

When the Federal Government sold the rifle range it promised to replace it in its entirety in another locality. So, the Greenough Shire bought this land for the purpose of selling it to the Federal Government for use as a rifle range; but the Federal Government has been very slow in implementing its promise to replace the rifle range, to carry on cadet training, and to provide civil emergency training.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Rubbish!

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The time which the Government took to find the necessary money to buy the land for the rifle range proved to be too long, and so the Department of Industrial Development took the land over from the Greenough Shire. Since then the Department of Industrial Development has sold a great portion of that land to A. V. Jennings and to Allied Eneabba, to enable those companies to process the mineral sands. This land is at Meru, which is six miles out of Geraldton.

I support the Bill and hope that the companies will be able to get into production within a short time.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [10.59 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments and for their support of the Bill. I was a little surprised with the remarks of Mr Tozer as I know how generous the Government has been in dealing with local authorities and you, Mr President, would know about that better than anybody else. Nevertheless, the comments made by Mr Tozer will be brought to the attention of the Minister for Industrial Development.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Interpretation—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Mr Heitman wished the company well and said that he hopes that it gets into production. I was under the impression that the company was already in production.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think I explained on the first measure that these companies—I think there are five of them—started under the Mining Act. I know that one or two of them are in production, and the others are so near that it does not matter.

I think I also explained that the companies could have operated under the Mining Act. It is a matter of decision or choice, and we favoured the agreement. I think that probably the major reason is the growth of interest in environmental mat-

ters which are better catered for under an agreement. I think the Leader of the Opposition is probably right.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [11.03 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 9th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.04 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 3rd September, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (46): ON NOTICE

1.

RYE GRASS

Research into Toxicity

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What is the present stage of research into the problem of rye grass toxicity?

(2) What are the plans for future research?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Field studies have been made and are continuing on methods of controlling growth and spread of rye-grass toxicity by nematocide applications, cropping techniques, burning, heavy grazing and herbicide treatments. Laboratory work is proceeding on diagnostic methods for detecting toxicity, on the identification of the toxic agent (nematode, bacterium or fungus), and the chemical identification of the toxic principle. The use of therapeutic agents on poisoned livestock is also being investigated.

(2) The agronomic studies on controlling rye grass are encouraging and will be followed up in future research. Nematocidal techniques also look promising but now require economic assessment. Research on the biology

and life cycle of the parasites, the epidemiology of the disease, the distribution of the agents of the disease and the development of a forecasting method for farmer warning is in the planning stage. Toxicological, bacteriological, mycological, and therapeutic studies will be continued.

2. COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES

Standpipes

Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

As in answer to question 29 on Tuesday, 19th August, 1975 he listed five standpipes in the Merredin water supply district as being metered—

- are local authorities charged for water used from these standpipes;
- if "Yes" will he give details of the authorities and standpipes involved;
- which of these five metered standpipes draw water from a source which has other metered connections?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- Yes, except for Beringbooding and Mount Roe.
- Water drawn from Muntadgin standpipe is charged to Merredin Shire.
Water from Hyden standpipe is charged to Kondinin Shire.
Water from Warralakin standpipe is charged to Westonia Shire.
- Hyden, Muntadgin, Warralakin and Beringbooding.

3. HOUSING

Southwell and Samson Developments

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

- In what financial year does present planning point to the completion of construction on most lots within the SHC holdings known as Southwell?
- When all lots in Southwell have been occupied to what area and what lots will the commission turn in order to fill application needs from people registering for assistance in the Fremantle area?
- Is the commission able or has it plans to construct dwellings upon land within the City of Fremantle and known as the Samson Estate?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Not before 1977-78.

(2) Probably Leeming, South Street, 58.27 hectares approximately, being portion Cockburn Sound location 631; and Jandakot, lot 1 Mason Road, 54.63 hectares approximately.

(3) The commission has no current plans for home building in the Samson Estate in which it does not own any land.

4. RATES, TAXES, AND CHARGES

Report of Inquiry

Mr TAYLOR, to the Premier:

With respect to the Press release of the Premier reference P75/693 of 4th August, wherein comment was made that a report on the outcome of an inquiry into all forms of rates and taxes was expected to be handed to him "in the near future", has he now received the report?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Yes, as advised in reply to question No. 4 in the Legislative Council on 27th August, 1975.

The report has yet to be received and considered by Cabinet.

5. PHOENIX, CALISTA, AND NORTH PARMELIA SCHOOLS

Additions

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Works:

What is the present anticipated completion date of construction of the following projects—

- Phoenix Primary School—12 teaching areas, administration and covered assembly area;
- Calista Primary School—library resource centre;
- North Parmelia Primary School—six classrooms, resource centre and covered assembly?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- The 11th January, 1976.
- The 15th December, 1975.
- Not known as this contract has not yet been let.

6. HOUSING

Southwell Development

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

In the SHC development known as Southwell, will he advise—

- the number of units constructed for purchase;
- the number of units constructed for rental;

- (c) the number of units in both
 - (a) and (b) which—
 - (i) are presently occupied;
 - (ii) are completed but still awaiting occupation?
- (d) the number of—
 - (i) purchase; and
 - (ii) rental units, still planned for construction or completion within this development;
- (e) the construction programme of both purchase and rental units planned for this present financial year?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (a) 44 units—purchase.
- (b) 96 units—rental.
- (c) (i) 42 units—purchase; 96 units—rental.
- (ii) 2 units purchase—now in process of sale.
- (d) 624 units in total but distribution between purchase and rental yet to be determined.
- (e) Unknown at present; yet to be finalised, in the light of total capital funds available to the Housing Commission.

7.

TOWN PLANNING

Bedfordale Rural Zone: Water Supply

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

With reference to his answer to part (6) of question 48 of Wednesday, 27th August, do I understand his answer to mean—

- (1) With respect to part (a) of section (6)—that before a building permit is issued, health authorities and others would need to be satisfied that water for domestic purposes is readily available on site from either—
 - (a) a bore or soak; or
 - (b) a 20 000 gallon capacity tank, erected and full?
- (2) With respect to part (b) of section (6)—that before permission is granted to construct any residences a 20 000 gallon capacity tank will have had to be erected and filled?
- (3) With respect to part (c) of section (6)—that no person would be permitted to continue to live in a completed residence should, despite the fact that they have a 20 000 gallon capacity water tank on site, they either—

- (a) fail to locate suitable and adequate ground water on site; or
- (b) such ground water, previously located, become unfit for human consumption, or cease to flow at a sufficient level?

- (4) If "No" to any answer, would he please clarify?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Under the provisions of the Town Planning Scheme no dwelling unit may be constructed unless it incorporates a domestic water storage tank of minimum capacity 20 000 gallons and no dwelling shall be considered fit for habitation unless such tank is operating.

- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

8.

TRAFFIC

Thomas-Rockingham Roads Junction

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have any traffic counts been taken with respect to the junction of Thomas Road and Rockingham Road, Kwinana?
- (2) If "Yes" will he provide details?
- (3) Have accident statistics been compiled for this junction?
- (4) If "Yes" will he provide details?
- (5) Is his department aware of the traffic conflict at this junction, particularly in the mornings and mid-afternoons when change of shifts from all major local industrial establishments results in a crossflow of vehicles coming and going, and from all directions?
- (6) What plans has his department for alleviating or overcoming such vehicular conflict?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I hereby table the details of the latest traffic count taken on the 5th August, 1975.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) I hereby table details of accident statistics.
- (5) There is some inconvenience to traffic in peak periods as at other junctions and intersections throughout the metropolitan area.
- (6) There are no immediate plans for carrying out improvements to this junction as there are many other sites within the metropo-

ltan area which have a higher priority. However, priorities are subject to annual review.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 357).

9. PHOENIX ROAD

Opening of Second Arm

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When will the second arm of the Phoenix Road dual carriageway between Stock and Rockingham Roads be opened for traffic use?
- (2) Is the opening of this arm at present awaiting action by the Department of Main Roads or by another department?
- (3) If by another, then which department?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Phoenix Road is the responsibility of the Cockburn Town Council and I suggest that the Member seek the required information from the council.
- (2) and (3) The opening is not awaiting action of the Main Roads Department and I am not aware of involvement by any other department.

10. SPEARWOOD SCHOOL

Use

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

- (1) Is the old Spearwood Primary School, Rockingham Road, Spearwood, still in use for departmental purposes?
- (2) If "Yes" when is it anticipated that the department will no longer require its use?
- (3) Has the department any plans for either alternative use or disposal of the old school once it is no longer required?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The classrooms will no longer be required by the Spearwood School as from the beginning of the 1976 school year.
- (3) The Education Department is considering the use of the accommodation for other special educational purposes.

11. TOWN PLANNING

Woodman Point: Plan

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

Will he table a copy of drawing No. 8571 21, Plan F265, drawn on 11th November, 1969, being titled "Woodman's Point: Preliminary Sketch showing redevelopment proposals"?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Yes—plan is tabled herewith. However, it should be appreciated that the plan is only in a conceptual stage as a basis for discussion and investigation.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 358).

12. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

Staff Vacancy and Free Periods

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

- (1) Has the vacancy created by the absence of Mr Byfield from Eastern Hills High School now been filled?
- (2) Is the Minister aware and does he accept the abnormally high number of free periods available to students in the lower secondary grades at the school?
- (3) If the Minister does not agree that there were a high number of free periods for lower secondary students during the mid-term, will he indicate schools which have a higher number of free periods per student?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) School timetables are not maintained at the department and as the school is on vacation it is not possible to obtain the information sought.

13. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

Classrooms

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

In reference to necessary improvements at Eastern Hills High School and the present use of classroom accommodation, about which parents, pupils and staff have repeatedly complained and in particular the two old weather-board classrooms at the school—

- (a) is the Minister able to promise relief for the students for next year;
- (b) if "Yes" how does he propose to relieve the present totally unsatisfactory position at the school?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) and (b) As a result of the decision of the Federal Government to restrict expenditure on schools' capital works, major changes in the State programme are necessary.

It is not possible at this stage to give any firm assurance.

14. **LAND**

Resumption: Lot 99 Great Eastern Highway

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Transport:

In reference to the resumption of portion of lot 99 Great Eastern Highway, Mundaring, owned by Mr L. A. Byrne, and for which Mr Byrne had agreed to accept \$3 520 in full satisfaction—

- (a) when can it be anticipated that settlement will be made;
(b) will interest at the rate of 9½% per annum be paid up till the day of settlement, and if not why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) As soon as Mr Byrne returns the signed discharge of claim form to the Crown Law Department.
(b) Yes.

15. **KARRATHA HIGH SCHOOL**

Air-conditioning

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

- (1) Is it the intention of the Education Department to have the old wing of the Karratha Senior High School air-conditioned?

(2) If so—

- (a) when is it proposed work will start on this project;
(b) will work be completed in time for 1976 school year;
(c) will it be necessary to shift students out of this section while conversion is taking place;
(d) what is proposed for temporarily housing students if they are required to move while alterations are in progress?

- (3) Is the Minister aware of the unrest among the teaching staff at the school over the delay in proceeding with the air-conditioning of the old wing?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Yes.

- (2) (a) and (b) Tenders for the proposed air-conditioning and remodelling works of the old wing of the school have closed. Until the full extent of the loan fund allocation is known, however, it is not possible to let a contract for the work.

(c) Yes.

- (d) It is proposed that temporary classroom accommodation be provided while the alterations are in progress.

(3) Yes.

16. **STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION**

Revenue, and Levy on Income

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) For the financial year ended 30th June, 1975, what was the increased revenue received by the SEC resulting from the increased tariffs which occurred during that period?

- (2) For the same period what did the SEC contribute to general revenue as a result of the Government's decision to impose a 3% levy on the commission's income?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) \$16.8 million.

(2) \$2 298 196.

17. **POWER STATIONS**

Expansion

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has the report on the State Energy Commission power station expansion been submitted to the Cabinet sub-committee?

- (2) If not, when is it anticipated the report will be completed?

- (3) Has a definite decision been made for the transfer of units to the Muja powerhouse at Collie?

- (4) If not, when can a decision be expected?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) No.

(2) Within about two months.

(3) No.

- (4) Following the submission of the report (item 1) to the Cabinet sub-committee.

18. KWINANA POWER STATION

Oil Contract

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What is the duration of the contract which provides a base price for oil at Kwinana power station of \$47.30 per long ton?
- (2) Is there an escalation clause in the contract?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Four years.
- (2) Yes.

19. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Kwinana Industrial Complex: Pollution Officer

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

- (1) Has the appointment of a pollution officer for the Kwinana complex been resolved?
- (2) If not, when can an appointment be expected?
- (3) Has the review been completed concerning the entire matter of environmental management at Kwinana?
- (4) If not, when is it anticipated finality will be reached?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The matter of when or whether such an appointment may be made has yet to be resolved.
- (3) I presume the Member refers to a study commissioned by the Environmental Protection Authority to assess the current state of knowledge with regard to Cockburn Sound as a tool for future environmental management. In which case the answer is no.
- (4) The report was expected from the consultants on 1st September, however, a further and I believe final extension has been requested to 30th September in order that full use may be made of information which came to light towards the end of August.

20. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Bunbury

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has any positive action been taken by the SEC to rectify the unsatisfactory power generation situation at Bunbury?
- (2) Has there been any increase in the 2 x 37 MVA transformers operating at Bunbury?

- (3) Is the growth rate safety margin still being exceeded at Bunbury?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The Bunbury harbour zone substation has been commissioned.
- (2) No. The above substation loading, however, correspondingly reduces the load on the 37 MVA transformers at Bunbury power station.
- (3) Work is proceeding to install additional equipment to overcome possible higher draw than that which is considered completely safe, allowing for all contingencies.

21. PRE-PRIMARY AND PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

Effect of Commonwealth Budget

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

What effect, if any, does he claim the holding down of growth in spending in the 1975 Federal Budget as it affects Federal Government funding of State Government schools, education institutions, etc., will have on—

- (a) extension of pre-primary centres within primary school grounds; and
- (b) acquisition by the Education Department of existing pre-school centres now under the jurisdiction of the Pre-School Board?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) and (b) The effects of the Federal Budget on the operation of the Children's Commission are not yet known.

22. FRASER'S MINE

Directors of Associated Companies

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

Would he please name the directors of the two companies now associated with Fraser's mine at Southern Cross; namely—

- (a) E. B. Carnicelli Pty. Ltd.;
- (b) Davies Drilling Pty. Ltd.?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Documents filed in the Corporate Affairs Office show the names of the directors of the companies in question as follows—

- (a) E. B. Carnicelli Pty. Ltd.
Eric Bernard Carnicelli,
Kenneth James Mellet;
- (b) Davies Drilling Pty. Ltd.
Harry Davies,
Ada Deborah Davies,
Harry Edward Davies.

23. PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION*Substitution of Expression*

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

Does the Minister intend to amend the Education Act and the Pre-School Education Act for the purpose of deleting reference to the expression "pre-primary" and substituting therefor some other name or expression?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Amendment to the legislation is not planned at this time.

24. MOTOR VEHICLES*Main Roads Department Study of Numbers*

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

Will he table the Main Roads Department 1972 study on the State population and motor vehicle numbers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No such study was carried out by the Main Roads Department in 1972.

State population at 31st December, 1972, was 1 065 763, and motor vehicle numbers 478 682.

25. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION*Bindoon: Department of Defence Area*

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

(1) Has he, the Environmental Protection Authority, the Environmental Protection Council or the Conservation Through Reserves Committee been asked to comment in any way on the Australian Army's desire to extend the Bindoon training area?

(2) If so, upon what date, to which organisation and in what form?

(3) Has any recommendation been made by any of the bodies referred to in (1)?

(4) If so, what are the details?

(5) Is there an environmental impact statement extant and if so will he table it?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) My department has been so approached.

(2) On 3rd July, 1974, my department received a letter from the Department of the Environment and Conservation, Canberra, requesting advice as to whether the proposal warranted an environmental impact statement.

(3) Yes, by the Department of Conservation and Environment.

(4) The department recommended to the Federal Department of the Environment and Conservation on 4th November, 1974, that local representatives of the Department of Defence visit the area with officers of the Department of Conservation and Environment to assess the likely environmental problems. No such approach has been made by the Department of Defence.

(5) I understand that an environmental impact statement has been prepared and locally available. The Department of Conservation and Environment has not yet received a copy.

26. JUMBO STEELWORKS*Water Requirements*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Adverting to his answer to question 6 (4) of 26th November, 1974, of the 90 000 cubic metres used per day how much will have to be drawn from outside sources, including public water supplies?

(2) What volume of sea water will be required by the jumbo steel plant per day?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Virtually all potable water will be drawn from sources outside any of the potential industrial sites.

(2) The preliminary estimate is 1½ million cubic metres a day.

27. LAND*Department of Defence: Bindoon*

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

(1) Is he aware of a suggestion that the Department of Defence plans to acquire land at Bindoon?

(2) (a) If "Yes" has any consideration been given to initiating discussions with the Department of Defence to attempt to negotiate an exchange of properties, that is, to ask the department to return defence property at Rottneest or a section of defence property at Garden Island;

(b) if "No" will he do so?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

(1) Yes, by the recent Press report.

(2) (a) and (b) It is understood the land is freehold and the State is unable to negotiate any exchange of land.

28. **JUMBO STEELWORKS**
Environmental Investigation

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

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority yet adopted a procedure or set of guidelines to undertake an environmental investigation once a proposed jumbo steelmill site is known?
- (2) If the procedure has been prepared will he table it?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

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

29. **CONSERVATION RESERVES**
Drysdale River Area

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

- (1) On how many occasions has the Conservation Through Reserves Committee made recommendations to any authority or body relating to the establishment of conservation reserves in the Drysdale River area?
- (2) What are the dates of the recommendations, the names of the authorities or bodies to whom the recommendations were made and the texts of the recommendations?
- (3) What was the reason for the recommendation that the area should be a "B"-class reserve rather than "A"-class, and who made such a recommendation?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) The Conservation Through Reserves Committee made recommendations to the Environmental Protection Authority in March, 1973, that the Drysdale River area be reserved as a national park and vested in the National Parks Board. In April of 1973 the Environmental Protection Authority recommended to the Under-Secretary for Lands that the area be declared Class "A" for the purpose of national park and be vested in the National Parks Board. The classification and vesting of reserves is a matter for the Minister for Lands and the information sought may be obtained through direct question to that Minister.

30. **LAND**
*Department of Defence:
 Bindoon*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

With respect to a suggestion that the Department of Defence plans to acquire land at Bindoon—

- (a) what safeguards has the State Government with respect to future planning needs for the area;
- (b) will the area be alienated for all time, or are terms likely to impose limited alienation for a limited period of time;
- (c) will he table any relevant environmental impact statement?

Mr O'Neill (for Mr RIDGE) replied: It is understood the land is freehold, and therefore—

- (a) the State has no further planning needs of the area;
- (b) dependent on the terms of transfer;
- (c) I have no copy of the relevant environmental impact statement believed to have been prepared by the Commonwealth Department of Defence.

31. **JUMBO STEELWORKS**
Infrastructure Costs

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

What are the estimated costs for major items of infrastructure associated with the proposed jumbo steelmill at a greater Perth site such as—

- (a) housing;
- (b) sewerage;
- (c) water supply;
- (d) land;
- (e) port facilities;
- (f) major roads;
- (g) railway link to the Pilbara;
- (h) electricity;
- (i) gas;
- (j) hospitals;
- (k) schools;
- (l) tertiary education institutions;
- (m) other amenities?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Detailed estimated costs for major infrastructure or other items are not available, as the study by the consortium is still not concluded.

32.

LAND

*Department of Defence:
Bindoon*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

With respect to a suggestion that the Department of Defence plans to acquire land at Bindoon—

- (a) what area is involved;
- (b) who is the present owner of the land;
- (c) is the State Government in a position either to—
 - (i) stop any proposed sale;
 - (ii) prevent, by zoning or other ways, the use of the land for the purpose desired;
 - (iii) impose any conditions either before sale or subsequently?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied: As it is understood the land is freehold and no Crown land is involved, any proposed transfer would be the subject of negotiation between the Commonwealth Government and the vendor.

(3) Has the owner or licensee the right to refuse to give to a water board inspector such information regarding turnover of liquor sales?

(4) Is it also a fact that delicatessens are being assessed on their rental values and not on the value of the property as is the case with home owners?

(5) If "Yes" will he give reasons why this method is being used?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) No. Annual values for rating purposes are assessed on gross rentals. These rentals are assessed on the basis of the total trade of the premises of which liquor sales form part.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) No. The owner, agent, or occupier is required under the board's Act to give the information to a valuer appointed by the board.

(4) and (5) Annual values are assessed on rental values in all cases where rentals can be demonstrated and this procedure is followed for both delicatessens and home owners.

33.

LAND

*Department of Defence:
Bindoon*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

Would the Government consider attempting to arrange with the Australian Government's Department of Services and Properties an exchange of properties in that the department might exchange the quarantine station site at Woodman Point for land at Bindoon desired by the Defence Department?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied: As no Crown land is involved, the State is unable to negotiate any exchange of land.

35.

EDUCATION

Resource Centre: Geraldton

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

What plans, if any, are held for the establishment of an education resource centre in Geraldton?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

A teacher group in Geraldton has been given a Schools Commission grant to establish a teacher centre in the Forrest Lodge. The department has had discussions with the group with regard to possible collaboration.

36.

WATER SUPPLIES

*Lot 765 Chapman Road,
Bluff Point*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

With reference to the proposed subdivision of lot 765 Chapman Road, Bluff Point, to provide a residential block facing Railway Street, and the provision of a water supply service to that block in Railway Street—

(a) will he detail how his department arrived at a quote of \$1424;

34.

WATER SUPPLIES

*Rates: Liquor Stores, Hotels,
and Delicatessens*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it a fact the Metropolitan Water Board is now assessing water rates on liquor stores and hotels on the amount of turnover of liquor sales?
- (2) If "Yes" when was this principle adopted by the Metropolitan Water Board and for what reasons?

- (b) will this figure be reduced or partly refunded if the adjoining block is similarly subdivided at the same time;
- (c) will refunds be made on this figure if other similar blocks are similarly subdivided at a later stage;
- (d) if "No" to (c), will he please explain why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (a) Servicing the subdivision requires the upgrading of 116 metres of pipe from 58 millimetre to 100 millimetre. Also an extension of the main for 60 metres in 100 millimetre A.C. piping. The quote of \$1 424 was made up of the cost of piping, necessary fittings and labour.
- (b) This figure could be partly refunded if the adjoining block is subdivided at the same time.
- (c) No.
- (d) As a condition of subdivision owners are required to make arrangements with the Public Works Department for the provision of water to all blocks created in that subdivision. The department, under its present policy does not concern itself with the benefit derived by further subdividers and considers that this is a matter between the original and any future subdivider who may receive an advantage from the work. The Government has this policy under review.

37.

LAND

Coastal Areas: Squatting

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is he aware that some people squatting at Little Anchorage and other places along the coast between Perth and Geraldton were given a deadline of 31st August to move and that extensions are being refused?
- (2) Have these people been offered blocks in the townsites of Leeman and Coolimba by the Lands Department?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), will he please advise whether such blocks are ready to be taken possession of?
- (4) If the blocks are not available will he—
 - (a) take all possible steps to expedite the availability of the blocks;

- (b) use his good offices with the Coorow Shire Council to gain extensions for the persons concerned until the relevant blocks are available?

Mr O'Neill (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) A squatter has no extraordinary or preemptive right to a block of land. The Lands Department has a limited number of blocks at Leeman and Greenhead which it will consider releasing to genuine fishermen prepared to build in accordance with Shire Council by-laws.

38.

MILK

Licensed Manufacturing Dairymen

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

Will he table a list of licensed manufacturing dairymen and indicate the area in which each is located?

Mr OLD replied:

A list is being prepared and should be available for tabling shortly.

39. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wood Chipping Industry

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

- (1) Has the Department of Conservation and Environment worked in co-operation with the Australian Department of Environment and Conservation on problems associated with the proposed Western Australian wood chipping industry?
- (2) If "Yes" in what way and to what degree has co-operative effort been carried out?
- (3) Has the Australian Environment and Conservation Department indicated to the Western Australian Department of Conservation and Environment that it has any specific objections to the proposed wood chipping industry in Western Australia, and if so, what are the objections?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The department assisted the Forests Department in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement to meet Federal Government requirements.

- (b) The department has taken part in on-site visits of the area and discussions with the Federal Department, together with the Forests Department and other State Government organisations and in numerous other formal and informal discussions concerning the proposal.

(3) No.

40.

FARMERS

South-West Statistical Division

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

- (1) What is the total number of operating farming units in the south-west statistical division?
- (2) What is the number of farmers dependent for over 50 per cent of their income on beef farming in the south-west statistical division?
- (3) What is the estimated average net income of farmers in the south-west?
- (4) How many of these farmers would receive above the average wage?
- (5) What is the estimated average net income of manufacturing milk dairymen in Western Australia?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) 4 006 active rural holdings (year ended March, 1974).
- (2) to (5) Not available.

41. *This question was postponed.*

42. INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

Promotion by Government

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) In what way has the Government promoted International Women's Year?
- (2) How much money has the Government spent on the promotion and in what form?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) The Government has recognised and promoted International Women's Year by establishing a fellowship, which will enable an outstanding Western Australian woman to travel overseas or interstate, to further her study, or to work in her selected field.
More important, however, is the fact that the Government has marked International Women's Year in a lasting

manner by the establishment of the fellowship on a permanent basis, rather than make a once-only contribution, which would have little continuing value.

The assistance to be provided under the fellowship will depend on the person selected, and on the field of work in which she is engaged.

Assistance will take the form of a return air fare and, where appropriate, allowances to assist with living expenses, tuition fees, books and equipment.

Applicants will be selected from women who are working for the welfare and advancement of women or children in Western Australia, and who are making a continuing contribution in those fields.

The fellowship proposes that the recipient shall study or work overseas, or interstate, and on returning to Western Australia, pass on to others the specialised knowledge she has gained.

Lack of educational or professional qualifications will be no barrier to the fellowship.

No less than one in three awards are to be made to a woman whose life work was closely identified with country or remote areas.

Selection of fellows will be made by a special committee representing women's organisations.

I believe this move will stand as a permanent tribute to the women of this State and, by being inaugurated during International Women's Year, will mark that occasion in a most significant way.

- (b) It is significant that a record number of women have been honoured by Her Majesty The Queen, both in the New Year's and Queen's Birthday Honours list—some at a high level.

As the Member will know, this has resulted from recommendations of the Government.

- (c) There are many other ways in which the special significance of International Women's Year has been acknowledged by the Government, but it should be clearly understood that the important thing is to do things of a lasting and continuing nature.

ure as a matter of basic policy and progress, rather than place over-emphasis on special occasions, which might have little or no follow-on value.

- (2) In promoting the Women's Fellowship, the Government has undertaken to make a continuing contribution in support of the principles underlying International Women's Year, and therefore it cannot be precisely expressed in monetary terms.

43. TIMOR REFUGEES

Government Assistance

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the State Government been able to offer assistance to the refugees from Timor now in this State?
- (2) If "Yes" in what way?
- (3) What help is available?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Department for Community Welfare interviewed all refugees and their families on arrival at the Graylands Migrant Hostel. The initial interview was concerned with identifying family groups, identifying missing relatives, obvious health problems, educational requirements, financial status, likely accommodation needs and employment prospects. Particular emphasis was placed on the needs and status of the children.
- (3) The Department for Community Welfare has co-ordinated the voluntary agencies, such as the Salvation Army, CWA, and other organisations to ensure adequate clothing and immediate material needs are met.

In addition, the department has made arrangements to assist in the conducting of a child care centre at the hostel. A programme has been designed for community health and child health to assess in detail the medical needs of all refugees.

Early next week there will be a meeting of all departments concerned, at which time the assistance given will be assessed and individual programmes formulated to assist families with on-going problems.

All refugees have been issued with temporary visas current to 31st December, 1975. Until such time as the Federal Government makes

a decision regarding the refugees' future status, it will not be possible for the State to develop long-term programmes for the welfare of the families.

44.

HEALTH

Mobile Dental Service

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

- (1) Does the Perth Dental Hospital (or similar) still have a mobile dental service for house-bound persons?
- (2) If "Yes" does this qualify for assistance under the States Grants (Paramedical Services) Act?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

45.

APPLES

Tree-pull Scheme and Production

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the total acreage of bearing apple trees in Western Australia in—
 - (a) 1972;
 - (b) 1975?
- (2) With regard to the \$4.6 million Australian apple tree-pull scheme introduced in 1972, how much was allocated to Western Australia?
- (3) To date how many Western Australian growers have been assisted under the scheme and—
 - (a) what districts have they come from;
 - (b) what acreages have been involved;
 - (c) what payments have been made?
- (4) What was the total production of the 1974 and 1975 Western Australian apple crop?
- (5) In each of the years 1974 and 1975 how many bushels in Western Australia were—
 - (a) exported overseas;
 - (b) consumed locally;
 - (c) processed?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) 10 427 acres.
(b) 1975—not available.
1974—9 787 acres.
- (2) State by State allocations of the fund were not made but to date Western Australia has approved \$77 440.

- (3) 33 growers have been assisted—
 (a) 3 in the lower great southern.
 30 in the lower south-west.
 (b) 34½ acres in the lower great southern.
 289 acres in the lower south-west.
 (c) \$9 543 and \$67 897 respectively.
- (4) 1974 crop—2 764 948 bushels (Govt. stat.)
 1975 crop—2 950 000 bushels (on tree estimate).
- (5) —

	1974 (millions of bushels)	1975 (millions of bushels)
(a) Export overseas	1.13	1.31
(b) Consumed locally	0.83	not available
(c) Processed	0.80	0.34
	2.76	...

46.

LAND**Building Blocks: Groundwater Level**

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

- (1) (a) Are there any conditions currently pertaining to a minimum height above groundwater before approval to subdivide an area of land for residential purposes may be approved;
 (b) if "Yes" for how long have such conditions applied?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) (a) above, in the event that subsequent to approval to subdivide being given, what redress is available to purchasers of the subdivided land, where it is found that the height of the land is below the allowed minimum above groundwater level and where approval to build a residence has been given by a shire council?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) No. Where land is likely to be subject to drainage or high water level conditions, the Town Planning Board normally requires the land to be filled and/or drained to the requirements of the local authority.
- (2) Answered by (1).

QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE

1.

PENSIONERS**Concessions: Inquiry**

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

Can he advise when the report on pensioner concessions which was

commissioned some time ago, and which I understand was completed last May, will be made available?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The Treasury and other departments involved are making assessments of the report and the financial and other implications. In addition, in view of the fact that much of the report deals with matters which overlap the States—matters which, in other words, are general and Australia-wide in character—I have sent a copy of the report to the Prime Minister and all other Premiers asking them to make an evaluation of it. I am hopeful that within the next two weeks we will be able to release the report to the public together with some of the financial factors involved without which the report does not have a great deal of meaning.

2.

PROSTITUTION**News Conference: Transcript**

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Is he prepared to make available to the Opposition the transcript of the news conference of last Thursday which, in his letter to the Editor of *The West Australian* published on Monday, he said was available to the editor?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I shall be only too pleased to do so and will tell my office to send a copy to the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

3.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES**Bunbury**

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Further to question 20 on today's notice paper, in part (3) of which I asked whether the growth rate safety margin was still being exceeded at Bunbury, will the Minister advise whether the growth rate safety margin at Bunbury is being exceeded at this particular point in time?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

If the replies to the three parts of the honourable member's question are taken cumulatively, I think they are self-explanatory and answer the present question. In part (1) of the question the member asked whether action had been taken to rectify the unsatisfactory situation, and the answer was that a substation had been commissioned, which means more electricity will be generated. Consequently, part (3) of the question,

asking whether there is any excess capacity, is answered by the fact that because the substation was commissioned there is more generating capacity, so the situation has improved. The answer to part (3) of question 20 was that further steps are being taken to increase the capacity. I cannot give any additional information.

4. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Inquiry into Franchise: Report

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Premier agree that I have been more than patient in waiting more than 16 months for him to table the report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the franchise of the State Government Insurance Office?
- (2) Would he co-operate with me as he has with the member for Victoria Park and see that this report is tabled within the next two weeks?

The SPEAKER: I point out the first part of the question is out of order because the member for Maylands is asking for an opinion. I think he could have phrased it in another way. Perhaps the Premier will answer it in the way it should have been asked.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) In answer to the second part of the question asked by the member for Maylands, I want to tell him that the Government will in due course make this report available to the public. However, there is a good reason in the interests of the S.G.I.O. that the Government should undertake some other studies which are very important to the future of the S.G.I.O. In fairness to that office it is better that the total question be dealt with at the one time. I appreciate the honourable member's impatience. I have not found him altogether patient about the matter because he has impatiently asked a lot of impatient questions!

5. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wood Chipping Industry

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

My question arises out of the answer given to part (3) of question 39 today and is as follows—

- (1) Would not the Minister agree that this department should be aware of any specific objections the Australian Government may have regarding the wood chipping industry?

- (2) Will the Minister undertake to ascertain the precise attitude of his Commonwealth counterpart and make that attitude known?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) There has been an exchange between myself and the Federal Minister regarding the matter raised by the member for Warren. This is being considered at the present time by Mr Berinson, and when the information is to hand I will make it available.

6. PORT OF ALBANY

Report by Captain Hartley

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the Captain Hartley report on the Port of Albany yet available to him?
- (2) If so, can he give some indication regarding how soon it will be available publicly?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) The report is not available to me, and I cannot answer the second part of the question until such time as it is.

Mr Jamieson: You said it would be available on the 25th of last month.

Mr O'NEIL: The business of expecting a report from someone and actually receiving it is a matter outside my control.

AUCTION SALES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Impact Statements and Parliamentary Committees: Motion

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [5.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Government should adopt as general practice the use of Environmental Impact Statements in all projects through which significant alteration or damage to the environment may possibly occur.

The House affirms that such Statements should be freely and widely circulated in draft form, so that the public may comment. Such participation is not a privilege conferred by governments upon the people, but are essential rights in any country aspiring to be regarded as a democracy.

Furthermore, the House asserts that knowledge is power and that it should have power over the Executive in environmental and other matters. To this end, Parliamentary Standing Committees should be established so that—

- (1) Members can obtain detailed knowledge and so enable them to base legislation upon such knowledge;
- (2) All citizens may be able to make open submissions to such committees. Such a public involvement in the decision-making process will more closely approximate the ideals of democracy and of open government, because governments will have to justify their decisions publicly.

If members care to study my motion they will see it should not be a question of environmental impact statements being privileged information circulating from Government department to Government department; rather I would say the essential component of a proper environmental impact statement is public participation. Therefore, I do not believe a proper impact statement has yet been produced in this State.

If the public are unable to see the impact statement until it is finalised—or perhaps months or years after it is finalised—then I believe its value is much less because, first of all, we must realise that there resides outside the Public Service a great reservoir of expertise which is growing. There is a great band of people who have expert abilities which society should tap. Secondly, I do not believe that a Government department charged with the responsibility for a project—and I could cite here the Main Roads Department in respect of freeways, the Forests Department in respect of the wood chip-pling industry, and so on—is necessarily the best judge of its own case, but that as society as a whole will benefit or suffer from the project society as a whole should have a chance to partake in the decision-making process.

The third reason I believe the public should participate is that there will not be the same temptation to omit certain matters which would be included in a statement if it were known that the statement would be subject to public scrutiny. Two types of error can occur in impact statements if public scrutiny is not allowed. The first is the omission of a very pertinent factor, and the second type of error is fallacious reasoning; that is, the drawing of invalid conclusions from data.

I believe history has shown us that Governments cannot be trusted always to look after the welfare of the people. Sometimes Governments look after their

own welfare, which does not always coincide with the welfare of the people. We have seen this in many many cases in Australia, and we have seen it throughout the world. This is what history teaches me and, I believe, many other people. It is not a question of Governments being dishonest; the world is not as simple as that. It is a question of a conflict of interests.

For example, in a country such as Australia which has had as part of its ethos a belief in development for development's sake there is the temptation for Governments to build monuments to themselves. I will not name what I think are some of the monuments Governments have built to themselves, because I do not particularly wish to be controversial and I do not wish to score political points against any Government, past or present.

However, I believe Governments have attempted to survive and have in fact survived by making the people feel that the State is getting on very, very well under those Governments, and "getting on very, very well" means economic development has occurred. The economic advantage or disadvantage to the State has not been properly assessed; and certainly the environmental advantage or disadvantage has not been properly assessed.

I will not try to pretend that I am an original thinker, although I would like to be an original thinker just as I suppose we would all like to be. I have drawn fairly heavily upon suggestions made in the fourth annual report of the United States Council of Environmental Quality regarding what should be included in an environmental impact statement. I intend to quote from that report because I think the list given is fairly complete and is certainly worthy to be used as a starting point from which to depart.

An environmental impact statement, according to the Council of Environmental Quality's fourth annual report, should contain a description of the proposed action. It should describe the environment at that particular time, and not just verbally. If I could interpolate here, this is one of the big disadvantages of our procedures in Parliament: we have verbal discussions. The Minister brings a Bill to the House and describes it, but no notes are made available to members. I believe that if the Government and all members of Parliament took their jobs seriously then when it was known that an issue was coming forward the Government—having the greatest army of people to provide such documentation—should provide to the Parliament what one might call background notes or a green paper. Such notes would not be expressed only in words, but would contain diagrams, maps, photographs, and tables.

Being able to study these, members would have a far better background upon which to base their discussions. So I would comment here that the description of the

environment at the present time—and this is point No. 2—should not just be in words but should also be expressed in maps, diagrams, technical data, and so on.

Mr Bryce: This is done to great effect in other Parliaments.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Certainly it is done many times in various places throughout the world, and I believe it is something we should definitely introduce here.

The third point a statement should contain is the relationship of the proposed action to the established or proposed land use policies of the area involved. If the proposal conflicts with the established land use policy, then some attempt should be made to reconcile the two.

The fourth point is that statements should contain an estimate of the major impact on the environment. The fifth and sixth points environmental impact statements should contain are respectively the minor and indirect impacts, and any alternative which could achieve the same objective.

This is where some studies have fallen down. They have dealt with a proposal and its likely effect upon the environment, but they have not really dealt with alternative proposals which might achieve the same goal by different methods; and, therefore, they have not really shown all the options open to society at that particular time.

Here I would like to use a descriptive phrase that has been used by Dr Coombs when dealing with economic aspects of the environment in a chapter he wrote for a book entitled *Conservation*.

Dr Coombs used the term, "an inverted lottery". If I can recall his analogy correctly, he said that in a lottery one pays a price which is small and certain. In return, one hopes for something large—say, \$16 000—and uncertain; as a matter of fact, it is extremely uncertain that one would win the lottery. Dr Coombs suggested that many environmental lotteries are inverted because one is getting something that is certain, such as the economic advantages of establishing an industry; one is getting something that perhaps is small, such as an industry which will provide employment for 100 people but which may not greatly affect everyone in the State; and, in return for that certain and small return one is paying something that is perhaps huge. We just do not know what the environmental impact of such an industry will be because there has not been a proper study of it. The price we pay may be huge and is most uncertain because of our lack of knowledge. Therefore, the reverse situation to a normal lottery applies.

Dr Coombs' suggestion, which is worth bearing in mind, is that that is not a very sensible way of running our country. In return for something which is small and certain, we should not be prepared to pay a price which may be very large—one does

not know whether or not that price will be paid—and uncertain, because of our lack of knowledge. I believe it to be a useful kind of description; as I said before, I wish I were the originator of this analogy because it is very apt for this kind of problem.

The alternatives to the proposed action may include waiting for technical data and additional information; another alternative could be an action of a different nature. In the latter case I use as an example the recent proposal for mass transit as alternatives to freeways, which might achieve the same benefit, with different environmental impacts.

There might be different sites for the base of operations; I example the Pacmin-ex controversy of a few years ago. The steel mill which people seem to think will be established in Perth may be able to be designed differently. I instance the question of dry quenching or wet quenching of coke, which has very important ramifications for air pollution, the wet quenching process causing considerable pollution problems. These alternatives should be compared having regard to their different environmental impacts and also the cost-benefit analyses.

I was concerned that no cost-benefit analysis was carried out of the wood chip industry in the south-west of Western Australia. It was alleged that such a study was made by the Department of Industrial Development, to which the responsibility properly fell. However, my request to the Minister for Industrial Development to table the study was refused; indeed, the Minister said it was really not a study at all, but a list of factors, which certainly does not represent a cost-benefit analysis. We the public have no idea just how useful this study—if one can dignify it by such a term—was by the Department of Industrial Development.

Some of the environmental impact statements we have seen in Australia have dealt with the given effects of the proposed action and not with the possible alternatives. Two which come to mind are the studies relating to the proposed Black Mountain tower in Canberra and the Redcliffe petrochemical project in South Australia; in both cases, the environmental impacts of possible alternatives were not considered.

Impact statements also should include unavoidable effects; these are things we will encounter if we pursue a particular project. The eighth point refers to how to avoid avoidable effects; the ninth point relates to the irreversible commitment of resources—in other words, resources which will not be available for any other purpose because they are committed for something else.

The report should be understood by laymen, but it should be sound enough

to be able to stand up to competent scientific analysis. It should be freely available; there should be none of this producing 30 copies and saying, "One is available in the reading room of the EPA if you care to go there between the hours of 9.00 a.m. and 4.00 p.m."

Mr Sibson: They are not bad hours; it reminds me of your policy towards door-to-door salesmen.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: If possible, the documents referred to in the statement should be available. If they are small enough, they should be part of the impact statement; however, if they are too large and it would be too expensive to present them with each copy of the statement they should be freely available to people who may want to check the findings contained in the statement. The impact statement also should contain the consequences of not taking the proposed action.

I want to make it clear that those 13 points emanated from the fourth annual report of the Council of Environmental Quality of the United States, which was presented to the President.

In relation to the question of comment on environmental impact statements, it is of no use such statements being presented and then ignored by the industry concerned. I have seen statements presented and the people involved say, "There it is; we have got it, and now we can start the industry without any further analysis of it." That is absurd; one may as well not have produced an environmental impact statement. Firstly, of course, there should be a comment from the EPA, which should be able to comment on the proposal itself and on the impact statement, and say whether in its opinion the EIS was a proper and adequate statement.

The draft statement should be made available to the public for their comments. I have already indicated the good I think will flow from public scrutiny of an EIS. I believe the days of Governments making decisions for the people are gone; I do not believe a Government has a right to make decisions without reference to public opinion. So, although eventually a decision will have to be made and a Government will have to make it, that decision should be made only after there has been public scrutiny of the proposal.

Comment should be invited from the public. Advertisements should be placed—not just one advertisement tucked away in the "Public Notices" column of *The West Australian*, but an adequate type of advertisement—regarding the existence of the draft proposals and the public should be able to suggest modifications both to the proposal and the EIS.

A public inquiry should be ordered if it is considered necessary. I suppose that, here, it would be ordered by the Minister, perhaps on the advice of the EPA. But

certainly, if there were a great demand for a public inquiry because the matter was very controversial or there were so many unknown factors, the Government probably would be compelled to hold such an inquiry.

One of the most controversial projects to be seen in New South Wales for some time was the Boyd Plateau project, into which the Government refused to hold a public inquiry; I believe that to be a good case where there should have been a public inquiry.

After the draft EIS has been circulated and commented upon by the EPA, by other expert Government bodies, and by the public—by "public" I do not mean just individuals but also people representing conservation organisations, university departments and so on—the preparers of the EIS should then consider the points which have been submitted as a result of the public scrutiny of the draft proposals. I will come to the problem of who the preparers should be in a moment, because this is quite a thorny problem.

The views expressed on the draft EIS should be published in the final report; it should not be possible for the preparers of the final report to ignore some of the comments as though they did not exist. I believe such a situation was highlighted in the case of the proposed southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway, where many points were put forward by various people: they may or may not have been valid points, but they were not commented upon in a satisfactory way.

The final EIS should go to all who have commented upon the draft and to those who are affected by it. I should like to refer at this point to an important concession made by Dr Cass while he was still Minister for the Environment in the Australian Government. He gave an undertaking to make it mandatory for the final EIS to be released to the public at least six weeks before a decision on the proposed action was made by whoever was to make the decision. In other words, rather than a final EIS being produced and a decision made, there is to be a lapse of six weeks so that people may look at the EIS and make up their minds before whoever is responsible for making a decision goes ahead with that decision.

I think this is a very important concession by Dr Cass who, members of goodwill would realise, is a genuine conservationist. We do not always get genuine conservationists sitting in the chair of the Minister for Conservation, given the way the political lottery works. I believe this to be a genuine concession to the environmental movement.

We should avoid what is happening in the United States, where there has been an excessive involvement by solicitors and lawyers in the production of environmental

impact statements, with resulting interminable law suits. Of course, the main spinoff would be in the way of fat fees for lawyers.

Of course, in this country that would mean that some of the big corporations fighting for a project would obtain the services of Queen's Counsel and there would be a legal wrangle. As far as possible we should avoid the mistakes made in the United States by not allowing the various protagonists to be represented by legal counsel.

I agree with Dr O'Brien, the Director of the Environmental Protection Authority in this State that we should avoid the production of glossy public relations documents masquerading under the name of environmental impact statements.

Because some environmental impact study is not sufficient, it does not mean the instrument is not good. When a person breaks a shovel while working in the garden he does not decide to use an axe on the job. He would get a better shovel. Similarly, because an environmental impact study could be a worthless public relations document it does not mean to say that if it is properly compiled it is no good. In my opinion the important aspect is that an environmental impact study is properly undertaken; and that is if there has been proper public scrutiny. If there is proper public scrutiny we would not get the meaningless glossy documents we often see, because such documents would be shot full of holes by the expertise available in society.

It is absolutely vital that environmental impact studies should be part of the decision-making process, and not things dreamed up to justify a decision already made, whether it be a decision in the Cabinet room or in the board rooms of companies. Certainly an environmental impact study should not be something which comes in at the tail end of consideration of a project, after there has been a public outcry. It should be part of the entire decision-making process.

Another trap to avoid is the demanding of an EIS for every project. I think we can become bogged down speedily in demanding that every time a water main is to be laid in a new subdivision an EIS must be undertaken. That would be going to absurd lengths, and we should avoid such absurdities.

How do we know which projects require environmental impact studies? I suggest, firstly, they would be required obviously in respect of major projects such as the jumbo steelworks and, secondly, they would be required on projects that were controversial.

Dealing with public scrutiny I should make the point that there are perhaps two parts to every decision. Some of the matters involved are very technical, but others are not technical but are value

judgments. Dealing with technical matters, any Government would be foolish in failing to realise that a great deal of expertise is available among the general community. Certainly when dealing with value judgments it is not right that judgments of the Commissioner of Main Roads or the Co-ordinator of Industrial Development should be foisted on the community. If it is a question of value judgments then it is only right and proper for the public to participate.

Another reason in support of public scrutiny is the fact that experts do not always agree. Under our Government system the public servants are not permitted to make public comments. I think this system should be changed, and if a public servant thinks the decision of a Government is wrong he should be able to say so publicly. I know this suggestion will be uncomfortable to Ministers of the Crown; I am not concerned with them but with the people in general.

If the experts disagree then such disagreement should be seen so that the people can make up their minds. However, if we have the situation where Big Brother knows best, and the people who disagree with a Minister or the Government are muzzled, we could have the situation where the Government and its experts are believed to agree on a certain proposal, when that is not the case at all.

We would have a situation of Big Brother appearing to know best. I do not believe that Big Brother knows best; I believe we should try to push back as far as possible the advent of Big Brother exercising control. I realise we are not far from 1984, but we should endeavour to prevent Big Brother from taking over our lives completely.

I am concerned with the establishment of a proposed jumbo steel mill. I believe it will create a danger in that a decision will be made which will alter irrevocably the whole character of Perth. The people will suffer or benefit—although I believe in many ways they will suffer from such a proposal—in that they will not be properly consulted. They will be fed information a little at a time in the way Big Brother thinks best. Big Brother will say, "I know what is best for the people. I will give them one or two snippets of information as I think fit, because I am the master." So, I believe there is a danger that these decisions will be made by Big Brother, in the form of the Government.

We have an example of this in respect of the discharge of industrial effluent into Cockburn Sound. I have asked questions relating to this matter, and the answers given by the Minister in effect say, "Mind your own business."

When I asked a question of the Minister for Industrial Development as to whether the discharge of industrial effluent into Cockburn Sound had caused

damage to the seagrass the reply of the Minister was. "It may have done." What kind of answer is that? I thought it might have done, otherwise I would not have asked the question.

We are told by the Government, "This is possible only through the co-operation of industry." Before a project is established we are told that the industry will be under the control of people and will have to observe the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act. However, after an industry has become established we are told by the Government, "We cannot tell you what the industry is doing to the environment, because this matter is a trade secret." The Government often claims that some of the processes are secret in a highly competitive business, that industry has the right to destroy the environment, and that the people will not be told because the information is confidential.

In answer to a question the Minister for Industrial Development said he hoped the information would be confidential to a Government of any political colour. He was trying to implicate Labor Governments, and implied that if we were the Government we would also regard such information as confidential.

This depends on where one's values lie; and on whether we consider the right of a commercial enterprise to outdo its competitors and take them over is more important than concern for the environment and the State. I still believe the environment and the State belong to the people and not to certain corporations which happen to have the ear of the Government.

I do not take a great deal of comfort from the assurance given by the Government which says that industry will co-operate, and industry must observe the Environmental Protection Act, because I know once an industry is established the people will be told to mind their own business and it is not their concern that seagrass in Cockburn Sound is being destroyed.

I asked for the tabling of a report on Cockburn Sound, but I was told by the Minister that I could not have it. However, I rang the Fremantle Port Authority and a copy was made available to me by mail. Without reports such as this the people cannot know what is happening to Cockburn Sound. To whom does the sound belong? According to the Minister it seems that Cockburn Sound belongs to BHP!

Mr Taylor: Apparently it does not belong to the electors.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I have already dealt with some of the abuses arising from environmental impact studies, and now I would like to mention the lack of such studies. For example, the Government might claim that a certain project was not

a major one, and therefore it did not require an EIS. We had an instance in Victoria where it was stated that the Newport power station was not to be a major project. In this case there was a great deal of trade union activity, and I was very glad to learn that the trade unions took their environmental responsibilities more seriously than the Government. As a result of their activity an EIS is to be undertaken.

We have another example where an environmental impact study was refused. I refer to the effect of the building of the Dartmouth Dam on the Mitta Mitta River. The Government claims it was not required. Fortunately in this instance strong opposition was raised by the conservationists, and as a result a study is being undertaken.

I suggest to the Government that pressure from conservationists will increase and it will have to reckon with such pressure from conservation movements. I will certainly be working in my puny way to ensure that the Government will take heed of the views of responsible conservation bodies.

On other occasions there is abuse of an EIS, and this might be caused by the lack of an in-depth study. We have an example of this in the case of the Lord Howe Island airstrip. No investigation was made as to where the material was to come from, and therefore there was no knowledge to hand to indicate that damage would be done to the native forest, or to a beach on that island which the Australian Conservation Foundation believes to be of World Heritage standard. This was the so-called environmental impact study on the Lord Howe Island airstrip, which did not look into possible major damage being caused to the amenities and beauty spots on the island.

Sometimes a decision is made to proceed with a project before an EIS has been completed. I suggest it is very wrong for Governments to do that sort of thing. At other times an EIS is too narrowly based; for example, consideration of the uranium industry in Australia without considering the effects of exports of uranium to foreign countries.

I have already mentioned abuse of environmental impact studies and the inability of the public to have proper access. If a project is started and then an EIS finds it is unsound because we could have a post-operative EIS, will the project be closed down? That is something we have to think about.

Sometimes the report of an EIS gives way to factors not considered in the EIS, so there has been no chance to dispute it. For that reason it would not have any effect; an example is the Madden Plains coal waste dump in New South Wales. In its report on the EIS the Environmental

Protection Authority of New South Wales stated there were compelling economic considerations which had not been considered in the EIS; in other words, the EIS considered only environmental and not economic factors. In any case the project still went ahead in spite of the trenchant criticism by the Environmental Protection Authority.

The evaluation of environmental impact statements by the EPA, or whatever body it happens to be, is crucial, because we cannot agree on costs involved and on the economics associated with the destruction of a species. How could an estimate be made of the cost of destroying a species? In many cases it would be possible to estimate the cost of saving a species because of the profit foregone by not pursuing a project.

Let us suppose there was a proposal to mine or dredge heavy sands, we will say, from Lake Kogolup—where there is a mineral claim—and also let us suppose that lake was the habitat of a species of wildlife found nowhere else in the world. The mining process might destroy that species and it would be lost forever if the dredging went ahead. If the project did not go ahead, in order to save that particular species of wildlife, an estimate could be made of the number of dollars forgone. However, if the project did go ahead and the species of wildlife was destroyed, how would it be possible to evaluate the cost in dollars? It is a case of value judgment, and that is why the public have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. The public may decide that a certain species is more important than a certain amount of production. Certainly it cannot be easily quantified.

I was tempted to become immersed in the technicalities of environmental impact statements but I decided against that temptation. I do not know why; perhaps I am a little tired. However, I am interested in the use of environmental matrix. I hold in my hand a matrix prepared for the Manjimup wood chipping environmental impact statement. It is rather interesting because the processes of the project are scored along one side of the map, and the effects on the environment are scored along the other side. The magnitude and the importance of the expected environmental effects appear in squares on the map.

To collate the information is an interesting exercise. There are various techniques, both arithmetical and algebraic, for resolving the problems which are more sophisticated. The point I am making is that no-one denies this is a very complex matter and should be dealt with by experts. However, many of the discussions concern value judgments and, therefore, they are not technical. Also, an enormous amount of expertise lies outside the Government. Government experts are muzzled; they cannot speak up when they believe their

department, their Minister, or the Government has reached a wrong decision. Such conflict may be revealed if there was an opportunity for public scrutiny.

Environmental impact statements are not the end of the process. Monitoring is important. We have been concerned with the suggestion that monitoring should be undertaken by the company concerned, and that the company should report only at three-yearly intervals. However, much damage can occur during a period of three years. A company might discover that damage is occurring and it could sit on that information for a period of three years before it reported the matter to the EPA.

I do not want to canvass the whole question of monitoring because it is outside the scope of this motion. I do not believe a system of environmental impact statements is the panacea. It will be only one weapon in the whole armoury which can, and should be, used.

Finally, I want to make the plea, again, for an appropriate organisation within this Parliament so that there will be a standing committee on the environment. That is contained in my motion. Some of my colleagues laughed at me—good humouredly, I hope—because of some of the questions I asked about the establishment of a jumbo steel mill. I think my colleagues laughed because they thought I had made up some of the terms myself. Perhaps I did, to test the knowledge of the Minister!

A jumbo steelworks is something about which we will have to make a decision. My opinion is that such a works will destroy the city of Perth. I am not trying to be melodramatic, and I am not talking about the environmental aspect. I think Perth will be destroyed for social reasons. The city will not be the same as we now know it. It has been claimed by some people that the construction of a jumbo steelworks will make Perth a better place in which to live, while others claim it will make Perth a worse place in which to live. I have a certain value judgment on such a project, the same as everyone else has. However, I believe there should be public debate.

How will members of Parliament be able to grapple with the complex problems associated with the construction of a jumbo steelworks? I asked questions of the Minister for Industrial Development which I thought were fairly simple but the Minister replied that technical answers could not be given at this stage. However, my questions were elementary when related to the making of steel. How will members of this Parliament resolve technical matters and make decisions?

Mr Coyne: Such problems can be left to the experts. I am representing the people.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Congratulations! Nevertheless, the member who has just

interjected will legislate, but he will leave decisions to the experts. He will sit in his seat, either on that side or on this side of the Chamber, and he will be told by the Premier—or whoever it is who tells him—to leave it to the experts. If we are to leave everything to the experts why do we not go home? If the member opposite considers himself to be a social worker employed to mend some old lady's roof then let him get on with the job of mending the roof. However, if he professes to be a legislator then surely he should not legislate from ignorance.

Mr Jamieson: He would be a nice old tomtomcat on a hot tin roof.

Mr Coyne: How can you evaluate the effects of a jumbo steelworks in Perth?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We are going to have to evaluate it.

Mr Coyne: How could you? You have a full-time job now; so do I.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Why is this matter brought to Parliament? The honourable member is admitting Parliament is a charade and a farce.

Mr Coyne: To get the overall picture you must get in the experts to advise you. You are not a medical expert, so you call in doctors to advise on medical matters. You are in the same position with regard to the environment.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The honourable member's concept of government is about 100 years old. I am not surprised, in view of the way he voted in the division in the early hours of this morning. He calls himself a Liberal and believes in the liberty of the individual, but he says, "Leave it to the experts; leave it to Big Brother; he knows best."

Mr Coyne: I said if I want to know anything about kangaroos I see a kangaroo shooter.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I am suggesting we should go to the experts. I have not at any time claimed to be an expert—

Mr Coyne: You are acting as though you do.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —or claimed that experts are not needed. I am saying this Parliament should have a standing committee so that the experts can come to us and we can begin to make up our minds and act responsibly, as responsible legislators. We have no right to be in this place pretending to legislate when in fact we are not legislating but merely doing what some civil servant believes we should do. If we had a standing committee on the environment we could get the experts in and listen to them. If over the last 12 months a standing committee had been sitting following the motion I moved last year, many of us in this House would be far better informed than we are at the present time about the problems associated with a jumbo steelworks or any other matter concerning the environment.

Despite the interjections, some members of this House take their jobs seriously. For example, when the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning tabled the reports of the MRPA on the Kwinana Freeway, many of us looked at the documents, tried to grapple with them, and then went to the experts in an endeavour to understand what was going on. But can one become an expert, or knowledgeable, or understand what is going on in two or three weeks after a Bill is introduced? I say we cannot, and that we should be continually preparing ourselves so that when these decisions have to be made we will be legislating from knowledge.

Responsible Parliaments throughout the world—in Canada, the United States, Britain, and New Zealand—and the Australian Parliament, and Parliaments of other States of Australia, including South Australia and Queensland, have acted responsibly and said, "We are being asked to legislate on many complex matters. It is up to us to find out as much as we can, especially from the experts, so that we will not be herded like bleating sheep into the benches on this side or that side but we will know what we are voting on and will have some idea of the issues involved."

Once again I make a plea to this Parliament to organise itself in a responsible manner so that it can discharge its responsibility.

Mr Bryce: Surely that is what the people elected us to do.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I commend the motion to the House. I believe there are people of intelligence and goodwill on both sides of the House, and I ask them to look at this proposal, think about it, and see whether any great harm would be done if in fact we established a standing committee on the environment, and whether it would be a way in which the people would get their money's worth from the Parliament of Western Australia. Although certain members are working very well, and I suppose the Ministers are working as hard as they can—certainly the public will be getting their money's worth from the Ministers—as far as most members of this House are concerned the people are not getting their money's worth from the Parliament. I believe we should consider organising ourselves in a proper way so that when issues come before us we can legislate from knowledge. Even though we will be imperfect and will never be experts on these subjects, we will be less ignorant than we are now.

I make the plea that my motion be given proper consideration and be not rejected because it is an Opposition motion. When we sat on the other side of the House, the member for Mt. Marshall, who was at that time the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, moved a motion calling for an inquiry into hire purchase with respect to farm machinery. We widened the inquiry—we had the numbers to do

so—to cover all aspects of hire purchase. The member for Mt. Marshall became a very capable chairman of that Select Committee. He will agree with me that in the end the five members of that Select Committee, while not being experts in high finance, knew far more about hire purchase than they did at the beginning. In the beginning I did not even know what a jacked deal was.

I feel that I can discuss these matters and understand them far better as a result of that inquiry. We were the Government on that occasion and we had the numbers. We did not simply say, "As this motion was moved by an Opposition member, we will crush it." We said, "This is a reasonable proposition. The Hire-Purchase Act does need overhauling." As a result we now have new legislation and I feel we made a fair job of our report. Perhaps it was not a perfect report, but certainly the legislation is better than it would have been if we had never sat and heard expert evidence from the Australian Finance Conference and the other various witnesses who came before us. We heard experts from the university, people who sold used cars, and representatives of companies such as Lombard Australia Ltd.

On that occasion the Government acted responsibly. It said, "This is a reasonable proposition and it will not hurt us to look at it." I was lucky enough to be chosen by my party to represent it on the committee, together with the then member for Merredin-Yilgarn and the member for Boulder-Dundas.

Mr Coyne: Did everyone on the committee learn as much as you did?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I would think so. As a matter of fact, we were fairly busy, but had I been able to put more time into it, I would have got more out of it. The member for Mt. Marshall did a tremendous amount of work, and he involved himself more than anyone else did. The member for Boulder-Dundas, with his legal experience, gave a great deal of assistance to the committee. We brought down a report—

Mr Harman: And it was acted upon.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —and it was not a bad report. We were busy people, and most of us knew little about the subject before we commenced. Our report was acted upon, and the result was better hire-purchase legislation. All I am asking is that the Government should look at this proposal on its merits; not just as a motion put forward by the Opposition, but as a motion which may or may not be reasonable.

If the motion is reasonable, surely the Government should consider it. I know the Minister for Conservation and the Environment takes his duties very seriously, and I hope he will speak to the Premier and his colleagues in the Cabinet. Perhaps he will say, "This proposition

being put forward is a reasonable one. These people are asking that they be organised to do the work. Really they are asking to work harder for the people of Western Australia."

Mr BARNETT: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Conservation and the Environment).

BILLS (6): RETURNED

1. Chicken Meat Industry Committee Bill.
2. Radiation Safety Bill.
3. Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill.
4. Acts Amendment (Judicial Salaries and Pensions) Bill.
5. Railways Discontinuance and Land Revestment Bill.
6. Marketing of Barley Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

PROSTITUTION AND VICE

Inquiry by Royal Commission: Motion

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [6.05 p.m.]: I move—

In the opinion of this House the Government should appoint a Royal Commission—

- (a) To ascertain the scope, organisation and mode of operation of the form of prostitution in Western Australia;
- (b) To identify persons and organisations who directly or indirectly finance, or manage such prostitution etc., or derive any pecuniary or other form of benefit therefrom;
- (c) To ascertain the manner and extent of the enforcement of the law against prostitution and in particular whether enforcement has been consistent with regard to the operation of all persons and organisations identified under (b) above;
- (d) Generally to ascertain whether there are any links between the organisation and operation of prostitution and the operations of other forms of illegal vice, particularly gambling in Western Australia; similarly whether there are any links between any form of illegal vice in Perth and any form of illegal vice outside the metropolitan area, and or other Australian States;

- (e) To examine whether the existing laws contribute to exploitation and intimidation; and
- (f) To make recommendations with regard to any change which appears to be desirable in the laws relating to prostitution and other forms of illegal vice and in the methods of law enforcement.

I have no enthusiasm for the task which I have undertaken to discharge, but I have been so concerned about the information which has been volunteered to me in recent days that I felt impelled to endeavour to do something about it.

I looked carefully at the proposal which the Premier submitted, and a letter which he wrote to me in which he indicated his readiness to appoint a special legal officer who would examine evidence already in the possession of the Government and any further evidence which might come to the Government from members of the Opposition, members of the Government, and representatives of organisations. I feel that this will not achieve anything, and I will give my reasons for that statement.

In his letter the Premier said—

The Government stands ready and willing to convene a Royal Commission—preferably presided over by a Judge—but before an enquiry can be effective, it is important that it has terms of reference which will enable the Commission to get to grips with the matters which are subject to complaint and allegation.

Further on in his letter the Premier said—

The Government believes that those who consider they have information of a reliable nature which implicates a person, or persons, in malpractice, including any suggestion of bribery and corruption, should be prepared to supply the details of their allegations, and the parties involved.

Then, further down, he said—

An enquiry into the general question of prostitution would be meaningless, as it would be so wide-ranging as to make it almost impossible for a Royal Commission to answer the sort of questions that a Commission needs to answer if it is going to have any real value.

Then he said—

The Royal Commission should not be a vehicle which certain people can use for achieving their own personal ends, of pursuing any personal vendetta they might wish to wage against any particular person or persons.

I consider that paragraph to be an insult to those people who are endeavouring to have the situation which I am going to describe cleaned up. To suggest or imply

that the action they are taking is to enable them to achieve their own personal ends is in my opinion an attitude which the Government is not entitled to adopt at all.

Mr B. T. Burke: Shameful!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Supposing those who have this information gave it to this specially qualified legal officer. Would they be called upon to substantiate what they submitted and, if so, what protection could they claim against subsequent action?

Mr Speaker, I am going to remind you and the members of this House of a situation which concerned myself when the Government of the day, of which you were a Minister, received an allegation against me and introduced a Bill into this House to deprive me of any legal rights I had at the time, and then appointed a Royal Commission. That Government did not appoint a specially qualified legal officer to go into that matter. All the Premier of the day had to do was to call me into his office and I would have been able to satisfy him completely that there was no basis for the action being taken.

However, that did not suit the Government of the day. It thought it had something on me and it could not appoint a Royal Commissioner quickly enough. I refer to the Royal Commission into starting price betting. When that Royal Commission was subsequently held the judge in charge of it first of all declined to allow me to call the Premier. When I said to him, "Well, I am going to ask you in the open inquiry for permission to call the Premier, and you will have to refuse me in the inquiry" he subsequently agreed that I could call the Premier; but I had to submit to him beforehand the questions I wished to ask the Premier. He vetted them and, from memory, disallowed two or three.

Mr Thompson: Who was the commissioner?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Subsequently the inquiry was held and the Royal Commissioner decided that the two fellows, Peat and Berry, who made the allegations upon which the Government acted were a pair of liars, and he said so in his report. I mention this to show that on that occasion a Liberal-Country Party Government did not feel it necessary to appoint someone beforehand to go into the question to see whether or not a Royal Commission should be held. That Government could not appoint a Royal Commission quickly enough on that evidence alone—the evidence of two people subsequently found to be liars.

What have we got in this case? We have abundant evidence of liaison between police and madams. We have evidence of a proliferation of brothels being established right alongside the residences of

respectable people, and when those respectable people draw the attention of the Perth City Council and the CIB to the existence of the brothels nothing is done, and the brothels remain there and continue to operate.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Before the tea suspension I was endeavouring to show that the Government has acted differently in connection with the demand for a Royal Commission now from what it did some years ago when the Government thought it had something on me. On that occasion it did not need any preliminary inquiry to enable it to determine what it ought to do.

Mr O'Neil: Maybe it should have taken the same action then as it proposes now.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The action I suggested the Premier should have taken was to tell me of the allegations made against me thus giving me an opportunity to explain the situation. Had he done this the State might have been saved a lot of money. But he did not choose to do this.

In order to justify the holding of a Royal Commission, the preliminary inquiry the Government proposes does not need to go any further than what is on the Government files.

There is a file in the Police Department which records what I am now going to say. There were two policemen in Kalgoorlie who were in very close association with a madam called Maria Tradof. If it is desired I will mention the names of the policemen here and now.

Mr O'Neil: I think it would be wise to mention their names.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The two policemen were Henley and Detective-Sergeant Wilkinson.

As a result of what was going on somebody decided there should be an inquiry, and two police officers called Brennan and Wiley went to Kalgoorlie to commence the inquiry; and as a result of this Henley resigned and Detective-Sergeant Wilkinson returned to Perth. As far as is known no disciplinary action was taken in connection with the matter. That is on the file in the Police Department and I have reason to believe the Minister for Police knows all about it.

Mr O'Neil: Did you mention the date on which that occurred? I did not hear you.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, I cannot be precise about the date although I think it was given to me at the time.

Mr Sibson: What is your insinuation?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: About this time quite a substantial deal in a transfer of real estate took place and a madam called

Estell Strong bought a brothel in Kalgoorlie for \$120 000. It must have been a lucrative sort of business.

Mr Old: It may have been a nice piece of real estate.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: She paid for this brothel with \$60 000 white money and \$60 000 black money.

Mr O'Neil: What does that mean? I do not know what it means.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The seller of this brothel was a Nancy Taylor and there was a certain policeman associated with this deal who received \$1 000 for his part in the business and who subsequently finished up buying a house in Ward Street, Kalgoorlie, in February or March, 1972. That will be recorded on the police file.

Mr O'Neil: What was his name?

Mr Jamieson: He gave his name.

Mr O'Neil: He mentioned he was a policeman and he said he bought a place in a certain street.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I do not think I should give all the names at once; I shall give just a few; the others can be found by looking at the police files.

Mr Young: You are the one who is doing this, why do not you name them?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the honourable member is anxious to have the names he should vote for the Royal Commission and he will get them.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: What the Government proposes to do will not meet the situation at all, and for very obvious reasons. In this letter from the Premier he indicated he wants the information to be supplied by midday, Monday.

Mr O'Neil: You are supplying a lot of it now under privilege.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: That is the purpose for which it has been provided over the years in Parliament. The Premier has sought this information by midday, Monday.

I know that Mr Shaw, the State Manager of Telecom. here, has been asked whether he could supply certain information about changes in telephones, and he has indicated it is extremely unlikely that he could conclude his inquiries and have the information available by midday, Monday.

Accordingly I rang Mr Shaw to find out if this was indeed so, and he assured me it was; because there was so much to look into that he felt it was unlikely it could be done. These are the words he used to me—"extremely unlikely that he could have this information available by midday, Monday".

Of the number of people who have communicated with me by letter some have signed their names and some have not. Of those who have spoken to me by telephone some have hesitated to give their names while others have not; and I agree with them for the reasons they have submitted for withholding their names at this stage. They have indicated to me that they cannot put themselves at risk in submitting information to the type of inquiry the Government proposes to set up; they were not prepared to do this without being given protection, and for the major reason that the people at the top in this game are wealthy people with a lot of money.

Mr Sibson: Who are they?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Such people would not hesitate to issue a writ against those with no money.

Within the last fortnight I have had telephone conversations with a man who feels he has a case, and he wants to go to the court.

Mr Coyne: You get plenty of them around the place.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: However he needs the services of a QC to give him any hope of success; and the QC has required that he come up with \$4 000 before the QC would move on his behalf. The man in question has not got \$4 000 and he cannot proceed.

I have been endeavouring to get him assistance from Commonwealth legal aid in order to enable him to prove his case, but here again he stands the chance of losing because the courts do not always come to the right decisions.

Mr T. J. Burke: The supreme court of Nedlands never does!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Can we blame a person who has no money for refusing to put himself in a position of having to face the cost of a libel action? He would not put himself at risk if he did not have the wherewithal to meet the cost of such an action. It is an old dodge for a man with money to be able to issue a writ and threaten to take it first through one court and then through another.

Mr Jamieson: We have seen it happen here.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is the main reason that the people who have communicated with me have declined to allow me to mention their names at this stage; and who have declined to come before this special commissioner whom the Government has appointed, but who have indicated they will come forward if a Royal Commission were appointed.

Some of the information which has been communicated to me—and this letter answers the interjection of somebody here who wanted to know the names of some of these madams—

Mr Sibson: It is I.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I will satisfy the honourable member's curiosity. The madam is Mrs Flatman.

Mr Sibson: That is an obvious one.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Accompanied by her husband, Mrs Flatman visited the premises of the Minister for Police, the Hon. Ray O'Connor. I want to say here and now in the absence of the Minister that before dinner I told him of my intention to state this and I gave him an opportunity to confirm or deny it. I will relate the conversation as I proceed. The person who gave me this story—and who is prepared to go before a Royal Commission—said that on the 7th August, which was a Thursday, Mr and Mrs Flatman visited the Hon. Ray O'Connor's home.

Mr O'Neill: Was it this month or last month?

Mr Jamieson: Last month.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and during the course of the discussion he said to her—

Mr Sibson: Was this person who was relating the story there at the time?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am telling you the story as told to me, and the person who told it to me said she would be prepared to go before a Royal Commission and state this.

Mr Young: It is an important question. Was she there at the time?

Mr Jamieson: Just hear the story.

Mr Bertram: Just a moment, Perry Mason, let the Leader of the Opposition speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am not at all worried, because I have unlimited time.

Mr Thompson: And unlimited energy!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am not likely to be put off; the honourable member need not worry about that. To proceed with this story, this woman said that Mr and Mrs Flatman had visited the Hon. Ray O'Connor on Thursday, the 7th August; and after visiting him they went to a certain shop in Midland and they made the statement that they had come from the Hon. Ray O'Connor's home—

Mr Sibson: Whom are you talking about now?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —and he had advised them when they were there that they should go abroad until this trouble about prostitution had blown over.

Mr Jamieson: We should have a guarantee from the Minister for Police that they will come back.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: They have gone abroad. Whether or not they obtained the advice from the Minister and took advantage of it can be proved only by a Royal Commission. I spoke to the Minister

about this before tea tonight and I told him this was what I would say. He denied that Mr and Mrs Flatman were at his home on Thursday, the 7th August, but he did say they were there on a Sunday although he was not sure of the time or the date. He denied that he told them what I have been told they did say.

They said their purpose in going to see him was that they were going to complain about the pressure the police were putting on them. He said the reason they went out to the Minister's home was that they were unable to reach him at his office.

Mr T. J. Burke: It was a hot day and they wanted to have a swim!

Mr Young: I know you have unlimited time, but will you repeat the number of people who were involved in the telling of that story to you, because it is very confusing.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Excluding the Flatmans the number of people involved in this story was not more than two.

Mr Young: So at that stage it was third-hand, without the Flatmans?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Without the Flatmans. Now, the story is this: When the Flatmans went to this shop they said, "We have just come from Mr O'Connor's home." Then they said what he had told them to do.

Mr Jamieson: To scamper!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The person to whom they told this story then told the person who told me, and who was in the shop at the time—

Mr Young: If that is as accurate as the land deals at Gwangara then it is not a matter for a Royal Commission.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am putting forward the information which the Premier asked for.

Mr Jamieson: He admitted they had been to his place. This is a bit too close to home for comfort.

Mr T. J. Burke: Why did not the Minister stay in the Chamber to defend himself?

Mr Sibson: Your story is "they told him and he told me".

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I cannot help it if this is unpalatable to the member for Bunbury.

Mr Coyne: It is not information.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: What is it then?

Mr Coyne: They are innuendoes.

Mr O'Neil: Can you give us the address of that shop?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: We will give it to the Royal Commission if one is appointed.

Mr O'Neil: I understand you heard this from somebody who had heard it from somebody else.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: We will state the name of the person to whom the Flatmans were supposed to have spoken. There is information to indicate there seems to be a liaison between some top men in the Police Force and the top madams, under which these top madams are able to enter into arrangements in the fairly secure knowledge that they will not be molested.

Mr Coyne: They thought that about the TAB incident.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the law were being enforced, it is reasonable to accept that as soon as a brothel was established it would become known to the police before it would become known to the people who would frequent the place. In many instances it seems the police are the last to find out. That does not say very much for the perspicacity of the Police Force.

It is to be expected, as brothels are illegal, when they become known to the police the police would take action to close them up. In those circumstances no-one but a fool would enter into a long lease of premises which are likely to be closed down. One would expect them to enter into weekly rental arrangements, and many of them do. However, there are some who do not. Shirley Finn was one and Dorothea Flatman was another who purchased premises for this purpose and who took long leases.

Kimberley Finance and J. Devereaux who jointly owned No. 6 and No. 8 Forbes Road gave a lease for the purpose for which this building was ultimately used.

Mr O'Neil: Did they give a lease for the purpose for which the building was used? You do not lease a building for the purpose of using it.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I did not say that.

Mr O'Neil: You say they gave a lease of the premises for the purpose for which the building was used.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The person who took the lease took it for this purpose.

Mr O'Neil: How did you know?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I do not know.

Mr O'Neil: That was what you said. I know you made a mistake.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I did not make a mistake at all. I am saying again that they leased these premises to the person who accepted the lease for the purpose for which the building was used.

Mr O'Neil: That was not what you said in the first place.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Now the Minister wants to be pedantic.

Mr O'NEIL: Mr Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has challenged me as to the accuracy of what I said he is recorded in *Hansard* as having said. Is it possible

for me to ask for the *Hansard* report of what the Leader of the Opposition has just said?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr Bryce: What is the point of order?

Mr O'NEIL: I am not raising a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I would not like members to interject while I am trying to discover whether or not the Minister has an argument in this regard. Let me determine this point at the outset.

Mr O'NEIL: Can I simply make an explanation that it is my understanding that the Leader of the Opposition said that?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Under what Standing Order has the Minister the right to make an explanation in the middle of my speech?

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is correct. If any member wishes to raise a point of order he may do so, and under such circumstances I believe we can consult *Hansard* to establish the exact words used; but as no point of order has been raised—it was only a query—and as the point has been clarified, without further ado we will hear the Leader of the Opposition again.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I do not want any misunderstanding about the situation, and I have no reason to convey other than the situation as I see it.

Mr O'NEIL: I am assuming that you said what I said that you did say unwittingly.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Minister should not assume. I will tell him the situation as I understand it. I will try to phrase my comments in such words so that there is no room for misinterpretation.

Mr O'NEIL: That is what I am after.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The premises were leased to Kimberley Fashions, and the person to whom they were leased was Kimberley Murray who, I understand, is none other than Kimberley Flatman.

Mr Jamieson: He is using an assumed name.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Firstly, I believe it is an offence for a person to lease premises in an assumed name; so, that is a matter which a Royal Commission could look at. Associated with Kimberley Finance is one J. Devereaux. I do not know whether, when the premises were being leased, that either Devereaux or Kimberley Finance was aware of the fact that they were to be used for prostitution.

Mr O'NEIL: Thank you. That was the point I was trying to make.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: What I do know is that Kimberley Murray knew what they would be used for.

Mr O'NEIL: Assuming your accusation is correct.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The point I am making is that he took a lease, instead of a weekly rental.

Mr Bertram: The amount of rental might be indicative.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: He must have been under the impression—and subsequent events proved this because the premises still operated—that he would not be molested and would be allowed to carry on. I understand that under the law and the procedures, when a prosecution takes place there is an obligation on somebody to take action to see that the telephones are disconnected; but that is not being done in all cases. It is being done in some cases. Instead of the telephones being disconnected when some of these people moved along to other premises, they were able to take the same telephone number with them. Does not that suggest that either somebody is falling down badly on the job with regard to some of these places and they are not concerned about what ought to be done—

Mr Grayden: You are suggesting something is wrong with the GPO. Surely this is the responsibility of the GPO.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: How would the GPO know?

Mr Grayden: It transferred the telephone.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The GPO has to be told, and the obligation is on the police to tell that department. Let us have a Royal Commission to find out precisely.

Mr Coyne: Find out why the telephone was changed over?

Mr Grayden: This is under a Federal Labor Government. It was responsible for transferring the telephone and now Whitlam comes into the picture.

Several members interjected.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Surely, Mr Speaker—

Mr Grayden: Perhaps some Federal Labor members are involved.

Mr Bateman: A few Liberal members are involved.

Mr Davies interjected.

Mr Grayden: You would know all about it; I do not. Perhaps I should say he thinks he knows all about it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: Have you got an interest, too?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! After an incident, of course, it is likely there will be some disorder for a while. That is quite legitimate, but there must not be continuous interjecting. I ask members to behave themselves. I call on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I cannot refrain from saying, after having heard what the Minister said, that we have now heard everything.

Mr Grayden: The Leader of the Opposition will hear further unless he can establish that his allegations are correct. They have been incorrect so many times in the past.

Mr Jamieson: Have you something to hide, too?

Mr Grayden: The Leader of the Opposition had better be right on this occasion.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Is that the tactic?

Mr Grayden: Slandering people, all along the line.

Mr Bryce: Another smokescreen.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The tactic adopted by the Minister for Labour and Industry stamps him as a blackguard.

Point of Order

Mr GRAYDEN: Mr Speaker—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: I am going to ask the Leader of the Opposition, first of all, to withdraw and I say this: that he—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is entitled to ask for a withdrawal, but that is all.

Mr GRAYDEN: Well, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am pleased to comply with the request, Mr Speaker, and I ask you to request the Minister for Labour and Industry to withdraw the remark he made which caused me to make the remark I made.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to know what the remark was which the Minister made.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I cannot give you the exact words, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Unless the Leader of the Opposition can remember the words used, there is no possibility of the offending person having to withdraw the remark.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If you will listen to me, Mr Speaker, I think I can show you there is the possibility because the remark from the Minister, whilst I cannot quote it verbatim, was to the effect that I was making statements which I could not substantiate, as I had done in the past.

Mr Grayden: Completely incorrect.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule there is no infringement and no need for a withdrawal of those remarks. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Well, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is only one action which the Leader of the Opposition can take.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: And I will take it. I will move that your ruling be disagreed with for the following reasons: that the Minister is implying, without any evidence at all—just a general statement, which anybody can make—that I have made allegations in the House here which I could not support with evidence. The Minister is not in a position to quote one instance. That has happened so often here and I have been fairly tolerant.

Mr Grayden: We had an example from you and the paper would not publish it.

Mr Jamieson: Stick to the facts.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Whilst I dislike doing it, I say that if the Minister had not made the remark which he did make, I would not have made the remark which I made.

Mr H. D. Evans: He tried to intimidate the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I object to the remarks made by the Minister because they imply that I am a person who is prepared to make allegations without evidence and without a basis.

Mr Grayden: That happens all the time.

Mr Jamieson: There it is again.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There it is again. Is the Minister allowed to get away with that sort of thing? As much as I regret taking this action, and I hope you, Mr Speaker, will reconsider the situation, I move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

Mr T. D. EVANS: I formally second the motion and I would like very briefly to support it because I think the occasion calls for such support. As everybody in the Chamber is aware, our leader would be regarded as the father of this House. I think it is apposite to say that in moving in the manner in which he has done it would not come easy to him. I am sure that if one were to look through the long *Hansard* records of the period during which the Leader of the Opposition has been here—since 1933—one would find this was one of the very few occasions that he has moved to disagree with a ruling made by a Speaker, particularly on a matter affecting him personally.

If you, Mr Speaker, want further proof that the words used by the Minister were offensive to the Leader of the Opposition you need only have regard for the fact that while the Leader of the Opposition was explaining his move the Minister for Labour and Industry made the comment, "he is always saying it". I cannot understand

that you would need further proof when the Minister has persisted in the remark he made.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion, even though it does not give me a great deal of personal pleasure so to do.

The **SPEAKER**: Before putting the question I feel I should make brief reference to this motion. I do not need to be informed by anybody about the quality of the character, and the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition. No-one has to inform me about that. I have been here for a considerable period of time.

Regarding the incidents which have just taken place I, as Speaker, found I had to rule in one direction on one occasion, and in another direction on the next occasion. I considered the remarks made in one instance were really offensive and should be withdrawn, and I considered in the other case—as with many remarks made in this Chamber since I have been Speaker, and very many of those remarks were infinitely worse—that the remarks which have been made probably caused some sort of offence but were not considered to be so offensive as to warrant their withdrawal. I have ruled in that way previously.

The Speaker cannot please everybody, and he cannot please both sides or please two opposing individuals. He must do as he sees fit according to the circumstances which exist at the time, and I so rule.

I am remarking in this manner for the benefit of the younger members, more than for the benefit of the older members. It is the prerogative of any member to disagree with the Speaker's ruling, and so it has happened this time. I only regret that it has happened on an occasion when, I believe, I have ruled correctly.

Mr O'NEIL: When the Leader of the Opposition commenced his speech on this motion he indicated that he was entering upon an area which was personally distasteful to him. One can appreciate the difficulty in which a person such as he finds himself.

A little earlier I had occasion to attempt to correct what I believed the Leader of the Opposition had said unwittingly, and there was a heated moment and an exchange of some rather heated remarks. However, I took that action purely for the purpose of having the record straight. The sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition was evident by his remarks when he commenced to speak and when he said he felt this was a rather distasteful subject.

However, in the issue now before us, when the Leader of the Opposition moves to disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker, that he withdraw some remark, it is pertinent to point out that the Leader of the Opposition—as would be the case with many members in this Chamber—was not

specifically aware of what the precise remarks were. The Leader of the Opposition admitted that himself. It seems, therefore, that in this particular episode we are dealing with something which is quite similar to that episode which recently occurred where, I believe, the Leader of the Opposition said something unwittingly which was later corrected.

It is the intention of the Government to support the ruling, but I recall an occasion such as this, some little time ago, when you, Mr Speaker, earned the great respect of this House by using an initiative which I do not believe I have ever witnessed in this House previously; that is, to leave the Chair and invite the persons concerned to consult with you in your rooms in order that the matter could be resolved other than by a vote of this House which, in fact, would either support you or, in essence, pass a vote of no-confidence in you by disagreeing with your ruling.

It may well be that because of a prerogative available to you you may comment further, but if you do not see it that way I accept it is your decision to take the alternative which you took previously. It is our intention to support you, as you would expect us to do, and vote against the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr THOMPSON: As your deputy, Mr Speaker, and as the Chairman of Committees, the situation in which you find yourself is one in which I could very easily find myself. I believe that the standard of conduct in this House has deteriorated over the past few months. Without any question that is the case.

Mr T. J. Burke: It says a lot for your control!

Mr Bertram: Like the Canberra Parliament.

Mr THOMPSON: I believe all of us, on both sides of the House, should take stock of ourselves and lift the standard. We had a very high standard when I first came here, and I have been here only five minutes, really.

Mr T. J. Burke: Since 1971.

Mr THOMPSON: I do not say all the deterioration has been the result of actions of members opposite.

Mr Jamieson: Well that is very nice.

Mr THOMPSON: There are other people, members from both sides, who are responsible for this situation.

Mr T. J. Burke: The Premier is not here.

Mr THOMPSON: I would like to draw the attention of the House to Standing Order 144 which says—

When any Member objects to words used in debate by another Member, the Speaker, or Chairman of Committees shall, if either considers the

words to be objectionable, or unparliamentary, order them to be withdrawn; and, if necessary, an apology made.

I think the pertinent words are, "... if either considers the words to be objectionable or unparliamentary ...". Now you, Sir, did not judge them as having been unparliamentary or objectionable. If you had, you would have had no hesitation in supporting the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, only last night, if I recall correctly, you ruled against a senior member on this side of the House in favour of a submission that had been made by a member from the other side.

Mr Moiler: What is wrong with that?

Mr THOMPSON: I think you have been extremely fair, Sir, and I hope the House will support you unanimously in this matter.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I feel that the conduct of this House and its actual running and control has improved in recent months. I appreciate personally the fairness and the firmness with which I have been treated. I certainly do not cavil on any ground of that nature. However, I regret that I must disagree with you, Sir, on this occasion, and I must support my leader because I believe that is certainly the proper course for me to follow.

In this instance the Minister, in his interjection, not only attacked the Leader of the Opposition on the subject but he made his remarks in a very general and obnoxious way.

Mr Grayden: Completely untrue!

Mr H. D. EVANS: I was within easy hearing distance of the Minister, and my hearing is not impaired. I certainly took exception to the way in which the Minister made the comment.

Mr Grayden: You listen to the comments of your friend on your left.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Also, there was a note of intimidation in the remarks made by the Minister. They were unseemly and have no place in this House. They would be far better off in the gutter.

Mr Grayden: That is where you should be.

Mr H. D. EVANS: We must consider the literal meaning of a remark—and I realise that I am speaking in a Chamber where the value and weight of words are well known; we are not dealing with people who are inexperienced in the expression and value of the choice of a word. We must consider not only the literal meaning, the denotation, which is involved here, but also the expression and the connotation that goes with it. Indeed, there is a reference in our Standing Orders to the fact that ironical questions or remarks should not be made. Irony is a deliberate form of speech; it is a device whereby there is a disparity between the literal and

the intended meaning. So an expression can be used in such a way that an inoffensive remark can take on a vastly different significance. I feel it was such expression that contributed somewhat to the remarks of the Minister opposite. So it is on those grounds, and bearing in mind the way in which the criticism that was originally levelled was expanded, I have no other course but to support my leader.

Mr GRAYDEN: Mr Speaker, I say first of all that the House has no option but to uphold your ruling. We have just listened to the member for Warren—I have heard hypocrisy in the past, but he has gone to the extreme.

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr Grayden: Now he is going to ask for a withdrawal!

Mr H. D. EVANS: —I take strong exception to the expression used by the Minister and I seek its withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I have heard the word "hypocrisy" used here before, and no-one has sought its withdrawal. Under the circumstances existing at the present time, I am inclined to ask the Minister for Labour and Industry to withdraw the remark so that we may continue.

Mr GRAYDEN: I withdraw the remark.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you.

Debate (dissent from Speaker's ruling) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: I can short circuit this debate by saying that my remarks to the Leader of the Opposition were absolutely unequivocal; there can be no question about it, absolutely no misunderstanding anywhere along the line because we have only to refer to *Hansard*. We have a *Hansard* reporter at the desk taking down everything that is said.

Mr Jamieson: Well get on with it.

Mr GRAYDEN: The House can suspend, and we can see precisely what was said. What did I say? I said, "On this occasion the Leader of the Opposition would have to substantiate his allegations."

Mr Bryce: Is that all that you said?

Mr Jamieson: Not all! Now you have really put yourself in.

Mr Bryce: And the rest of it.

Point of Order

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, on a point of order I must now request that the *Hansard* note be produced to the House to see exactly what the Minister did say by interjection, because he certainly did not say that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct that *Hansard* discover the interjection made by the Minister for Labour. In the interim

I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 8.21 to 8.38 p.m.

The SPEAKER: Order! As members are aware the reason for my leaving the Chair was to establish the words used by the Minister for Labour and Industry during the debate on the motion. I have obtained from *Hansard* the remarks made, and will quote from the report, giving the members' names as they appear in the report. The report commences—

Mr Grayden: The Leader of the Opposition will hear further unless he can establish that his allegations are correct.

Mr Grayden: That is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to be quiet when I am on my feet. The *Hansard* report of the Minister's interjection continues—

They have been incorrect so many times in the past.

Mr Jamieson: Have you something to hide too?

Mr Grayden: The Leader of the Opposition had better be right on this occasion.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Is that the tactic?

Mr Grayden: Slandering people, all along the line.

Mr Bryce: Another smokescreen.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The tactic adopted by the Minister for Labour and Industry stamps him as a black-guard.

Those are the words in dispute. I inform the House before the debate continues that I see no reason to depart from the ruling I made.

*Debate (dissent from Speaker's ruling)
Resumed*

Mr JAMIESON: Having heard the sermon from the Mount from the member for Kalamunda, who just happened to open his copy of the Standing Orders at Standing Order 144, which he used to base his argument in defence of your ruling, Mr Speaker, I must draw his attention to Standing Order 128, which reads—

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

I also draw his attention to Standing Order 129, which states—

All imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on Members, shall be considered highly disorderly.

It is true that there has been some heat in the debate; it also looked as though the Minister for Labour and Industry had lost his cool, so to speak. As a con-

sequence, he probably said things he might not normally have said. However, he certainly accused my leader of slandering people, all along the line.

Mr Grayden: We have had several instances, have we not?

Mr JAMIESON: When he was asked to quote the instance, of course, he talked about the property north of Perth; as far as I know, this House has never discussed that matter.

Mr Grayden: He slandered Ministers recently, and then abjectly withdrew.

Mr JAMIESON: We are talking about something that happened outside the House. If the Minister cared to visit the Parliamentary Library, he would see that *The Australian Financial Review* was the first newspaper to publish that statement, yet nobody seems to have taken any action against that newspaper. I say that by way of an aside; that is my source, because I read it in that paper.

Mr Grayden: The Press did not publish his withdrawal in full. Had it done so, he would have been discredited for all time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JAMIESON: I am not talking about that; I am talking about from where the information originally emanated. If the Minister wants to go into that, we can have a debate on the matter at another time. However, I believe the circumstances are very clear. The words used are undoubtedly objectionable; they imply that the Leader of the Opposition is prone to slandering people all the time and I cannot see how those words do not come within the scope of the Standing Orders I have quoted.

Mr Thompson: But the appropriate Standing Order is Standing Order 144, is it not?

Mr JAMIESON: No, Standing Order 144 is just where the honourable member's thumb fell on the book.

Mr Thompson: Well, why do you not read Standing Order 144?

Mr JAMIESON: It states in effect that when any member objects to words used in debate, the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall make a judgment.

Mr Thompson: When the member objects.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes.

Mr Thompson: That is what happened was it not?

Mr JAMIESON: The point is that the very member who caused the objection demanded a withdrawal of something that was said. If he had not taken any action, the position would have been very different. He cannot have it all one way. To return to the sermon we heard about

the House and its conduct, I have been here a fair while and I have heard more people—

Point of Order

Mr SIBSON: Mr Speaker, I take a point of order.

Mr Bryce: It's the member for Bunbury!

Mr B. T. BURKE: Be careful—he is going to try to sell you his car.

Mr Moller: He has woken up again.

The SPEAKER: Order; How can I establish anything unless there is quiet?

Mr SIBSON: We are debating whether the words objected to are unparliamentary. Surely that is covered by Standing Order 144.

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr SIBSON: We are talking about words which have been objected to.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Do you have a point of order?

Mr SIBSON: I contend that Standing Orders 128 and 129 are not relevant to this situation.

Mr Bryce: It is past your bed time.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate (on dissent from Speaker's ruling) Resumed

Mr JAMIESON: I only hope there are some Bunbury constituents in the gallery.

Mr Nanovich: You are very nasty.

Mr JAMIESON: Some ugliness has crept into this place from time to time; over the years I have seen it occur on odd occasions. Members have been invited outside and all that sort of thing. I think it is quite unnecessary; people involved in this sort of activity are very childish in their attitudes towards certain issues. This is one of the things we do not like to see in a Parliament. However, I have seen many Parliaments throughout the world and can say with authority that few are as well controlled and behaved as is this Parliament; it is virtually a model Parliament, despite what some people might think to the contrary.

I support my leader in his move to disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker; we consider the words to be offensive and obviously, from your reading of *Hansard*, they are offensive and should be withdrawn.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I rise to support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Before stating my case, I should like to say briefly that while an area of grey existed about the words used there did seem to be some minor justification for your ruling, Mr Speaker. However,

following the revelation of exactly what the Minister said, that justification has entirely disappeared.

A reference to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* reveals that the word "slander" means, "false report maliciously uttered to person's injury; uttering of such reports, calumny; false oral defamation". I venture to say that had the Minister used not "slander" but "lie" he would have been asked to withdraw. But the word he used was tantamount to saying that the Leader of the Opposition had lied and, following that revelation, we asked you, Mr Speaker, to request the Minister to withdraw the remark. You have refused and in those circumstances you leave us with no option.

Are we to assume that you do not know the meaning of the word "slander", Mr Speaker? Or do you know the meaning of the word and are we now free to call each other liars across the Chamber? That situation is untenable. If in fact you were not aware that the word "slanderer" meant, in effect, "liar", I ask you to change your ruling. But before I sit down and give you the opportunity to do so, Mr Speaker, I will just say that the whole demeanour of this Minister is a disgrace to the House.

Point of Order

Mr GRAYDEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask for that statement to be withdrawn.

Mr Moller: You have caused enough damage.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Balga to withdraw the remark.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I said that the conduct of the Minister in this House was a disgrace; it is true, and I withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Balga once again to withdraw the remark.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I withdraw that remark, and conclude by saying—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grayden: You would not have the courage to say that outside.

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, I cannot allow this point of order to continue in this manner. You must certainly have heard what the Minister said just now. To repeat that remark, across the Chamber, is unbecoming to this Parliament and I ask you to uphold the decorum of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I just want to say that not all members in this House comport themselves with great dignity and decorum. There are many members who do not and just about everyone in the House knows who they are.

I do not want any member of this House to challenge another member to fight either inside or outside this House. What they do outside the House is outside my scope, because it is outside Parliament

House. However, I do not want that sort of conduct to be followed in this Chamber, and so I do not want the Minister or any member to make such a remark in this House in the future.

Mr Grayden: How much longer—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr B. T. BURKE: This is the second occasion on which the Minister has made such a statement and while he could not—as we all know—pull the skin off a rice pudding, nevertheless I am thankful for your help to make this one serious point.

*Debate (dissent from Speaker's ruling)
Resumed*

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is quite all right for the Minister to carry on like this but it is not all right for me to refer to people as being a disgrace to the House. The point at issue is that the Minister used the word "slanderer" in referring to my leader, which is equivalent to using the word "liar" when referring to the Leader of the Opposition; a man who, I may add, went to the trouble of advising the Minister for Police during the tea suspension that he intended to make certain statements concerning him, so that the Minister would have an opportunity to be present in the Chamber when he made the statements. That is the character of the man about whom this Minister speaks.

Mr Grayden: Will you ever be able to face your workmates?

Mr HARTREY: Mr Speaker, I am happy to pay a tribute to your impartiality in the Chair, and to say that I have often appreciated the justice, as well as the leniency, that you have meted out to members of this House.

However, on this occasion, I cannot, unfortunately, support your ruling against the Leader of the Opposition. He asked for the withdrawal of an allegation that he was uttering slander. In law, slander means the verbal utterance of defamatory matter which is false. I do not want you to feel that I am being impertinent in attempting to give you a lecture on law, but I suggest that in the circumstances what the Minister said about the Leader of the Opposition was out of order. However, I will add that if an utterance is not false it is not slander. Therefore an allegation that a man has uttered slander is an allegation that he has lied. Such an allegation would be held to be most unparliamentary.

I therefore feel that you, Mr Speaker, should have demanded a withdrawal and an apology and I must accordingly support the motion to disagree with your ruling. At the same time I note that my leader called the Minister a blackguard and therefore that remark, too, is, as I imagine, unparliamentary language—very unparliamentary—and if the Minister objects to it, you, Sir, would surely rule it out of order also. I suggest that both parties be called upon to withdraw and apologise.

In conclusion, I agree with my deputy leader that this Parliament has a very high standard of conduct by comparison with, for example, other Parliaments in Australia, the French Parliament, or Parliaments in many other countries.

Question (dissent from Speaker's ruling) put and negatived.

Debate Resumed

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Had I known I was to cause all that trouble, having regard to the source from which the remark came, I would not have taken objection to it.

Mr. Grayden: That is a typical statement from you.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I was endeavouring to say that there is quite a general impression abroad that there is a liaison between some top madams and some officers in the Police Force because of the discriminatory treatment, and one of the terms of reference in my motion is directed towards an inquiry into that aspect.

Generally, when the police intend to take action against a prostitute they issue a warrant and arrest a person. Sometimes there may be six girls operating in a certain place and the police arrest two of them. I wonder why they do not arrest the whole six. It would appear they want a business to continue while they take two of the girls away. When they arrest these girls and take them to the police station, generally they are allowed out on bail.

However, with regard to Mrs Flatman, a warrant was not issued for her arrest; she was not taken to the police station and allowed out on bail. Somebody decided that she must be among the elite in the prostitution business and so she had to be treated differently. So a summons was issued against her and in due course, if the law is allowed to take its course—it has not always been allowed to do so—she will appear before the court.

I want to know, and many other people want to know, why some girls are arrested and taken to the police station and have to give their proper residential address, and others who are taken to the police station give their brothel address, and why Mrs Flatman was not taken to the police station but a summons was issued against her. That is what has to be straightened out.

I also want to know why, in a certain case, 16 charges against a prostitute, having reached the Police Court, were withdrawn, when witnesses were prepared to come forward to establish that the offence had been committed. These facts are on the police files. There is no need to go outside to obtain evidence on this question. These files would be available to the Minister for Police. He knows all about them. He is aware that these 16 charges were not proceeded with. A Royal Commission is the only medium that will give

us any hope of getting to the bottom of this matter. Many people are involved in it in so many ways. There is also much money involved and it is not confined to prostitution.

Many members know the big baccarat schools that are operating in the city and we also know that whenever any other person attempts to start up a similar school it is closed down. Why? Some of these people associated with the big baccarat schools are quite wealthy. How is it they are able to continue to operate with impunity? The police know what they are about.

Mr Laurance: You have had a Royal Commission on that and when it came out with a determination you opposed it.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The terms of reference of this motion are framed for the purpose of ascertaining what association there is between prostitution and gambling; what association there is between people in this State and other States. I understand there is an organisation called the "Black Cat" which has been operating in the Eastern States for some time, and it is now coming to Western Australia. These are matters that have to be inquired into, and people will not be satisfied until they are.

I know that you, Mr Speaker, would feel somewhat annoyed—and I certainly would—if you suddenly found someone intended to commence operations for the purpose of establishing a brothel next door to where you live. I have received complaints from a number of people. I have their names and addresses here. They told me that brothels were established right next door to them. They complained to the police but no action was taken. On one occasion a person said that 72 men were counted going into the premises next door to him.

Mr Rushton: That was in 1972, was it?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It was said that 72 men were counted entering the premises next door to where this person resided. Also, it was found that some of the persons who wanted to frequent the brothels knocked on the door of this person's house and inquired, "Is this the place where you get it?"

Well now, are we to allow that sort of thing to continue and proliferate? It seems to me that we will come to the stage eventually where we will have to change the law to deal with this and regulate it properly. Anyone who kids himself we can wipe it out is being just too stupid. However, we cannot allow it to continue with preference being shown so that some people make big money and pay \$120 000 for a brothel in a place like Kalgoorlie.

So the purpose of the Royal Commission would be to examine what is going on and then to propose what alterations of the law the Government ought to consider.

In due course the opinion of Parliament can be expressed in connection with them. We just cannot allow the present situation to continue.

Sir Charles Court: I am sorry that I missed the earlier part of your remarks for reasons you know. Were you ever asked for an inquiry into prostitution when you were Premier?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: When I was Premier? I cannot recall having been asked by any particular person to have an inquiry, but I can remember a visit which Mrs Flatman and someone else made to me in the Premier's office when it was pointed out to me that the girls engaged in the prostitution business were paying taxes on their earnings and therefore the police should be told to let up on them.

Sir Charles Court: I was not thinking of that aspect which was raised in the Parliament some time ago as you know. What I am getting at is: were you ever asked for an inquiry into prostitution, and what attitude did you adopt?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I say quite honestly that I cannot recall having been so asked.

Sir Charles Court: I understood you felt an inquiry would not get very far.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It might have been suggested at certain times that there should be an inquiry. I cannot even say that. I definitely have no recollection of having been asked authoritatively to conduct an inquiry. I received complaints about what was occurring and discussed some of them with the Minister for Police at the time.

Sir Charles Court: I understand you had told the Press at that time that you did not think an inquiry was warranted, or something to that effect.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I do not think so. Members will be gathering from what I am saying that I believe there are a number of aspects to this which require a proper inquiry with protection for those who will come forward. A number of people have indicated to me that they are prepared to go to a Royal Commission and state to it what they have stated to me, but they are not prepared to go to this special legal officer whom the Government has appointed because they run too great a risk—and they are in no financial position to take that risk—and I cannot blame them.

Sir Charles Court: Do they consider they would run a risk in just stating an allegation without having to give any evidence? They do not have to give any evidence.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Oh yes. No-one would know better than the Premier that if a person makes an allegation that person immediately leaves himself open to a writ.

Sir Charles Court: That is if he tells an untruth.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, that has to be established subsequently.

Sir Charles Court: If he tells the truth he has no fear.

Mr Jamieson: That is not always so, either.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I recall instances during my lifetime when people have issued writs in order to shut up other people.

Mr Moller: My very word.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It has not necessarily followed that the allegation made was untrue.

Sir Charles Court: But you are missing the point. Anyone who makes an allegation that is untrue deserves to be dealt with according to the law. That is the whole basis of the law.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes, but the Premier knows it goes a lot further than that. The other day I read a very good article by a person who is now a Judge, but who was not a Judge when he wrote it. He pointed out the myths with regard to the belief that a person can get justice if he goes to court. A person can be absolutely truthful in what he says, but there is no guarantee that if the other person has the money to pay for a Queen's Counsel and the case ultimately goes to court, the judgment will be in his favour.

Sir Charles Court: In most cases I think the courts decide according to the evidence. I think you would accept that.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There was an instance some years ago when a certain person, well known to the Premier—I will not mention his name now because the circumstances involved have long passed—said in the bar of the Raffles Hotel, in the company of at least 20 people, that he knew for a fact that John Tonkin had an interest in two SP betting shops. I was up here at lunch and a friend of mine happened to be in the bar of the hotel and he rang me.

I went straight across to Sir David Brand who was in the dining room and told him of this allegation, and said, "You had better tell so-and-so that he should come and see me or he will have to put up with the consequences." I was going to give the person an opportunity to apologise and withdraw his allegation.

The next morning I saw Sir David and asked him whether he had passed on my message, and he indicated he had done so. So I thought I had better ring the fellow, which I did. I told him the information I had received and indicated that I did not want to be hard on him. I was Minister for Works at the time. I said to him, "You had better come to see me and bring someone with you because I do not want to take advantage of you." I arranged for him to come to see me at 12 o'clock, but at that hour I received a telephone call from him when he informed

me that he was not coming. I said, "You have been to see a lawyer, have you? All right. You take the consequences."

So I contacted the Police Department and asked for an inspector to be sent to me. I told him what had happened and that the man who heard the allegation was prepared to swear an affidavit to this effect. I suggested that there was a case for criminal libel. The policeman interviewed my informant who swore an affidavit and then made inquiries round about, but he could not get anyone else who was prepared to confirm what my informant had said.

The policeman also went to the person who it had been alleged had made the remark about me, and of course he did what anyone would do in the circumstances; he denied it. So the policeman came back to me and said, "Mr Tonkin, I am afraid we could not establish a case for criminal libel so we are not able to take the matter any further." I then indicated that I would pursue the matter privately.

I then consulted a lawyer, who is now a Judge, and told him the circumstances, showed him the affidavit, and asked him to go ahead and issue a writ for libel against the person involved. He said to me, "Mr Tonkin, you are a public man. If you go to court with this, the court could take the view that, being in public, you have to accept a lot of criticism which the ordinary person does not have to face. You have an affidavit from a man who says he heard this remark. The person who is alleged to have made the remark will deny he did so. The court will give him the benefit of the doubt and you will finish up with a bill." That is what happens.

Can we blame people who have this information for refusing to go to this legal gentleman with it when they have no protection?

My deputy leader has now drawn my attention to the opinion of a top university professor of criminology in this State who advises the people not to give evidence.

Sir Charles Court: That is to an inquiry.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes; to the type of inquiry the Premier has established.

Sir Charles Court: We have not. It is purely an evaluation of information to advise the Government whether we should proceed with an inquiry. They are not taking evidence.

Several members interjected.

Sir Charles Court: The professor refers to an inquiry the police want.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am suggesting there was no need for the inquiry the Premier is setting up. He would know he did not

have a similar inquiry when a decision was made to hold a Royal Commission into SP betting because the Government thought it had something on me.

Sir Charles Court: I do not think that was the reason at all.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There was supposed to have been an affidavit in the hands of the then Premier from Berry and Peat concerning what this bookmaker had said to them. The Speaker knows all about it. That affidavit was supposed to be in the hands of the Government, but when I was able to convince the Royal Commissioner that I should have the right to call the Premier, I asked him the question: did the Government have an affidavit? He said, "No." So, without an affidavit, but simply on an allegation made by two people who were subsequently proved to be liars, the Government of which the Premier was a member decided to have a Royal Commission. I want to contrast that situation with the Government's attitude in connection with this matter.

Mr Bryce: Different standards.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There is no justification whatever for trying to put this off any longer. I know the Government does not want an inquiry. It is sticking out as plain as a pikestaff; but public opinion will oblige it to have one.

Sir Charles Court: We will have an inquiry if we can get specific allegations about which a commissioner can do something.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There are plenty on the police files which will justify a Royal Commission.

Sir Charles Court: Innuendoes and rumours. All we ask you is to give us something positive.

Mr T. D. Evans: You were not here when the Leader of the Opposition commenced his speech. You had better read what he said.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the Premier were to read the transcript of what I said he would get something positive all right.

The terms of reference I have suggested are all-embracing. If we are to have a proper inquiry it should be an all-embracing inquiry so that we can counter this disquiet which exists in the public mind and straighten out what is obviously wrong. From the letters and the phone calls I have been receiving in recent days from people who are prepared to stand up and be counted, it is very clear to me that there is plenty which needs to be inquired into; and the quicker it is done the better it will be for all concerned.

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

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

MEAT INDUSTRY

Inquiry by Royal Commission: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 7th May, on the following motion by Mr H. D. Evans—

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed to investigate all aspects of the meat industry including production, marketing, processing, distribution systems, and consumption, and to make recommendations where appropriate to the Government and the industry generally, to ensure stability of the industry in Western Australia.

MR CRANE (Moore) [9.15 p.m.]: I wish to speak to the motion which has been moved by the member for Warren. We all recall that over many years people have asked for a Royal Commission to be appointed to investigate matters affecting the meat industry. I understand that quite a few years ago—in fact before the Labor Government came to power—a similar motion was moved; yet no Royal Commission was appointed.

I entirely agree there are many matters within the meat industry which require investigation. An inquiry was conducted recently by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, and resulted in a very good report which goes quite a way towards answering the questions many of us have asked.

Mr H. D. Evans: It does not scratch the surface.

Mr CRANE: Some aspects of the meat industry are in so much trouble today that I believe we need an inquiry as quickly as possible, and probably more quickly than a Royal Commission could conduct one. The motion before us refers to "all aspects of the meat industry". That is very broad and takes into account such meats as poultry and pork. We would all agree that at the moment the only problem confronting the poultry farmers is that, red meats being so depressed in price, for the first time in many years there is real competition for poultry. As regards pork, we would all agree that very good prices are being received at the moment. In fact baconers would be at an all-time high. So when we talk about the problems of the meat industry, we must come back specifically to sheep meats and beef.

There seems to be something mysterious about a Royal Commission. Some people are of the opinion that Royal Commissions solve all our problems; but I do not believe the matter is as simple as that. We are all well and truly aware of many aspects of the meat industry, and as regards sheep meats one of our greatest problems over the last few years has been that we have not been able to exploit fully the markets available to us. I say that without fear of contradiction, and I refer specifically to the live sheep market.

When we talk of sheep meats we immediately think of the Middle East countries. Iran is the largest of those countries, with 33 million people, and is naturally the largest market. The total exports to Iran last year were around 60 000 tonnes. I understand exports could rise to 100 000 tonnes. So here is a tremendous market which must be exploited to the full, and if it were so exploited I am sure some of the problems associated with our meat industry would not be as great as they are at the moment.

Iraq is a market which has developed in the last 12 months and could become very important to us. Other countries in the Middle East—Kuwait, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf States of Qatar, Bahrain, Oman, Muscat, and the United Arabian Emirates—are all markets we could use to greater advantage if the mutton industry were permitted to operate freely. Live sheep are a very important part of this market.

Mr H. D. Evans: Are you going to support the motion to extend the powers of the Lamb Marketing Board?

Mr CRANE: I am dealing with the problems which have brought about the honourable member's motion.

Live sheep are a very important part of the meat market; so important that it is quite evident if any countries are to supply meat to this market—and when I refer to meat I mean also frozen and chilled meat—they must also be prepared to supply a considerable number of live sheep.

This is one of the reasons for the continual requests for a Royal Commission. The fact is that because of interference from the trade union movement we are not able to operate in this market freely. We are therefore at a great disadvantage because other countries are at present supplying to Iraq, Iran, and the other Middle East countries, to the detriment of Australia and, particularly, Western Australia. It is interesting to note that Mr Charles Hilgendorf, who is the Chairman of the New Zealand Meat Board, had this to say when he recently returned from a trip to that area—

New Zealand may have to begin exporting live sheep to gain access to Middle East markets, especially Iran. If we don't send live sheep, we don't sell meat to Iran. It is as simple as that.

I put this question to the House: How can we in Western Australia continue to hold these markets if we are not prepared to supply to them the kind of meat they require and in the manner in which they require it?

Mr Skidmore: Is the honourable member aware that an agreement was reached with the producer for the export of live sheep?

Mr CRANE: The honourable member is aware that an alternative arrangement which is not satisfactory to the producer is prevailing at the moment. In my opinion, the producer has no right at all to interfere in any way with the trade union movement. By the same token I suggest the trade union movement has no right to interfere with the marketing of primary produce.

Mr Skidmore: It has a right to protect its livelihood.

Mr CRANE: That is a very interesting remark which has just been made: "It has a right to protect its livelihood." The point I am making is that although we do not wish to rattle sabres we do wish the Meat Industry Employees' Union would understand that it is in effect destroying its livelihood by not enabling us to export live sheep to these markets; because if we do not export live sheep to these markets we will certainly not export meat which has been killed, and as a result the meat industry employees will be putting themselves out of work. It is as simple as that.

Mr H. D. Evans: You do not think they did a service in keeping the smaller sheep out of the Middle East, where they were ruining the trade? Our reputation was flagging.

Mr CRANE: I do not know that they did. The Middle East has been a very good market for our large animals, and will continue to be. A while ago some interested people in Western Australia made an effort to encourage the supply of smaller animals but, as many of us predicted, it was soon proved that young sheep were not an attractive proposition to the grower, because if there is one thing a young sheep seems to try to do in the first 18 months of its life it is to lie down and die. If it is possible to sell them as lambs, that is much easier than to try to take them through the first summer and sell them as hogget. This is a fact which any practical sheep producer will verify, and if he is not going to get any more or as much for that hogget the market will fall through. This has subsequently proved to be correct.

The point I make here is that if we do not recognise the fact that we must supply to these markets the type of meat they require, we will not be supplying any meat at all.

There is facing us now the problem of the beef industry. How hard have we tried to export these animals live? I remember a couple of years ago—and the member for Warren will bear this out because he was with me—Sheik Abdulla, the Minister for Agriculture in Bahrain, told us in his office his country would like to import 7 000 live cattle a year as well as 35 000 sheep. But the bans on the

export of live sheep have caused the shippers to be disinterested in trying to encourage this trade. This is an instance where interference from other people has caused serious troubles in our own industry.

Beef is probably causing us more concern at the moment, although when we consider there will be 7 million sheep to be disposed of this financial year no doubt sheep will be causing us a great deal of trouble in a few months' time; but for the moment we are not so much concerned with that. We are concerned with the beef industry because it is the beef problem that is on our lips each day.

When we look at this industry we find there are 820 000 tonnes of beef available in the world but markets for only 210 000 tonnes. These figures are roughly correct and were supplied only recently. The strong argument for changing the marketing system will not solve that problem because it is not possible to divide 820 000 into 210 000. It just will not go.

Mr Moiler: Do those figures suggest the Federal Government is not to blame for the slump in the beef industry?

Mr CRANE: I am not blaming the Federal Government.

Mr Moiler: Your Government usually does. The Premier does regularly.

Mr CRANE: I have done a certain amount of study in regard to the meat industry. I am concerning myself with facts. I do not think I can be accused of making dubious innuendoes. I do not blame anyone. I am merely quoting statistics and facts.

Mr Moiler: You are disproving what your Premier says.

Mr CRANE: I do not recall what the Premier said. I will continue. The situation in regard to beef over the last few months has been chaotic. Last November a company with which I was associated received an order for 4 000 tonnes of beef. This was a tremendous order at a time when we were so oversupplied. We quoted \$US1 225 a tonne and were told by telex we would have to come down to \$945 even to have an opportunity to supply that market.

We found out then that to supply at \$945, which was just under the previous quote, we would be able to pay only 7.7c a pound for a 450-pound animal, and at that time the market was paying about 15c. So members can see the hopelessness of the situation when the world markets were playing one against the other and in which it was almost impossible to supply meat to those markets. The result was, of course, that it could not be supplied.

Mr H. D. Evans: Isn't this exacerbated by the competition between the exporters?

Mr CRANE: I do not know that we could blame the competition between the exporters entirely; the situation was that there was just too much beef about for too small a market and it would not have mattered what type of system we had, we could not improve the situation.

So we come to the problem which is facing us today and with which I believe we should come to grips; that is, the problem of the beef industry in Western Australia, which is the reason this motion calling for the appointment of a Royal Commission has been moved. We find that this year there will be approximately 600 000 head of cattle available for the Western Australian market. We know that the home usage will be about 260 000 head, or 5 000 head a week, which will leave 430 000 head of cattle to be disposed of on the export market. Once the export market is saturated—and it does not take much to saturate it today—we will find that we would still have a surplus above our production of 10 000 tonnes of boneless beef.

Many people have spoken out and said somebody ought to do something. I would go along with that entirely, but who are the people who must do something? Must we always turn to a Government and ask it to act as a benevolent society? Or should we as producers turn to ourselves and do something for ourselves? Until we get rid of this surplus beef we will be faced with a compounding problem, and the suggestion that I put forward is that we look very seriously at processing this surplus and storing it against a rainy day.

Mr Skidmore: That is very costly.

Mr CRANE: I know it is costly, and I will give the costs in a moment if the member will be patient. For his information, it would cost \$14 000 to store 10 000 tonnes of canned beef for two years. It would cost \$2.050 million to store the same amount of frozen beef for one year. So members can see from those figures there is no comparison between the costs of storing canned and frozen beef. The cost of storing frozen beef is so prohibitive that we must forget about it.

Mr H. D. Evans: What is the world demand for canned beef?

Mr CRANE: I understand last year Australia exported about 20 000 tonnes.

Mr Skidmore: What is the market?

Mr CRANE: I am not sure whether that figure is accurate, but it is approximate. I am not concerned with the market at the moment. Whatever we do for the beef industry has to be a lifesaving operation.

No matter what scheme we come up with some people—particularly economists—will say it is not viable. The word "viable" is a most repulsive word to the farming fraternity.

Mr Hartrey: It means "Not in conformity with the capitalist system".

Mr CRANE: I do not know what it means in this regard, but it is not very acceptable to the farming fraternity. I suggest that had there been economists in the days when Christopher Columbus wanted to sail in the *Santa Maria*, the West Indies would never have been discovered. Until we get back to utilising the pioneering and courageous spirit of people who are prepared to take the situation into their own hands and Governments which have the courage to do likewise, we will still merely conform to the wishes of the economists. I think it was Churchill who said, "If you laid them all end to end they would never reach a conclusion", and I believe he was right.

I firmly believe this has particular reference to agriculture and that we should look very seriously at bringing economists under the control of our new Agriculture Protection Board because they have done a great disservice to the rural industry over the past few years. However, that is just my opinion and many may not wish to agree with me.

I move on now to my suggestion that we do something with this 10 000 tonnes of boneless beef. The point I am making is that we do not necessarily have to have expensive Royal Commissions to find out what to do with this meat. I am not a particularly clever person and yet I am able to come up with a few facts and figures. I come up with them purposely because I want someone else to take up the matter and tell me just how wrong I am; when people do that they help us to find the figures we are looking for.

I make the suggestion that we can this surplus beef. I asked a question in the House some time ago about the possibility of doing this at Manjimup and I was told it would not be satisfactory because there is no abattoir at Manjimup in which to slaughter the stock. So I make the suggestion now that the farmers themselves take the matter into their own hands with the blessing and help of either the State or Federal Government, and can this surplus beef—whether it be from cows over a certain age or whatever—to straighten up our herds and get them back to a reasonable size. Then we can go on from there when the market picks up, as it inevitably will.

Mr H. D. Evans: Has the State Government made any response to a request to have a look at this?

Mr CRANE: I would not know about that.

Mr H. D. Evans: It has not. So now you know.

Mr CRANE: The figures I have come up with, just to give members or others the chance to disprove them, are that the cost of processing 10 000 tonnes of meat would be \$6 million—I took these figures

from the Australian Meat Board so I presume they are reasonably accurate—the storage cost as I have previously stated would be \$14 000, interest at 10 per cent for 12 months on the money required would be \$601 400; and the total of that little exercise would be \$6 615 400.

If we simply took the beef from the producer and gave him nothing for it that would be the cost of the operation. I mention that as a basis, because I read in the Press the other day that producers are starting to shoot their cattle. In fact, the meat board suggested in one of its pamphlets that the cost is so prohibitive that we might just as well shoot our stock. I believe it is a sin to shoot these animals and to destroy food in a world which is starving.

Mr Hartrey: I agree.

Mr CRANE: In other words, the exercise I have just outlined would cost \$89.31 a head. The next exercise I did was to pay the producer \$22.50 a head, and in that case without going through the costs separately I arrived at a figure of \$8.448 million. In other words, there is an extra cost of \$1.833 million involved if we pay the producer \$22.50 a head.

If we proceed to the next exercise in which we pay the producer \$45 a head for his surplus beef, the extra cost involved is \$3.666 million.

Mr Skidmore: I missed that figure.

Mr CRANE: If the member wishes I will give him a copy of the figures later. At the same time it would cost \$10.282 million to process that 10 000 tonnes of surplus meat and give the producers \$3.666 million; but the main point here is that whilst it would cost just over \$10 million to do this, the value of 10 000 tonnes of corned beef on today's market is \$13 million. So perhaps the economists would say the proposition might be viable after all if we can sell the meat. Bear in mind that we may end up with a very high mountain of tins of bully beef.

However, to carry out this little exercise we would need a canning works. What would that cost us? Inquiries I have made suggest that a works to can 10 000 tonnes of beef per annum, or 40 tons a day, and working two shifts would cost \$300 000.

So, even if we buy the works we are still in front if we can sell the beef. If we cannot sell it, we would still have it. If we canned this meat in 5 kg tins, which are the very big tins, we would be faced with an extra cost of \$200 000.

It is unfortunate that I have to spend my time working out these figures when I believe they should have been made available to us by farmers' organisations or by other responsible people so that we would know what they are.

Mr Skidmore: Such as the Department of Agriculture.

Mr CRANE: The running costs of a cannery work out at \$27 000 a day, and that figure takes into account cartons, glue, labelling, and everything else. I have all the figures in front of me, and I have done all the work. We would require 500 000 feet of floor space to house the cannery.

The point of my exercise is that where there is a will there is a way. I believe our slogan in this State ought to be, "We eat what we can and what we can't we can". I do not think that would be a bad slogan to use. Whilst I believe an inquiry is necessary—and I shall speak further on this point in a moment—I feel the producers themselves should be encouraged to look very seriously at doing this for themselves. I understand that in the Scandinavian countries the co-operative system works very well and is to the advantage of the producer. I have not yet been able to spare the time to study that system, but I intend to do so if time permits. I am a little like the person in the television advertisement: one day I am going.

However, we should look seriously at the system I have proposed because at the present time there are those factions which believe that the statutory marketing of all our produce would be the panacea for all our marketing ills. In this instance I believe it would not matter what system we used; we would still have trouble in trying to place a tremendous production into a very small market. That is why I suggest we keep our surplus and dispose of it in the form of gifts to needy countries, or use it ourselves in years to come.

Further, such a cannery could in a year or two's time perhaps be employed to produce the requirements of our own State.

Mr Hartrey: For how long would canned meat keep?

Mr CRANE: It used to keep quite well during the war. I recall that in the Navy we used to have our iron rations once a week to keep our supplies turning over.

I make the interesting point that perhaps it is not always necessary to appoint a Royal Commission to ascertain these things. At the moment our market is flooded and yet I find in the year 1973-74 we have imported from South American countries not less than 188 tons of canned meat. In the last 11 months we have imported 105 tonnes of canned meat from that source.

Yet we cannot even get rid of our own meat. I understand that charity begins at home, so what is wrong with having a good look at what we can do for ourselves?

Mr Skidmore: Have you analysed the reason for that?

Mr CRANE: No, I have not. I make one point in asking producers to do something for themselves, because it does assist

if one helps oneself. It does assist if a person makes an effort to solve some of his own problems. Let him get help by all means. It would seem that we need \$12 million for the purpose of establishing a cannery and to pay for the production I have mentioned. It is not very difficult to find \$12 million if an effort is made to do so, and the figures would suggest that that amount could be repaid. I think I know where such a sum could be found.

In speaking about farmers doing something for themselves, it was, I think, Abraham Lincoln who said—

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

I believe that the function of Government is to help producers help themselves, and not to do the whole job for them, because so many people have to be looked after by the Government.

I have confined my remarks to the question of mutton and beef, but I return now to the question of the appointment of a Royal Commission. Firstly, I believe a Royal Commission would be an expensive undertaking. Following the inquiry conducted by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, we have a great deal of information available to us now which could form the basis that would assist us to find out a few things not yet clear.

I believe we would be better served if a Select Committee were appointed to inquire into all aspects of meat marketing. A Select Committee could serve our purpose just as well as a Royal Commission, but what is more important it would be more expeditious, and there is a note of urgency in this matter. I certainly believe a Select Committee could ascertain the few remaining points we want to know.

Mr H. D. Evans: Is the member for Vasse going to support your move for the appointment of a Select Committee?

Mr CRANE: I do not know, but I do know that if a Select Committee were appointed it could do the job with a minimum of expense and produce a report fairly expeditiously. Furthermore, it would report back to the House, whereas a Royal Commission does not necessarily report back to the House, but to the Governor.

Mr H. D. Evans: According to the report of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee this was going to be done. An inquiry by that committee would be better than one by a Select Committee.

Mr CRANE: The member for Warren may have an opportunity to serve on a Select Committee if one were appointed. It would certainly be a challenge, and perhaps it could be said that by making

that statement I am throwing down the gauntlet. Accordingly, I propose to move as follows—

Delete all words after the word "House" in the motion with a view to inserting in lieu, "as a matter of urgency a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the marketing and distribution of beef and sheep meat products, having special regard to—

1. Returns to producers.
2. Viability of beef and sheep meat producers.
3. Planning for long-term stability in the beef and sheep meat industry.

Amendments to Motion

Mr CRANE: I will move to delete the words first, and accordingly, I move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "House".

MR McPHARLIN (Mt Marshall) [9.50 p.m.]: I second the amendment. We now have before the House an amendment to the motion moved by the member for Warren for the appointment of a Royal Commission. When one analyses the speech made by the member for Warren and the reasons he advanced that a Royal Commission should be appointed to obtain information he is seeking, one wonders whether it would.

Many inquiries have been made into the meat industry. The latest one was conducted as a result of a motion moved by the member for Vasse last year, and eventually that led to the appointment of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee to inquire into various aspects of the meat industry which included livestock production; abattoir and other processing needs; organisations of meat inspection; marketing opportunities; organisation of marketing; improved beef classification; distribution systems; and costs at domestic market levels.

As Minister at that time I instructed the committee to report back on the 15th March, but this date was later changed to the 28th February. That committee inquired into many aspects of the meat industry and made a number of recommendations in its report.

We know there is need for further investigation. The motive of the member who moved the motion is justified in that he is seeking a further form of inquiry. It is necessary to obtain a great deal more information to make further recommendations.

Mr H. D. Evans: Do you reckon you will be able to do this with a Select Committee?

Mr McPHARLIN: I think more information will be gained in the areas the member for Warren is aiming at than in the

area that was dealt with by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. I agree with the member for Warren's motive, and I think a Select Committee would have power to obtain more information than was obtained by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. That committee has recommended that further studies be made into the distribution system and cost of production. The committee has said studies are needed into the feasibility of centralised fabrication of primal cuts; that is, the basic cutting up of a carcass at abattoirs instead of in retail butcher shops, and also studies into meat marketing margins.

That is an area about which the honourable member wants more information. That is recommended by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee and I think a Select Committee could obtain more information than could an advisory committee. Inquiries could be made into variations in trading hours and meat consumption needs. That is the area at which the amendment to provide for the appointment of a Select Committee is aimed.

All the other information that has been provided to the meat industry has come from various sources such as the Australian Meat Board, the abattoirs, meat wholesalers and retailers, and the producers. A great deal of information is available at present because numerous inquiries have been conducted over the years. The specific reason for the appointment of a Royal Commission is that, quite clearly, it would direct its inquiries into the area of wholesale and retail margins. I believe a Select Committee would also be competent to obtain that information which is most necessary.

As we know, the meat industry is in a bad way; the beef industry in particular, and we are all seeking ways and means whereby the present situation can be improved. I commend the member for Moore for some of the suggestions he has made on the ways in which the beef industry could perhaps be assisted by taking off some of the surplus stock that is available. These areas could be examined by a Select Committee; whether or not assistance is possible, is another question.

Mr Skidmore: Tremendous capital would be needed to take off some of the surplus stock available.

Mr McPHARLIN: That is very true. The member for Moore spoke of the cost of canning. I will supply more figures on canning than those given by the honourable member. Firstly, I will touch briefly on the cost of cold storage. It has been suggested that quantities of cattle could be taken off the market and placed in cold storage. The Australia-wide figures I have reveal that tremendous cost is involved; in fact, so much so it would be prohibitive.

Mr Skidmore: There is a degree of risk associated with it, too.

Mr McPHARLIN: The total national cold storage capacity for meat—and this figure is related not only to beef—is approximately 110 000 tonnes. The figures indicate that probably it is possible to store beef from approximately 300 000 cattle, which is a small number compared with the total number of cattle we have available on the market. The cost of storing 40 000 tonnes of beef for one month would be \$960 000, and for 12 months the cost would amount to \$8.2 million. These figures have been provided by the Australian Meat Board.

Mr H. D. Evans: I am not querying them.

Mr McPHARLIN: Therefore, the cost of storing beef for that period is prohibitive. I now intend to provide a few figures additional to those given by the member for Moore on canning. These figures again are on the Australia-wide basis. The production of 100 000 tonnes—that is net packed weight—of canned meats would require approximately 930 000 cattle. If we obtained those cattle for nothing the cost of producing the canned meat would be \$60 million. That is the cost of canned meat at the works. If we gave \$5 per 100 lb. to the producer the cost would be \$75 million, and if we gave \$10 per 100 lb. to the producer the cost would be \$88.5 million. That illustrates the high cost involved in the canning of meat. Then, of course, if that meat has to be held, there is the storage cost. The current market values, of 100 000 tonnes of corned beef would be approximately \$130 million FAS.

Further information shows that in recent years only about 300 000 tonnes of canned meat—that is, excluding pork meats—are moved in international trade.

Mr Skidmore: It is very slow moving, though.

Mr McPHARLIN: Yes. At present the indication is that the market is saturated; it has just about reached a dead end. So the meat would have to be held and fed onto the market slowly and some financial assistance would be required by the industry so that a return could be given to the meatworks and the producers because there would not be a sufficient flow to keep the industry moving.

So it would be very difficult to substantiate the establishment of a canned beef industry according to the figures that have been supplied to me.

The cost of production of canning beef, excluding the cost of the live animal, is estimated to be \$760 per tonne. So, if a Select Committee wishes to undertake an inquiry into this area the information is available. It would have to carry out a market projection study to determine whether or not the canning of beef is feasible and whether the product can be

sold on our markets. This would have to be assessed on a strict economic business basis.

Comments have been made that, in view of the present-day prices and the lack of markets, it would be cheaper to shoot surplus animals which nobody wants; and this is going on.

The SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable member that he has eight minutes left. On an amendment he is allowed only 20 minutes.

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not wish to detract from the motives behind the move of the member for Warren in seeking a Royal Commission. I feel that a Select Committee would be able to obtain the required information, and I also think there is need for further inquiry.

For those reasons I support the amendment moved by the member for Moore and hope that other members will also support it. As a result of recommendations coming forward from such a Select Committee the marketing of meat could be improved. Already several organisations and individuals have made recommendations for the introduction of improved systems of meat marketing. Those involved would include the producers, the exporters, the traditional handlers of the meat, the butchers, and the stock firms.

Perhaps a fund could be created, and the Select Committee could look into this aspect. In times of buoyant markets contributions could be paid to such a fund, so that in lean times producers would be able to draw from the fund to assist them in their operations.

Mr Skidmore: In the past they have not been as amenable to such schemes.

Mr McPHARLIN: A scheme of this nature has operated in New Zealand for a considerable time. If such a fund is created producers would be able to draw on it in times of need, and the Select Committee would no doubt look into this aspect. It is hoped that as a result of this inquiry recommendations to improve the situation of the beef industry will be adopted. We know that the loss of export markets has brought about a retraction of the industry, but we hope those markets will improve in the near future. I believe that a Select Committee can come up with recommendations which could be acted upon to the advantage of the industry. I hope other members will support the amendment.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington) [10.05 p.m.]: I rise to make a few short remarks in support of this amendment. I believe that a Select Committee would serve to bring together members from diverse areas of the State in this Parliament. I think those people would make an objective assessment of the situation.

I do not think the inquiry by a Select Committee would in any way denigrate the work that has been done by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee; rather I see its work as a contribution to what we have learnt.

I believe it is necessary to discuss this question with producers of both beef and sheep meats throughout the length and breadth of the State. Members would be well and truly aware of the fact that when producers were brought together they would be able to give their theories on how to overcome the existing problems.

These theories are diverse and varied and they include the speighing of cows, the killing of calves, the burning of grass and pasture, the conservation of fodder, not conserving fodder, and the like. We should give these people a chance to express their points of view, so as to bring about an objective assessment of their theories.

Mr H. D. Evans: Would it not be better to talk to those who are handling the market?

Mrs CRAIG: It would indeed, and I shall come to that. The member for Warren has put forward a very valid point. I believe that a Select Committee would need to look very carefully at the marketing of meat. We must try to insulate ourselves against the present situation, and we should take steps to ensure that the same situation does not arise again in the future.

I am sure members are aware that economists, including the Department of Agriculture, said only three short years ago to the producers, "Breed more beef cattle. The variety does not matter. The market will last forever. This State will be able to produce as much as it wants, and it will be able to sell as much as it wants." That turned out to be a very unfortunate assessment of the position.

We must concentrate very hard on marketing expertise. This is something Australia has not been good at. Marketing is a highly specialised aspect of the industry, and we must learn to produce that which our markets require and not that which we want to produce and hope to flog to somebody else. That simply is not practicable.

The viability of beef and sheep meat producers will also be of great concern to a Select Committee. We really do have a problem in that regard. Is it our desire to retain the producers on their farms? What sort of rescue operation are we prepared to mount? Where can we find the answers to the problems, so that these people do not have to walk off their farms? Answers to those questions should be found.

At the outset I indicated my remarks would be short, so with those few words I fully support the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into beef and sheep meat marketing.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.08 p.m.]: Far be it from me to become involved in the problems of the rural industry, because already it has enough. The honourable member who has moved for the appointment of a Select Committee might be better advised to move for the appointment of an Honorary Royal Commission. I give him this advice, because an inquiry by a Select Committee would be held in camera. However, when witnesses are called before an Honorary Royal Commission, the members of that commission have the authority to admit the Press to report on the evidence given. Reports would no doubt appear in the Press. From my experience of Honorary Royal Commissions I found that publicity given in the Press was of great service.

Some witnesses will say one thing before an Honorary Royal Commission and the evidence would be reported in the Press. As a result other witnesses would rush in to correct what has been said. When witnesses are called before a Select Committee, only limited views and advice are obtained. When evidence is given and the commission considers it is not correct it would be possible to give other people an opportunity to present their points of view.

The appointment of a Select Committee would preclude the inquiry from being made public. What we want is publicity on what is said at these inquiries, and it would be better in the circumstances to move for the appointment of an Honorary Royal Commission. I do not care what terminology is used to bring about the appointment of a Royal Commission, but that is preferable to a Select Committee.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [10.11 p.m.]: First of all I intend to support the amendment. Members will be aware that in November last I moved a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee along similar lines to the motion with which we are dealing. However, if members care to read my speeches in the debate on the 13th November last and on a number of other occasions they will be aware of my views.

At page 3043 of the 1974 *Hansard* I am recorded as saying—

MR BLAIKIE: This is 1974, and I believe the time is opportune for such an inquiry. I hope I shall be able to explain to the House why it is necessary.

In my opinion, such an inquiry should be conducted by the Government rather than by members of Parliament. I will elaborate on this point as I continue my argument.

I gave several reasons in my speech as to why I believed the Government ought to institute an inquiry at that time. In fact the Government did authorise the Meat

Industry Advisory Committee to carry out an inquiry, as a result of which a report has been finalised. This is a very valuable document; and the member for Warren in a debate in May this year also emphasised its value to the industry.

Mr H. D. Evans: With qualifications.

Mr BLAIKIE: With very few qualifications. He said the report was a very important adjunct, and could form the basis for commencing further inquiries.

Mr Skidmore: That was the first time the inquiry should have been held.

Mr BLAIKIE: The member for Swan has just interjected. I would point out to him there was a sense of urgency as I saw the situation at that time. I said in my speech there was an air of urgency and it was important that an inquiry be undertaken as early as possible. I believe the Government could institute an inquiry and obtain a report far quicker than it would obtain the report from an inquiry by a Select Committee. If a Select Committee had been appointed the final report and recommendations would not have been known until May of this year. Those were the facts. I believe at the time they were correct, and I now also believe they are correct.

The report of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee is a very valuable document, and will now form the basis for further investigation. I would now like to recapitulate the situation of the beef industry I was referring to in November, 1974. Since then the position has become far more critical. Now, with some hindsight I can say that some members on this side of the House are beginning to appreciate that a plight exists in the beef industry.

In October last year I gave evidence to the Industries Assistance Commission that, unless there was some improvement in the beef industry and in the financial position of many of the producers in the high rainfall and high cost areas, in my opinion 40 per cent of the producers would be forced into a nonviable position and would walk off their farms.

This is a situation which encumbers so many farmers today, and as each day goes by it becomes intolerably worse. I do not like to paint a black picture, but with hindsight we can now admit that what was forecast is proving to be correct. The member for Warren would be well aware of the tragic circumstances in which so many people find themselves.

I had an opportunity to travel through Queensland and New South Wales a couple of months ago and I was horrified at the depressed cattle prices I saw in those States. The situation in Western Australia will reach the same stage during the next six or eight weeks. Some cattle will be unsalable. The situation is approaching that stage now.

Probably members will have read the Press reports during the last week or so in which it was reported that some producers have commenced slaughtering their livestock. The rate of slaughter will increase because some stock will have no commercial value at all.

While in the Eastern States I became aware that it was impossible for any beef producer in Australia to make a profit from the production of beef. It is a national disaster affecting the national scene. The Australian beef producer right across the country is facing the problem of survival. We are facing a world beef market depression. The European Economic Community has some 300 000 tonnes of beef in intervention stock; New Zealand will have 100 000 tonnes available for export at the end of the year, and Australia will have in excess of 200 000 tonnes available for export at the same time. The total known world market for that beef is in the order of some 300 000 tonnes, so members can draw their own conclusions and see that 300 000 tonnes will not find a market at all with chaotic results to the producer.

During November last I mentioned the need for an assistance scheme. It is now September, 1975, and I can say categorically that the various assistance schemes available now are of little consequence to beef producers in this State because the situation has worsened considerably. If a producer borrows \$10 000 he will lose that sum of money during the next 12 months, and then will have to try to borrow another \$10 000 which will only increase his liability. I believe that because of the national disaster facing the beef industry and beef producers right across Australia the Commonwealth Government will be obliged to make welfare payments to beef producers.

I refer again to the amendment moved by the member for Moore, and for the reasons I have stated I believe a Select Committee, backed by the work already carried out by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, can perform a most important function and, in fact, conduct an inquiry equal to that which could be conducted by a Royal Commission.

As the amendment states, it is important to look into the marketing techniques and practices. I am sure the experience of those members who will be appointed to the committee from this House will prove to be of benefit all round. It should also be a function of the Select Committee to look into the workings of the Beef Industry Committee. As the member for Warren has already said—and I do not challenge him on this point even though I may challenge him on other points—the Beef Industry Committee has come in for some criticism. A Select Committee could inquire into the workings of that committee in order to see that it operates in the interests of the industry. The district committees also perform a very important

function and a Select Committee could look into the workings of those committees.

I say again that I support the amendment moved by the member for Moore. I believe it could, and will, perform all the functions of a Royal Commission but in a much more personalised way. The members of the committee will have had some knowledge of the industry, and the people engaged in it. Also they will have the added advantage of local knowledge. With those remarks I support the amendment moved by the member for Moore.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.21 p.m.]: They have done it again; they have sold out the rural producers in a manner to which we are becoming accustomed! It is my intention to give some details to show how the rural producers have been sold out.

I will recapitulate a little and state that in the first instance when this crisis was brought forward the member for Vasse, at a very appropriate time, moved for the appointment of a Select Committee. Almost before that suggestion could get off the ground the form of inquiry was transferred to the Meat Industry Advisory Committee.

We now have a similar situation where my suggestion for a Royal Commission has been converted into a move for the appointment of a Select Committee. It is nothing more than a device or a diversion at a time to serve as a deodorant when the beef farmers of this State are facing a desperate and critical situation.

Firstly, I will refer to the failure of the voluntary scheme which was supposed to be the panacea. I want to remind members of what the Premier had to say during a recent debate—of his golden words. He said that one particular item in the index was responsible for the rising cost of living, and this was the price of meat. At the time he said that members opposite had criticised the beef scheme. He said the member for Mt. Marshall, who introduced the scheme when he was Minister for Agriculture, had been subjected to a lot of ridicule from members of the Opposition. The Premier attributed the responsibility for the higher cost of beef in Western Australia to the voluntary scheme.

A higher price was being paid to producers then than was being paid in the Eastern States. That was the reason the cost index was higher, and for that he made no apology. The voluntary scheme had been introduced and that was responsible for creating higher prices. The Premier looked around for the accolade which he felt he deserved on that occasion, but we have heard nothing about it since. During the last three weeks the price of beef in Western Australia has been lower than the price in the Eastern States.

The Premier is silent on this one. Does he still maintain that the voluntary beef scheme has regulated the price of beef?

Sir Charles Court: Up until a certain point it did work, and gave some help to the farmers.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The scheme was on a voluntary basis and did not work. It could not work, as we said.

Mr Skidmore: The farmers did not want it to work.

Mr H. D. EVANS: As far as we are concerned a Select Committee will probably have much the same effect as the Select Committee which inquired into lamb and mutton, the appointment of which was the responsibility of the member for Collie in 1968. That inquiry was passed on to the Clayton commission, and the report was probably as innocuous as any report which one would be able to find. One of the conclusions of that inquiry was that the money being paid by consumers was not finding its way to producers. However, the report did not state how much money, or for what reason the money was not reaching the producer. The report did not suggest a method to obviate the undesirable situation.

That brings me to the meat industry inquiry and the report brought down by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. The committee made 10 recommendations and, in the main, provided a description of the industry, and how it operated in general terms, but it did not get down to the problems facing the industry.

A system of marketing has to be devised which is fair, just and equitable to all those involved in the industry. It comes back to one principal basis of introducing a weight and grade system—to over-simplify the position. At the present time under the provisions of the voluntary beef scheme the system cannot work because operators purchase in the saleyards and sell at broken meat prices. They are able to pick up at trade prices relatively cheaper stock, but once an animal goes through the abattoir nobody can say whence that animal came, who previously owned it, or what quality it was. When the broken meat leaves the abattoir some of it may be exported—the brisket and the fore end—but what about the better rear end cuts such as the fillet? That finds its way into the local market.

The operators at Midland purchase their meat at a lower price than at the abattoirs in, say, Bunbury, Harvey, or Dardanup. When the country operators want to serve their own metropolitan clients they have to go back to the saleyard and buy at a lower price which they do. The country operators then sell in competition with their city counterparts and prices are depressed.

Immediately the voluntary scheme came into operation the animals were downgraded. A most reputable grazier once

asked an agent, at a country saleyard, to show him a prime animal but out of a total of 700 animals the agent was not able to indicate one prime animal. What rubbish for that to occur in that particular area and at that time of the year. Top grade animals were being bought at lower grade prices. If the minimum price was paid for an animal the weight of the animal was then dropped by 50 pounds, or so, and brought to Perth and sold in competition with the meat purchased by local processors at the Midland Junction Abattoir. That has contributed to the situation because it created competition at the Midland Junction Abattoir. The prices were lower in order to compete with the country processors, and it appears the price will drop further. We have a complete and utter shambles.

The last sale at Manjimup was a disaster. The member for Vasse knows what I am talking about. In last Saturday's newspaper an article appeared under the heading, "Farming with a bullet". On the radio on Tuesday morning last an item referred to a farmer in my colleague's area of Margaret River. The farmer was burying 40 animals which he had to shoot. It was a question of economics, though the action taken by the farmer was said to be more of a gesture than an economic solution. However, the point was made that that man could not get a reasonable price for his animals and he was forced to dispose of them.

Several committees are operating in the southern part of the State. One is fairly active in the Albany area, and another is active in my own area. An article published in our local newspaper, *The Blackwood Times*, on the 16th July, 1975, states that the farmers are being blatantly robbed. The claim was made by a beef producer who knows what he is talking about.

Local committees are actively trying to reform the market system and they are endeavouring to obtain something like a fair and equitable price. The examples they have quoted are irrefutable. They have their own scales and they weigh their own animals.

They have taken steps to obtain a better price before putting the cattle into the saleyards. When the price has not been up to what was expected they have withdrawn the animals and obtained a better price by going back to the abattoir from which they sought an initial price.

This is the system that is working now. Members opposite talk of private enterprise—it is competition all right, but it is certainly in the wrong way.

The export market controls the overall long-term beef situation, not only in Western Australia but also in Australia. Political decisions were made in countries which were our traditional markets and until these political decisions are reversed

and economic situations in these countries have been remedied to the extent they will buy our meat, the position will not improve. The amount of beef imported to these countries is not very great. Some of them produce about 93 per cent of their meat requirement, and it is only the 7 per cent that we can supply by way of export to top off their requirement. So this is not a matter of very great import to those countries, but it is of major consequence to Australia where we have developed to cater for those markets.

In the long term we cannot do very much except to press for additional markets anywhere in the world. The beef will keep arriving at the abattoirs. The calf drop of earlier this year commences to come into the market now, and by the end of the year, when feed becomes short, there will be a catastrophe in the saleyards. All this time we will have operated with this fool of a price scheme that never had a show of working anyway. Now we turn around and establish a Select Committee of inquiry.

I referred to the Clayton report, and the significant recommendation of that committee. It said that in the area of significance—where it was sought to find prices and costs—no information was available. The only people with that information are those operating the trade. It is as simple as that. Unless we have access to that type of information—and believe me, no firm will part with it lightly—we just will not achieve what is really required to maintain the position and to come down finally with a marketing situation which will at least assist to solve the present plight of the farmers.

There are two aspects to the market. The export market does not deal in prime meat but in the older, more mature, and even aged meat. This is the lean manufacturing type in the main, and it does not have a very useful purpose on the local market. Western Australian housewives are looking for baby beef; prime young stock. I suppose the breakup of production would be about 45 per cent mature export beef to 55 per cent prime beef. Surely it is not beyond the devices of a Parliament such as this to devise a marketing system giving access to the local market with the balance of the meat taking its chance on the world export market at world export prices. Surely if the will is there, if there is a real desire to do something like this, it can be achieved. The way the system is being fiddled with now makes me shudder.

The SPEAKER: The member has four minutes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Sir. I could use much longer, but I will have time to make the several points that need to be made at this juncture.

The recommendation on the distribution of costs is indicated in the Meat Industry Advisory Committee report. It states—

Investigations in this section of the enquiry were limited because of the lack of objective studies of the distribution system for meat in Western Australia.

Knowledge in this area could be advanced by studies being made of:

The feasibility of centralised fabrication of primal cuts for distribution to retailers.

Marketing margins at the wholesale and retail levels.

Variations in retail trading hours for butchers.

Meat consumers' needs and preferences.

Investigation is needed in the abattoirs—the cutting of the carcasses and the wholesale organising of the cuts of beef and sheep. At the present time these are competitive in a way that is diametrically opposed to the interests of the producer, and this situation has to be changed.

I have no love for a Select Committee. The amendment has adulterated and watered down the intention of the motion to set up a Royal Commission. However, it is the old numbers game and we will have to accept a Select Committee. The Government should withdraw the amendment, or defeat it, and then vote for the original motion. That would be the preferable course, but I say again that the decision is based on the numbers game and we are dealing with people who do not have the interests of producers at heart as they pretend to. The Opposition is compelled to go along with what is a very poor second best.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr Skidmore: Surprise, surprise.

MR CRANE (Moore) [10.36 p.m.]: I move an amendment—

Insert in lieu of the words struck out the following—

as a matter of urgency a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the marketing and distribution of beef and sheep meat products, having special regard to:

1. Returns to producers;
2. Viability of beef and sheep meat producers;
3. Planning for long term stability in the beef and sheep meat industry.

Mr McPHARLIN: I second the motion.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.37 p.m.]: I would like to draw attention to the terms of reference of this proposed Select Committee and the breadth of the perspective

which the terms cover. It mentions returns to producers, viability of beef and sheep meat producers, and planning for long-term stability in the beef and sheep meat industry. It would be difficult to introduce anything further into the scope of the motion as the terms are the broadest possible. There can be no query on that.

I remember the note of urgency mentioned earlier in this very debate. Also, I remember when the member for Vasse allowed to lapse his original motion for a Select Committee sometime last November he pointed out that he chose the alternative of an inquiry by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. He felt this was more expeditious, and it would achieve practically the same result as a Select Committee. We have that report now, and I do not know what a Select Committee could tell us beyond that. I am not very hopeful of the result of this inquiry.

Over what period of time is it proposed that the committee will sit? I presume the House will rise sometime in November, and I will be very surprised if the committee has made even a comprehensive start. Just yesterday I was speaking to a member of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. He was one of those instrumental in bringing forward the report, and his comment was, "We only just scratched the surface." That illustrates how little has been done so far.

The question was raised as to why the Tonkin Government did not take some action in regard to reform of marketing of meat by way of an inquiry. I would like to remind the member for Moore of just what was achieved in this area during the term of the Tonkin Government. Not the least of the achievements were the granting of the power to trade to the Midland Junction Abattoir, the setting up of the Lamb Marketing Board which could and should be expanded, and the establishment of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. These were among the measures taken to meet the difficulties of meat marketing. I seek enlightenment firstly in regard to the time factor of this Select Committee and secondly, as to its composition and its manner of operation.

Amendment put and passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

Appointment of Select Committee

MR CRANE (Moore) [10.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the following members be appointed to serve on the Select Committee, together with the mover:—

The Member for Vasse (Mr Blaikie), the Member for Wellington (Mrs J.

Craig), the Member for Warren (Mr H. D. Evans), and the Member for Maylands (Mr Harman).

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.41 p.m.]: Firstly, there was no intimation before tonight that the Government proposed either to move for a Select Committee or to amend the motion appearing on the notice paper in any way. I believe this type of courtesy could be extended on some occasions. Secondly, we were given no intimation of the possible composition of the Select Committee.

I note it is suggested that the Select Committee be composed of five members. This point is also debatable as a Select Committee of five will be cumbersome. In my opinion three members would suffice. This committee will be required to travel considerable distances, I feel sure; it will have to take evidence in various places; it will be involved in fairly detailed study; and a Select Committee of three would be far better able to cope with these requirements. The time will come when a comment will be made about the Select Committee, "Well we told you so."

So I would ask for enlightenment, as I did earlier, in regard to the method of operation of the committee and also about what will happen when we run out of time at the end of the session.

Mr Hartrey: It will be an honorary Royal Commission.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That may be so. Has sufficient thought been given to the proposed composition of the committee, or is this something that has been scrambled together tonight?

Question put and passed.

MR CRANE (Moore) [10.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the Committee have power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to move from place to place, and to report on Tuesday, 4th November, 1975.

Mr H. D. Evans: You have to be kidding.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.45 p.m.]: I asked a number of questions and some of that enlightenment to which I referred is slowly coming forward now. I can only repeat my interjection, "You have to be kidding!"

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [10.46 p.m.]: I am not going to be in any way critical of the decision to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into this matter because on many occasions in this House I have been critical of the Premier for not allowing such committees to be established. Although I would have preferred to see a Royal Commission established to investigate such an important matter as the beef

and sheep meat industry, I do not object to the appointment of a Select Committee.

However, I ask for an assurance from the Premier, having in mind the wide terms of reference allotted to this Select Committee and the fact that we would want to approach the investigation in the best possible way and obtain the best possible decision to enable us to make the most appropriate recommendations, that if the committee finds itself unable to complete its inquiry by the 4th November, he will give favourable consideration to an extension of time; or, if Parliament is in recess, that he will convert the committee to an Honorary Royal Commission.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [10.47 p.m.]: The honourable member has asked quite a reasonable question in the course of speaking to this motion. If the committee finds itself unable to complete its deliberations by the 4th November, and the House is sitting, I give a categorical assurance that the Government would agree to his request for an extension of time. With regard to the possible extension of the Select Committee into an Honorary Royal Commission, I would not be prepared to commit the Government without first referring the matter to Cabinet, which is the normal procedure.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 4th September, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (35): ON NOTICE

1. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES *Country Towns Assistance Scheme*

Mr **MAY**, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How many towns have been assisted under the Country Towns Assistance Scheme since commencement of the scheme?
- (2) When did the scheme commence?
- (3) How many towns have been assisted since 4th April, 1974?
- (4) Will he detail the towns concerned and the date assistance commenced?

Mr **MENSAROS** replied:

- (1) 26 Towns. Negotiations are going on with two more towns and there are three more possible towns which could apply. This, then,