are there any plans to use Rutter Park itself for such purposes?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) In view of the possible future widening of Grantham Street, the Education Department has acquired properties in the vicinity mentioned and is desirous of acquiring further properties in the area for the purpose of extending the Wembley primary school site. No question of resumption is envisaged but property owners have been asked if they would give the Education Department the option of first refusal if they wish to sell.
- (2) Present plans do not envisage the use of Rutter Park for such purposes.

10.

HOUSING

Tenants' Costs

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) With reference to his letter dated 9th March, 1972 stating that a study group was set up to examine several aspects of the total cost of housing to tenants in State Housing Commission areas, including gas costs, has the group completed their study?
- (2) If so, what are their findings, suggestions and/or recommendations?
- (3) What action is to be taken, and when?
- (4) If (1) is "No" will he make the report available to the House and also convey to the House the answers to (2) and (3) when making the report available?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) No. Some members of the study group have also been engaged on planning and development programmes necessary to ensure continuity of employment and production. This has caused some delay.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).
- (4) As soon as the report has been completed, the Member will be advised.

11. **TEACHERS***Salaries: Union Deductions*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) During the last 12 months how much money has been deducted by the Education Department from teachers' salaries on behalf of the teachers union?
- (2) How much has the Government received in commission?
- (3) What amount has been deducted for—
 - (a) union fees;
 - (b) levies?
- (4) What was the purpose of the levy?
- (5) What number of teachers—
 - (a) have fees and/or levies deducted;
 - (b) do not have fees and/or levies deducted?
- (6) Do students of training colleges have union fees deducted; if so, how much per member?
- (7) What authorisation is given for the deduction to be made and by whom?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) \$314,000 (includes deductions of \$75,400 for credit union).
- (2) \$5,965.
- (3) (a) \$238,600.
(b) Nil.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) (a) 7,350.
(b) 1,319.
- (6) No.
- (7) The deductions are made in accordance with long-standing policy on procuration orders lodged by the teachers.

12. **KINDERGARTENS***Government Grants*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What are the details of the recent increased kindergarten teachers award?
- (2) Is the Government intending to adhere to the present formula for grants to the kindergarten association?
- (3) What increase in grant will result from the increased awards, and, if none, in which way will it vary?
- (4) Is the Government intending to increase the grant above the formula to enable some relief to contributory parents?
- (5) What additional assistance is the Government going to give kindergartens in terms of its election promises?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) The details are set out in "The Teachers' (Kindergarten) Award", which, with permission, I hereby table.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) An increase of \$203,452.
- (4) It is believed that the increased grant payable under the formula will enable the association to meet its additional obligations without imposing an undue burden on parents.
- (5) Increased assistance of the magnitude proposed will, I am sure, be welcomed by the association as evidence of the Government's sympathetic attitude to kindergartens.

The award was tabled.

13. **MIGRANTS***Number, and Countries of Origin*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Immigration:

How many migrants arrived in Western Australia during the last calendar year and from what countries?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The information sought cannot be given from the figures available. Western Australian statistics relating to assisted passage migrants include a number of generalised classifications which do not reveal the country of origin, for example, "refugee" and "special passage assisted programme". Commonwealth statistics are for 9 months to September, 1971 only and include Long Term arrivals (staying over 12 months) with Permanent arrivals.

A schedule setting out both sets of statistics, is submitted for tabling.

The schedule was tabled.

14. **ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES***Generating Plants: Percentage Consumption*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Electricity:

What was the annual percentage of power consumption of the State Electricity Commission generating plants for the years 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

12 months ended June—

	%
1968	6.8
1969	6.8
1970	6.7
1971	6.8

15. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Pumped Water Storage Scheme

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Having regard to the Premier's reply to my question and his reply during the last session, what progress has been made on the Booth proposals?
- (2) Who is making the inquiries and when can the report be expected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) and (2) The Consultants have advised the State Electricity Commission as follows:—

"From the results of the present study, I am of the opinion that a pumped storage scheme operated in conjunction with the system of the State Electricity Commission of Western Australia during the next 10 to 15 years is unlikely to be economical and that its chances of showing a margin of economy sufficient to justify its adoption are very small."

16. ESTIMATES

Contribution to State Development Fund

Mr. COURT, to the Treasurer:

With reference to item No. 152, Contribution to State Development Fund \$950,000 (Division 26—Miscellaneous Services) of 1971-72 Estimates, how is the \$950,000 to be applied?

(This question follows the suggestion from the Hon. Attorney-General during the debate on part 4 of the Estimates, 9th December, 1971.)

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

The contribution of \$950,000 has been allocated as follows:—

	\$
South Hedland High School	171,000
Police Station	29,000
High school hostel	150,000
Dredging mooring area Port Hedland	300,000
Housing for Harbour and Light employees	100,000
Air-conditioning of houses for Government employees in northern area	100,000
Miscellaneous works	100,000

17. ESTIMATES

St. John Ambulance Association

Mr. COURT, to the Treasurer:

- (1) With reference to Item 111 St. John Ambulance Association \$275,000 (Division 26—Miscellaneous Services) 1971-72 Estimates, can he please advise whether any application for an increase in the amount of assistance is currently before the Government and in particular applications from some of the sub-centres like Port Hedland, etc., where they have special problems due to the high road accident incidence and the long mileage involved?
- (2) If so, could he give an indication as to the possible outcome of these requests?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) and (2) An application for an increased grant to the St. John Ambulance Association was submitted towards the end of 1971. The Association was advised that a decision would be made on their request in April, 1972, in the light of operating results to the end of March and based on a revised budget for the financial year. The association agreed to supply the information requested.

Provision is made in the grant to the Association for the operating deficiencies of needy sub-centres and grants are not made direct to sub-centres.

18.

STATE FINANCE

Allocations for Education

Mr. COURT, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What amounts have been allocated by the Government for education purposes following receipt of advice of additional moneys from the Commonwealth Government for general and unemployment relief purposes since the State's 1971-72 Loan and General Revenue Estimates were presented to Parliament?
- (2) What proportion does this represent of the total amount of such additional money?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) \$735,499.
- (2) 13.1%, excluding \$1.7 million special budgetary assistance provided on account of the State's prospective deficit.

19. MUNICH BUSES

Exhaust Fumes: Reduced Pollution

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware of the recently introduced Munich buses manufactured by the M.A.N. company and which are claimed to produce "virtually no harmful exhaust fumes"?
- (2) If so, will he advise the House whether there are features superior to other known developments in reducing pollution from motor vehicles?
- (3) If not, will he make inquiries and advise the result?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Minister for Transport is unaware of the M.A.N. type of buses used in Munich but assumes that the same principle exists as with General Motors Corporation in America of which he is aware.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The Chairman of the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust has reported fully on the General Motors Corporation buses in America. All details are contained in pages 28-29 of his report to the Minister for Transport following his recent overseas study on passenger transport. The Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust has recently decided to specify compliance with British Standard AU 141 (a) for all diesel bus engines purchased in the future and is the first major bus undertaking to do so. The standard referred to demands an exceptionally low smoke level. The chairman's report is available and with permission is herewith Tabled.

The report was tabled.

20. EDUCATION

Busselton Primary and High Schools

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has construction commenced on the building of a canteen at Busselton high school?
- (2) When is it anticipated it will be ready for use?
- (3) When is it expected that buildings will be available for use at the Busselton primary school for use by the guidance branch of the department?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The contract completion date is the 23rd May, 1972.
- (3) Completion by late October 1972 is anticipated.

21. *This question was postponed.*

22. HOUSING

Occupancy: Changes and Rentals

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State Housing Commission homes have changed hands since 30th June, 1971?
- (2) Has the rental been increased to new occupants?
- (3) If so, by what amount?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) 1,483.
- (2) In accordance with long standing policy vacated dwellings are relet at a re-assessed rent based on updated cost factors. The rents of 1,141 (one thousand, one hundred and forty one) tenancies were accordingly increased prior to being relet. The dwellings not charged an increased rent were either near new and accordingly charged the existing rent, or vacated after short-term occupancy, or were at towns specifically exempted from rental re-assessment—e.g., Collie and Wittenoom, because of the large number of vacancies.
- (3) The total amount of rental increases was \$3,100.30 weekly.

23. KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL
Additions

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that additions to Kalamunda High School—scheduled to be completed by 20th March, 1972, are not yet available to the school?
- (2) When it was known on 21st May, 1971 that these additions were required, will he say why it took so long to commission an architect and let a contract for the project?
- (3) Why was there no special action taken to speed up construction when it was brought to his notice nine weeks ago that the contractor would not complete the work on time?
- (4) Will he, in association with the Minister for Works, table copies of letters from the architect responsible for this project that gave rise to his advising this

House as he did in answer to question 40 on Wednesday, 24th November, 1971, that the contract was running to time?

- (5) Is it not a fact that the only advice given by the private architect on the question of completion was that the job would be late?
- (6) Why were demountable classrooms not provided, as was promised by the Minister for Education, in answer to question 40 on Wednesday, 18th August, 1971?
- (7) Does he consider adequate the present arrangement of three classes being conducted in two auditoriums (main hall and supper room) of the Kalamunda shire hall?
- (8) Is it fair that students of the school should have to move furniture into and out of the hall because of the use of the venue by other organisations?
- (9) Is there any substance in a rumour that teachers at the school are reluctant to teach in the hall?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No delay occurred. An architect was commissioned on the 24th June, 1971, Commonwealth approval of the detailed programme was given on the 28th June, 1971, and a contract let on the 20th October, 1971.
- (3) Special action was taken by the private architect and the Public Works Department.
- (4) No letter is available with regard to the question answered on 24th November, 1971, as the architect was contacted by telephone. At that time, only a month after the contract was let, the work was running to time.
- (5) The architect advised the Public Works Department by letter on the 7th January, 1972, that there could be some doubt that the contract completion date would be met.

On the 14th February, 1972, the architect definitely advised that the contract would not be completed by the due date.

- (6) Initially four additional demountable classrooms were to be provided for the commencement of the 1972 school year. However, following discussions with the principal and a re-assessment of probable enrolments, it was decided to provide two further demountables, making six in all.
- (7) The present situation is not considered satisfactory. However, when a deputation from the Kalamunda Parents & Citizens' Association met the Director-General

of Education last year to request the upgrading of the high school they were warned that building extensions would not be available for the opening of the 1972 school year. They gladly accepted the department's offer to upgrade the school in the full knowledge that it would be necessary to make temporary accommodation arrangements in the new year.

- (8) Since the parents assured the Director-General of their willingness to co-operate in overcoming any inconvenience resulting from the decision to upgrade the school, a similar co-operation by the students does not seem unreasonable.
- (9) The department has had no official notification of this.

24.

TOWN PLANNING

Corridor Plan: Ritter Report

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) What was the total cost to the Government of the Ritter report?
- (2) What was the cost of printing the report?
- (3) What amount was paid to other consultants in connection with the report?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) and (2)—
 - (a) Mr. Ritter was paid a fee of \$4,000.
 - (b) Further provision was made for payments to him of up to \$1,000 to cover the cost of preparing material for his report and, of this, \$750 has been paid to him.
 - (c) Printing of the report cost \$4,900 which it is anticipated will be covered by sales of the document.
- (3) Nil.

QUESTIONS (12): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. SCHOOL OF VETERINARY SCIENCE

Establishment

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does he agree that the establishment of a veterinary school in Western Australia within the next three to four years is most important?
- (2) Does he agree with the Minister for Education that, because of shortage of funds of other States, Western Australia does not risk losing the fourth Australian veterinary school in this State?

- (3) Would he agree that, if the opportunity to secure the veterinary school was given to other States, it would be accepted without hesitation?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the notice he gave me of these questions. I would like to assure him that—

- (1) I recognise the value to Western Australia of such a school.
- (2) My colleague, the Minister for Education, would be better able to answer this question, as he was present at the last Premiers' Conference in February when he discussed the matter of funds with other Ministers.
- (3) I have no actual knowledge about how the other States would react in this matter. I have no doubt they would press claims. I also feel that certain financial restrictions would apply equally to the other States as to this State.

2. POULTRY FARMING

Licensed Hens: Reduction

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Adverting to my previous question without notice on the 15th March, 1972, related to his review of hen quotas—

- (1) What are the details of his decision?
- (2) If no decision has been made in terms of his last advised intention, when will he make his decision known?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) At the earliest possible opportunity.

3. PUBLIC TRUST OFFICE

Administration, Commissions, and Income

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) What was the cost of the administration of the office of the Public Trustee for the years ended the 30th June, 1966, to the 30th June, 1971, inclusive?
- (2) What were the total commissions and fees earned during each of those years by the office?
- (3) What income was derived by the Public Trustee's Common Fund during those years?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the member for Wembley for sufficient notice of his question as to enable me to obtain the answers, which are completely statistical in form. However, I will read them out. They are as follows:—

(1)	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
	233,703	250,576	320,866	372,113	434,708	526,749
(2)	183,717	101,343	225,081	270,517	336,536	364,279
(3)	208,933	326,526	394,436	448,422	528,809	648,405

4. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN BARLEY MARKETING BOARD

Appointment of Members

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House the file dealing with the appointment of members to the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question. The relative file is submitted for tabling until the end of this sitting week.

The file was tabled for one sitting week.

5. METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING AUTHORITY

Membership and Reappointments

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Town Planning:

When is Executive Council expected to consider new appointments and reappointments to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority? I would mention that this question arises from question 11 on the 23rd March.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The 7th April next.

6. THOMAS STREET AND WINTHROP AVENUE

Median Strips

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Works:

With regard to question 2 on today's notice paper, and the Minister's answer to it, will he request the Commissioner of Main Roads to ascertain from the Perth City Council and the Subiaco City Council whether indeed an improvement plan for Winthrop Avenue and Thomas Street has been prepared, and whether it is intended to implement any plan with regard to the improvement of the median strips?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I will undertake to do that for the benefit of the member for Cottesloe.

7. NATURAL GAS CONVERSION CONTRACTORS

Strike

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) As a result of the striking gas conversion contractors, does the Minister realise the gravity of the situation in 400 homes in Subiaco, especially to—
 - (a) mothers of young children; and
 - (b) elderly people who, by dint of habit, do not remember not to use these partly converted appliances, hence the risk of explosion and asphyxiation?
- (2) What safeguards will the Minister take in the future to avoid a recurrence of a similar situation?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Any and every possible safeguard that would be appropriate to a future situation would be undertaken.

8. KINDERGARTENS

Government Grant

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Referring to the answer to question 12 on today's notice paper, does this mean the Government has not made any increase in the grant to the Kindergarten Association above the Brand Government's formula of grants?
- (2) What additional help is the Government intending to give to the kindergartens in terms of its election promise?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The honourable member asks whether the Government has, in fact, adhered to the formula. If he is aware of the formula he will know that it provided for payment to be made according to the maximum salary which, I understand, in respect of the last operation of the formula, applied to that level of salary appertaining to a teacher of eight years' experience.

The new award makes reference to 12 years' experience and the Government has, in fact, adhered to the application of the formula in regard to the salary range of

a teacher with 12 years' teaching experience; and this has resulted in the additional amount which I gave in my answer. This is \$91,000 more than the amount that would have been allocated if the formula had been applied on the eight years' experience range to which reference has been made.

9. VINCENT JAMES VILLANI

Murder Conviction

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

Will the Minister ask the Chief Secretary to advise me whether it is true that Vincent James Villani, who was recently convicted of murder, was at the time of the crime an escapee from Karnet and had been at large for a period of about six weeks before the crime was committed?

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable member given notice of this question?

Mr. THOMPSON: No.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member to put the question on the notice paper.

Mr. THOMPSON: This is a question without notice.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: You are asking it of a Minister in another place.

Mr. THOMPSON: The question is asked of the Minister representing the Chief Secretary. It requires only a "Yes" or "No" answer.

10. STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENTS) ACT

Ear Tags and Marks

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to question 37 of Thursday last regarding the placement of ear tags, would the Minister have published in the *Journal of Agriculture* a correction of the statement made by Dr. Gardiner and point out that the ear tag should be placed on the ear opposite to the one with the ear mark?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I am happy to give the member for Roe this undertaking, and to assure him that the matter will be sorted out legislatively as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Statement by Speaker

The SPEAKER: I will take two more questions without notice.

11. STATE FINANCE

Allocations for Education

Mr. COURT, to the Treasurer:

In respect of the answer given to part (1) of question 18 on today's notice paper, the Minister gave the amount as \$735,499. I do not expect him to have the answer to what I am about to ask, but I would like him to have the information available tomorrow. What proportion of this \$735,499 was allocated for capital works for education, and also what were the sources from which each of the capital and revenue allocations was made?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

I will undertake to obtain the information sought by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition if he will supply me with a copy of the question.

12. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Vessels: Acquisitions and Sales

Mr. JAMIESON (Minister for Works): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition sought further information on question 10 of Thursday last, which information I undertook to obtain for him. The Minister for Transport advises as follows:—

During the 12 months prior to December, 1970, the State Shipping Service had been trying to obtain suitable unit-load type vessels on bareboat charter as an interim replacement pending the delivery of the L.A.S.H. vessels.

It became apparent that bareboat charter of overseas vessels was almost impossible and since all available capital funds were committed to the L.A.S.H. project, the alternative of purchasing berthing ships could not be considered.

Short details of the vessels *Parthia* and *Media* were first noted on the brokers' lists in November, 1970, and management decided in December, 1970, to obtain further information and general arrangement plans to enable more accurate assessment as to whether the vessels could be suitably adapted to the north-west and Darwin trade. The Minister for Transport at that time knew of the commission's interest in these vessels and approved of the action to seek further details.

The additional information, ultimately received, indicated to management that the vessels would, with modifications, be suitable to the north-west trade, but they were definitely not available on charter.

Management commenced preliminary negotiation with Cunard on the 4th March, 1971, to indicate interest in these two vessels pending receipt of all L.A.S.H. tenders expected by the 10th March, 1971.

The Minister for Transport was advised on the 12th March, 1971, that the commission could not recommend any of the tenders owing to the extremely high capital cost of the vessels.

On the 14th April following inspection of the vessels and estimated costs of modifications, the Cabinet approved the recommendation to negotiate firmly for the two vessels.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE
OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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

TRANSFER OF LAND ACT
AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [5.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As has been indicated, the Bill proposes to amend the Transfer of Land Act, 1893-1969. It deals with four matters which are considered desirable to improve the functioning of the Land Titles Office.

The appointment of a deputy commissioner of titles is long overdue. It is the general practice when creating new statutory offices to make provision for a deputy who is empowered to act during the absence of the officer or during a vacancy in the office.

No such provision exists in respect of the Commissioner of Titles. Whilst the present organisation has operated satisfactorily, there have been occasions when, owing to the sudden illness of the commissioner, it has been necessary to wait some time for a meeting of Executive Council to appoint an acting commissioner. In the interim there has been no officer empowered to carry out the statutory functions of the office. Such a position is undesirable, and for this reason alone the creation of an office of deputy commissioner is warranted. In addition, the

increase in registrations requires that the commissioner should have power to delegate some of his functions so that clients of the office will not be unduly delayed in having their business completed.

A recent study of the Property Law Act of New Zealand disclosed provisions for the removal of easements which the Commissioner of Titles considered could be adopted with advantage in this State. Therefore, it is proposed to enlarge section 129C of the Transfer of Land Act to cover easements as well as restrictive covenants. It is considered there will be no longer delay if the matter is dealt with by the court than if notices were sent by the Office of Titles and time given to the persons affected to consider their position.

The study also emphasised another unsatisfactory feature of our Act which should be rectified. This refers to section 229A, providing a method of getting rid of easements that have not been used or enjoyed for a period of not less than 20 years. As the section now stands, it is necessary to prove not only nonuser for this period but also abandonment. Abandonment, being a question of intention, is hard to prove. For this reason it is proposed to adopt a provision similar to that in the Victorian Transfer of Land Act, that nonuser for 20 years shall constitute sufficient evidence of abandonment.

Attention has been directed to the need to enable forms to be prescribed or altered by regulation. At present some forms prescribed by schedules to the Act may be altered by regulation, but this procedure is considered unsatisfactory. Nowadays forms are usually prescribed by regulation, which enables alterations to be readily made to suit changing conditions. An amendment therefore is proposed to enable all forms to be prescribed by regulations.

These small amendments are recommended for favourable consideration.

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

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [5.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Presbyterian Church of Australia Act, 1970, was introduced at the request of the then Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Western Australia to give effect to proposals for a new constitution governing the church in Australia. The Bill was introduced in another place by the then Minister for Mines and Leader of the Government in that other legislative Chamber.

Advice has subsequently been received from the present moderator that their Federal committee in Melbourne has drawn attention to the need for certain minor amendments to the Act. An examination of the provisions of the Bill will surely convince members that these are in fact quite minor and are indeed of a machinery nature.

It has been the practice for legislation of this type to be introduced by a Minister of the Crown. I am therefore pleased to introduce the Bill on behalf of the church, and I commend it to the House.

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd March, on the following motion by Mr. Brown:—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to:—

May it please Your Excellency: We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. SEWELL (Geraldton) [5.17 p.m.]: First of all I wish to make some comments concerning territory outside the Geraldton electorate; that is, the area from the Irwin River to the Moore River, which is, of course, in the electorates of Greenough and Moore represented by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Moore respectively. Anyone who has known this area for a number of years and has had the opportunity to fly over it could not help but be impressed with the progress made in the last 10 to 20 years.

For many years this land was avoided by farmers because it consists mainly of scrub plain country and the prospects for the growing of cereals were not very bright. However, credit must be given those who have taken up the land and who are growing cereals and, particularly, meat and wool. This area, bounded by the coast on the one side and the Midland railway on the other, will in years to come be one of the principal areas in Western Australia for the production of meat. We know that the export prospects for meat at the moment are very good. The area between the Murchison River and the Moore River has become increasingly important in the growing of all cereals—wheat, barley, and oats—and small seeds for the production of oil.

We have all been pleased that in the last year or so the only known gasfield in Western Australia has been discovered in the area—and also oil—and has been utilised in the metropolitan area. We also know that the mineral sands at Eneabba, which is only some 90 miles from Geraldton, will be mined. All this progress will result in more grist to the Geraldton mill, so to speak.

In addition, it has been indicated that good coking coal is to be found in the area surrounding Eneabba and Gingin. If all these new products can be taken to Geraldton for export, not only will the area benefit but also the State generally, particularly if the necessary ancillary industries, such as abattoirs, are established.

I think I have mentioned before in this House that I consider the Greenough electorate one of the wealthiest in Western Australia because it contains almost everything, even gold, to a lesser degree, on the Murchison boundary. It has lead and zinc also—and progress is being made in Northampton in regard to zinc—and is well known for its wheat, wool, and pastures. In addition, natural gas as well as oil has been found. Whether the oil is utilised remains to be seen. We must not forget, of course, the mineral sands at Eneabba. Because of all this production, Geraldton has a very bright future, particularly in view of the fact that a Labor Government is in office as it is committed to decentralisation and therefore there is a chance that the products of this area will go through the Port of Geraldton.

The next item with which I wish to deal is one of great importance; that is, the provision of a new high school in Geraldton. An excellent site has been obtained although it seems rather ironical that, because of the recent redistribution of boundaries, the new high school will be in the electorate of Greenough. I interpolate here to say that, in view of the present trend, it may not be many years before the member for Greenough is also the member for Geraldton. Because of the increase in the population, the boundaries are being extended further north all the time and the electorate of the Leader of the Opposition is gradually encroaching on the Geraldton electorate.

Mr. Lapham: Are you going to engulf him?

Mr. SEWELL: I do not know about that.

Sir David Brand: We get along very well together.

Mr. SEWELL: At present the member for Greenough is very well off in his district. This only proves what I have said over the years; that is, that with its growth in population and production Geraldton is progressing.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will quote portion of a letter from the Geraldton High School Parents and Citizens' Association, dealing with its views on the school, which views are shared by everyone in Geraldton and the area I mentioned previously. The letter reads—

We are gravely concerned about the future of the Geraldton Senior High School. The school building has been extended many times since the original building was opened in 1939. The main building can be extended no further and the existing classrooms cannot accommodate future increases in the student population. In 1971 the school population reached 1208 and in 1972 a population of 1270 is being planned for. Because the existing classrooms cannot possibly accommodate the extra students in 1972, the Principal has had to apply to the Education Department for two demountable classrooms to be placed somewhere in the grounds.

The figure of 1,270 has already been exceeded, and next year the number will be higher again. To proceed—

The Geraldton High School P. & C. Association is alarmed at the thought of demountable classrooms being imposed on the school. Already there are four "temporary" prefabricated buildings which have been with the school for 20 years. Also, the actual location of a demountable classroom will pose a problem because the school site is built out.

The P. & C. Association is also alarmed at the consequential effect of increases upon the specialist facilities within the school. The specialist buildings e.g. Science block, Manual Arts centre, Home Economics centre and Commonwealth Library are fully used by the present school population. Further increases will certainly overstrain all these specialist facilities. Unless action is taken to arrest the growth of the Geraldton Senior High School it is obvious that these specialist facilities will become inadequate.

I agree with the view expressed in that letter and I would not like any more buildings placed on the present site. The high school was planned originally by Mr. Clare, a former principal architect in Western Australia, and it is a credit to him and also to those who have been responsible for the additions over the years. It would be a shame if the area were ruined by further additions, and so I draw the attention of the Minister for Education to the importance of this school and the urgent necessity to establish another high school on the site already acquired.

The SPEAKER: There is too much talking.

MR. SEWELL: Another subject concerning education is the provision of a full technical school. The present technical school has been operating for several years and is achieving a great deal, but apprentices must now be sent to Perth to complete their training. The department has given an assurance that the land is available and all it awaits is the finance to provide a full technical school. The establishment of a new high school and a full technical school is an urgent necessity in Geraldton.

Another is the provision of a home for the frail aged. This matter is under the surveillance of a committee in the area and we know it is the "in-thing" right throughout Australia to establish these homes. The Commonwealth Government does help considerably with finance, but to save a certain amount of expense—and I have mentioned this before on several occasions—a new regional gaol should be established and then the present gaol, which was the old Victoria Districts Hospital, could be utilised for this purpose. The present gaol is a very substantial building and has served a very good purpose as a gaol, although some criticism has been levelled at the attitude to its prisoners.

I want to say here and now that I have nothing but praise for those in charge of the gaol in Geraldton, and the way they handle the prisoners who have, in some minor way, offended against our society. I am not talking about the hardened criminals but the lesser ones. Some of them could not even read or write when they entered the gaol, but they have been given lessons and some have even been taught carpentry and have left the gaol much better men—and youths—than when they entered. They had no chance before, and so I thought I would mention the matter because those in authority are doing a good job.

I would like the Minister in charge of the building of new gaols to indicate when it is intended a new regional gaol will be built in Geraldton. A good site has been set aside on the Chapman River, and as soon as the new prison is established, the present prison—the old Victoria Districts Hospital—could be set aside for a home for the frail aged. Whether or not this will be done I do not know.

Other matters which have been causing concern for a number of years include the deepening of the harbour and the provision of harbour facilities. Geraldton now has a harbour board which is doing a good job. I understand the board plans to do extensive work in the harbour this year. Probably this will take the form of providing another entrance, or making the existing entrance usable by undertaking considerable blasting operations. I understand a large sum of money will be necessary and, inevitably, funds from the Treasury will be needed to supplement what the board itself can raise.

We have seen some progress made since the harbour and port facilities were taken away from the control of the Railways Department. The facilities generally are very good, except for the shallowness of water in the entrance to the harbour. However, if money is available either this financial year or next we may see some progress made towards deepening the port.

Iron ore is a subject about which we have heard a great deal and, doubtless, will continue to hear a great deal in the future. People in Geraldton are pleased to know the Mines Department has extended the leases of what is known as Blue Hills, which is worked by the Western Mining Corporation. The company brings iron ore 40 miles from the present deposit so that it may be mixed with iron ore at Koolanooka. Apparently this gives the required mineral contents. In consequence of extending the leases, iron ore is still being exported through the Port of Geraldton.

This brings me back to the old problem of what will happen to the deposits at Wilgiemia, Weld Range, Mt. Bould and Talling Peak in the future. I have not been able to obtain a forthright statement from anyone on this matter. It is known that some worth-while companies are interested and, indeed, there is talk of the standard gauge railway being brought to Meekatharra and terminating at the coast, perhaps at Geraldton or north or south of Geraldton. The last I heard it was north of Geraldton.

The same applies to deposits of radium and nickel. Radium, of course, will not be used in any great quantities for some time to come. Perhaps the nickel at Mt. Keith and Wiluna will be mined first. However, we know these minerals are in the ground and future generations will reap the benefits when companies, at some future time, decide to mine the minerals which are to be found in this State.

The Geraldton power station was purchased by the State Electricity Commission which has indicated its intention of installing a gas turbine. I have forgotten the number of kilowatts involved, but the point is that it is quite a big turbine. I think the State Electricity Commission is to be congratulated on the foresight it is showing. Quite apart from the town of Geraldton, the area from Greenough through to Mullewa must go ahead in the years to come. I have already mentioned some of the minerals which are to be found in that area and it is only a matter of establishing markets. For these reasons, I repeat that the S.E.C. has shown good judgment in planning to install the turbine. As a matter of fact it is ready for installation at the moment.

Certainly a teachers' training college should be built in Geraldton and I only hope it will not be many years before this is done.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. SEWELL: As I understand it, there are already five teachers' colleges in Perth training some 3,000 teachers. During the next 10 years this number must be doubled to cover increased population and the up-grading of classes. At the present time 26 per cent. of student teachers are from the country. There is no doubt that this proportion will continue and could increase as teacher training is probably the major opening available to country students in that payment is made during training and some accommodation is available, thus enabling country students to complete their training with minimum expense to their parents.

There would be a stable demand for the finished product and a stable inflow of students each year with a stable rate of expansion. As the demand is regulated by a statutory body the number of places available in both city and country simply cater for that demand of, say, 3,000 city places and 1,000 country places to handle the 4,000 teachers required.

The college would be relatively inexpensive to build as most subjects do not require extensive laboratories. A basic requirement would be a library and, also, a language workshop. A plan could be drawn up that allowed for the building to be carried out in stages, and certainly provision of the basic buildings could be spread over the three years of the course and expanded as required thereafter.

I would endorse thoroughly anything that is done to establish a teachers' college in Geraldton. I cannot see why one should not be established. Many young people from Geraldton and Greenough—the area represented by the Leader of the Opposition—as well as from other parts of the country come to Perth to train at the teachers' colleges and then go out as teachers. My ambition is to see Geraldton become a centre of education and culture in the near future. I cannot think of a better place than Geraldton outside of the metropolitan area at which a start should be made. I sincerely hope a start will be made and a teachers' college established there. The primary school and high school seem to be well staffed and are well looked after. In addition there is St. Patrick's, Christian Brothers, and the Stella Maris College of the Presentation Nuns, which would be a credit to any community. Last year a couple of hundred thousand dollars were spent on extensions to that college. For all these reasons it seems Geraldton would make an ideal centre for education and culture.

I have brought these matters to the attention of members and the various Ministers, but I wish to say that I consider Geraldton has been quite fortunate. Some time ago the people were a little depressed

because the demand for wool had fallen away and wheat quotas had been imposed. However, the fishing industry is one that has been very beneficial to the area. It is most important to the towns of Geraldton and Dongara where we may see many fishing boats—including rock lobster boats as they are termed nowadays—tied up. They are earning much needed dollars for Western Australia. Credit should be paid to the Fishermen's Association and those connected with it for the way they have guarded the industry as well as they could.

I repeat my claim that we are most fortunate in Geraldton where the climatic conditions are good and the attitude generally has picked up now that the price of wool has become more stable and the people are no longer afraid that no-one will want wool. The Geraldton Town Council, like all town councils I know of, comes under criticism because of increased rates, etc. However, I think it does an excellent job. The townspeople generally seem happy, optimistic, and are solid in their attitude towards Geraldton as a town. I cannot see any reason for anybody to decry Geraldton, the country generally, or the Government. Progress is achieved only with harmony; if people start squabbling amongst themselves they get nowhere at all.

I wish to thank those people who assist the progress of the town and district in their own small way. I think no complaints at all could be made against the local radio station and newspapers. Again, I repeat my opinion that Geraldton has an extremely bright future for many reasons, including the mineral wealth in the area and the fruit production.

MR. COYNE (Murchison-Eyre) [5.40 p.m.]: In speaking to the Address-in-Reply I shall refer to a number of subjects concerned with the area I represent. To begin with, I shall mention the matter of electricity charges in country areas. I was interested to listen to the member for Blackwood, although he spoke on a different angle in that he complained about higher charges for industry. I want to take up the case of electricity charges on behalf of housewives in the Murchison and the eastern goldfields districts because I consider they are at a serious disadvantage.

Charges in towns like Yalgoo and Mee-katharra—and to some extent Mt. Magnet—are quite prohibitive. When I visited the area last weekend I made a few inquiries in connection with the charges which affect a normal householder. I tried to locate someone in the town using appliances which are normally used in the metropolitan area, including air-conditioning. I was able to find only one person in the whole of the town who had an air-conditioner. Several had water coolers which are much more economical in their

consumption of electricity. The majority of people use only the electric light, radio, and electric vacuum cleaners. People find the cost of using electric kettles and toasters is too prohibitive. Wood or Klean-heat gas is the normal method of heating and, usually, wood or some other fuel is used for hot water systems. On average, people pay between \$12 and \$18 a month for electricity charges, which is more than three times the amount I would pay in Perth. They pay these high rates notwithstanding the fact that they are without the benefits of extra amenities such as electric kettles and jugs.

Many members have complained about the conditions in this Chamber on opening day due to the heat at this time of the year. We all complained at having to wear coats in the Chamber. We must remember that this Chamber has a high ceiling and we are provided with several fans, but people in outback areas do not have any of these amenities—even fans are uncommon.

Mr. O'Connor: Surely you do not want to take your coat off today?

Mr. COYNE: No, and I am pleased about that. I notice four fans in the Chamber which we will probably start to use again next March.

Mr. Jamieson: There are three above us, as well.

Mr. COYNE: Cheaper power is the only answer to the problem in those outback towns. The rate generally struck by shires is approximately 18c a unit. No distinction is drawn between power and light with the result that anybody using power pays the same rate all the way through. I was talking to the proprietor of the Yalgoo Hotel who told me that his electricity charges were \$3,700 over the last 12 months. I understand, too, that Mrs. Willis's store paid \$2,400 for the full year. Members will see that charges like these reflect back on the travelling public. The Yalgoo Hotel also operates three motel units which are fitted with air-conditioners with 1½-horsepower motors. They are paid for on the basis of a coin in the slot. I think Mr. Sabbadini said that an air-conditioner would run for 12 hours at a cost of \$4.80. People passing through the town would use air-conditioners for a minimum period of 12 hours, but sometimes in the summer-time the units would run all night.

The promises made by the Brand Government regarding these charges were very realistic. I do not remember the promises exactly now, but I do know the electricity charges for country consumers were to be fairly heavily subsidised. If the charges were subsidised the high electricity costs would not be passed on and the cost of living in these areas could be brought down considerably.

Mr. Jamieson: Most of these local authority power plants are now heavily subsidised.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, they are already heavily subsidised. I do not know how this problem can be overcome.

Last week I saw a notice in the *Geraldton-Greenough Sun* relating to water charges in the town of Cue. The revenue from the water supplied in this town was \$2,200, but the cost of supplying the water was \$11,000 or \$12,000. From my inquiries I found out that the difference is borne by the Public Works Department.

The same situation applies in Meekatharra. Water is a necessity, but surely electricity is a necessity also and consideration could be given to a similar system. Perhaps the metropolitan area could subsidise the country areas.

Mr. Jamieson: When I was Minister for Electricity the metropolitan area was already subsidising by more than \$12 each connection in the country.

Mr. Reid: The honourable member is making the point that there is a big difference between 2.3c and 18c per unit.

Mr. COYNE: Country people cannot afford to buy many electrical appliances; they use only the bare necessities, and even low wattage globes in an effort to effect economies. These people deserve more consideration.

Perhaps the State Electricity Commission could take control of these areas and subsidise the fees charged in the same way as the Public Works Department subsidises water charges.

I would like to mention another matter, and that is the water supply at Yalgoo. When I visited this area eight or nine months ago the railway dam was practically dry, and there was no public stand to augment the town's water supply.

For many years Yalgoo has had no permanent water supply. The residents depend on their own bores and windmills. During the past 12 months the water table has dropped by seven to 12 feet. Most of the residents have deepened their wells and lengthened the pipes to restore the water supply. However, the hotelkeeper was not able to do this. He spent about \$1,500 to upgrade his two wells—one to supply the motel and one to supply the hotel. He uses 3,000 gallons of water a day but his bores return only about 1,600 gallons. This means that every day he is 1,200 or 1,400 gallons short. This water is supplied by the council and pumped from a bore at the bottom of the railway dam. This bore was only recently installed and the residents think it is supplying underground water. It is pumped up to a service tank which was used for watering of locomotives in the early days.

This pump is controlled by the Public Works Department and an understanding was reached with W.A.G.R. that the water can be used only if water is supplied to railway employees. The water from the

tank is reticulated to the railway cottages. Other residents who desire water are supplied by the council at a cost of \$20 for 1,600 gallons. Members can imagine how expensive this can be. There seems to be no easy solution of this problem because of the extended drought conditions.

Another source of water for Yalgoo comes from an old goldmine which was subsequently taken over by the State battery and latterly by the Public Works Department. In recent years a windmill was added and a standpipe erected on the site. I understand there is about 200 feet of water in this shaft. At present it is reticulated to the school, the police station, and the post office. It has been suggested that the Public Works Department or the council could erect a big tank and a standpipe. People who needed the water could connect with this installation or cart their own water.

Some investigation of the quality of the water in the town has been carried out by the Public Works Department, and it was found that it has a high saline content. Towards the south of the town the mineral content is up to 1,600 parts per million, whereas towards the north on the recreation site it is only 894 parts per million. This latter figure is acceptable, but 1,694 parts per million would not be acceptable.

Once this dam completely fills again the water supply will be sufficient until the next drought. It would be far too expensive to reticulate the whole town but I suggest that a long-term plan would be to blend the town water supply with the underground water supply to achieve an acceptable mineral level for all purposes. The corrosive action of the high-level mineral water destroys hot water systems and badly affects appliances such as washing machines. Cooling systems block up and many people do not buy appliances because of the high cost of repairs.

At the present moment there is a move by the Public Works Department to look at the Yalgoo water supply. We shall probably hear more of this in due course.

I would now like to talk about the town of Mt. Magnet. Mt. Magnet is dependent upon the Hill 50 goldmine. This goldmine has a very good record of production. It is one of the best goldmines in the whole of Western Australia. However, at the present time it is not making progress as it is not sufficiently productive to cover its running costs.

The goldmine lost about \$600,000 last year, although this was mainly attributable to its part in a nickel search. During my visit to the mine last week I had an opportunity to inspect the bottom levels as I was interested in the relationship of the internal shaft to the main shaft. The main shaft is at a maximum level of 3,000 feet—it cannot go any lower. For this

reason it was decided to sink an internal shaft. This internal shaft would have been winder operated, and a big area was carved out for the winder installations to haul the ore to that level. Due to the lack of finance this operation has been suspended. In lieu of this a winze has been sunk to a depth of 80 or 90 feet. The ore is taken along the drive and it goes up the winze on the kibble. From the kibble it is transferred into trucks. It is taken along the drive and pushed onto a grating called a grizzly, which sorts out the big rocks. The remainder goes into a chute and is then transported to trucks and thence to the surface. This seems to be a problem area because the company is only obtaining about 8 dwt. dirt, whereas to be a paying proposition 12 dwt. or 13 dwt. dirt is necessary. This is still a good mine and it is a pity that it is not progressing.

I can remember about 1958 an Industry (Advances) Act grant of \$200,000 was made to the Sons of Gwalia goldmine to keep it in operation. This grant was in addition to about \$450,000 previously advanced in long-term loans and was to enable further exploration in the hope of achieving stability in the mine as many of the residents of Leonora were dependent on it. These same conditions exist today at Mt. Magnet where the community is now well established. Is it possible to advance money to assist the development of this internal shaft because it is known that there is still gold in the lower levels and a long life ahead of Hill 50?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Do you know whether the company has in fact approached the Government?

Mr. COYNE: I am very pleased to hear that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I said, "Do you know whether the company has in fact approached the Government?"

Mr. COYNE: No, I do not. I bring this matter up because it is apparent that morale at Mt. Magnet is low at the moment. The workers and businessmen do not know what will happen in the future. If the price of gold does not rise these people will not be able to carry on. They have already waited several years.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We are waiting for your Federal counterparts to remove our anxiety.

Mr. COYNE: The Government did not wait for Federal approval to help the Sons of Gwalia mine. Why cannot this be treated similarly?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Has the company made an application to the Government?

Mr. COYNE: I would like to move now to the other side of my electorate and talk about the eastern goldfields area. This is acknowledged as one of the best wool-producing areas in Australia. It embraces the shires of Coolgardie, Boulder, Menzies,

Leonora, Laverton, Sandstone, and Wiluna. The pastoralists in the area have made a considerable contribution to the welfare and economy of this State and the area is well worth trying to save. The present drought is the worst for 80 years.

The people affected by these conditions appreciate the assistance already given by the Government in the form of relief of land rents and shire rates.

An interview with Mr. John Tonkin, who is the president of the eastern goldfields branch of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, was reported on the 21st March in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* as advocating that prescribed areas be declared disaster areas.

He said an approach had already been made to the Minister for Agriculture to gain some support for this move. It is hoped that this action will enable the pastoral industry to obtain part of a Commonwealth grant of \$1,000,000 in the form of long-term loans at low interest rates. This would allow the industry to recover and re-establish itself on a firmer footing. It is claimed that during the past five years, in the Eastern States, \$100,000,000 has been distributed in the form of drought relief, in many cases without the means test being applied. Is it not therefore reasonable to expect that consideration be given to this request?

It is felt that the Federal Government should make a grant for this "disaster area" as it has done in the Eastern States on occasions. I am not certain as to how this aid was given—whether it was in the form of drought relief, fodder relief, or assistance for the cartage of stock—but in giving an example of how the eastern goldfields area has deteriorated, I have some figures which reveal this depressing situation. These figures are as follows:—

Year	No. of Sheep	Rainfall (Points)	Cut per Head (lb.)
1968	616,000	1,081	11.0
1969	649,000	329	11.1
1970	501,000	379	11.8
1971	248,000	348	10.4

Conditions since June, 1971, have steadily worsened and stock numbers in this area at present would be something below 200,000 sheep.

Some pastoralists have put their stations on a "care and maintenance" basis and have found jobs elsewhere. They have been fortunate in being close to mining towns such as Mt. Keith and Agnew, and being able to obtain employment on graders and suchlike during the week and so work on their stations at the weekend. Their sheep numbers have decreased, but they are hoping that conditions will improve in the future.

Work is no longer available for Aboriginal stockmen in the area. Previously Aboriginal stockmen were readily employed on stations because they were useful and knew the country well. They were

proficient at riding motorcycles and could round up sheep better than a white man. It is a sad fact that these people are now congregating in the towns and have access to beer and other intoxicating liquor which makes their chance of rehabilitating themselves fairly remote even if the pastoral industry does get on its feet again. They have now reached the stage where they have no desire to return to their jobs and have left the area altogether.

Unfortunately these Aboriginals do not have the necessary qualifications to get jobs in the towns. They are not used to manual work. Some have found work on the roads and do quite a good job, but those who have been employed on pastoral stations are not geared to that kind of work and so they remain in the towns.

Some thunderstorms did reach the goldfields on the 2nd March and afforded relief from water carting to some properties. Other stations, however, missed the rain which was very scattered. Heavy rain is badly needed to break the drought, and when the drought does break restocking will need to be increased gradually to allow the country to regenerate. This restocking will have to be done over a period of years. If normal seasons follow, it may take up to four or five years for the pastoral stations to regain their usual stock numbers.

Pastoralists have been left with properties in which they have plenty of equity but no liquidity. They do not have the access to finance that they usually have, such as from stock firms. These firms have gradually drifted out of the picture. However, it does not seem that the pastoral industry has had much success with the rural reconstruction authorities, because leasehold properties do not receive much consideration. What the pastoralists need badly are some long-term loans at low interest rates.

Mr. Nalder: Do you know of any pastoralists who have been successful with rural reconstruction assistance?

Mr. COYNE: I have one man on my books who is operating in a small way and I think he will receive assistance. These people do not want any handouts; they merely want access to long-term loans over a period of 10 or 15 years. They want loans of something like \$25,000 or \$30,000. The fact that there are only about 50 or 60 stations that would require assistance means that the total sum would not amount to a great deal of money. I would point out that \$25,000 or \$30,000 is only what would be required to purchase an ordinary dwelling in the city.

I think this is an area that should be assisted because it plays a tremendous part in assisting decentralisation. It is fortunate that we have the Poseidon mine which will prove to be of tremendous benefit to the State when it gets off the ground,

which I am sure it will. Leonora is a jumping-off place for Agnew and Wiluna and I certainly would not like to see it go downhill.

I now wish to speak on the question of goats. Quite a large article appeared in the last issue of the *Geraldton-Greenough Sun* which reads as follows:—

Goat survey for Meekatharra

A new survey is to be conducted by the Agriculture Protection Board at Meekatharra based on the study of wild goats.

Big numbers have been noticed in the district.

To examine the situation, Regional Vermin Control Officer of the West Kimberleys, Mr. Frank Green, is being transferred to Meekatharra by the APB to take charge of this survey. He will be employing seven men to work over the northern areas from Meekatharra.

Mr. Green is expected to arrive in Meekatharra in the first week of April.

I have been to Yalgoo, Magnet, and Agnew during the weekend and as a result of social gatherings in those towns I was able to speak to some prominent pastoralists in the area on the subject of goats. It seems to me that all one has to do to obtain any information is to get into conversation with some of these pastoralists, because they know the area backwards. I spoke to Mr. Jack Morrissey and he could tell me exactly how many goats are in his area. The same applies to Colin Howden on the Murchison and Jimmy Price of Cue. All of these men could tell me how many goats were in their areas.

Therefore, what need is there to send this team of men to make a survey of the goats? Apparently the purpose of the survey is to put into effect some sort of poisoning programme so that the goats can be eradicated. I have not seen a report about this survey, but I understand this is what is intended. If this is so the people in the district are very concerned, because when a start is made to poison kangaroos, goats, or any other animal, many side effects are experienced. By this I mean that such a poisoning programme affects the fauna in the area, such as birds and many small animals. To me, poisoning seems to be a very crude way to eradicate goats.

The goats are actually eating out the country, and because now there is no market for goats the present situation has arisen. Apparently the market for goats has been affected by the decrease in the price of sheep, and the fact that the market price for high quality sheep was \$2.70. It now seems that a good quality sheep will fetch about \$4 on the export market, but pastoralists are of the opinion

it would be better to foster some sort of marketing plan for goats by endeavouring to export the goat meat to overseas markets. They feel, as I do, that it would be to greater advantage to spend the money that is being made available for research on sending a representative abroad to try to ascertain what sort of market can be found for goat meat. If this were done it would provide an industry which would profit towns in the area, particularly Geraldton, where abattoirs could be converted to cater for the slaughtering of goats.

Such an abattoir could specialise in the killing of goats. The Geraldton Port Authority wants to construct a freezer works at the port and if this were done the goat numbers could be built up until there were sufficient to ship to an overseas market. Inquiries have been made of the shipping companies to see whether they are prepared to ship goats but at present no company is interested.

In my opinion the production of goat meat should be fostered. Apparently this meat is not acceptable as pet food and at present the consensus of opinion seems to be to poison them. However, if an effort could be made for goats to be produced in some way for human consumption this would help to overcome the problem. Some people like goat meat, and if the goats were despatched to Geraldton they could be killed and stored at that centre awaiting shipment overseas. Like kangaroos they would be killed by shooters and this would help to reduce their numbers. I am sure such a shooting programme could continue for years because there are hundreds of thousands of goats on the Murchison. When it was permissible to shoot kangaroos for pet food it was found that their numbers decreased considerably, and the same could apply to goats.

I believe the slaughtering charges for goats are higher than for the killing of sheep, because the knives become blunt very quickly. Also, goats are harder to skin than sheep and such factors must create some difficulty in the killing of goats.

Sir David Brand: Even the newspapers make them tough.

Mr. COYNE: Apparently the market for live goats is not very good, so there would be greater opportunities offering for goat carcasses.

Mr. Reid: Are they fat or skinny?

Mr. COYNE: They are quite fat and when they are brought down to the metropolitan area they are in fairly good condition. Therefore I consider that such a proposal would help in the eradication of goats and by selling them on the export market it would establish an industry and provide the area with a profit.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. COYNE: I have another matter I would like to discuss, but it is fairly lengthy and I do not think I will have time to develop it. Accordingly I would like to conclude by saying that during my recent visit to the Murchison-Eyre electorate I met a number of pastoral people who expressed their great appreciation of the efforts being made and the co-operation shown by the Minister for Education.

I would like to endorse those sentiments, and I have mentioned this fact before, because I feel that had the Minister thought of entering a popular-boy contest at present, I am sure he would win hands down.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [7.32 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion and make my contribution to the debate. Before I proceed on a number of items, however, I would like to apologise to you, Sir, and bring before the notice of the House my reason for not having given in writing notice of the question I did ask without notice the other day on the wearing of coats in the House when the weather was hot.

Though you informed me, Mr. Speaker, that I should have given notice in writing, I hazard a guess that you had a fair idea I would ask the question, because only the day before I had indicated to you my feeling in the matter; and I take it from your preparedness and your answer to my question that you had given the matter quite a lot of thought.

I would point out that the following day I went for a stroll in the city. I entered a well-known bank and among all the officers present in that bank I saw only one man in uniform. All the others had taken their coats off; at least those in the section of the bank at which I had an opportunity to look.

I then moved down to a Government department and walked along the passageway. I found that all the people I met in this department—and this includes some of the officers sitting in their offices behind their tables—were not wearing their coats.

I travelled further down Hay Street and entered an air-conditioned store and met the manager of that store. He had taken his coat off as had the others who were serving in the store. I then went on to William Street and entered another store. I walked down the full length of the store, which included a number of sections for men, and in not one case did I see any of the people working in those sections wearing a coat.

I mention this because I feel it is indicative of the way the public feels at the moment, particularly as it relates to conditions which might be extreme and uncomfortable.

Although I am disappointed with your ruling, Sir, I feel sure that if the occasion permits—and by this I mean if we are to sit in conditions of extreme heat similar to those which prevailed a short while ago—you might reconsider the decision you made. I am certain that during the time that remains to me in this House and to those members who will continue in this House we will see a change in this situation.

If conditions are changed I think it will be for the better, particularly as this affects members who sit in this Chamber under conditions which are extreme. I feel sure they would be glad to take their coats off, and I am confident it will not affect the decorum of the House one little bit. I hope that day is not far off.

Mr. Lapham: Who will make the decision as to whether conditions are extreme or otherwise?

Mr. NALDER: I do not think it will be necessary to ask too many members whether or not conditions are hot, particularly if the temperature is around 95 to 100 degrees. This would be demonstrated in the offices of the members themselves, and by those who walk along the corridors without their coats. Most of the members during the period I have in mind walked about with their coats off. Accordingly I feel the situation would be satisfactorily resolved without our having to ring the Bureau of Meteorology to ask what the temperature is likely to be.

Mr. Graham: I would like your reaction to, firstly, the wearing of ties; secondly, if no coats are worn whether we should wear long or short sleeves; and, thirdly, whether we should wear tailor-made shirts.

Mr. NALDER: I would be prepared to progress slowly and at the moment all I would suggest in such conditions is that members might be allowed to remove their coats; they would still be wearing their shirts and ties.

Mr. Graham: A long-sleeved shirt or a short-sleeved shirt?

Mr. NALDER: A number of members wear short-sleeved shirts which I think are neat and tidy; but I am sure it would be most acceptable to all of us if we were permitted to remove our coats.

Mr. Bickerton: I will go along with you and agree that members should be allowed to take their coats off, but I do not think they should be permitted to take their trousers off.

Mr. NALDER: It is only the Minister for Housing who has suggested this and no doubt he will have an opportunity to discuss this aspect later. I am sorry the Minister for Health is not here—

Mr. Graham: He is out of the State.

Mr. NALDER: —because I wish to refer to several items connected with health in the State. I hasten to say that my remarks are not by way of criticism.

I would first like to refer to the progress that has been made on the education side, so far as this relates to the number of health problems that exist. I was very pleased last year when an opportunity was afforded to the President of the Heart Foundation in Western Australia, Dr. Fortune, to give members of this House an informed address on the progress being made in dealing with some of the problems associated with these health matters. A number of these problems have been overcome and further progress is being made to meet other difficulties that might arise.

All I intend to say about this matter refers to education in so far as it relates to problems of health. I believe that on many occasions we can demonstrate to the public what can be done to minimise the number of problems that exist in matters concerning health. It is possible that this might not be necessary in connection with the problems that exist outside matters of health, but tonight I am talking solely about health problems.

There is little doubt that we would make tremendous progress if people were prepared to listen to the experts; to those who have been able to process information available from research carried out the world over. This can only be done by carrying out an educational programme in this direction.

We can tell people till we are blue in the face of the difficulties they are likely to encounter but such advice would run off them like water off a duck's back. It is not until they themselves are confronted with such problems that they realise it might have been better had they taken notice of the advice given them by the experts.

I do hope that ways and means will be found to permit this education programme, as it affects some of our health problems, to be spread far and wide. Some research should be made into the manner of getting the story across to the public. A difficulty which is as great as getting the story over to the people, is to get the public to accept the answers which have been provided as a result of research that has been carried out.

I emphasise this aspect because I think it is so very important. We all listened to what Dr. Fortune had to say with a great deal of interest, and I am very pleased indeed with the response and the attitude of the members of this House.

I would now like to make brief mention of the problems associated with cancer and to stress the situation that exists here. In some circumstances facilities are available for people to be tested during their lifetime to determine whether or not they are suffering from cancer or any other type of disease associated with it.

Members will be interested to know that a short while ago I was approached by a lady who requested me to approach the Minister in this matter. I do not propose to mention where this lady lives at this stage, because I do not think it would be quite fair; but it is significant that she should have approached me and asked me to approach the Minister in regard to these problems.

I will give briefly the points raised by the lady in question. She requested that an approach be made to the Government for compulsory smear tests for cancer in women. She informed me that she had 160 signatures from women in different walks of life who also requested that this be introduced, even though it is probably a departure from the accepted situation that we know today.

We all recall the position that was demonstrated when proposals were introduced earlier to combat some of the health problems faced by the public today. We all know that we have made tremendous progress because compulsory testing has been undertaken of every man, woman, and child in the country, particularly as it relates to tuberculosis. Because of this, great strides have been made to eliminate this disease. The lady I have mentioned informed me that she knew of two deaths that had taken place amongst women not so long ago; deaths which could have been avoided had the necessary tests been made earlier. She was absolutely certain from the medical advice given that had these tests been made earlier the two women in question would have been alive today.

Accordingly I passed this information along to the Minister and asked for his comments on the approach made to me by the lady concerned. The Minister replied that smears for women are taken by medical practitioners and that according to the inclination of the practitioners involved, the smears are sent to one of several pathologists; to the laboratory of the King Edward Memorial Hospital, or to the Public Health laboratory. I understand that some 25,000 such tests are being performed each year in Western Australia and if all women were to take advantage of the facilities available this number could possibly be trebled.

The Minister's prediction is on a voluntary basis and here again I think it is essentially a matter of education.

Mr. O'Neill: That is still a research programme at the moment.

Mr. NALDER: This may be so; but the information I am giving the House is the result of an approach made to me by a lady who had 160 signatures from women from all walks of life supporting her theory; those who believe that the time has arrived for such compulsory tests to be taken.

I am not querying this aspect; I am only stating the facts given to me. As I pointed out, the Minister replied to me and said if women knew that tests could be taken we could treble the figure of 25,000 tests that have been made in Western Australia.

I emphasise again the fact that an educational programme is possibly required to bring this information to the notice of the people concerned. It is obvious that many people do not know the service is available and the only way this can be achieved is to educate them.

Such a programme has been undertaken by the cancer information officer employed by the Cancer Council of Western Australia. It is important that people should know facilities are available and that if the disease is detected in its early stages relief, and perhaps cure, can be obtained. The Minister went on to say that to make the smear tests compulsory would be administratively impractical and socially unacceptable. I am not sure that this is correct. It might be that the Minister has access to other information to indicate that what he has said is the case. However, the lady who approached me was emphatic that she knew of two ladies who had died. According to the medical practitioner to whom she spoke those two ladies would have been alive today had they known about the tests.

The Minister went on to say that while it might be desirable to have regular tests he would not like to make them compulsory. He said that perhaps the information could be made available through the Health Education Council.

In this situation it is absolutely necessary to embark on a programme similar to that which is being actively followed by the Heart Foundation. I think the education should begin in the senior classes of the schools. As the students grew older they would realise the importance of having regular tests, not only to safeguard their own health, but so that the authorities concerned would be aware of what was happening regarding public health.

I now pass on to agriculture and I will make a brief reference to the progress being made in the programme to sell the Australian wool clip. It is heartening to know that all sections of the community appear to have accepted the programme submitted to the Federal Government by the various sections of the industry throughout Australia. In *The West Australian* of the 22nd March the following statement appeared:—

Legislation is expected to be rushed through Parliament to enable a new structure for the wool industry to be operating within three months.

The wool industry released details today of a proposed new authority that will control the industry and acquire the entire Australian wool clip.

That is some of the best news which has ever been passed on to the Australian public. The new structure will not only affect the growers who have been pressing for some form of organised marketing scheme, but it will also have an indirect reaction on every section of the Australian community.

I have always been amazed that so many people refer to the "howling farmers" and call them a nuisance. However, it is interesting to note that even though conditions are starting to improve in the agricultural section, many people who are not directly affected by agriculture are complaining that the unemployment situation in Australia has been caused, to a degree, by the drop in wool prices. I agree that this is a fact. A few weeks ago I went to a restaurant with an overseas visitor. The manager of the restaurant knew me and he told me that his business had been affected by the situation that had developed in the country. He said that a large percentage of his clientele had been farmers, and that they did not go to his restaurant any more. It is obvious that those farmers are not in the position to be able to spend some of their leisure time as they did previously in entertaining friends in the city.

Another businessman in the city whom I knew once told me that he could tell within two months whether there had been a drop in the price of wool; because any drop affected his business. As I have said, people in all parts of Australia are happy that the farmers have reached agreement, and that something will be done to iron out the problems associated with the important wool industry. I hope the new structure will be in operation by the 1st July, as was indicated in the Press.

No doubt the Minister for Agriculture has prior knowledge of what will be required in the way of State legislation, and I hope no stone will be left unturned to facilitate the passage of whatever legislation is necessary.

I was interested in a statement made by the member for Collie during his contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate. I wrote down what he had to say and I understand that what I have is almost word for word. While speaking on the subject of power generation—a subject in which I understand the honourable member is vitally interested—he said that his Government was carrying on the policy of power station construction initiated by the previous Government.

Mr. Jones: I said the policy had been determined before we came to office.

Mr. NALDER: I think it means practically the same thing.

Mr. Jones: No, there is a lot of difference.

Sir David Brand: What difference?

Mr. Jones: The policy to extend Kwinana.

Mr. NALDER: I want to mention that it is obvious the present Government is doing the same thing as far as the rural section is concerned.

Mr. Jones: Let us stick to one matter at a time; the honourable member can involve me in the power question if he desires.

Mr. NALDER: I say that the present Government is doing exactly the same as far as the rural section is concerned, and carrying on what was instituted by the previous Government.

Mr. Jones: That lets me off the hook, anyway.

Mr. Williams: Which hook?

Mr. Jones: The member for Bunbury had me on one, apparently, if one reads *Hansard*.

Mr. NALDER: As I progress I hope to indicate that what I have said gives those on this side of the House some cause for satisfaction. I will refer to figures supplied to me by the Minister for Agriculture regarding rural reconstruction. The total number of applications for assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme, since it has been operating—over a period of nearly 12 months—is 1,053. A total of 328 applicants has been accepted by the rural reconstruction authority, and assistance has been granted—or promised. Whether those people have received the assistance is another matter. However, 599 farmers who applied have had their applications rejected.

It really makes me sick when I hear of some of the cases of people who wanted some little assistance but did not receive it. I am not blaming the authority; apparently the rules have been laid down and the rural reconstruction programme must operate within those rules. I realise that with the 599 applicants who were refused assistance many of the claims would not be justified. From what I have heard some of the applicants were hoping to get cheap interest rates.

In some cases where people have spent large sums of money they required only a small amount to carry on, but they were refused. When I reread the policy speech of the present Premier—then the Leader of the Opposition—it makes me sick to think he promised so much to the farming community. I ask: What have they got? I noticed a political article a few weeks ago in which the Premier said that his Government took pride in having assisted the primary industry in Western Australia. However, there are many disappointed and frustrated people who supported the then Leader of the Opposition and assisted the Labor Party to become the Government.

Those people thought the world was offered to them. I will see if I can locate the present Premier's policy speech.

Mr. Jones: Do not lose it; it is valuable.

Mr. Williams: We will never lose it.

Mr. NALDER: I know my time is slipping away but I will refer to a statement made in the policy speech of the present Premier. He said that the preservation and development of primary industry required big sums of money, most of which must be contributed by the Commonwealth. He also said that Labor would face up to all farmers' problems, especially debts.

I know of one farmer who required only \$4,000 to keep him on his farm, but he could not get it. I know of other farmers who wanted \$20,000 and \$30,000, but they, too, could not get that amount of money. I do not know the full stories of the people concerned, but they are some of the people to whom the then Leader of the Opposition was referring when he said that Labor would face up to all farmers' problems, especially debts.

Mr. H. D. Evans: If a farmer can show that he can be made viable he will get the money. Is the honourable member advocating that even though an applicant might not be suitable, he should still be financed?

Mr. NALDER: The present Premier also said that Labor did not subscribe to the belief that producers must get big or get out. He believed that small farmers could remain profitably in business if given financial help and sympathetic and fair treatment. What does sympathy do? Many of them are off their farms and looking for work.

The situation is that 1,053 farmers have made applications under the rural reconstruction scheme and 5,099 have been rejected.

Mr. W. G. Young: You mean 599.

Mr. NALDER: I am glad the member for Roe pointed out my mistake. When the Labor Party was on this side of the House, I remember the member for Warren, as he was then, saying there were 3,000 farmers who would not be eligible under the scheme, that there was no hope for them; 3,000 farmers would have to go off their properties and another 4,000 were in similar circumstances. His estimate then was that 7,000 farmers in Western Australia might as well close up shop.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Give the source of those figures. Where did they come from?

Mr. NALDER: I am sorry; I have not the *Hansard* with me, but it was mentioned by the Minister when he was a private Member and again when he was replying to the debate on the rural reconstruction legislation that was introduced into the House

last year. That is by the way. I am glad the member for Roe picked up my mistake. It is just as well to be reminded of this situation.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That was as a result of a survey that you know all about.

Mr. NALDER: So does the Minister, but he was one who was quick to emphasise the terrible situation of the farming community.

Mr. Jamieson: They took a long while to get into it.

Mr. NALDER: Part (4) of the question was—

What amount of finance has been allocated involving special interest rates?

The answer was: \$59,500. That is the sum that has been handed out in special interest rates. It looks as though the Government is trying to make a profit out of the money the Commonwealth has allocated to it. Very little has been handed out in special interest. Part (5) of the question was—

What amount of finance has been allocated for farm build-up?

The answer was: \$1,440,090. Part (6) of the question was—

What is the total amount allocated?

The answer was: \$7,600,053. That amount has been allocated for 328 farms. I do not know what the minimum and maximum amounts are. I understand the maximum is about \$70,000. The minimum is about \$20,000. In my arithmetic, this means an average of \$23,780 is being allocated to assist each of those 328 farmers.

The matter that concerns me right now is the fact that there is obviously some problem associated with the rural reconstruction programme. It was debated when the Agricultural Council met here. The Minister has been to one meeting of the council, at least, and is to go to another one.

Mr. H. D. Evans: On the 5th of April.

Mr. NALDER: In six or eight weeks there have been four meetings of the Agricultural Council to deal with the reconstruction programme. The Minister should tell this House what the problems are.

Mr. H. D. Evans: After the 5th.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister will have his work cut out. He will have to announce the position as regards wheat quotas and goodness knows what else in the next few days.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The last conference put an embargo on statements. This does happen, as you know.

Mr. NALDER: I believe this House should know what the problem is because it will obviously affect a number of farmers

who are seeking some financial assistance. I hope progress will be made very soon, in the interests of our rural people.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Time is running out. It is getting too late for anything.

Mr. NALDER: I now want to mention wheat quotas. I do not know how far the Minister's public relations extend but last week I asked him about the release of the report of a special committee which, in his policy speech, the Premier promised the wheatgrowers he would set up. The Premier said—

Labor did not accept that existing wheat quotas were equitable and would seek improved methods that would allow traditional wheat farmers to remain viable and new-land farmers to survive.

He therefore appointed a committee which has been sitting for a long time—in the vicinity of 12 months.

Mr. W. G. Young: Since last April.

Mr. NALDER: In questions, I asked where the report was. It was circulating around the country and quite a number of people had seen it. The Minister said he rang the secretary of the Parliamentary Country Party and inquired whether he desired a copy of the report of the committee of inquiry into wheat quotas. Up to the present time the secretary has not received the report. As far as I know, today he had not received the report.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is funny. Everybody else got one.

Mr. NALDER: I did not receive the report. I rang the office of the Country Party to find out whether it had gone there by mistake, but no-one at the office had seen it. However, the report is circulating around the country. The Minister said he rang the secretary of the Parliamentary Country Party, so he must have spoken to the secretary; but the secretary has never spoken to the Minister about this matter. I do not know what has happened to the report.

The wheatgrowers do not know what to expect. It is near the end of March. Many of them have their superphosphate and, no doubt, their seed, but they do not yet know what the situation is.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The Farmers' Union had another two-hour discussion with me this morning.

Mr. NALDER: That is their business.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The legislation you brought in lays down that it is obligatory to discuss the matter with the union.

Mr. NALDER: And the Minister supported it then. The point I am emphasising is that the matter seems to be going on and on, and no final decision on the report has been reached.

Mr. Gayfer: Because they cannot improve on the system you brought in.

Mr. NALDER: That is very interesting to know, but I want to clear up this point because I have not seen the report. I know one member of the party has received a copy of the report, but as he received it in confidence I have respected his confidence and have not seen the report. I do not know what it is like—whether it is in a bound book or typed on ordinary paper. I would very much appreciate the opportunity to have a look at the report in order to see what is involved in this production that has been brought out by the committee.

Mr. Williams: If you give the Minister a kind smile he might send you a letter.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Did the secretary of your party say I did not speak to him on the phone in January?

Mr. NALDER: I understood him to say he had not received a telephone call from the Minister.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I spoke with the secretary on this matter in January, and as far as I know a copy of the report was sent.

Mr. W. G. Young: Are you confused about the time you spoke to me?

Mr. H. D. Evans: No. I spoke to a certain Legislative Councillor.

Mr. NALDER: In any case, he has not received the report.

The other day I asked the Minister for Agriculture some questions regarding veterinary officers and I received an interesting answer. I am relating this to the statement by the Premier that assistance had been given to veterinary officers in Western Australia. The Minister's answers indicate that the subsidy of veterinary practices was instituted by the previous Government in 1962-63. The figures were supplied up to the year 1969-70, when no claim was made. I did ask a question regarding the year 1970-71 but as there was no answer I drew the conclusion that no assistance was given in that year.

The answers supplied by the Minister enabled one to draw the inference that private veterinary surgeons operating in the country have been assisted because of their contracts for tuberculin tests on cattle.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr. NALDER: However, this does not indicate the true position because this situation was brought about through an agreement by the various States to carry out these tests. It is quite wrong to infer that veterinary surgeons are being assisted in this way. This is another instance of the Government's attempts to claim it is assisting the rural community. From the

Minister's own words this is not the fact because no money is paid to veterinary practices in the State.

Sir David Brand: What the Government should do is to make sure we can get the school going.

Mr. NALDER: I would like to make this point to the Minister for Education—I do not agree with his optimism regarding the other States' interest in the veterinary school. After listening to the discussions at the Premiers' Conference the Minister feels that other States are too short of money to be interested in this project. I ask the Minister at the next meeting of Cabinet to say that he is prepared to proceed with the veterinary school.

Mr. T. D. Evans: My feelings in this regard will not influence the decision one way or the other. We cannot make a decision until we know what funds will be available from the Commonwealth for the triennium, 1973-75.

Mr. NALDER: The Commonwealth Government wants to know whether the State is interested.

Sir David Brand: The Commonwealth is prepared to honour its undertaking. It has made this quite clear.

Mr. NALDER: The Commonwealth wants to know that Western Australia is prepared to proceed with the veterinary school. If we dilly-dally around, Western Australia will lose it. Obviously other States are waiting eagerly. From information I have obtained during the last 24 hours, there are other States which are prepared to accept the veterinary school. These States will appeal to the Commonwealth if our State indicates it will not proceed with the school. It is obligatory for our Government to come out and say it is doing everything possible to set up the veterinary school when the Murdoch University is brought into being.

Mr. Fletcher: If the State gets the veterinary school how will you stop the veterinary surgeons looking after cats and dogs in the metropolitan area, as they are doing now?

Sir David Brand: The important thing is to get the school.

Mr. Fletcher: You have to get your priorities right.

Mr. NALDER: My last comment is in regard to the unfortunate situation which has developed in the metropolitan area regarding fruit-fly. I think the decision to cease the baiting in Belmont will hang around the neck of the local member, the now Minister for Works. When he was on this side of the House he did all he could to sprag the fruit-fly baiting programme in Western Australia. He has achieved this in his own electorate and it is to his discredit.

Mr. Jamieson: That is neither fair nor factual, and you know it. It is downright you-know-what without being unparliamentary!

Mr. NALDER: When the Minister was on this side of the House he did everything possible—

Mr. Jamieson: I know what you did not do!

Mr. NALDER: —to discount it and to discredit the scheme.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You were unaware of the fruit-fly infestations.

Mr. Jamieson: You denied that there were trees on Government properties which were not being cared for.

Mr. NALDER: Action was taken to do something about it.

Mr. Jamieson: After this Government was elected the trees were cut down.

Mr. NALDER: This is what has happened in the Minister's electorate?

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

Mr. Williams: Give him some more time.

MR. BATEMAN (Canning) [8.16 p.m.]: The tumult and the shouting has died.

I would like to say in all fairness—and I suppose it is political—that Oppositions accuse and abuse Governments. However, I have never heard of a monument being built in memory of a person who criticised anyone.

The Premier has done a good job considering the short time the Labor Government has been in office.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Sir David Brand: What a strange interjection.

Mr. Court: You can keep a copy of that to show the Premier when he gets back.

Mr. BATEMAN: Members will recall that in the first session we suffered the sad loss of our Speaker. The Opposition attempted to make capital gain from the situation—I do not blame them, that is politics. Much criticism has been thrown at the Premier for not keeping his promises.

Sir David Brand: Do you not think that is a fair thing?

Mr. BATEMAN: The Premier will keep the promises he made, given time.

Mr. Court: I do not think he will live that long.

Mr. BATEMAN: I would like to refer to the Address-in-Reply debate. I have been in this Chamber for four years now, but I am prompted to make these comments because of the accusation made last Thursday afternoon by the member for Avon that members of Parliament did not

remain in their seats. I do not blame members for this. It is monotonous to listen to a speech which is mainly repetition for 45 minutes. The Opposition abuses and accuses the Government and throws brickbats at it. We then listen to the Government members hurling interjections back at the Opposition. I do not think the public of Western Australia elected us to do this. We were elected to legislate. This is the third week of the current session and what legislation has been brought before the House?

Mr. Williams: Now you know how we felt when you were on this side of the House.

Mr. Jamieson: We had 12 years over there.

Mr. BATEMAN: Some members hold the view that this is a good opportunity for new members to make their maiden speeches.

Mr. Court: It is a democratic institution.

Mr. BATEMAN: Members could make maiden speeches during the debate on the Supply Bill.

Members will recall my hardy old annual speech on deep sewerage and comprehensive drainage. I brought this up every year.

Mr. Williams: Will you bring it up this year?

Mr. BATEMAN: I would also like to refer to the opening of Parliament. Surely to goodness it is sufficient to hold an official opening of Parliament once in each three years. I do not think we should have the bun fight every year. This is another matter I would like to bring to the notice of the House.

If I may refer back to the Address-in-Reply—and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we will probably mention this tomorrow at your little conference—I think the debate should be reduced considerably so that we may get on with the business of the House; that is, legislation.

Mr. W. A. Manning: How long are you going to take?

Mr. BATEMAN: After those few remarks it is quite obvious that I will not speak for long tonight.

Mr. Williams: You have disappointed us.

Mr. BATEMAN: I would like to mention also that I am so concerned about a particular issue that on opening day I presented a petition handed to me by residents of the Kenwick-Thornlie area, signed by 1,113 people, petitioning this House in order to bring to its notice a situation which has existed at the intersection of Royal Street and Albany Highway in Kenwick ever since I have been in Parliament. It is interesting to note that in 1969, 14 serious accidents occurred at

this intersection; there were 11 in 1970, and 13 in 1971; and so far this year two serious accidents have occurred.

On many occasions I have written letters to the departments and the Minister concerned and I have always been told that something will be done in the next financial year. I have been told the same story again this year. So I wonder whether or not we are going to see something done about the introduction of traffic lights at the intersection of Royal Street and Albany Highway.

The reason I presented this petition on the day of the opening of Parliament is that I feel strongly about it and the people in the area feel strongly about it and nothing has been done. I felt that because we have a full House on opening day someone might have taken notice. However, like many other petitions which are placed on the Table of this House—and I say this with all due respect to everyone concerned—nothing has been done.

If I may I would like to bring to the notice of the House a situation which exists in Treasure Road, and also in Wharf Street. In each case the road crosses the railway line and many deaths have occurred at those crossings as a result of a crossroad running parallel with the railway line. Whilst drivers are waiting to give way to vehicles on the right a bank-up of vehicles occurs behind them, and some cars are left stranded on the railway line. This is a most serious situation. I would like again to impress forcibly upon the House the serious situation of the Royal Street-Albany Highway intersection. I hope something will be done about these problems.

It seems to be a simple matter to install traffic lights. The new "Carousel" centre at Cannington was opened only a week ago, and yet traffic lights have been installed there. I am not criticising the installation of those lights because they are most necessary. Traffic lights slow down and control traffic. We notice that the traffic from Perth to Fremantle is slowed down by the traffic lights. They do a good job in controlling traffic. I feel the introduction of lights at the intersection of Royal Street and Albany Highway would be of tremendous advantage to the people of the area.

Might I also bring to the notice of the House—and I think we will hear more about this—the situation of our surplus of eggs. The Minister for Agriculture maintains that in this State we do not have a surplus; but recently I read a speech by Mr. Ian Sinclair (Minister for Primary Industry) and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a portion. It is as follows:—

Commercial egg production this season will be approximately 213 million dozen—the highest on record. Of this quantity only 155 million dozen will be consumed within Australia.

This leaves 58 million dozen, or about 27% of total output available for export from 1971-72 production.

Superimposed on this huge surplus the season opened with the equivalent of 20 million dozen eggs (12,000 tons of pulp) carried over from 1970-71.

I do not know the answer to this problem. However, I read an interesting article in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, the 7th March, 1972. This article is written by Douglas Wilkie and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read a portion of it because I think we will have to face up to something along these lines—

A handout of a dozen eggs a week to 700,000 Australian pensioners would almost take care of those 540 million dozen unsellable eggs.

The cost, at wholesale prices, would be about \$20 million a year.

Not a scientific way to solve an economic problem but just as scientific, and not so indecent, as a suggestion that Australia should dump its "surplus" eggs in the sea.

I feel that perhaps somewhere along the line we should approach the Federal Government in regard to this problem; because any assistance would have to come from the Commonwealth. We can remember the days when the dairying industry had a surplus of milk and a free milk scheme for school children was introduced. Perhaps something along the lines of a coupon system for pensioners to obtain eggs could be devised. People with far better brains than I have could probably work out something. I am sure there are many indigent people, people on the breadline, and others who through no fault of their own find it difficult to purchase a dozen eggs a week. With the aid of our vast scientific knowledge perhaps something could be done to provide a little more help to our pensioners.

Mr. Bickerton: Could we get more grandmothers to suck eggs?

Mr. BATEMAN: Finally, I would like to make some mention of the social welfare problem which exists in all our electorates. I know that in my electorate on many occasions I am confronted with problems with which I am not competent to deal. We notice that high-density flats are becoming more and more evident, and we find that many people have a problem which I—and probably other members in this Chamber—am not competent to handle.

We must do something about assisting local authorities to employ social welfare workers, because there is a need for such people. The City of Stirling has a social worker, and I believe this has proved to be very satisfactory. I noticed an advertisement in a supplement to the *A.A.S.W. Federal Newsletter* of July, 1971, in which

the City of Richmond, Victoria, is seeking a social worker. Perhaps I might read out a few lines of this advertisement because it indicates what that city is looking for. It is as follows:—

The Richmond City Council is proposing to develop the scope and range of Social Services within the Municipality and now invites applications from qualified Social Workers (Male or Female) for appointment to the Council's Staff.

The duties of the successful applicant would include the following:—

To be available for discussion with those already actively involved in welfare activities in the area in order to assist them to determine local needs; to help devise means to meet these needs and to seek out causes of general social difficulties.

Those difficulties are to be found every day in our State—in our electorates. To continue—

To assist individuals, families and groups with particular problems by referral to the most appropriate sources of assistance, and to act as 'co-ordinator' where several agencies may be involved.

I feel that the employment of permanent social welfare workers attached to local authorities, and perhaps under the control of the State Government, would be a method by which we could do something to help these poor, unfortunate people we meet—and the conditions in some of the homes we enter are tragic.

We do have, within the States Grants (Home Care) Act of the Commonwealth, a means whereby Commonwealth money may be made available to help with the care of the aged. This refers to such things as "meals on wheels." I am sure we could find a loophole within that Act whereby we could raise money. I believe the Commonwealth Government accepts the word of the State Minister for Health in these matters, and I am sure that somewhere in the Act we could find a provision under which the Minister could approach the Commonwealth Government and have this necessary finance made available.

The Act states that it is—

AN ACT

To grant Financial Assistance to the States in relation to the provision of certain Home Care and other Welfare Services by States, Local Governing Bodies and Community Welfare Organizations.

What I have suggested would come under the heading of "Welfare Services by States." I urge the Minister to take note of this; and I assume that as he is not here his colleagues will convey the message

to him. In some way, somehow, we as responsible members of Parliament must bring about the introduction of a welfare service to aid those people in the situation I have outlined to the House.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.30 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words in support of the motion. Initially, I want to deal with matters arising out of the report by the Environmental Protection Authority on the Pacminex project, and I hope I will have time to deal with a number of other very important matters.

I do not intend to speak by way of making an attack on the authority or its report; far from it. However, I want to take this opportunity to invite the attention of members to the fact that we have before us a document which is history-making. I think it is the first time in Australia that a document of this kind has been presented to a Government, to a Parliament, and to a public; a document with such far-reaching effects and such important significance so far as the future development of natural resources of the country are concerned.

There are some people who jumped for joy when they heard the findings and recommendations of the authority, and then the decision of the Government. There were others, of course, who were in the depths of despair, and I think this just about covers the difference in attitudes towards this particular subject. Somewhere between these two points lies the answer, and it is to find this answer that we all have a responsibility, whether we be in Government, or in Opposition; whether we be environmentalists or a member of an industry seeking to expand an existing industry or to develop a new one.

The history of the Pacminex project is very well known to the members of this Chamber because we had some long and wearisome debates on the Bill that was introduced to ratify the project and to authorise the Government to sign the agreement subject to certain conditions. One of the conditions was that the authority had to examine the industry first and report on it and the present Government could decide whether it signed the agreement or not. The Government saw the report and decided not to sign the agreement, because if the report is taken literally as it is written it gives an emphatic "No" on all counts in respect of this industry.

I must admit that some of us were quite surprised that the authority gave such an emphatic "No" on all counts. However, the report has been made and we accept it from the Environmental Protection Authority as having been made in good faith. The history of this site—which is only one part of the exercise, by the way, Mr. Speaker—is something to which I will refer

this evening because there have been quite a few erroneous and mischievous statements made in respect of this site.

Originally the project partners—at that time I do not think the C.S.R. company was actively engaged in the project—without any consultation with the Brand Government announced they were to establish the project at Kwinana. The facts were that the Government had announced that, because of a number of considerations, a limit had been imposed on the amount of alumina that was to be produced at Kwinana. There was good reason for this. Firstly, the Government was concerned at the capacity of the area to absorb on a long-term, large-scale, basis, the red mud which comes from this product. The simple fact is that in the processing of low-grade bauxite the tonnage of red mud must, of necessity, be very heavy compared with the final product.

After assessing the situation, in view of the many complaints that were being received at that time in regard to the large tonnage of red mud that would be deposited in the area over a long term and the number of depressed areas we were acquiring for red mud disposal—it was agreed that the Alcoa alumina production could be limited to 1,250,000 tons a year. The Government therefore decided against the Kwinana site for Pacminex. Also, we were anxious for this industry to be decentralised.

After negotiations, and studying some six alternative sites, Alcoa and the Brand Government agreed on a site for its refinery at Pinjarra, and also agreed on the basis of environmental protection on a scale that had never previously been undertaken by any project anywhere else in the world.

Members have seen for themselves the tremendous cost of establishing a refinery in a new area such as that. The siting of the refinery at Pinjarra also enabled us to include in negotiations a contribution to the development of the harbour at Bunbury as a great regional harbour and part of a regional plan. In view of the long-term nature of the plan the Alcoa people agreed to it. It was therefore unthinkable that we, or any future Government, would let a newcomer establish a refinery at Kwinana after forcing Alcoa into all this additional cost.

When the Pacminex people were told to find another site for their refinery in place of one at Kwinana, they came up with one right alongside the vineyards. This was approximately in the area where the sleepers and rails for the standard gauge rail project through the Avon Valley were stored, and when one looked at it one realised that with that site one could be playing with fire. Objections came from the local shire, the vineyard proprietors,

and the environmentalists, and so the Government said to the Pacminex people, "You will have to go somewhere else."

We gave them certain indications as to where they could go. At that time the last thing the company wanted us to do was to identify a particular location, because the moment we did so the prospect of the company acquiring options over a site on a reasonable basis would be nil. So the company set about securing a site and obtaining options on it and came up with a site in the Swan Valley vineyards which, in the light of circumstances at the time, appeared to be acceptable. We were also of the opinion, on the advice given, that the red mud could be handled in that district and that the soil was not good agricultural land.

In the light of all this the company proceeded to acquire its options and to make feasibility studies to ascertain whether the project was viable. From that point onwards the company knew it would have to satisfy the local authority and the requirements of the Environmental Protection Authority as it was to be constituted at that time, or in the form it would be in the future.

Mr. Graham: The local authority was no trouble.

Mr. COURT: Initially, the local authority caused a good deal of trouble. It was very hostile to the whole project, but when the new site was suggested it came round to the idea that it was a good site—

Mr. Graham: Very strongly.

Mr. COURT:—and from that point onwards it started to get right behind us and it was, without doubt, supporting the project by the time the Minister was able to introduce into this House the Bill to ratify the project. And so the only other hurdle to surmount was the Environmental Protection Authority.

We have to realise that this company went on with its feasibility study when the present Government took office, knowing that one of the major points made by the Labor Government during the State elections was environmental protection. When in Opposition it was scathing in its criticism of the Bill introduced by the Brand Government; a Bill which we considered to be a sensible approach to this problem; something that would come to all of us, and something that we had to learn to live with. I feel sure that all of us, on both sides of this House, had accepted that we would have to live with it.

However, the developer knew, when he was in the hands of the present Government, that it had committed itself to these so-called "big teeth" of the authority, and "big teeth" it has got. The Bill was brought to the House and the present Opposition made it clear that in view of the mandate of the Government we were not going to deter it from getting this

legislation on the Statute book, but it was to be subject only to certain amendments that were sensible and desirable where the rights of individuals, etc., were involved. So this legislation went onto the Statute book.

We now have the report from the Environmental Protection Authority and I am not attacking it, nor do I propose to be critical of the authority. What I want to say is that I believe both the Government and the Opposition, as part of their very important trust in the matter, have a duty to study this report with greater intensity than would normally be the case. If I may, I will relate this report with matters to do with law. For instance, with an important, delicate, and far-reaching piece of new legislation it is not unusual for the Government of the day, or some of the parties most directly involved, to submit the legislation to test by a higher authority. This is done deliberately so that everyone will know where he is heading; he will know the criteria under which he will have to work. This is a good thing. Often they go to an appeal almost by arrangement, so that the supreme authority does express itself. From that point onwards a code of conduct can be established.

I believe the Government has a responsibility to Parliament, to the public, and to developers to do something of this kind related to the practical aspects of environmental protection. It was with this in mind that on the 15th March I asked the Premier a question without notice, as follows:—

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to make a detailed commentary on the Environmental Protection Authority report and findings on the Pacminex project?
- (2) Will it be possible to determine from this report and other information made available to the Government by the authority, the criteria on which both the Government and industry can base future approaches to the establishment of industry of this kind?
- (3) Would he please advise—
 - (a) The points on which the Environmental Protection Authority are at variance with the advice given by technical people to the previous and present Governments on matters related to the Pacminex project; and
 - (b) The technical and other advice on which the Environmental Protection Authority has formed its opinions?

I had very good reason for asking that question, and it is consistent with what I am saying tonight because I believe we

all have a responsibility to expose this report to very careful study in order to determine the criteria that is to be used for future developments. We will not get development taking place unless the developer can get a clear indication of what hurdles he has to jump—or expressed in another way, what standards he has to achieve. The Premier replied to my question in the following terms:—

- (1) to (3) It is not the intention of the Government to make a detailed commentary on the report of the Environmental Protection Authority, which has been tabled. Currently, officers of the Department of Development and Decentralisation are studying the detailed implications of the report, following which it is likely that talks will be held with the authority.

I find this to be a very disturbing answer, because I imagine the Minister for Development and Decentralisation would be very anxious not only to have this detailed study made by his officers and by other appropriate technical officers of the Government, and to have discussions with the Environmental Protection Authority, but also to convey to Parliament—and through Parliament to the public—some of the material that has come out of this particular study.

I accept that certain information in a document of this kind, or supporting a document of this kind, cannot be made public; and the authority has said there are some appendices which will not be made public—and for good reason. However, the Government of the day is entitled to have this information, and must have it. I go along with the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and I sympathise with his plight when he made the observation, following the Government's decision, to the effect that it was rather strange—I forget his exact words—some of the findings of the authority, as expressed in its report, were at variance with the views of some very competent and trusted officers of the Government—the officers who worked for the previous Government and who are working for this Government.

I believe that had the Premier accepted the proposition I put forward in my question we would have been moving towards a situation where this sort of information would be made public. For instance, at the moment we are not aware whether the Environmental Protection Authority relied on certain people, who are part of the council, for its final decision; whether, in fact, it did seek the technical advice of some of the people who advised the present Minister, and had advised myself and other Ministers in our turns; or whether they went further and brought in outside experts to study the situation.

I feel that the Government can, without any reflection on the authority and as a public service, indicate in a White Paper—or call it what one likes—or in a considered commentary, report to Parliament exactly the procedures that were followed by the authority in arriving at its final conclusions. Both my leader and I have made it clear that we are not seeking to criticise or to have a confrontation with the authority in any way. We sympathise with the Government, and we know its problem in handling a matter as hot as this, when a report of this kind is received. Neither my leader, myself, nor any member on this side of the House has tried to gain political advantage out of this report in any way since it was published.

I come to the question of having the background of this matter laid bare to make it possible for potential developers, as well as Ministers and heads of departments, to determine what criteria they have to adopt and live with, such as whether a group of specialists is brought in from outside the Government service, whether we go beyond the officers of the Public Works Department and the Water Board to get advice, or whether those people have, in fact, given the advice. I cannot determine from the report exactly how the authority got its advice. Obviously it sought information from specialists and technical people, and maybe from some academics and other very skilled people. As a result of that these findings must have been arrived at.

There are a number of matters on which I believe the Government could assist Parliament and the public by giving some factual information. For instance, the Environmental Protection Authority has dismissed as almost beyond recall the fact that natural gas will be available. I must admit this surprised me. I would have assumed this was a matter which the Government would have brought back to Parliament, and declared "We have had another look at this. There will be natural gas." On the other hand, it may be that the Environmental Protection Authority is right.

Even in the last few days we have heard references by the Minister for Mines about bringing natural gas from the north-west. In fact, I have put forward this proposition on several occasions, and suggested bringing it down from the north-west not only to this part of the State, but also across to the Murchison. I believe that one day we will be using that gas, and also gas from central Australia, in centres like Kambalda, Windarra, Mt. Keith, and others.

The other point on which I feel we can have information of a technical nature relates to the views of the technical people as to why the underground aquifers cannot be protected. As a layman I have read the report, and gathered that one of the concerns of the authority was the fact that it felt the flow of underground water was from the north to the south; in other

words, from the northern area towards the city. This might make a difference compared with the situation at Pinjarra.

The officers we had working for us and the experts we consulted during the time of the Pinjarra negotiations—a place where an industry is established on top of a very important aquifer—seemed to be satisfied this protection could be given. I am not quarrelling with the decision of the authority or suggesting for one moment that it did not seek advice; but I believe it would add to its own stature and would give a reassurance to those who are involved with future developments—bearing in mind this is only one of many developments that will be studied in the years that lie ahead—if it disclosed the people who are making these expert assessments, be the matter concerned with the atmosphere, meteorological information, the reaction on underground aquifers, and so on. These advisers can then be identified as to whether they are not only competent but also practical in their approach, and with an understanding of the balance which must be observed between development and the protection of the environment.

I do not believe this is the end of the world, just because the report has been adverse. I know it has been a shock to many people, but I feel the Government will be looking at it very intently and will be endeavouring to find some alternative. I would be amazed if it is not trying to find answers to some of the questions I am posing tonight, so that when any other developments come along they will be able to anticipate many of the problems that now confront us.

We have a number of established projects which must develop and it would be a tragedy if they cannot do so—an economic tragedy of the first order—because many people, for instance in the south-west, have planned their whole future. This applies not only to industrialists but also to people who want to live with their families and work in these areas for the rest of their days. If some rethinking is to take place on some of the projects, the sooner this is done the better.

It so happened this particular project was condemned on all counts by the authority. It was not just a question of a site, the atmosphere, the underground water, or the mining practices. It was the lot; and whilst this is a bit severe it might be a blessing in disguise. We must study the matter and this comes back to what I said earlier. We are all in this. It is not just a problem for the Government, although it has the Executive responsibility at this point in time. At this moment we are looking for generations ahead in an entirely new concept of development—a concept which has been rushed upon us much quicker than some of us thought would be the case; but it is a concept towards which we have been moving for a long period.

The only salvation in the whole picture is the fact that the rest of the world is going through the same travail and transition at the same time as we are. Somewhere in the industrial structure of the world increased costs must be accepted to provide for environmental protection. The protection cannot be provided for nothing. Already some of the great corporations of the world in Europe and North America are actually specifying in their annual accounts the costs involved for environmental protection, and some of the great corporations are involved in hundreds of millions of dollars. They are having to accept this as part of their normal costs.

This is fortunate for us because if we had to tackle this problem in isolation we would never get off the ground—with a piece of environmental protection legislation like this to operate under. Happily we are coping with the situation in company with the rest of the world and we will find a way of living with it. However, I believe we will find that way quicker if the whole background of this particular project is submitted to the most intense study by the Government. I would also like to believe that at some time in the very near future the Government will take the Opposition into its confidence on the background information which resulted in the report being formulated.

I am not suggesting the Government make public information such as secret processes. I do not think they themselves are the key to the problem. Physical factors such as the protection of the atmosphere and aquifers, and mining practices together with other related physical problems are the main concern.

Mr. Graham: I would have no objection to the Leader of the Opposition having access to all the papers, subject to consultation with the Minister for Environmental Protection, of course.

Mr. COURT: It is not a question only of having access to the papers. It is a question of having what I believe should be a public document or a complete commentary on the methods used by the authority to arrive at these decisions. I am rather surprised that someone has not suggested that the developers try to gain access to the appeal machinery. I am not suggesting they would be successful, but at least it would be one way of testing the machinery used for this type of work.

Mr. Graham: My advice is that the company has no right of appeal.

Mr. COURT: That is what I feared when I first read the legislation, but when I read it another way, I thought perhaps a right of appeal did exist.

Mr. Graham: Incidentally, it is a piece of legislation I find exceedingly difficult to read and comprehend, and I have been practising for many years.

Mr. COURT: It was the Government's legislation.

Mr. Graham: You realise that draftsmen, or counsellors as they are now called, are responsible for the drafting.

Sir David Brand: Would you be so kind had it been our legislation?

Mr. Graham: How do you mean, "so kind"?

Sir David Brand: So tolerant. Every Government is responsible for its legislation, surely.

Mr. COURT: If the boot had been on the other foot the Opposition would have been screaming blue murder about what has come out of this report, but we are adopting a more responsible attitude.

Mr. Graham: You are doing a lot of wild guessing, of course.

Mr. COURT: No. We warned the Government, but it went into the matter cheerfully. We did our best. We said, "You have the mandate," but some of the improvements we made to the legislation have, of course, saved the Government from even further embarrassment.

I was interested to hear the Minister's remark about the company not having access to appeal machinery. I read it another way. Of course, I do see his point that the matter is rather obscure and is designed more for people in the environmental protection field.

Of course, the Minister has the right to set up a public study of this matter. This type of approach may not for some reason be appropriate for an industry of this kind, but the fact remains that although one of the partners in this project has been very vocal and critical of us all, including myself—I often wonder who people will find to criticise when I pass out of this world—no practical approach has been suggested by them such as the one I am recommending now whereby the whole matter could be the subject of a sober approach of a considered nature. By this means we would at least know who are the people who provided the technical advice to the Government.

Mr. Graham: The Department of Development and Decentralisation applies such an approach in all its talks with the Director of Environmental Protection in order to sort out some of these problems.

Mr. COURT: I would hope so and would have assumed so from the Premier's answer. I would have been most amazed if the Minister had not insisted on such talks.

I am hoping that even at this late stage the Government will agree—and while Parliament is in session this time—to give us a fairly exhaustive commentary on the background of the studies made by the E.P.A. and the people who gave the advice under the various headings, most of which advice is being challenged by people

with technical qualifications but who are, in many cases, suspect because of their background and associations.

Mr. Graham: I think there are practical difficulties because most of the issues raised by the E.P.A. were raised by the appropriate departmental officers themselves and they thought they had come up with the solutions. I do not think any Government can take sides between two different sets of Government officers, particularly as this is virtually the initial exercise.

Mr. COURT: I hope I can get some "time-on" for this; but I do thank the Minister for his observation because I think it is the sort of information we want.

The fact is that these competent people we trusted—people who gave us a lot of advice, which we usually accepted—have obviously advised the Minister, but their advice has not been accepted or used by the E.P.A. What I seek to ascertain on behalf not only of the Opposition but also the general public and prospective developers, is who, other than these officers, gave to the E.P.A. the advice on which it based its decisions?

We must bear in mind that one of the members of the authority is a highly-qualified scientist and therefore we must respect his capacity to appreciate what is given to him. Mr. Adams, another member, is a very competent student of evidence and would be quite capable of making a sensible deduction from evidence given to him; and the third, Professor Main, is also a competent person in his own right. However, it would appear to me that somewhere along the line someone other than the officers whom the Minister and I know have been advisers to the present and past Governments were consulted in respect of some of these highly technical matters.

I do respect the right of the authority to do this. Time and time again it would have to go outside the Government service to obtain advice, but we are entitled to know who these people were so we can make our own assessment of the atmosphere in which future studies of this kind are to be undertaken.

I hope the Minister will appreciate that what I am saying is intended to be a constructive and helpful approach by the Opposition, because if we let this one go and say it is bad luck, we hope the next one will work out better and that we will not have the problems with microclimate, the aquifers, and all those things, I believe we will be whistling into thunder and acting like the ostrich by burying our heads in the sand, and hoping things will work out. In that case, I hazard the guess they will not work out.

Mr. Graham: As I suggested earlier, I do not think there should be any difficulty in supplying the honourable member with

details concerning the persons who gave testimony in respect of the various issues which countered the departmental officers' advice.

Mr. COURT: I appreciate that assurance from the Minister, but I would like to feel that he would go further and make that information available to the Parliament. My request is not for any confidences to be broken or for confidential information. However, if those who advise the E.P.A. are not prepared to be named they should not be asked for advice. When one is asked to give expert advice, one of the most important tests of one's capacity and integrity is to be prepared to stand up and be counted. Whether one is a lawyer, an accountant, or a scientist, when giving this sort of advice it is one of the tests of one's integrity and capacity if one is prepared to put one's name to the report and be counted. I could hardly believe that anyone of the calibre of those associated with the E.P.A. would not want to be named and counted. In fact, they would regard it as part of their professional goodwill to be identified with this sort of thing.

If the Minister is prepared to go further and make the information public, through Parliament, I would be delighted and, in fact, my mission tonight would be fulfilled. I think such information would allay a lot of fears and many illfounded doubts in the minds of some people if they knew the exact calibre, the experience, and the background of those people who have given advice.

If such information is not available we will have an emotional build-up, and a backlash of emotionalism such as we had from those who were in favour of environmental protection. Some people went so far that it was quite obvious their intemperate approach to environmental protection could not be tolerated. And so we will have a backlash from those people who want development at any cost. When people are denied knowledge of a matter they will start to react in a very emotional and unpredictable manner.

If we can halt much of the emotional criticism aimed at the Government, at myself, and at others—the unfair things being said about some of the scientists involved as though they had deliberately gone about this problem as a lot of long-haired people with no practical experience—it will be a good thing. It is in the interests of all the people, as well as in the interests of the development of the State, if those people can be identified so that we know who has been advising the E.P.A.

In other words, this comes back to what I suggested: that this be treated as a pilot case. This case is important to the nation. I understand tremendous interest has been generated in the other States, and in other parts of the world, because of the recent decision. The fact that this State,

which needs development, is prepared to make a decision not to proceed with a project of this kind, at least for the time being, because of a report which has been received has aroused this interest.

I submit, with due respect, that we are all groping in this exercise. We are all groping to find a balance between two extremes of thought and action. I think the goodwill which exists on both sides of the Parliament, and the fact that this transition period is occurring throughout the whole world, puts us in the position where we can be world leaders by finding a solution.

I still believe that development will not be impeded in the final analysis, although we could have some problems on the way up.

Mr. Graham: I have expressed the opinion previously, which I now repeat: I think it is a pity that the test case was one involving such a tremendously large industrial undertaking. In order to obtain a guideline it might have been far better to have had an industry of far less consequence.

Mr. COURT: I agree, but it so happened that we were plunged headlong into a project which was big by world standards. That is why it is more important and why we should use this case and delve into the background to see if we can determine whether or not we can avoid a repetition.

I have been criticised for allowing this project to proceed as far as it did without being in a position to give it the all-clear. I do not apologise for that at all; I do not feel any regret because I had expressed doubts about the economics of the project but the company still wanted to proceed with a full knowledge of the risks.

Mr. Graham: I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will agree it was unfortunate that the company had spent between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 only to find out it was a nonstarter.

Mr. COURT: That, of course, is not unusual. Many companies have had much more going for them before they have found out they did not have sufficient mineral content in their particular area. That would have nothing to do with the environment. So I do not think that is the real problem. The real problem, and I say this advisedly, is to overcome the situation quickly and effectively so that in the future anyone who seeks to find out whether he has a favourable proposition, so far as the natural resources are concerned, can work out an economical basis for environmental protection which would be acceptable.

As far as I am concerned, if a project is so marginal, economically, that it will not stand reasonable environmental control, it should not proceed. I think that is not a bad criterion for us to adopt. In the old days, when we were struggling to

implement industries and create jobs—and that was our No. 1 consideration—we were inclined to do the Nelson trick so far as the environment and other things were concerned. However, those days are gone.

Mr. Graham: But this particular company was prepared to stand up to probably the tightest anti-pollution controls on any industry in the State.

Mr. COURT: We do not dispute that.

Mr. Graham: I thought the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was suggesting, perhaps, that the company should not be there because it could not meet the cost of pollution preventive measures. It agreed to do that.

Mr. COURT: I had reservations about the economic viability of the project, but the company said that was its risk. As long as the company accepted that risk in full knowledge of the situation it was not for me to stop a company such as C.S.R. from going ahead. I regarded the project as being marginal, so far as economics are concerned.

I am making a general statement, and not related to this project, that in future, in view of the changed concept of development and environmental protection, we will have to accept that if a project is so marginal, economically, that it will not stand reasonable costs for environmental protection within its own cost structure, then it should not proceed.

To sum up: We have to try to remove, as far as practicable, some of the uncertainties, because nothing can cause an economic downturn as quickly as economic uncertainty, or any uncertainty in administration. I know it will be difficult to remove this uncertainty completely. However, we must play our part in an attempt to get rid of the present uncertainty that clouds not only this project, but many others, too.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. COURT: That is rather unfortunate, but I will be as quick as I can. We are now sitting back and looking at the Government's performance after 12 months in office. What a 12 months and what a contrast it is to the situation that existed previously! I say quite categorically the Government has not shown the finesse that is necessary to handle the situations which have developed.

I am sorry the Premier is not present, but I hope he will read and answer what I say. He has challenged statements I have made to the effect that the Brand Government was able to cope with a number of economic recessions during its time in office. We certainly did cope with them.

In one of the Premier's political columns he said that he had talked with Treasury officers and had been unable to find one

who knew of any action taken by the previous Government to overcome problems of recession during the life of that Government. I defy the Premier to name officers in the senior ranks of the Treasury who would tell him that, because they know the previous Government went through a very severe credit squeeze which makes the past few months seem like a Sunday-school picnic. Back in 1961-62 we went through a period which was much tougher than now and, at that time, Australia was not as strong as it is today. In fact, Australia was quite weak when it came to international funds and reserves. During that period we went out—physically went against the tide—and managed to hold the situation in this State.

I know Treasury officers for what they are—competent and honourable men—and they would be the first to say that very positive action was taken by the Brand Government to ride against the tide, which we did successfully. If ever there was a time when this State should have fallen flat on its face, when it had started to haul itself up by its bootstraps, that was it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Have you the cutting in which you claim the Premier made that statement?

Mr. COURT: I do not have it with me, but it was in one of the political columns.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I would like you to be able to quote what he said.

Mr. COURT: I will locate it for the Minister who should know it was in one of the columns. It must be a matter of tremendous embarrassment for a Premier to make that statement, because he has identified all top Treasury officers with his statement that they could not find evidence and did not know of any action taken by the Brand Government to ride against that tide. I defy the Premier to talk to any of the three top officers of the day—

Mr. Jamieson: They advised the previous Government to take it easy.

Sir David Brand: They did not give any such advice to me.

Mr. COURT: —as I know they would agree that action was taken by our Government. We had to ride against these tides; we had the capacity to see the signs of changing conditions; and we did not accept the fact that because Australia was having a slow-down we had to slow down with it. There are ways and means of overcoming these problems. I am not saying a Government can ignore completely a world-wide or national trend, but if a Government is on the job and can see far enough ahead, with such a small population in the State, it can ride out some of the breakers that are around. We managed to do this very successfully.

I know it will be asked, "Why could you do it when we cannot?" I am not saying the present Government could not do it

if it were to follow the right techniques, but a Government has to work at this day-in and day-out. It should not be looking for giants all the time, because often it is the little fellows who will put things right. It is amazing what can be done with Government funds and private funds if a Government is on the job all of the time.

The total unemployment is not great, a fact which the member for Northam mentioned the other evening. Many people would be able to find work if they were prepared to go somewhere else. I understand that was the burden of his complaint and, from what I heard of his speech, I had to agree with him. However, he would be brave indeed if he said to the Government, "Get some of these fellows off their tails and out into the country where there are plumbing and electrical jobs for them to do." Fortunately, people in this country are still free to work where they want to work.

The fact is that a Government which reads the signs of economic downturns beforehand can anticipate them to an amazing degree. It was done by the previous Government and I believe it could be done by this Government if it were prepared to follow certain techniques. It is not for me to advise the Government because it will not take any notice of me. I make the point that if the Government gives some thought to this and is prepared to listen to a few people who can help in the industrial sector, it will be amazed at what can happen.

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

MR. BRYCE (Ascot) [9.15 p.m.]: In taking this opportunity to address myself to the motion before the Chair, I desire primarily to turn my attention to the issues raised by the member for Floreat earlier in the debate.

Before doing so, I make the point that in subsequent debates in this Chamber on economic issues the member for Nedlands, who has just resumed his seat, should take the opportunity to point out to the present Government and its supporters precisely what the measures were which officials of the Treasury Department will substantiate were taken by the previous Government to avoid economic recessions.

Mr. Court: You arrange for me to get another half hour and I will tell you.

Mr. BRYCE: Ever since the Ascot by-election we have heard the comment that there are certain economic solutions which a State Government can pluck out of the air, but the Opposition never gets down to the basics of saying what they are; no concrete suggestions have been put forward. Even tonight the 1961-62 period was alluded to, but the supposed mythical solution to that crisis was not suggested for the purposes of example.

Primarily, as I have said, I wish to direct my attention to the statements made earlier in the debate by the member for Floreat who set out to attempt to justify the existence of the Legislative Council in this Parliament.

Sir David Brand: He did a very good job and was most convincing.

Mr. BRYCE: In his own words, the member for Floreat set out to abolish the case against the Legislative Council by contradicting false, hypocritical, and biased arguments which are used for party-political expediency. Since he indulged to such an extent in the same reasoning—falsehood, inaccuracy, and hypocrisy—he failed in his attempt. I can understand that the member for Floreat would place a great deal of importance upon political expediency, because ever since Sir Robert Menzies collected together the elements of non-Labor parties in Australia in the 1940s, they have existed on the basis of political expediency before principle.

Sir David Brand: You could not have been here in the early 1940s.

Mr. BRYCE: I am quite pleased to say I was not. On page 74 of *Hansard* in the second column of his speech the member for Floreat accused the present self-endorsed crusaders in the campaign against the Legislative Council of failing to define a mythical principle of "one-vote one-value."

Mr. Taylor: And that for Australia!

Mr. BRYCE: In my opinion this is the first of the deliberate inaccuracies and falsehoods. The member for Floreat used this statement to demonstrate he had an understanding of proportional representation. He even introduced the concept of preferential voting, which is quite irrelevant.

In my maiden speech in this Chamber last December I devoted some considerable time to the question of one-vote one-value and, before doing so, I debated whether or not I would use the term "malapportionment." Obviously the member for Floreat failed to appreciate and understand the meaning of that term because, in using it, there is no doubt that it means one-vote one-value in electoral districts of approximately equal numbers, or as equal as is possible.

On page 75, towards the end of column 2, the member for Floreat suggests that under the Westminster and United States systems of regional representation, which we have adopted, the number of people in an electorate is not the first and foremost consideration. My contention is that democracy is about people; the number of voters is not the only consideration but it certainly is and should be the basic criterion from which other considerations should stem. This basic principle has been adopted in the United States of America and in

Britain. In both those countries responsible Governments have already taken action to ensure that the iniquities of malapportionment are eradicated.

Mr. Blaikie: How do you reconcile that to areas north of the 26th parallel?

Mr. Taylor: The member for Ascot is contradicting what the member for Floreat said.

Mr. BRYCE: I suggest the honourable member consult *Hansard* if he is following the debate.

Mr. Taylor: The United States and the United Kingdom do not have the system that was described. That is the point.

Mr. BRYCE: At the beginning of page 76 the honourable member suggests that to cry "gerrymander" is justified only if these basic considerations are used to the detriment of another political party. Reference to the situation that prevails in the four States of Australia where Upper Houses are elected—following elections of sorts—will demonstrate that in every one of those Parliaments the system is clearly deliberately loaded in favour of one political party against another. In the Western Australian Parliament the Labor Party holds 10 of the 30 provinces, essentially because of malapportionment. In the South Australian Parliament the Labor Party's representation is four out of 20; in the Victorian Parliament it is nine out of 27; and in the Tasmanian Parliament it is two out of 19.

To my mind, this situation clearly illustrates that in Upper Houses throughout the country deliberate measures, stemming right back to the origins of Legislative Councils, were instituted to discriminate against one particular political party.

A great deal of play is made of the amendment to the Electoral Districts Act in 1963-64 and the system of election of members of the Legislative Council. The member for Floreat remarked that there was no great cry from the Labor Party when the 1963-64 legislation was introduced and discussed. I will not be critical of my predecessors on the ground that one of the basic, cardinal beliefs of the Labor Party is that in a democracy one-man, one-vote, one-value is of paramount importance, and on that occasion they were seeing implemented before their eyes the principle of one-man one-vote, irrespective of his wealth and holdings. I do not think I am unrealistic in suggesting the Labor Party was expecting too much at that time if it expected the conservative elements in this Parliament would go so far as to grant one-vote one-value.

Further down on page 76 the member for Floreat made reference to representation in the Australian and United States Senates. If he is unable to appreciate the difference between a States House in a Federal system before the advent of party politics and a Legislative Council based on

the concept of the House of Lords, I am afraid he will continually fail to understand the subtleties of this argument. He goes on to refer to figures borrowed from the general elections for the British House of Commons in 1970.

The SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. BRYCE: The honourable member said that in Britain a Labor seat was won where 11,600 electors voted and a Conservative seat was won where 100,000 electors voted. This example surely illustrates that the honourable member does not appreciate that there is no compulsory voting in the United Kingdom.

To conclude my reply to the member's arguments about malapportionment in Western Australia, I wish to present some of the statistics which cannot be swept under a carpet simply to suit political expediency.

In this State, 26 per cent. of the people elect 16 members to the Legislative Council and 74 per cent. of the people elect 14 members to the Legislative Council. In this sense, the disparity amounts to something which varies from a relationship of four votes to one to the extreme of 16 votes to one. In the metropolitan area, 360,000 people elect 10 members to the Legislative Council and in the rural districts 200,000 people elect 20 members to the Legislative Council. Malapportionment occurs in this State, and in the name of democracy something should be done about it.

The second part of the honourable member's speech related to the existence of the Legislative Council in the framework of the bicameral Legislature. The arguments begin on page 78. He argued—

Natural historical development in older countries has proved the importance of and democratic necessity for the checks and balances of the bicameral legislative system.

That is vitally important if the basic intention in politics is to protect vested interests and ensure that the *status quo* is maintained. He went on to argue that—

... every individual or group with dictatorial ambitions always endeavours first to abolish the second Chamber in order to perpetuate its own power.

This sort of argument is quite absurd, as I am sure the member for Floreat will appreciate on closer reflection. Is he suggesting our conservative friends in New Zealand who abolished the Legislative Council in that country were in fact groups who were seeking dictatorial power and were, therefore, dangerous people?

I intend to bore the Chamber by quoting a very relevant section of a speech made by the Prime Minister of New Zealand in 1950 when he introduced the Bill to abolish

the Legislative Council in that country. I believe in relation to arguments which have been used on many occasions this speech contains a number of sentiments that should appeal to members opposite. The Prime Minister of New Zealand (The Rt. Hon. Sir Sidney Holland) said—

In November last the people decided to have a change of Government. That is democracy. That is the right of the people. Every member of the Opposition would stand and defend to the last ditch the right of the people to make such a change, although the Opposition does not think the people were well advised in making the change last year. We took office on 13th December last. What did we find? We found that the Legislative Council was comprised of thirty-three members, the majority of whom, approximately twenty-seven, had publicly proclaimed their opposition to the policy of the present Government. Where is the sense of having an Administration elected by a very large majority when there is no chance of having its legislation passed by the Upper Chamber? We knew that at least twenty-seven of those thirty-three members would vote against the policy the people decided to have.

He concluded—

If we continue on that basis, democracy is bound to break down. We cannot allow such a situation. Democratically we go to the electors and place our policy before them. Both sides do that. The electors give their decision and they are entitled to have the policy put into effect for which they voted.

Those are the words of a Conservative Prime Minister who was confronted with this situation in New Zealand—a country which I believe has not been noted for its excesses, corruption, or dictatorial ambitions, according to the words used by the member for Floreat in referring to this situation.

Later in his speech the member for Floreat said—

It is no coincidence that most democratic countries have a bicameral system, and even more significant that most of those countries which have abolished it later reverted to it.

To my knowledge, that has not happened in one single instance, and I should be very pleased if the member for Floreat would bring to the attention of this Chamber the long list of countries which abolished Legislative Councils and subsequently restored them.

In this context I would like to quote the remarks of the Prime Minister of New Zealand, a conservative Prime Minister,

when he was supporting the abolition of the Upper House in New Zealand. His remarks were as follows:—

I had the privilege last year of visiting Australia with my friend and colleague, the Minister of Industries and Commerce. We went to the Queensland Parliament, where they have three parties. They abolished their Upper House in about 1922, I think, although I am not sure of the year. I spoke to the Premier of Queensland, the leader of one of the Opposition parties, and the leader of the other Opposition party, and all were unanimous that they had lost nothing whatever, that they would under no circumstances go back to the two-Chamber system. I do not know of any case—there may be, but I am not aware of it—where a country has, after introducing a one-Chamber system, reverted to the two-Chamber system. I believe that in New Zealand we can abolish the Legislative Council with great advantage.

Mr. Taylor: And they did.

Mr. BRYCE: The member for Floreat then went on to quote John Stuart Mill, a 19th century political philosopher. The honourable member qualified the use of this reference by saying it is still relevant and has not lost any of its importance as it is based on human nature, which has not changed. I would have to agree with this—I do not think human nature has changed since Thucydides, Pericles, and Aristotle. However, I am sure that most of the 18th and 19th century philosophers—Voltaire, Rousseau, Marx, Montesquieu—would be horrified if they returned to this earth for one day to observe what has happened to their philosophies. Human nature has remained constant, but many other aspects of society have altered. To quote what a man said about a house of review in the 19th century is simply political expediency.

On page 79 of *Hansard* the member for Floreat uses the classic conservative argument—

The importance and democratic necessity in the legislative field of the second Chamber is not only to guard against corruptive influence of undivided power and to restrain excesses . . .

I have already mentioned the countries which abolished the Upper House—New Zealand, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Norway, Iceland, Sweden last year the State of Queensland in this country, and the State of Nebraska in North America. There is not one iota of evidence to support the age-old conservative argument that we are in for dangerous excesses if we abolish the Legislative Council. I do not believe the people of these countries or States would substantiate this view

Bicameral Legislatures were sprinkled throughout the western world by British colonialism. If we are honest we will recognise this fact. This system of bicameral Legislature suited the interests and needs of the British ruling classes centuries ago

Mr. Court: It also suited the Labor Party in this State years ago. If you trace the history—

Mr. BRYCE: I have spent a good deal of time researching the history of the bicameral system.

Mr. Court: It is a most comforting system to the Labor Party. The Labor Party can introduce the most diabolical legislation, tell its supporters that it has tried and then hope like hell that the Upper House will throw it out.

Mr. Graham: The Labor Government can only govern with the permission of the Upper House.

Mr. BRYCE: In many parts of the globe where the British have fostered their system of stable government based on 18th or 19th century democracy, progressive Governments are strangled by Legislative Councils or Upper Houses, particularly where the Upper House is supported by systems of malapportionment. In the 18th and 19th centuries Legislative Councils were established primarily to block democratic claims from those who had been given the right to vote in the House of Commons. Ever so slowly and gradually the common people were given a say in Parliament, but it was ensured that their representation would not be dangerous or pose a threat to vested interests. This block to the democratic process was imposed as a result.

Some members may not be aware that in the 19th century the word "democracy" was as dirty a word as McCarthy made "Communism" in America in the early 1950s, or as Hitler made "Nazism" throughout the world in the 1940s. Our conservative forefathers had good reason to impose the Legislative Council—they wished to block democracy.

Mr. Jamieson: Don't go too far—you sound too much like Steele Hall.

Mr. Taylor: He has the right idea.

Mr. Court: It will not get him very far.

Mr. Nalder: When is he going to move to get rid of the Senate in Canberra?

Mr. BRYCE: As members may not be aware of it, I would like to add that it is part of the policy of the Australian Labor Party to abolish all Upper Houses. I attended the latest Federal conference where this was substantiated.

Mr. Nalder: Will this be the Labor Party's platform at the next Federal election?

Mr. BRYCE: If I was responsible for the Labor Party's election policy I would probably have a different set of priorities from that of Senator Murphy or Mr. Whitlam.

Mr. Nalder: You would be too busy looking after Ascot.

Mr. BRYCE: The House of Review has been used by party politics and the last argument used to retain the Legislative Council has withered and died. Therefore, I am completely in favour of the abolition of the second Chamber and the creation of a unicameral Parliament.

It would be a step in the right direction for Western Australia. We would join the band that leads the world instead of trailing as we do now, and have done with all other democratic reforms.

I would like to refer to another matter which relates to something very basic to the needs of every member of our community. It is also closely related to the economic welfare of the State as a whole. During the course of the debate several disparaging references were made to the political party in this Chamber which adheres to and upholds a socialist philosophy. The particular matter about which I would like to speak in the second part of my speech will serve to illustrate the unbridgeable gap that exists in the philosophical sense between the Government and the members who sit opposite on certain basic issues.

Mr. Court: There is no such thing as a democratic socialist.

Mr. Williams: Sukarno was a democratic socialist.

Mr. BRYCE: I thought the Deputy Leader of the Opposition received his lesson on democratic socialism during the so-called 'big debate.' If he was in the habit of listening he would have heard a good definition on that occasion.

Members on the Opposition benches subscribe to the law of the jungle—their basic philosophy is one of profits before people and free enterprise first. Not very long ago we heard a speech about the necessity to uphold law and order. However, the only law which the particular member was interested in upholding was the law of the jungle—at least this was the impression I gained.

The people of this State ever so slowly appreciated that the previous Government did in fact pursue a policy of profits before people. However much those in a political party which subscribes to the beliefs of members opposite may protest that they are concerned about the people, whenever the crunch arrives and a decision has to be made about the interests of profit, the profit motive, or the interests of the public, it is always the interest of the profit motive which wins the day. Ever so slowly the people of Western Australia appreciated what was happening.

Mr. O'Connor: The crunch arrived when your Government took over.

Mr. Court: You are talking about 50 years ago.

Mr. BRYCE: I am talking about the failure of the previous Government to protect the interests of the people with any form of consumer protection legislation. The attitude of the previous Government was, "Let us not consider this; it is likely to interfere with the interest of the profit motive; it is a conflict." The failure of the previous Government to act until it was too late to protect the interests of the people against the exploits of land barons and real estate dealers and developers is a clear illustration of just how that Government misunderstood this issue.

Mr. Court: Promise us that you will make this speech before the next election, will you?

Mr. BRYCE: In the brief time I have been here I have discovered that the leader—excuse me for the mistake—I should say the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the habit of making many mumbled comments which only *Hansard* can pick up.

Mr. Court: I will shout louder if you like. I cannot help it if some of you are deaf.

Mr. BRYCE: The A.L.P. believes as one of its basic philosophical platforms that the security of the family should be a primary aim of Government, and to this end we believe that one of the means by which this can be best ensured is to encourage people to secure and own their own homes.

For the remainder of the time available to me I would like to concentrate on a situation in which I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues will be interested; a situation which has come to my attention concerning one of this State's largest building companies, which enjoyed so many of the spoils of the recent land boom; and a situation which I believe is of great importance to the people as well as to the Government. I sincerely hope that other people in my electorate will not be caught in the jaws of the same financial predicament which so many young couples—and I intend to quote one case—have brought to my attention.

It appears to me that the particular company—I am sure members will discover its name shortly—has been indulging in some of the most incredible financial practices in order to maximise its own profits at the expense of hundreds, and possibly thousands, of people. I have yet to reach the bottom of this scandal. The dealings of this company have involved many English migrants who came to this country in good faith to buy homes and to establish themselves in the Australian way of life. Its dealings have involved the deliberate deception of building societies and have inflicted blood-sucking financial agreements and financial suffering on young families. I can quote many examples of this in my electorate.

Mr. W. A. Manning: What about naming the company so that we can follow it up?

Mr. Graham: Give him a chance.

Mr. BRYCE: I shall be pleased to name the company, and when I make known the details of this specific case perhaps the honourable member on the back bench who is so vocal will deplore the tactics of this company. I will be surprised if he does.

The specific example to which I would like to draw the attention of members concerns a young English migrant couple with five children who arrived here in November, 1969. After settling themselves up domestically they were left with an amount of \$1,200 with which to buy a home. The home they wished to buy was priced at \$15,380. In order to transform a deposit of \$1,200 into a home worth \$15,380 a certain amount of fiddling was necessary. Two basic forms of deception were involved. I am quoting a specific example, but I know this has occurred in dozens of other cases.

Mr. R. L. Young: The client did not have anything to do with the fiddling?

Mr. BRYCE: I will give the honourable member the details in a moment. The building society was being defrauded by this particular building company. Understandably, when a client goes to a building society to borrow money in order to finance a home, the first thing the building society looks at is the finance credibility of the client, the size of the deposit, and the capacity of the client to repay the loan.

In this case, of course, the building company was well aware that no building society would consider financing a home costing \$15,380, with a deposit of only \$1,200. Now for the first step as far as deception is concerned: The particular building company—with its own finance company set up expressly for the purpose—paid a deposit into the young couple's bank account for the express purpose of falsifying the bank balance. Before the young couple went to the building society—one hour before—they called at the office of the building company and were instructed in what lies to tell the building society if they were questioned on the credibility of their financial statement.

I would like to illustrate that I am not speaking wildly in the dark in making this claim. I have here a statutory declaration from another of my constituents—not the one to whom I am specifically referring at the moment—and I can secure numbers of others.

Mr. O'Connor: Did you also contact the company?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, I will relate the details of that shortly.

Mr. Court: I hope you have passed this on to the Attorney-General?

Mr. BRYCE: I have. The statutory declaration is as follows:—

I, Stanley Perry of 40 Farnham Way, Morley, 6062, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

That between May and August 1971 I negotiated the purchase of a property with Landall. The amount of money I was able to realise was less than the difference between the first mortgage offered by a large West Australian building society and the purchase price of the property.

On a point of clarification, I would mention it is not the West Australian Building Society which is involved. The gentleman chose not to name the society because at the moment it is furious about being taken for a ride on so many occasions. To continue—

Landall indicated to me that when being interviewed by the building society that I should tell them that I had paid Landall the full amount of the difference stated previously.

To cover the possibility of an investigation of bank transactions Landall deposited approximately \$1600 into my bank account and I was to tell the building society that I was a newly arrived migrant (which I am not) and that the money was a transfer from the U.K. I had to sign a post-dated receipt and a form of I.O.U. for the amount.

Later Landall arranged a personal loan through Project Finance who I believe are connected with Landall.

That describes the situation whereby a building company has deliberately deceived one—only one that I know of, but possibly more than one—of this State's respected building societies for the purpose of maximising by high pressure sales tactics its own profit motive.

Mr. O'Connor: A building company and an individual. They both did it as far as I can see.

Mr. BRYCE: I intend to illustrate this point in a moment.

Mr. Court: What we are interested in is what the Attorney-General has done about it.

Mr. Graham: What you are interested in is seeing that the full story is not told. What about giving the member for Ascot a chance?

Mr. Fletcher: Don't waste his time. He has only 10 minutes left.

Mr. Court: That is all right; you should have thought of that when I was speaking.

Mr. BRYCE: This so far is only half of the story of deception. Maybe the couple concerned, newly arrived in a country of lotus eaters with a wonderful opportunity

ahead of them, were convinced by high pressure salesmanship that there is nothing wrong with this procedure.

I can quite easily believe there are thousands of young—and not so young—couples in this community who could be deceived by arguments such as these, whether they be Australians or newly-arrived migrants.

The second half of the story relating to the couple in my electorate who came to me with their problem is even more sordid. The money that was plugged into their account to bridge a credibility gap came to \$3,148.50. A very generous unregistered second mortgage was then drawn up at an interest rate of 14 per cent. to be calculated on the original principal of \$3,148.50 and to be charged quarterly. The second part of the fourth schedule provided that instalments of interest and capital were to be paid at the rate of \$28 a month, commencing on the 1st August, 1970.

Once again, there are probably some rather clever accountants and other professional people on the other side of the House who may suggest that surely this couple might have taken the time to make the calculations. I feel quite certain that there are hundreds, and possibly thousands of people in this community who would be incapable of working out such calculations to find the right answer. In this instance the payments of \$28 a month over and above the first mortgage did not even cover the 14 per cent. interest. This young migrant couple had been residing in the State for nearly two years, and in this home for 18 months, when they received a letter from Project Finance Ltd. stating, "We find that after 18 months and after making all these payments you have not made any indent in the principal and interest of that which you owe but that you are further in debt to the sum of \$3,333 instead of the \$3,148 borrowed."

Mr. Williams: Is that a flat rate of interest?

Mr. BRYCE: No, 14 per cent. simple interest. This unregistered second mortgage was imposed on this couple to enable them to secure this home. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that this practice shall cease. I have other constituents in the Belmont district, where Landall is carrying out a housing construction programme, who are unable to secure copies of the second unregistered mortgage agreement. Many of them are unaware of the rate of interest they are paying. Once again it could be said that they are culpable, but I would point out that this society has laws to protect the weak against the strong in a sense of physical violence, and in my humble opinion it is of equal significance that we should have laws to protect the people whose circumstances I have just outlined. In this sort of situation

I believe that legislative action should be taken to prevent such happenings. To my mind economic rape is no more acceptable than an act of sexual rape.

In this particular instance the company concerned had agreed to discount the interest rate on the mortgage because of my representations. It was no coincidence that I received a telephone call this morning from the company to say it was prepared to discount the mortgage itself for the benefit of this young couple. To save him from his financial predicament the company was prepared, in the first instance, to reduce the rate of interest from 14 per cent. to 10 per cent. following representations by the head of the building society who was extremely annoyed at this improper practice; eventually a pay-out figure of \$2,500 was accepted.

The principal reason for my raising this case in the House is based on the fact that there are many couples occupying homes in my electorate, and hundreds more occupying homes in the metropolitan area who are in a similar predicament, and the matter should be drawn to the attention of all people, to the attention of all migrants, and, in particular, to the attention of the Minister for Consumer Protection in the hope that something can be done about it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Runciman.

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 29th March, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (2): ON NOTICE

1. NATIVE RESERVES

Tabling of Plan

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

Will he lay on the Table of the House a plan of Western Australia showing the various Native Reserves which have been declared and are current at the present date?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

I table herewith a map of Western Australia, in two parts, showing all native reserves in excess of 100 acres at present declared under the Land Act.

I would like to add that we do not have a plan showing the lesser reserves, which are contiguous to various towns. It is not proposed