

as was indicated during the debate, the Government is dealing with the same set of advisers whether that Government be a Labor Government or a Liberal Government. I would refer to the remarks I made when introducing the Bill. I said—

As is now fairly widely known, the wage movements of the financial year just concluded have greatly strained the Government's financial position. Though substantial provision was made in the 1970-71 Budget for wage increases which were expected during the year, it eventuated that the cost of award increases exceeded that provision by no less than \$14,240,000.

A further adverse effect on Government revenue occurred during the financial year just concluded when probate duty fell short of expectations by \$1,500,000, stamp duties on conveyances and transfers were down by \$2,300,000, and mining royalties and rents failed by \$2,300,000 to reach the estimated revenue collection.

When dealing with the current market situation, and particularly in connection with the cattle industry, Mr. Ferry also dealt with a question which had been answered during the week. It was asked by Mr. McNeill and the answer appears on pages 74 to 76 of *Hansard* No. 2. I would like to draw attention to a certain portion of it which appears on page 76. I might add that the reply I gave was authorised by the Premier. The following is portion of a long answer:—

The adverse effects on Western Australian agriculture will be less severe than those likely to be encountered in other areas of Australian agriculture. Nevertheless, the loss of traditional U.K. preferences and their replacement by import levies presents a further difficulty at a time when many of the agricultural industries are faced with low prices and various import restrictions in major markets. In some cases, though, the U.K. market is no longer as important an outlet for Western Australia's agricultural products as it has been in the past.

The remarks by various speakers throughout the evening rather complemented each other. The subjects of education, north-west disabilities, environmental protection, and the like were dealt with. Mr. Berry introduced a new topic—that is, annual value rating—which is a subject with which we have dealt for a long time, but this is the first time it has been so trenchantly criticised.

Mr. Baxter, in defending the democracy of the Upper House, also raised the rural reconstruction issue which I think was recently debated in another place along almost the same lines as Mr. Baxter adopted on behalf of the leader of the Country Party.

I see no point in delaying this debate. I again thank members for their support of the measure and for having spoken so forthrightly and capably, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and passed.

House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 27th July, 1971

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

HOUSING FOR ABORIGINES

Emergency Measures: Petition

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [4.32 p.m.]: I present to the House a Petition addressed as follows:—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, residents in the State of Western Australia, do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will recognise the urgent and immediate need for housing for the Aboriginal people of this State of Western Australia, and will enact emergency measures to combat this problem immediately.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have signed the petition. It bears 361 signatures, and I have signified that the petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS (42): ON NOTICE

1. RAILWAY LAND AT MIDLAND

Leasing or Sale

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Railways:

(1) What area of land, formerly Midland Railway property, is now available for purchase or leasing?

- (2) Is any action being taken to call tenders for or auction such land, if any?
- (3) Has any decision been made for Victoria Street to be extended in a westerly direction past the property recently purchased by Woolworths Limited?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

- (1) 4 acres 26 perches (approximately).
- (2) Proposals for future use of this area are currently being examined and will be finalised shortly.
- (3) Land has been set aside for extension of Victoria Street. Construction is a matter for arrangement between the Main Roads Department and the Swan Shire Council.

2 STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY

Rolling Stock Maintenance

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What arrangement has been made between the State and Commonwealth Governments in regard to maintenance of motive power and rolling stock for the standard gauge railway?
- (2) Will he outline the position in regard to major and minor repairs and overhauls?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

- (1) There is no arrangement between the State and Commonwealth Governments in this regard.

Locomotives do not operate outside their own systems, which are responsible for their maintenance.

Passenger rolling stock on interstate services are serviced at Forrestfield, Port Pirie, and Sydney, and costs are debited to each of the Western Australian, Commonwealth, South Australian, and New South Wales systems on a mileage basis.

Statistical Division	Authority Zones
Northern	Northern
Northern	Midlands
Northern	Northern Central
Central	Northern Eastern
Central	Central
Central	Eastern
South West	South West
Southern	Great Southern
Southern	South East
Southern	Southern
Eastern	Ravensthorpe/Esperance
Others	Pastoral

Wagon stock which is fit to run is returned to the owning system for maintenance, but where repairs are carried out in a foreign system, costs are debited in accordance with the Intersystem Rolling Stock Interchange Agreement.

- (2) Answered by (1).

3. BARRACKS ARCHWAY

Demolition

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Government considering presenting to Parliament again the question of demolition of the Barracks Arch?
- (2) If "No" are any other initiatives being considered for the Barracks Arch?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

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

4. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Applications: Merredin-Yilgarn

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the number of applications for financial assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme received from the electorate of Merredin-Yilgarn?
- (2) How many of these were approved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) For the purpose of recording the source of applications the authority has divided the State statistical divisions into the zones set out below and illustrated on the map which is submitted for tabling.
- (2) Details of applications and approvals to the 23rd July, 1971, for each zone are as follows:—

Applications		Approval to 23/7/71	
No.	Amount	No.	Amount
33	1,289,385	2	66,466
27	821,337	1	36,400
22	779,888	3	77,000
23	811,100	2	55,332
53	1,552,904		
39	1,465,657	1	4,820
58	1,753,036	5	55,306
117	3,391,377	9	163,666
22	757,682	1	15,270
64	1,667,004	3	21,670
36	1,181,239	3	38,931
7	282,474	1	18,360
501	15,753,083	31	553,221

The map was tabled.

5. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Funds: Availability

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

- (1) What was the total of funds available to the State Housing Commission for home building operations during the 1970-71 year?
- (2) Was this sum exceeded during the year 1970-71?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" by how much was the sum exceeded?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) \$37,000,000.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by (2).

6. BACKYARD ORCHARDS

Registration

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Was the decision to discontinue registration of backyard orchards taken on a request from the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association?
- (2) If "No" why was not the industry consulted?
- (3) What financial loss, if any, was sustained by the Department of Agriculture in the registration of backyard orchards?
- (4) Was consideration given to increasing the fee to a payable proposition?
- (5) If (4) is "No" why not?
- (6) What alternative measures, if any, does he plan to introduce to keep accurate records of backyard orchards in order to protect this export industry from the spread of pests and diseases?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Orchard registration was introduced in 1935 to provide a source of funds to control fruit fly. As the registration of backyard orchards had ceased to provide net income, its continuation could not be justified.
- (3) \$16,500 was the estimated loss in the last financial year.
- (4) and (5) Raising the annual fee for backyard orchards was considered but fee collection and registration and policing registration would still have taken an undue and costly proportion of inspectors' time.

- (6) Recording of backyard orchards has not contributed directly to control of urban fruit fly. Active policing of the control measures by inspectors under the Plant Diseases Act will be implemented.

7.

WATER SUPPLIES

Widgiemooltha: Storage Tank

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

At what proposed date will a water storage tank listed for Widgiemooltha be provided?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

It is proposed to connect the existing railway service tank to the town reticulation prior to the forthcoming summer.

Provision of an additional high level service tank is dependent on nickel company development in the area.

8.

PRIVATE TAXIS

Cost to Owner-drivers

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Further to question 27 on Wednesday, the 21st July, 1971, will he advise the approximate amount it costs owner-drivers to purchase and place their private taxis on the road—

- (a) where the owner-driver retained his metered vehicle;
- (b) where the owner-driver has no meter; and
- (c) in each case on a new vehicle purchased and of a quality required to be used as a private taxi?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (a) Three owner-drivers (Nos. 1, 2 and 3) each retained his metered taxi-car and purchased a large secondhand vehicle at a cost of \$3,800 (approx.) respectively.
One owner-driver (No. 4) purchased a new vehicle at approximately \$2,700 to which he transferred his meter and placed the P.T. plates on his existing large vehicle.
One owner-driver (No. 5) purchased a second-hand vehicle for approximately \$1,300 to which he transferred his meter and placed the P.T. plates on his existing large vehicle.

- (b) One owner-driver (No. 6) sold his metered taxi-car license for \$9,500 and traded his 1966 large car for a 1968 large car at a cost of \$2,000, resulting in a credit of \$7,500.

One owner-driver (No. 7) sold his metered taxi-car license for \$9,600, plus \$1,000, which he expended on a second-hand vehicle and placed the P.T. plates on his existing large car, resulting in a credit of \$9,600.

One owner-driver (No. 8) sold his metered taxi-car license for \$9,400, plus \$800, which he expended on a second-hand vehicle and placed the P.T. plates on a new large vehicle costing approximately \$17,500, resulting in a net cost of \$8,100.

One private taxi-car licensee (No. 9) who did not previously own a metered taxi-car, purchased a second-hand large vehicle for \$3,800 approximately.

- (c) Answered by (a) and (b). It will be noted that of the nine P.T. licenses on issue, only one owner-driver has provided a new vehicle.

The quality required of a private taxi-car is prescribed in No. 18 Regulation, i.e.—

- (a) shall have a wheel base of not less than 118 inches;
- (b) shall have a tare weight that exceeds 30 cwts;
- (c) shall not be fitted with a taxi-meter;
- (d) shall not be of any colour other than that determined by the board.

The only additional cost is the annual license fee of \$25 and uniform for the driver if provided.

9. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Tax on People Over 18 Years of Age

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Further to question 30 of Wednesday, the 21st July, 1971, will he explain what he meant in the newspaper article of the 20th July, 1971, regarding possibility of a tax being placed on people over the age of 18 years?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

The comments made are self explanatory. The Minister when speaking on this subject has always gone to great trouble to explain his research, and thoughts on this matter were purely his own and not those of the Government.

10. UNEMPLOYMENT

Number and Percentage

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

- (1) What was the number of people unemployed in Western Australia on the 30th June—
 - (a) 1966;
 - (b) 1967;
 - (c) 1968;
 - (d) 1969;
 - (e) 1970;
 - (f) 1971?
- (2) What percentage of the work force did this represent in each of those years?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The number of persons in Western Australia registered as unemployed with the Commonwealth Employment Service on the 30th June were:
 - (a) 1966—3,370.
 - (b) 1967—3,757.
 - (c) 1968—4,151.
 - (d) 1969—4,007.
 - (e) 1970—5,147.
 - (f) 1971—6,683.
- (2)
 - (a) 1966—1.10%
 - (b) 1967—1.20%
 - (c) 1968—1.13%
 - (d) 1969—1.05%
 - (e) 1970—1.30%
 - (f) 1971—1.63%

11. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Non-payment: Action

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In fairness to people abiding by the law and submitting returns and payments for road maintenance tax, is adequate action being taken to penalise those breaking the law in this field?
- (2) Will he assure the House that he will see the law is carried out as far as possible and action taken against law breakers who fail to submit returns and payments for road maintenance tax?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Subject to availability of the requisite evidence, legal action is continuing to be instituted against offenders for failure to submit returns and pay road maintenance charges.
- (2) Answered by (1).

12. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Abolition: Transport Charges

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does he expect a reduction of transport charges following the abolition of road maintenance tax?
- (2) If so, to what extent?
- (3) Does the Government intend to take action by fixing transport charges or some other method to assure the reduction is passed on to the consumer?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) to (4) All these matters are now under consideration by the Government.

As soon as determinations are reached they will be publicised.

13. SCHOOL BUS SERVICES

Qualifying Number

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the minimum number of children for whom the Education Department will provide a school bus?
- (2) When was this policy established?
- (3) What is the cost per bus/mile for this minimum number of children?
- (4) If the minimum number of children were reduced, would the cost per bus/mile be varied?
- (5) If (4) is "No" would he reduce the minimum number of children for which a school bus will be provided at least until the population in rural areas has stabilised after the present drift?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Contract service—12 children.
Subsidised and feeder services—6 children residing more than 3 miles from the nearest school or school bus route.
- (2) Contract services—approximately 1935.
Subsidised and feeder services—Approximately 1950.

- (3) Costs are not based on a bus/mile, but vary according to the vehicle used and the length of the route. The average cost at present for all routes is 35.85c per bus/mile.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Answered by (4).

14. WATER SUPPLIES

Bolganup Dam

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the storage capacity of the Bolganup Dam for the water supply to the town of Mt. Barker?
- (2) Is this supply sufficient for the town's present needs and the immediate future?
- (3) If (2) is "No" what plans has the Government for increasing this supply?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 50,000,000 gallons.
- (2) The demand of the town has now reached the safe draw from the dam.
- (3) A route for a pipeline from the Denmark River is at present being surveyed.

15. SUPERPHOSPHATE

Sales

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many tons of superphosphate were sold in Western Australia in each of the years ended the 30th June, from 1967 to 1971 inclusive?
- (2) How many tons of superphosphate were sold from each of the following works in each of the above years—
(a) Geraldton;
(b) Fremantle area (Kwinana and Rocky Bay);
(c) Bassendean;
(d) Picton Junction;
(e) Albany;
(f) Esperance?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The tonnages for all fertilisers sold in Western Australia are as follows:—
1966-67—1,239,000.
1967-68—1,347,000.
1968-69—1,381,000.
1969-70—1,264,000.
1970-71—1,100,000.

More than 90 per cent. of these totals would be superphosphate and superphosphate plus trace elements.

- (2) Not available, being the prerogative of the companies.

16. **PILBARA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

Establishment

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) What progress has been made by the Government to the proposal he announced in the *Daily News* on Monday, the 10th May, 1971, for the establishment of a Pilbara development authority?
- (2) What functions and responsibilities does he envisage for the authority?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) When the statement was made regarding the establishment of a Pilbara Development Authority I was careful to emphasise it was in the embryo stages. Further thought has been given to the matter and it is still under consideration.

17. **PENSIONERS: COUNTRY**

Medical Treatment: Free Rail Transport

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

Will the Government allow pensioners living in country areas requiring specialist medical treatment free return rail travel to the metropolitan area?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Yes. This has been the practice for many years and it will continue.

18. **REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONS**

Establishment

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) What action is planned by the Government on the suggestions the Minister for Housing proposed to place before the Government on his return from Britain (reported in the *Daily News*, on the 15th June, 1971, under the heading "Government May Study New Regional Plan") for regional development commissions throughout Western Australia?
- (2) Is legislation necessary and proposed?
- (3) Would he elaborate on the form of commissions the Minister for Housing suggested and their relevance to Western Australian conditions?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (3) Between the 22nd May and the 3rd June, 1971, the Minister for Housing visited the United

Kingdom for the purpose of studying, among other things, the British New Towns which are created to assist to decentralise housing and industry and to cope with population and developmental growth.

In a press interview on his return, the Minister outlined the British New Towns Scheme and experience. He exemplified how it might be applied to assist this State's decentralisation and developmental planning requirements. The Minister's statements on his overseas observations were broadly and generally based, and no detailed consideration has yet been given to their possible relevance to Western Australian conditions.

19. **HOUSING**

Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement: Funds

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

- (1) Since the answer to (4) of question No. 8 on the 21st July, 1971, indicates that the loan funds to be made available to the State Housing Commission for the year 1971-72, under the Commonwealth and State housing agreement, is known, what is this amount?
- (2) What was the allocation to the State Housing Commission under the Commonwealth and State housing agreement for the year 1970-71?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) \$12,500,000.
- (2) \$12,500,000.

20. **STATE HOUSING COMMISSION**

Rental Account: Profit or Loss

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

- (1) Is he able to state whether the State Housing Commission made a profit or a loss on its rental account for the year ended the 30th June, 1971?
- (2) If accounts are not yet finalised, could he give an approximation of the profit and loss sustained in this account?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The annual accounts for the year ended the 30th June, 1971, have not been finalised yet. However, at this stage, a loss on rental transactions is evident.

- (2) The position in relation to the rental transactions is estimated as follows:

Commonwealth-	\$
State	600,000 loss
State Housing	40,000 profit
Net Loss	\$560,000

It will be appreciated that a considerable amount of dissection is involved in apportioning amortisation and administration factors between purchase and rental properties as detailed accounts of these factors are not kept. However, a similar apportionment has been used as in prior years, and it is considered that this basis gives a close approximation of the position.

This compares with a net loss of \$577,864 during 1969-70 and a net profit of \$96,340 during 1968-69.

21. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION AND MARGINAL DAIRY FARMS SCHEMES

Sales of Farms

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many applications have been received from farmers wishing to sell their properties through the—
 - (a) Commonwealth rural reconstruction scheme;
 - (b) marginal dairy farms scheme, and from which shire district have they originated?
- (2) How many have been approved, and what is the cost to date under each scheme, and from which shire district?
- (3) Are any farms being held by option to purchase through each scheme?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), would he state the number in each shire district respectively?
- (5) What would be the funds required to date if all options were exercised under each scheme?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) Commonwealth Rural Reconstruction Scheme—Nil.
- (b) Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme—

Augusta-Margaret River	
Shire	46
Busselton Shire	11
Nannup Shire	2
Manjimup Shire	14
Denmark Shire	5
Greenbushes Shire	2
Balingup Shire	3
Albany Shire	1
Waroona Shire	1
	<u>85</u>

- (2) (a) Rural Reconstruction Scheme—Nil.

- (b) Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme—

Augusta-Margaret	\$
River Shire 8	223,550
Denmark Shire 4	89,770
	<u>12</u>
	<u>\$313,320</u>

- (3) Yes.

- (4) (a) Rural Reconstruction Scheme—Nil.

- (b) Marginal Dairy Farm Reconstruction Scheme—

Augusta-Margaret River	
Shire	10
Busselton Shire	1
	<u>11</u>

- (5) \$298,000.

22. WOOROLOO TRAINING CENTRE

Conversion to Hospital

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Having regard for the Government's previously expressed opinions, does it now intend to return the old Wooroloo hospital to its previous use before the conversion to a prison?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Funds are not available to build a new Prisons Department Training Centre.

23. ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Future Use

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Government decided to what purpose the old Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital is to be converted?
- (2) What are the details of the future use of this hospital?
- (3) What alterations and additions are to be made to the present buildings and grounds?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of the change?
- (5) From what source will these funds come?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) To be used as accommodation for intellectually handicapped and physically disabled children. Initially eight children will be accommodated in the newer building with little alteration.

- ## 26. HAWKER-SIDDELEY BUILDING SUPPLIES

**24. ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT
DISTRICT HOSPITAL
Additional Equipment**

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for
Forests:

- In connection with the sale of the State Building Supplies to Hawker-Siddeley—

(1) What were the names of the timber mills involved in the transaction?

- (2) What were the timber concessions or timber areas made available to each timber mill involved?

- (3) What was the annual intake of timber for each mill on a yearly basis five years prior to the sale?

- (4) What was the annual intake of timber for each mill after the takeover by Hawker-Siddeley?

- (5) What is the number of mills that have been closed since the takeover by Hawker-Siddeley and the date of closure of each mill?

- (6) What are the timber areas, in acres, still retained by Hawker-Siddeley in areas where the mills have been closed?

- (7) Are other areas being obtained by the Forests Department for the Hawker-Siddeley group?

- (8) If "Yes" to (7), will he name the areas involved?

- (9) In the timber areas granted to Hawker-Siddeley under the agreement and where mills have since closed, have small operators applied for timber reserves?

- (10) If "Yes" to (9), will he advise the names of the operators concerned and their future prospects of obtaining the timber from Crown land?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Worsley, Buckingham, Dwellingup, Shannon River, Deanmill, Pemberton, Banksiadale, Kent River.

- | (2) Sawmilling Permit
No's: | Area
Acres |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 1542 Worsley | 43,060 |
| 1537 Buckingham | 88,660 |
| 1541 Dwellingup .. | 31,450 |
| 1329 Shannon River ... | 133,660 |
| 1543 Deanmill | 119,050 |
| 1333 Pemberton | 77,895 |
| 1540 Banksiadale | 136,509 |
| 1473 & 1503 Kent River | 42,800 |

(3)

Intake Loads	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59	1959/60	1960/61
Worsley	10,276	10,605	9,174	8,047	7,787
Buckingham	9,127	9,807	10,747	9,872	9,957
Dwellingup	14,540	15,439	13,225	14,003	11,824
Shannon River	31,040	29,666	28,480	26,410	25,620
Deanmill	33,770	38,452	38,010	35,853	33,710
Pemberton	43,502	42,573	41,598	43,950	40,990
Banksiadale	28,660	27,792	29,922	30,653	29,314
Kent River	244	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

(4)

Intake Loads	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66
Worsley	8,459	9,480	11,818	14,248	13,821
Buckingham	6,966	10,770	17,203	20,272	19,108
Dwellingup	12,984	21,431	38,248	41,300	43,530
Shannon River	25,416	24,298	24,279	25,389	29,473
Deanmill	35,534	36,509	37,631	37,267	41,413
Pemberton	40,672	23,218	24,600	25,134	26,056
Banksiadale	29,390	24,757	Nil	Nil	Nil
Kent River	Nil	Nil	Nil	5,686	7,559

(5) Three.

Banksiadale—23rd June, 1963
(destroyed by fire).

Worsley—22nd November, 1968.

Shannon River—22nd November, 1968.

(6) Banksiadale Sawmilling Permit 1540—135,978 acres.

Worsley Sawmilling Permit 1542—42,873 acres.

Shannon Sawmilling Permit 1329—133,820 acres.

Timber from the above permits is being cut at other mills of the Company for which an increased intake was approved.

(7) No.

(8) Answered by (7).

(9) No.

(10) Answered by (9).

27.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES

Prosecutions, Warnings, and Fines

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

For the months of April, May, and June for the years 1970 and 1971 in the metropolitan area, how many traffic offence prosecutions and warnings have been recorded, and what is the total sum of fines awarded for each month?

Mr. MAY replied:

No record is kept of the total amounts of penalties imposed by infringement notices and the amounts shown (see sheet below) relate to receipts from infringement notices which have been paid.

Traffic Offences
Metropolitan Area

1970	Prosecutions	Infringement Notices	Cautions/ Warnings	Fines Prosecution	*Infringements Paid
April	885	1,790	332	\$61,953	\$27,767
May	777	1,942	558	43,725	31,817
June	769	1,974	779	40,875	31,624
			Total	146,553	91,208
Grand Total				\$237,761	
1971					
April	1,489	2,067	737	\$71,130	\$36,401
May	968	1,950	831	47,943	36,546
June	1,150	3,049	848	53,775	60,989
			Total	\$172,848	\$133,936
Grand Total				\$306,784	

* Infringements paid do not relate to infringement notices issued.

28. DROUGHT

Relief Measures

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

What action is he taking with regard to the near drought conditions prevailing in a large proportion of the wheat belt in respect of—

- (a) making available grain for stock feed;
- (b) road and rail freight concessions for transport of stock to agistment;
- (c) subsidies for water carting where necessary?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The situation is being closely watched. The Drought Finance Committee has met. A review of experience in assisting farmers affected by the widespread 1969 drought and the more limited 1970 drought in southern districts is being made as a basis for consideration by the Government of future drought aid.

A permanent Drought Consultative Committee is being set up to regularly review drought matters for the agricultural areas.

29. FARMERS

Fencing: Long Term Loans

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

- (1) Would he consider making available long term loans to farmers, on a similar basis to the key dam scheme, to allow them to fence their properties against the depredations of kangaroos and emus when they adjoin any type of Government reserve?
- (2) Would the Government be prepared to share the cost of erecting a boundary fence when it is common to their reserve and a farmer's property?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The conditions for receiving a Crown grant require the would-be landowner to fence the boundaries of the land. While neighbours make mutual arrangements for fencing common boundaries, the fences on boundaries adjoining roads, reserves, and Crown land have always been and must remain the responsibility of the landholder.

Boundary fencing is a normal development cost and should be financed as such. Key dams are storages to meet emergency situations over and above normal development requirements.

30. TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Revenue, and Distribution of Funds

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) What revenue was received by the Totalisator Agency Board for the year ended the 30th June, 1971?
- (2) What were the operating costs for that period?
- (3) What was the amount of revenue available for distribution by the board?
- (4) In what manner, and to whom, was the distribution made?

Mr. MAY replied:

(Note: Board's financial year ends the 31st July, 1971).

- (1) Net revenue for the 11 months ended the 30th June, 1971—\$3,261,677.
- (2) Operating costs—\$2,599,853.
- (3) Funds available for distribution—\$2,520,771.
- (4) In accordance with the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act 60 per cent. of the distribution is made to the Western Australian Turf Club and 40 per cent. is made to the Western Australian Trotting Association.

31. TRANSPORT

M.T.T. Buses: Cost and Life

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

- (1) What is the cost of an M.T.T. bus delivered to the M.T.T.?
- (2) What rate of depreciation is written off annually for costing purposes?
- (3) At what mileage are buses put in for major overhaul?
- (4) What is the effective working life of buses purchased in recent years?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) \$23,000.
- (2) Five per cent.
- (3) Necessary work is carried out at fixed mileage intervals during the life of the bus.
- (4) Approximately 20 years.

32.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Coogee Area: Disposal of Effluent

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is the study by Environmental Resources of Australia and Scott and Furphy of effluent treatment and disposal in Owen Anchorage from industries in the Coogee area complete and the report before the Government?

- (2) If not, when is it expected?
- (3) If the work is complete and reports received, when does the Government propose to make public the findings and plans to cope with the effluent treatment and disposal if changes are needed?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) A statement on the reports will be made after the financial implications of carrying out the recommendations have been examined in detail.

33. FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT ACT

Enforcement

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Does the Government intend to bring into force the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

No, but the proposed rural reconstruction legislation will include provision for stay orders while applications for reconstruction are being considered by the rural reconstruction authority, and, with ministerial approval, in other special circumstances.

34. FERTILISER WORKS

Feasibility Study

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the State Government decide to abandon the appointment proposed by the previous Government for the study of inland fertiliser works because of its own concern about the competence of the firm proposed or only because the Country Regional Councils Association of Western Australia wanted consultants of their own choosing?
- (2) Are the consultants (or other firm) now proposed the nominee of the association or from a panel nominated by the Government?
- (3) Which consultants (or other firm) are under negotiation at present?
- (4) Is the State Government to pay the whole of the costs of the feasibility study?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) The appointment of the firm originally chosen by the previous Government to undertake the feasibility study of an inland fertilizer works, and whose appointment

was deferred prior to this Government's assuming office, was abandoned for a number of reasons. However, the firm's competency was never in doubt.

The Country Regional Councils Association have not indicated to me that they would only accept consultants of their own choosing, but it is correct that they prefer another firm.

- (2) The firm which will undertake the study, subject to the terms of reference and fee being satisfactorily negotiated, is the firm with which the Country Regional Councils Association have had earlier discussions.
- (3) Davy Ashmore.
- (4) Provided we can conclude satisfactory negotiations referred to in the answer to question (2), the Government will pay for the cost of the feasibility study.

35. WATER SUPPLIES

Helena Valley Dam

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How much natural vegetation will be removed from the water storage area of the pipehead dam being constructed in the Helena Valley?
- (2) How much natural vegetation has to date been removed from the banks of the Helena River between Mundaring Weir and the pipehead dam?
- (3) Is it intended in the future to interfere with the river banks?
- (4) If damage is to be done, or has to be done, why is this necessary?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) All trees and scrub below a contour 5 feet above the crest of the weir have been removed.
- (2) The area comprises a narrow strip of land approximately 3 chains wide which runs upstream from the weir to the confluence of Piesse Brook and the Helena River, a distance of approximately 45 chains.
- (3) The construction of the weir has been completed and no further clearing is envisaged.
- (4) Trees and scrub would die after immersion and cause pollution through discoloration, and damage to offtake systems and pumps because of debris.

36. **ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES***Hydroelectric Pump Storage Station:
Mt. Dale*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Premier:
What action has been initiated in seeking expert opinion on the proposal for a 240 megawatt hydroelectric pump storage station at Mt. Dale?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The consultants who were commissioned to advise the State Electricity Commission in connection with power failures, were asked to investigate the proposals for a 240 megawatt hydroelectric pump storage station at Mt. Dale and have submitted a report which is being studied by departmental officers.

37. **MINISTERS OF THE CROWN***Increase in Number*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Premier:

- (1) Does he intend to increase the number of Ministers in the Cabinet?
- (2) If so, by how many, and when?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) No consideration by the present Government has been or is at present being given to the matter of increasing the number of Ministers in the Cabinet.

38. **MORATORIUM MARCHES***Future Participation*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does he propose to grant approval for students, teachers and public servants to participate in any future moratorium marches on the same conditions as he did for the recent moratorium march?
- (2) If so, does he propose to impose any conditions on the conduct of the parade, including the nature of flags and chants, etc., that will be permitted?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) Any application made for approval for students, teachers, and public servants to participate in future marches for any particular purpose will receive consideration and a decision will be made on the merits of the case.

39. **ROAD TRANSPORT***Wool to Albany*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did he confer with the member for Albany regarding question 23

on the Notice Paper on Wednesday, the 21st July, 1971, following receipt of my question and prior to answering my question in this House?

- (2) Did he take part in anything that accounted for the publicity received by the member for Albany on this question?
- (3) If (1) is "Yes" does this mean that the Minister will continue with this practice in Parliament?

Mr. MAY replied: The Minister for Police and Transport has supplied the following answer:—

- (1) No.
- (2) In a telephone conversation, originating with Mr. Cook, he asked me if I had received a report on great southern transport from the Director-General of Transport. My reply was that a report had been received by me and was being considered by the Government. I am not aware of any publicity received by the member for Albany on this matter. The information in my reply would have been given to any member.
- (3) Answered by (1).

40. **BUSINESSES IN COUNTRY CENTRES***Additional Concessions*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it correct that he has agreed to make an added concession of 10 per cent. on the supply of goods and the provision of services to business people operating in country centres?
- (2) To what categories, in detail, does it apply for—
(a) goods;
(b) services?
- (3) When did this concession commence?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes. It has been agreed to allow country based manufacturing and service industries an additional 10 per cent. preference over city tenderers within their respective regions when tendering for Government requirements.
- (2) (a) To manufactured goods.
(b) The extent to which service industries may be assisted is being studied by a committee of representatives from the Public Works Department,

Government Stores, Tender Board, and Department of Industrial Development and Decentralisation.

- (3) The concession is expected to commence in two to three weeks' time when the committee's report and recommendations are completed.

41. RAILWAYS

Flashing Lights: Vincent Street Crossing, Beverley

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) When may it be expected that the flashing lights will be installed at the Vincent Street crossing, Beverley?
- (2) Why was the work commenced and then left, even though considerable expense had been incurred?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

- (1) It is anticipated that installation will be completed by the 19th August, 1971.
- (2) Field work commenced in April to take advantage of the temporary availability of the installation gang although it was known that the complex wiring of the relay and equipment cases could not be commenced due to technicians being engaged on higher priority work.

42. RAILWAYS

Deraiment at Noggojeering Siding

Mr. McIVER, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Would he advise what costs to the department were involved by the recent deraiment of a goods train at Noggojeering siding?
- (2) Will he advise cause of deraiment?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

- (1) Repair work arising from the deraiment has not been completed, but the total cost to the department is estimated to be \$13,700.
- (2) A departmental investigation has revealed that this deraiment was attributable to overwidth gauge.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. INLAND FISHING LICENSES

Amendment of Regulations

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Is it the Government's intention this session to amend the regulations which require people to

purchase an inland fisherman's license at a cost of \$2 to catch marron, perch, cobbler, and other freshwater fish?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Inland fishermen's licenses became due for renewal on the 30th June, last. In reviewing the position the Department of Fisheries and Fauna decided that whilst it was necessary for those persons fishing to continue to hold a license no charge would be made in connection with pensioners and children.

2.

HOUSING

Expenditure of Loan Funds

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Deputy Premier: In view of the reply given by the Minister for Housing to my question on today's notice paper that for the year 1970-71 the State Housing Commission did not exceed the loan funds allocated to it, can he explain why he in this House mentioned on a number of occasions during last week that the commission had overspent by some \$2,000,000?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I have no doubt you will recollect, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from a report made to the Brand Government in its dying hours, such report having been submitted by the Under-Treasurer of the State.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd July, on the following motion by Mr. A. R. Tonkin:—

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

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

MR. REID (Blackwood) [5.06 p.m.]: I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair. I am sure you will discharge the duties of your office in an able and capable manner. To the other members of the Chamber, particularly the new members, who have given their opening addresses, I would like to add my congratulations for the high standard that has been set by them. I can only hope that my contribution will also be of some worth.

I am acutely aware of the great honour that has been bestowed upon me by the electors of Blackwood in choosing me to be their representative in the Parliament of Western Australia. This is an honour that not many men or women in the community attain, and I am certainly mindful of the great responsibilities attaching to the office. I am also aware of the very sincere contribution made by my predecessor, Mr. Ron Kitney, during the last Parliament; and, before him, that made by John Hearman who was, of course, Speaker of the House for many years. These members have set a standard I hope to emulate. It is most gratifying from the point of view of a new member to be received so warmly by the members of the staff and the members of Parliament generally. It is heartening for a new member to find he is received and regarded firstly as an individual.

In turning to the Blackwood electorate one discovers that it runs approximately 85 miles in a south-easterly direction from the boundary of the Bunbury townsite, and that it is approximately 40 miles in width. It is an excellent example of a rural seat, because it ranges from living in the near suburbia of a major town, such as Bunbury, to the southern pioneering areas of Chowderup and Tone Bridge. This area produces almost every possible agricultural commodity known in Western Australia with the exception of cotton, pineapples, and bananas.

Quite apart from containing some of the most fertile soils and the best farmlands in the State, it supports a whole-milk and butterfat industry and produces the bulk of the State's export apple crop. It also encompasses some of the finest beef raising areas in the State and grows some of the finest types of wool.

Industries such as fat lamb, potato growing, timber, grain, and mining are also of tremendous importance. Ironically enough, with only a few exceptions all the industries mentioned are in serious trouble.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I have a time allocation of 45 minutes. I realise, however, that some of the best brains in Australia, if not in the world, are devoting their entire energies to solving this rural crisis. It is therefore unlikely that my time allocation of 45 minutes, or my 20-minute address, will help solve or improve the world situation. Accordingly, I have decided to adopt the latter figure and, having made this decision, it naturally follows that in dealing with such a complex and involved problem one runs the danger of generalising and falling into the familiar trap—as has been done in the past—of making vague statements including such expressions as “market penetration,” or “diversification.”

These expressions have been around for so long that they are treated only with contempt by the farmers. What is needed at the moment is an honest and direct approach to the problems confronting us. The biggest question confronting us is probably this: Do we want an agricultural industry in Australia? Of course we do; but the questions that follow are: Whom do we want in it, and how much can we afford, as a country, to keep them there?

The latter two questions are far more difficult to answer. I believe that most politicians in this nation of ours have been guilty of undermining the position of the family farmer in Australia today by failing to recognise the seriousness of the mounting problems in agriculture that have been apparent over the last five years.

As farmers we have been told, firstly, to get big or get out. This advice was then changed and we were told, “You must diversify.” We were later informed that we worked with our hands and not our heads, and that we would become more efficient by employing farm advisers and economists.

Where, Mr. Speaker, are those men who were reputed to be the fountains of wisdom? Where were they after we got big, diversified, and hired the necessary brain power? These fountains of wisdom have all disappeared. One might ask, “Why?” The reply, of course, is that this was not the answer at all. Portion of it might have been true and might still be true, but it is not the solution.

The tragedy of the situation remains; it is the farmer in the 35 to 40-year-old bracket who faces the greatest crisis today. He is the man who has gone out prepared to work hard to improve his lot by borrowing heavily to develop and remain viable. He carries the additional burden of educational expenses because he has, in the main, a young family. What is more important he is the backbone of the agricultural industry in Australia; he is the one we can least afford to lose.

This type of farmer, however, will be the first to go unless realistic recognition is given to his problems. It seems to be part of human nature not to want to dwell on misfortune or tragedy, yet part of us wants to hear the morbid details; whether they involve a farmer walking off his land penniless—losing all his savings—after a lifetime of hard work; or whether it concerns some city dweller left homeless with a large family after having lost his uninsured home in a fire.

We are too quick to excuse our conscience by saying that he should have known that low wool prices and droughts were coming; or, in the latter case, by saying it is his own fault for not insuring his house, even though the money might just not have been available to do this.

To me it is unbelievable that tax concessions should be available to everyone in Australia who has a tax problem and who wishes to enter the field of food production—a field already oversupplied on the local and world scene. Probably the most pressing need today is for a reappraisal of these tax concessions, bearing in mind the urgent need to protect and assist the family farmer, while discouraging outside parties from entering food production.

Tax concessions could still be made available to those engaged in non-food producing areas, such as in afforestation. Until this step is taken, any moves towards the reconstruction of any of the industries in difficulties will be largely negated. How can the nation truthfully offer farmers assistance with their reconstruction while literally holding a gun in the back of another section of the community and urging it to start clearing productive farmland?

This was fair enough in the early 1950s, when we were largely a primary producing country and urgently needed foreign exchange; when there was very little industry or mineral export. However, it is not necessary now. Farming is probably the most unbusinesslike business there is. The farmer embarks on a 12 months' programme to produce something; whether it be wool, meat, fruit, or grain, with little more than a faint hope that someone in the world, either locally or elsewhere, will offer him a price that will cover his cost of production and give him a small profit margin after he has run the gauntlet with mother nature. She, of course, has the power to wipe out the year's work in minutes by means of storm, fire, flood, or drought.

I would like to illustrate this aspect with a true story; something that occurred to me some years ago. It was the day of the Sunday school picnic in December. We attended church in the morning and then travelled to the coast with a group of 40 excited little ones. After watching over them while they played in the water we returned home that evening only to discover that my fruit crop had been completely wiped out by hail. My next-door neighbour, however, who had been drinking beer all day and keeping company with fast women, got off Scot free! If there is a moral to this story I am not sure that it is a very good one.

This happened to be the third time in four years my crop had been affected by hail, and had it occurred again the following year I would probably have been put out of business. However, because the premiums are so high it is not economical to insure fruit crops. Prior to this experience 20 years had elapsed without any damage being incurred, but what sort of profit margin needs to be built in in order to cater for these types of incidents?

My next-door neighbour, by the way, has mended his bad habits and is now married with a wife and family, and has settled down to a quiet life. Also, he has not yet received a hail strike!

Orderly marketing stands alone in offering security to the farming community. Legislation, therefore, offers the best hope of improving the rural situation. This legislation will need to be far sighted and sometimes courageous to achieve the desired effect. Free enterprise has had disastrous results in the fruit, meat, and wool industries. We all enjoy living in a free society, but as far as the primary industries are concerned, it has been too free and someone else has enjoyed it too much.

I read with interest in the Premier's policy speech the reference to the Queensland Government's contribution of \$10,000,000 for drought relief. This is a tremendous effort for a developing State to make without, perhaps, the support of the developing mineral fields, and it must have been made with the full realisation of the consequences if aid was not quickly forthcoming.

Queensland also offers an interesting example in the operations of the Committee of Direction; that is, the C.O.D. This committee was set up some 40-odd years ago during one of Queensland's blackest periods when fruit and vegetable produce was at rock bottom prices. These prices had been depressed by individuals to absolute bankruptcy level. The influence of the Committee of Direction on the market immediately lifted the price to a payable proposition for farmers. The committee and free enterprise firms still operate successfully in Queensland, but there is no longer any doubt who is underpinning the base price.

This committee is unique in that it makes its own legislation independent of the Queensland Government. I believe these powers were granted by a Labor Government, and I hope that the outstanding success of this organisation will not go unnoticed by this Government if and when it is examining legislation in connection with the wool, fruit, and lamb industries in Western Australia.

Having submitted some proposals on production and incentives to produce, together with ideas of how to rationalise the position through legislation, I would like briefly to comment on markets and marketing. Surely in this field lies our greatest scope for a breakthrough. The Department of Agriculture in Western Australia has many officers of outstanding ability—many of the senior officials I have known for 20 years or more and they are tremendously respected—and yet I feel that the department has been found to be sadly lacking during this current recession.

In order to maximise this department's operations, I suggest it should be split into three separate and distinct groups; that is, one of research, one of advisory services to farmers, and one of markets and marketing. The present situation where a research service and an advisory service exist under the same roof makes for a bad marriage. The professional element from the research department where, by necessity, experiments and observations have to be proven to the last decimal point, has a definite restrictive influence on the advisory services, and tends to alienate itself from the problems in the field. This is aggravated by some services such as the horticulture section which has only two fully trained men in the field, the remainder of the staff being stationed at the headquarters in Jarrah Road, South Perth.

By creating a special marketing and handling section with full liaison with grower bodies and free enterprise firms, a far more singleminded approach would be obtained when examining new markets and handling methods. This section, with its grower, exporter, and departmental content, would make a strong impact on any trade delegation which, at the moment, is long overdue, especially now with Britain's entry into the E.E.C. being only a matter of course there not being, apparently, a transitional period. The effect of her entry, despite comments to the contrary, could hardly be more serious to the agricultural industries today.

I firmly believe that as politicians we must cross from behind the protection of the political barriers and go out to offer and give leadership. For too long we have sat back saying, "Come to us once you have a majority decision and we will help you," knowing full well that this situation very seldom eventuates.

On my last agricultural point I would like to say that I believe the introduction of a simple annual computerised form outlining the current assets and liabilities—including stock and plant—of all farmers is long overdue. These forms could be completed annually with the tax returns and forwarded to Canberra for record purposes. At little more than a moment's notice an accurate year-by-year assessment of a particular rural industry which was developing or growing towards trouble could be ascertained. This would be immeasurably preferable to the present undignified process of pleading, foot stamping, and shoulder crying, that farmers have to go through before receiving any recognition of their problems.

On forestry matters, there is a pressing need for the Government clearly to define its intention to farmers when purchasing cleared farmland for softwood plantings. At the present moment the less the department co-operates with the remaining farmers in a district, the quicker it will

be able to buy them out, which is wrong. Grants to local authorities affected by the loss of rates should and must eventually be made. It is unjust to ask four or five south-west country shires to subsidise the growth of this important industry which must ultimately be of tremendous value to the State as a whole.

A farm forestry policy should be introduced to encourage farmers to plant pines on suitable soils and sites on their properties. Attention should be given to offering pine-planting grants and immediate action should be taken in the probate and tax fields at present affecting private plantations.

The country businessmen's predicament must also be recognised during the current recession in the country areas. Obviously, as soon as the rural position improves, so will the position of the businessman, but at the moment he has special problems which should not be overlooked.

The mining industry in the south-west is also bringing its share of problems. While the whole community welcomes the benefits associated with new industries, and therefore encourages those industries, anyone travelling on the South-Western Highway between Greenbushes and Bridgetown must agree that a high price in environment has been paid. A sensible middle-of-the-road policy must be adopted.

I am pleased to say that the educational standard in the Blackwood electorate has improved. This, of course, must be our continual goal; that is, to seek a steadily rising plane of educational facilities. Of equal if not of more importance is the need in the country areas for children to obtain vastly increased boarding allowances and increased country hostel accommodation. We must try one day to offer to all students equal opportunities in education.

To summarise briefly, I would say that orderly marketing, coupled with good legislation that can rationalise the production of rural produce, headed by a hard hitting efficient marketing section, offer the best chance for the rural sector today. This would add up to a far lesser cost to the Government than providing new schools, hospitals, roads, and the like, which are at present available in the country, but which would have to be provided in the cities should there be a mass migration from farming areas to those cities.

May I suggest that what we need today is not a deceptive hopefulness that success comes easily, but the will to grapple with staggering difficulties.

It has been a great honour to present this address on behalf of the electors of Blackwood, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members for your attention.

MR. MOILER (Toodyay) [5.24 p.m.] : This being my maiden speech and the first occasion on which I will have the privilege to address this House, I propose in the 45-minute, interjection-free period allotted to me to take this excellent opportunity to raise a number of matters which concern the electorate of Toodyay.

First of all, however, I would like to join with previous speakers and congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office you now hold. I would also like to congratulate the Premier, his deputy, and the Cabinet Ministers on their election to their offices and portfolios. I wish to thank the electors of the Toodyay electorate for their trust and the responsibility they have placed in me, and I pledge that during the time I am privileged to sit in this House I shall to the best of my ability represent each and every member of the Toodyay electorate. I will always be conscious of the responsibility the position holds, and I pray that time will prove me adequate to the task. I would also like to thank my friends and Labor Party supporters who were instrumental in my winning the recent election.

Finally I would like to thank the officers and staff of Parliament House who have made it as easy as possible for my entry into this Chamber since my election.

The electorate of Toodyay covers many hundreds of square miles and contains the whole of the Shire of Toodyay, the bulk of the Mundaring Shire, and the greater portion of the Swan Shire; and in these shires are many localities. Within the localities naturally reside many individuals with problems, problems which on a State basis may be considered to be small, but which to those constituents concerned are real and major problems. Sometimes the problems fall into the category of no scheme water or an inadequate supply, no electricity, or, as has been the case more recently since the mineral boom, the problems affecting some constituents have been associated with the fact that persons representing mining companies and the like have entered their private property for the purpose of prospecting. Entry to the property has been obtained merely by the presentation of a permit-to-enter form.

On the last point I was pleased to note that the Government indicated in the Governor's recent Speech that it proposes to repeal the Mining Act of 1904 and submit a new Act. I am confident that at the appropriate time the Minister concerned will give due consideration to the recommendations made in the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the operations of the Mining Act, with particular reference to the problems associated with the entry of individuals onto private property for the purpose of prospecting, and that he will adequately safeguard the rights of the private property holder.

Other issues concern my electorate and I am anxious to take this opportunity to mention some of them. I will refer firstly to the possible development of an alumina works within the Swan Shire, and the associated mining in the Darling scarp; and, secondly, to the corridor plan report. With regard to the latter subject I will indicate the obvious ignorance those responsible for the report must have of the Swan Shire area. Thirdly, it is my intention to urge this Government to adequately protect but also develop the Avon Valley National Park.

I also suggest to the Government that it should make every endeavour to initiate a rail commuter service between Northam, Toodyay, Swan, Midland, and Perth.

Mr. McIver: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOILER: Of course, I am more concerned with a rail service from Toodyay as I realise that the member for Northam is quite able to advocate the extension to Northam.

The final matter which I have listed—which I wish to develop first—is a matter which the previous Government proved inadequate to tackle. Its inadequacy has contributed, to some degree, to the hardship being felt in the rural sector at the present time and has resulted in additional costs to the consumer. I refer to the refusal on the part of the previous Government to develop regional country abattoirs and what, to my mind, has been the waste of millions of dollars at the Midland Junction Abattoir, which money should have been channelled into country establishments.

In 1961 a group known as the Great Southern Abattoirs Ltd. attempted to establish an abattoir in the great southern region. It had many distinguished directors, the chairman being Mr. William Allan Manning.

Mr. Fletcher: What is the honourable member quoting from?

Mr. MOILER: I am quoting from the prospectus of Great Southern Abattoirs Ltd., which is dated, March, 1961. I should like to read just one paragraph from the prospectus and, in so doing, I point out that the word "instrumentality" which is referred to obviously means "abattoir." It says—

Approaches were made to the State Government for establishment of a Government instrumentality, but these were unsuccessful, owing to the fixed policy of "no expansion of Government business undertakings."

It is obvious from that extract that people in the Narrogin area of the great southern, before attempting to form a co-operative, considered it reasonable for the Government to establish an abattoir.

However, having received the Government's ultimatum, or advice, on no expansion of Government business undertakings, they had to resort to this method of establishing an abattoir. The Government did not give reasons, such as it was not feasible to establish an abattoir, or that an abattoir was not needed. It was merely because of the previous Government's policy of no expansion. Had the Government developed country abattoirs, or more positively assisted the development of abattoirs, farmers would be in a far better position than they are at the present time. Their stock would now be slaughtered within the area in which they live. It could be slaughtered, inspected, and channelled direct to the retail outlet within the metropolitan area. Farmers would be receiving a better return for their stock than they are at present and the consumer would be paying less for the meat he is receiving.

In the past, Governments have given lip service to the policy of decentralisation. If there is one industry that could be decentralised economically and sensibly it is the abattoir industry. If country abattoir facilities were available to farmers, compatible farmers could form into small groups and negotiate with individual buyers within the metropolitan area. Their stock could be slaughtered, inspected, and supplied direct to individual butchers. It is my contention that if we want to control the cost of meat to the consumer we must retain the small, individual butcher.

It would eliminate the middle man if regional abattoirs were established where inspection and every other process could be carried out. The farmers could then channel the carcass meat direct to the butchers with whom they have negotiations. It may be interesting to members to learn that at the present time no less than one-sixth of the retail market in the metropolitan area comes under the control of one company. The remainder could steadily be coming under the control of a small number of operators. I believe that if action is not taken soon the control of the entire market could quite easily come under a few major companies.

If the previous Government had channelled portion of the finance that has been spent at Midland into country regional abattoirs, farmers would be far better off now. In how much higher esteem would the Country Party be held in country areas had it threatened the coalition unless it received industry in the country, such as abattoirs! How much happier would farmers in Narrogin be now if they had a regional abattoir of an adequate size! It is my belief that a section of the Farmers' Union advocate the establishment of an abattoir in Chittering, or nearby.

The previous Government allowed the deterioration of the market system at the Midland Junction Abattoir, where there are 16 export operators, two of whom have 80 per cent. of the slaughtering facilities available to them and the other 14 have 20 per cent. What happens? The farmer sends his stock to Midland. The 14 operators who have 20 per cent. of the slaughter floor facilities available for export meat soon buy the number of stock they require to fill their quota. The other two operators are left to buy stock to fill 80 per cent. of the slaughter floor. I am not suggesting there would be any collusion between these two operators, because there would not need to be; the previous Government had given it to them.

I would now like to raise the matter of the possible establishment of an alumina works in the Swan area and the mining for bauxite in the Darling scarp. This is a proposal which would require an expenditure of \$180,000,000—almost as much as this Government provided for last week in the Supply Bill. A work force of well over 1,000 men would be required during the course of the construction of the project. Once it has commenced producing alumina the industry would employ 700 men, 600 at the works and a further 100 in the mining area. It can be seen that it would be an industry of some size and a major proposal. As it is a major proposal naturally some problems must be associated with the project.

There are sure to be advantages and disadvantages. It will be this Government's task to consider these along with all the problems which are likely to arise from the works and the mining before committing the State to develop it. I believe the Premier and members of the Cabinet are in the process of weighing up the benefits. I imagine questions have been directed to various Government departments on the advisability or otherwise of setting up a works. The answers received will enable the Government to make a reasoned judgment as to whether the works should or should not be established, or should be established in one spot or another.

I personally believe that a works would not increase the air pollution problem we now have. I am sure the Minister concerned would require the works to accept stringent controls before it was established, if a decision is made to establish it. I suggest that stringent controls should immediately be placed on many of the industrial plants operating in and around the metropolitan area at the present time. One works which immediately comes to mind which could well afford to have some regulations placed on it to cover operations is the Midland Brick Works.

It has been suggested that there may be a water problem in the area where the alumina works may be established. It is understandable that people may fear some pollution of the water table, not only of underground water but also of creeks that originate in the area. If the Government decides to go ahead with this development, I believe it should make sure that there will be no pollution of the water in the area and it must also guarantee compensation to the surrounding farms if the water supply upon which farmers now depend for irrigation purposes is reduced in any way. This could easily be done. The amount of water that is available to farms could be metered before the works are established and if it can later be shown that the supply has been reduced to the detriment of the farmers concerned, adequate compensation should be assured.

If this development is given consideration by Cabinet, many aspects of it, in a draft form, would have to come to Parliament to be ratified. I am sure that at that stage we would have ample opportunity to discuss the problems we feel might be associated with such development.

With that in mind, I would like to make a final comment on this matter. I suggest that if this Parliament—and I particularly include the other place—genuinely desires decentralisation then some of the vast reserves of bauxite held by Alwest and Alcoa—so vast that the companies cannot calculate how much they have—should be taken from those companies and given to the Pacminex company on the condition that it decentralises its activities. If the margin of profit in regard to this mining is such that the company cannot provide housing and all the other infrastructure, then why cannot the Government provide the company with more leases in order to decentralise its activities?

Mr. Speaker, I have also mentioned the corridor plan report and it appears to me that the Swan Shire has been neglected in that report and also in many other ways over past years. In speaking about this report, I do not propose to debate the question either for or against corridor planning, but merely to draw the attention of members to the fact that it appears the only reason given for the absence of a corridor to follow the general direction of the present Great Northern Highway is contained in three small paragraphs in the report. The reason is virtually that the Swan Valley vineyard area must be retained; but that is only a small portion of the Swan Shire.

I would like to quote the three paragraphs from the report. As I said, these paragraphs are virtually the only reference

made to the Swan area and give the reason for the absence of a fifth corridor running through the Swan Shire. I quote firstly from page 15, as follows:—

In the north-west, a corridor form is emerging with the extensive residential development of Hamersley, Whitford and Wanneroo.

It is proposed to have a corridor running through those areas. To continue—

The north-east, though served by road and rail routes, has not been used for urban purposes because of the valuable Swan Valley vineyards...

Then on page 16 the report goes on to state—

Between the corridor arms lie the non-urban areas.

In this case there is an angle of about 90 degrees between the arms. To continue—

It is an important aspect of the coastal plain that within the Metropolitan Region, with the exception of the Swan Valley, it consists predominantly of infertile soils which have only proved of limited use for agricultural purposes.

I could not agree more. The third paragraph I would like to bring to the notice of members is on page 45. In part, the paragraph states—

The Swan Valley vineyards are an important agricultural asset in the Region and should be retained for agricultural use.

Once again, I could not agree more. But the point to bear in mind is that the Swan Valley area in which the bulk of the grapegrowing country lies is contained in that section of land between the Great Northern Highway and the West Swan Road. Outside of that area there are only small pockets of land used for vineyard purposes. I suggest that the gentlemen responsible for compiling this report never got off the West Swan Road or the Great Northern Highway, and went no further north than Upper Swan.

The land east of and adjoining the broad gauge railway line is of little use to the grapegrowing industry. The land consists of 10, 20, and 30-acre lots some with vines growing, others in which the vines have been pulled out, and some where the owners are trying to establish some type of agricultural pursuit. However, the acreages are too small for the owners to develop their land into reasonable agricultural pursuits and so they should be allowed to subdivide it into one or two-acre lots. They could then quit the land, which is what the majority of them would like to do. By so doing, the vineyard area which is of a high standard would be consolidated. I would not like to see the vineyards removed, but the development of a corridor with subdivisions and urban development in the surrounding area would help to consolidate the grapegrowing industry.

Whilst I am on the subject of the corridor plan report I would like to make it perfectly clear that at no stage have I considered that the Beechboro area, the Santa Maria Downs area, and the Bond Corporation land are in any way connected with the corridor plan. In my opinion the Beechboro area is an integral part of the metropolitan area and it lies within six miles of the G.P.O., Perth. Therefore, it should not be considered as part of the corridor. The area is bounded by Gnangara Road in the north and, I think, Victoria Road in the south, and it contains approximately 12,000 acres. The land is vacant and I believe it is held in nine ownerships. To my way of thinking it would be a town planner's dream to be able to get to work and plan the development of that area for the benefit of the people who would eventually live there and for the benefit of the State, generally.

I would like to see a socialist Government strong enough to resume the land with adequate compensation to the present owners; but if that is not possible I would like to see the area developed as quickly as possible and by the best method available to us. I want to see this land developed so that couples can obtain blocks of land at reasonable prices upon which they may establish homes in the hope that one day they may own them.

I am not satisfied that the present land prices are satisfactory. Four years ago I purchased a one-acre building block in Mundaring for the sum of \$1,700. Even though recently there has been a recession—and I am not denying that land prices have steadied—today a similar block in Mundaring would realise approximately \$4,000; and that block would have no more facilities available to it than were available in the case of the block I purchased four years ago. Yet people would be required to pay \$2,300 extra for that block for no reason at all. They would pay more merely because they bought it four years later.

I do not consider that to be a satisfactory position. If the Government is not in a position to resume and develop land for housing, it should remove the many inhibiting factors which at the present time prevent reasonable lots of land being subdivided by small landholders such as those I have already mentioned in the Swan Shire area. In that area all the facilities are available and it would only be a matter of bringing out a surveyor and putting in a few pegs to mark the lots. Then people could go ahead and commence to build.

In the Mundaring area there is also ample land that is already serviced. It is my belief that the only way in which the price of land will be reduced is by making more land available for selection.

One of the other issues I propose to mention in the time available to me concerns the Avon Valley National Park. I hope that we will see this park developed during the life of this Labor Government. It comprises a fauna and flora reserve and a forestry reserve—each of which is contiguous with the other—totalling 30,000 acres, and it is within an hour's drive of Perth. As the population of the metropolitan area and of the State increases, we must ensure that we have adequate reserves such as this one within easy reach of the metropolitan area. I can see no great advantage in having reserves thousands of miles away from the bulk of the population. Granted, those reserves are obviously of some benefit to the State, but I think we must reserve land close to the metropolitan area where the bulk of our population lives, so that people can get away from the rat race during the weekend and take their families for a drive through the natural setting of parks such as the Avon Valley National Park.

I would like to see strategic areas of that park fenced off so that a game reserve could be established. Also, the flora and fauna which are rapidly disappearing from the area could be re-established in an endeavour to make them flourish. The roads through the park should be upgraded, but I think there should be only one entry and only one exit, which should be manned at appropriate times to ensure that the very small minority which seems always to spoil things for the majority is kept in check.

I suggest that a watering point for emus and kangaroos should be established alongside the standard gauge line, because this would be an added attraction for people travelling on the broad gauge. They could anticipate seeing some kangaroos watering close to the railway whilst making their journey to and from the Eastern States.

I would also suggest that a rail commuter service through Toodyay, the Swan district, and Midland to Perth should be established. I do not consider this to be an illogical suggestion. Toodyay is a town that has been bypassed by time in recent years. Nevertheless, it is a town that has all the facilities necessary to accommodate a large population. It is situated a little more than an hour's travel from Perth. The Government should make it attractive for people to live in outlying areas and wherever possible—as it is in Toodyay—provide public transport from these areas to the metropolis. Here again, the broad gauge line could be used for the establishment of such a commuter service, thus enabling people who live in outlying areas to travel to their places of employment in the metropolitan area within a reasonably short time.

If the Government does go along with the proposal to establish the alumina refinery in the Swan district, the provision of a commuter rail service through this district might not only be feasible, but also prove to be quite necessary; because to run a railcar from Toodyay to the site of the proposed area of mining development would be more rapid than if one were to travel from most parts of the metropolitan area, even from Midland, to the mining area. The same could be said in regard to travelling from Toodyay by rail on the broad gauge line to the proposed site of the alumina works.

Therefore, in making such a suggestion, I consider that it is quite feasible that such a proposal could come about. Many issues which affect the Toodyay electorate I will not mention tonight, but during all the times that are made available to me in the future I shall raise them in this House. I can assure members, and Ministers in particular, that I will never be guilty of failing to advocate a policy in support of the people of the Toodyay electorate at every opportunity afforded me.

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [6.04 p.m.]: I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak in this House on the Address-in-Reply debate; and at the outset I offer you my congratulations on your appointment to your most important office. As a member of the Opposition I would also like to offer my congratulations to the members of the Government and the Premier because they have a very hard road ahead of them and I wish them success in their labours.

Today, speaking for the first time, I have an overwhelming feeling of the tremendous responsibility that the people of Vasse have placed in me, but this is a challenge I accept. It is affording me an opportunity to acknowledge the work done by the previous member for Vasse, The Hon. Stewart Bovell, who is now the Agent-General for Western Australia in London. Mr. Bovell was elected to Parliament as the member for Sussex in 1947, and subsequently, in the Brand Government was the Minister for Lands, Forests, and Immigration. I offer my respects to a man who was a true representative of the people.

As I have already said, Mr. Bovell is at present in London representing this State and I congratulate the Government of the day for making that appointment. I have no doubt that the dignity and traditions that go with this office are in the most capable hands of a man who is not unkindly known as the Squire of Vasse.

The Address-in-Reply debate allows a member to speak on a variety of subjects and tonight I intend to draw the attention of the House to various elements in

the Vasse electorate and, in particular, to decentralisation as it affects the industries that are at present operating there. However, before I go on, I would be remiss if an acknowledgment was not made of Western Australia's remarkable achievement of reaching a population of 1,000,000. For this State to emerge from the doldrums that were experienced in the mid-1950s to the position it is in today is something quite remarkable. To continue this expansion rate and maintain the confidence of the people will be a challenge to the Government. I am quite sure the people of the Vasse electorate will be looking to the Government to ensure that this confidence is maintained.

The Vasse electorate lies almost completely within the boundaries of the Augusta-Margaret River and Busselton Shire Councils and a wide diversity of industries are practised. It is favoured by a climate probably second to none in Western Australia, and I believe in the years ahead it will be acknowledged as the playground of Western Australia. I spoke earlier of decentralisation and one of the first aspects I wish to bring before the House relates to the dairying industry. This is an industry that is decentralised and certainly requires some assistance from both inside and outside the industry.

In past years dairying has been the major source of income to the majority of farmers in the south-west. Statistics in the 1969-70 returns show that the Augusta-Margaret River and Busselton Shire Council areas produced dairy products of a volume that was bettered only by the Harvey Shire area.

In the combined shire areas the total in terms of whole-milk production—and this is even more significant when one takes into account that the area I have spoken of is dry land farmed—was as follows:—

	gals.
Augusta-Margaret River-	
Busselton	10,115,818
Harvey area	12,193,916

This is a tremendous achievement. However, with falling prices butterfat producers have been forced to diversify to other forms of agriculture and this diversification is continuing.

Today we can look at the tragic situation that faces the farmers in this area who changed from butterfat production to sheep. I certainly hope the current beef prices will be maintained because it would be catastrophic if those farmers who are engaged in the production of beef are placed in the same position as sheep farmers.

In my opinion the dairying industry consists of three sections; namely, the butterfat section, the whole-milk section, and the manufacturing section. I believe that the manufacturers have not played ball

with the others engaged in the industry and this has certainly been at the expense of the butterfat producer.

I would say that the manufacturers have been operating a transport system which is outmoded and completely out of touch with conditions existing at present. The system is archaic to say the least. How can the dairying industry continue to pay the cost of transporting milk from Augusta to Boyanup in tankers, bottling the milk at Brunswick, and then, by another means of transport, carting the same product, in processed form, back to Augusta?

In the electorate we have country roads which are besieged by milk trucks, milk tankers, and cream trucks, all of which are operated by different companies. Now that it is anticipated that Busselton will go onto whole-milk production in February the roads will be cluttered up with a few more of these vehicles. It is a fact that, in the final analysis, the only one who pays the cost of such transport is the producer.

It might be interesting if I briefly explain to the House how these trucks are operated by the various companies on a country road on a particular day and at a particular time. For example, at 7.30 a.m. Company A would send a cream truck out on this road. At 9.30 a.m. Company B would send a truckload of milk cans on the same road. At 10.30 a.m. Company B would then despatch a tanker for the cartage of milk, and then, at 10.45 a.m. this would be closely followed by a milk tanker despatched by Company A. This is the situation that exists today. I believe that if we are to continue to have a dairying industry in Western Australia it is essential to have co-ordination of transport.

I believe that the co-ordination of transport would be a major factor in assisting the producers to attain a higher return. If all sections of the industry are not prepared to co-operate to achieve this objective—and I know full well that the whole-milk and the dairy sections have done so—then the industry will have to accept a decision made by Parliament. The butterfat industry has been the subject of adverse and unwarranted criticism over the years. The men who have farmed those properties that have produced butterfat in the past have been put in a position that has been governed by world markets.

Today I have noticed people in the wool and wheat industries beginning to realise what is meant by world parity prices. Whilst butterfat producers have laboured against formidable odds, the whole-milk section of the industry has been relatively free of the adverse criticism that has been levelled against the butterfat section. This is because this section of the industry has had the foresight and the ability to place its own house in order. I

believe that of all the agricultural industries in this State whole-milk production is certainly the most profitable.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Prior to tea I was outlining the situation in respect of the whole-milk and butterfat sections of the dairying industry. I said that I believed the whole-milk section of the industry in Western Australia was probably the most prosperous of any agricultural industry. To follow on with that, I believe it is most necessary for the whole-milk section to recognise the needs and the problems of butterfat producers and to take definite steps to fully integrate the two sections. I would support fully any move designed to cut the ever-increasing costs, and if it would offer increased returns to producers.

It has been mooted that a single marketing authority would be advantageous to the industry in Western Australia. If it can be proved that a single marketing authority will in the ultimate benefit the interests of all dairymen, then after examination of such a proposal I would support it.

The areas controlled by the Milk Board have definite boundaries. I would question on what authority these boundaries are fixed, and what right has the board to prevent a dairyman from selling his product in his own State. It is quite an anomaly when a dairyman, producing milk in Western Australia, can be prevented from supplying the milk to his home market, but is permitted to import the same article from interstate and to sell it to local consumers without any fear of a penalty being imposed.

I bring these matters before the House, because I feel some genuine hope that the various sections of the industry will get together on these matters; and also that those interests which are controlling the manufacture of the products will arrive at policies which will assist the future welfare of all sections of the industry.

In February next year, whole-milk quotas will be in the Busselton Shire Council district. I would like to quote from the *Busselton-Margaret Times* of the 8th April—

One of the greatest boosts this district has had both to the farming community and the district as a whole has been the issuing of milk quotas.

That was said by the president of the dairy section of the zone council of the Farmers' Union. In the same newspaper of the 20th May appeared a report under the heading, "Dairy Farmers Don't Need Whole Milk Quotas." That was a report on a statement by the Minister for Agriculture in reply to a request for boundary extension. It is necessary for the whole-milk boundaries to be extended, to include the Augusta-Margaret River Shire, despite what the Minister has said, as I believe that there are farmers in this district who are most anxious to take part in this industry.

I spoke earlier on decentralised industries, and the most significant industry in my electorate, and one which is a large employer of labour, is the timber industry. I would like to bring before the House the role that this industry plays. It has a formidable record and, as I said earlier, it is an industry which offers the district its major source of employment.

I realise that in times like the present the timber industry is rather hard-pressed. I am sure that those who are associated with the timber industry will make approaches to the Government, so that it fully appreciates the problems which confront the industry. I would ask the Government to reassure the private mill operators of its awareness of the industry's concern, and to do all it can to make sure that this industry continues to operate at a profitable level.

In the Government sector there are in my electorate two forestry mills. At the last count I found that those mills were also hard-pressed for orders. The Forests Department employs a total of 72 persons in the two forestry mills, and the timber industry as a whole employs 362 persons. I hope the House will appreciate the necessity for the industry to be given the consideration to which it is entitled.

The remaining item I wish to speak on—I will leave decentralisation and work in the private sector—is the tourist industry. My electorate is situated within close proximity to the metropolitan area and is acknowledged as a major tourist centre. Magnificent beaches are to be found stretching from Geographe Bay to Dunsborough. The rugged shore line along the west coast between Cape Naturaliste and Leeuwin, and the cave country of Augusta-Margaret River and Yallingup contains features of world-wide significance. These are some of the features that give the district a diversity of tourist attractions.

In past years the private sector of the tourist industry has been active. The development of tourist attractions has been assisted by the Tourist Development Authority which has from time to time made substantial grants available. I hope that a much greater acknowledgment is made of the area, and that the case for increased tourist development grants will be well worthy of consideration by the Government in the times ahead. I thank the House for listening to me so patiently.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [7.38 p.m.]: I did not set the theme of the comments which I will make; members opposite have done that. We answer argument with argument, and that is the purpose of our presence in Parliament.

Mr. Brown: We can interject.

Mr. FLETCHER: Members can interject, but there is no need for outbursts. In his contribution to this debate the member for Floreat made reference to the

moratorium march; the member for Mt. Marshall took us to task in respect of the situation which exists in the pastoral areas; and the member for Wembley made reference to demonstrations against apartheid and to the unwitting, but perhaps unfortunate, ambassadors of South Africa.

However, I would be remiss if, like other members, I did not congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair. I say this: you should have occupied the Chair many years before.

Mr. Bickerton: He was much younger then.

Mr. FLETCHER: You should have occupied the Chair many years before, and similarly the Premier and the Ministers should have been on this side many years ago. In spite of what members of the present Opposition have said, they look comfortable sitting opposite and they, too, should have been there years ago! I hope I will be able to see them sitting opposite for many years to come, with a progressive diminution in their numbers—a diminution brought about through the medium of electoral casualties and the ballot box rather than through any other type of box! The House will hear fewer questions from me, sitting on this side of the House. For some reason I have become less inquisitive!

Mr. Court: You will not be permitted to become inquisitive.

Mr. FLETCHER: The lack of questions from me could be related to the fact that there are more satisfied customers around, as a result of the assumption of office by the present Government. I notice that the seat which I formerly occupied on the opposite bench is vacant. It is strange, but I have some reluctance to ever occupying that seat again. I am pleased to notice that the seat is vacant, and is unoccupied by any conservative posterior. However, I have not been ashamed of my role while I occupied that seat. Members heard a great deal more from me while I was sitting opposite, than they will while I am on this side. Members will not hear me speaking from the front bench of the Government for the reasons given by the member for Pilbara.

My peers thought I should not occupy a seat on the front bench. I would like to think that, perhaps, in the ballot I did come close to getting a front bench seat. Then again, the thought occurs to me that this might have resulted from the abundance of talent that is to be found on this side of the House.

I deferred my speech this evening for the benefit of two or three members opposite, to enable them to speak and leave to attend to some outside commitments. This shows that I can still be co-operative; however, I do not intend to be any less provocative, as the situation demands.

Firstly, in respect of the pastoral industry—a matter raised by the member for Mt. Marshall—he took us to task in regard to what he termed the U.F.G.A., which I understand is the United Farmers and Graziers Association, and to the fact that it wanted to latch itself onto our party. Surely it is elementary that if that organisation was dissatisfied with the then Government that now sits on the opposite side of the House it would seek assistance from us. We were not particularly happy with any association that that organisation attempted to bring about, but as a consequence of its dissatisfaction with the situation arising from what it considered was unsatisfactory representation from the members now sitting on the opposite side of the House, it sought assistance from us. I am big enough to say that the world situation was not necessarily the responsibility of members opposite when they were in Government; however, there are many members opposite who are now clamouring for State assistance.

Let me say initially that I deplore what has happened in the pastoral industry in Australia, and particularly in this State. Furthermore, I deplore the prices that farmers receive for wool. I also deplore the price I had to pay for the suit I am wearing, which is an all-wool suit, and for the woollen cardigan and socks I am wearing. I say that to demonstrate the part I am playing in attempting to do what I can to help the wool industry. I am deeply concerned with the poor price which farmers receive for their wool, compared with what woollen garments cost.

Mr. Bickerton: Does the member for Fremantle wear woollen underclothes?

Mr. FLETCHER: I will not elaborate on that point. As I was saying, I deplore the disparity between the price received by the farmer and the cost to the consumer of certain articles. I am also concerned at the high cost of overseas freight rates, and the impact that those freight rates have on the export of wool, wheat, and other primary products to overseas markets. However, that is the type of situation which members opposite represent: The freedom of private enterprise to charge what it likes for goods and services which it has to sell.

The shipping consortiums are strangling our export trade, and the same thing seems to be happening overseas. Members opposite, overnight, seem to be holding us responsible for rural reconstruction in this State. I feel sorry for the Minister for Lands because of the responsibility which he carries and the responsibility which the farming community will impose on him. In my opinion rural reconstruction, with proper production and marketing safeguards, is a national responsibility and not necessarily a State responsibility. I ask members opposite to keep that in mind

when attempting to blame this Government for the situation which now exists. That situation existed before we came to office.

I will quote briefly from page 170 of *Hansard*, 1970, to show that the situation existed before the Labor Government came to office. Strangely enough, Mr. Fletcher was speaking at the time.

Mr. O'Connor: Speaking strangely?

Mr. FLETCHER: Do not twist my words. Mr. Fletcher was saying, presumably while speaking to the Address-in-Reply, the following words:—

In His Excellency's Speech we find the following:—

However, the State's economy has been affected by drought, lower wool prices and the need to impose wheat quotas. The combination of all three has lowered the State's farm income by at least \$80,000,000, with consequent adverse effects upon industries geared to service the agricultural sector.

I went on to say:—

I am concerned with that aspect, not only as it affects the farming community but also as it affects the industries dependent on farming. As a result of this we find there are repercussions right down the line both in respect of industry and agricultural equipment. If the farmers are not able to buy machinery there is certainly no purpose in manufacturing it.

My theme was that repercussions from the position of the rural industry were felt throughout the economy of this State. If, by some miracle, the Labor Government had that \$80,000,000 available it would have to be dispersed on schools and hospitals, and the farmers would still have to join the queue.

The rural problem is not new. My own friends and relatives are, and have been for years, involved in the pastoral industry. I have noticed, even with my relatives, that they are individualists when everything is going well but they become socialists overnight immediately things become difficult. In effect, they want to get their fingers into the public purse by way of receiving assistance. I also know of other farmers who have gone from rags to riches; from the days of the depression to the affluent war years and early post-war years. Many members opposite will recall the time when a farmer's income was adequate for him to be able to buy a new car each year, and to buy a new tractor rather than repair an old one. Taxation concessions paid for those items.

The older generation has knowledge of the pastoral recession, and the younger generation of farmers never had it so good until recently. The younger generation assumed that the good times would

go on indefinitely. However, the bubble has burst. We have wheat quotas, and there is considerable strife about who should have which quota.

As I have already said, in the absence of one honourable member opposite, the farmers are individualists when things are going well, but they are socialists when things are not so good. They now want our Government to come to their assistance.

Mr. Gayfer: To fix up the wheat quotas?

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, I have no doubt the farmers would like the wheat quotas straightened out. We have been blamed for everything, but I ask: How on earth can the Minister for Agriculture satisfy everybody when there are so many divergent views among the farmers themselves as to what should constitute a wheat quota, and who should have it?

Mr. Gayfer: We have been saying that for three years, and the honourable member would not believe it.

Mr. FLETCHER: It seems that farmers are out to snatch a wheat quota and say, "To hell with the other fellow." As I was saying, farmers are individualists when things are going well but become socialists overnight when things are not so good.

Instead of creating reserves during the flush periods I have mentioned—in the absence of the member for Avon—upon which to draw in difficult times, and instead of attempting to gain the freehold of their properties during the flush periods, it now appears that many farmers are off the sheep's back and on to the taxpayer's back.

Mr. Gayfer: Which is like some of your party's protected industries.

Mr. FLETCHER: Let me say that if it affords any satisfaction to members opposite to think that the taxation they are paying from their parliamentary salaries will go towards subsidising the wool industry, I am not particularly happy about my contribution—by way of taxation—being used for such a purpose when it could be going towards the construction of schools, hospitals, and other social services.

Mr. Gayfer: This will make interesting reading in the newspapers.

Mr. FLETCHER: The newspapers do not make a habit of quoting my remarks.

Mr. Gayfer: I will be quoting the remarks of the member for Fremantle.

Mr. FLETCHER: I notice that the 35c which has been advocated will cost the public something in excess of \$100,000,000. A sum of 40c was advocated and it was alleged in a recent Press comment that this could cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$200,000,000.

I believe the Federal Government should state where the \$150,000,000 involved in the subsidy is to come from,

and whether it is intended to carry on with the expensive Wool Commission which was recently created. We should be told whether or not the Wool Commission will continue to bid at auctions. As I have said, the commission is an expensive organisation which was set up to assist the industry, and now we have this additional expenditure. Naturally farmers see the situation from a different point of view, but I still maintain there should have been some initiative on the part of many farmers who are now holding out their hands. Those farmers should have improved their situation when times were good.

Mr. Gayfer: Does the member for Fremantle know how much it costs to run the Wool Commission?

Mr. FLETCHER: Naturally, I do not know. However, I do know that it is an expensive proposition and I also know that there will now be an additional expenditure of \$150,000,000 involved in further assistance.

Members opposite might know more than I know but it appears that there is an attempt to subsidise the efficient and the inefficient, and also to subsidise any class of wool. I ask: What incentive is there for a farmer to produce a better type of wool if he is to receive financial assistance?

Mr. Gayfer: I think the honourable member should wait to see how it will work.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am talking of assistance, and I can mention a personal experience. A firm by the name of P. M. and W. B. Fletcher had a business at 45 St. George's Terrace. My limited capital was involved in the business and my family was running it. However, during the war it was not possible to purchase paper and ink, and other requirements, and the business progressively declined. When I came home from the war I had sufficient capital to settle affairs but not to re-establish the business with other members of my family. My father died soon afterwards and the business went out of existence. Nobody came to our financial assistance, and I draw that comparison with the present demands of farmers.

I will now draw another comparison. A young friend of mine, since I have been in Parliament, settled on a block of land in the Hyden area. He obtained the necessary finance and got hold of an old tractor and an old plough, but he finished up walking off the property. The private banks told him that unless he could put greater equity into the venture they could not lend him further money. However, that young man went out and re-established himself somewhere else.

I am illustrating the point that the farmers should not sit back and hold out their hands and expect to get unlimited assistance. They should get up off their backsides and seek alternative employment if they cannot make a success of their present ventures. Those who can genuinely make a success, or who are a viable proposition, could be assisted. However, all and sundry should not be assisted: the inefficient as well as the efficient.

Mr. Court: You are repeating the words of Mr. Hawke, you know.

Mr. FLETCHER: That does not scare me, even though Mr. Hawke might scare a lot of people opposite.

Mr. Court: You are repeating his words, and also giving in slightly different language the import of a resolution passed by the A.L.P. Federal Conference at Launceston.

Mr. FLETCHER: Does that make it any less true?

Mr. Court: It is an unfair situation because you are overlooking the fact that these people who are asking for some assistance carried this nation for years.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will concede that we would be in real difficulty without the pastoral industry.

Mr. W. A. Manning: If there was no wool there would not be very much to export through the ports.

Mr. Gayfer: Dr. Patterson of the A.L.P. has made up his whole rural programme.

Mr. Jamieson: Seeing that the member for Avon knows all about Dr. Patterson—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the member for Fremantle needs any assistance with his speech.

Mr. FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; you have created order out of chaos. Returning to my subject, there is an alternative issue which should have been mentioned long ago. We have been tied to the United States of America, economically and politically. We have not been able to offend that country, and it rewards us by rejecting our meat. To me, that is a slap in the face to our State.

At Robb Jetty the American importers seem to go out of their way to reject meat, and they make excuses about the lack of cleanliness. I will say this for the management at Robb Jetty: I do not know of any other abattoir in Australia where the standard could possibly be higher.

As the member for Floreat made reference to the moratorium march, I would like to say that the same United States dragged us into Vietnam because we are economically and politically subservient to that nation. We have sacrificed our youth to please that country. We have

bent over backwards to please that country, and what did it do? I will give one illustration: that country rejected our meat.

Mr. Court: Do you not believe in honouring treaties?

Mr. FLETCHER: I have only a limited time in which to speak.

Mr. Court: What did your Prime Minister Curtin do during the war, and what saved Australia?

Mr. May: What killed him?

Mr. Court: The left wing element in the Labor Party.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is strange how I seem to spark off controversy. I am making the speech. I wish to make the point that the present Federal Government and the present United States Government have won elections by saving us from what they call "the Red Menace," by despatching the youth of America and Australia to Vietnam. Having done that, as sure as I stand here, the Federal Government and the United States Government will now attempt again to win elections by withdrawing troops from Vietnam.

Mr. Court: Do you not want them to be withdrawn?

Mr. FLETCHER: I think it is very desirable that they be withdrawn but they should never have been sent there. I will tell the House what will happen. The President of the United States will be returned in office by withdrawing troops and, as a consequence, buying goodwill. But what about the thousands of men who have died in Vietnam? What a price to pay! What a dirty, filthy thing to do—to kill men for petty political purposes, and nothing else.

Mr. Court: It was not that at all, and you know it.

Mr. Williams: You are making a fool of yourself.

Mr. FLETCHER: Those Governments try to buy electoral goodwill by doing what I have just stated.

Mr. Rushton: The member for Northam now suggests sending girls.

Mr. FLETCHER: Be quiet! It is difficult enough to make the more intelligent people over there understand, without having infantile interjections from someone who would never understand.

Not only have there been thousands of casualties among United States and Australian troops, but also, as a by-product, the statistics indicate that one-tenth of the people who return are drug addicts. That is the price America is paying for its participation in Vietnam, quite apart from the millions of Vietnamese people who have been killed as a result of saturation bombing and napalm bombing. Australia has been participating in that sort of thing.

I spoke on this matter when I returned from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in Ottawa in 1966, and what I said at that conference has been recorded in *Hansard*. At that time the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition got up and said he repudiated everything that the member for Fremantle had said. Let me tell that member now—

Mr. Court: You were not entitled to say that on my behalf.

Mr. FLETCHER: In case the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not read it, it has recently been reported that 75 per cent. of the American people are now saying what the member for Fremantle said at that time.

Mr. Court: Rubbish!

Mr. Graham: Quite right.

Mr. Court: You had no right to say that on behalf of the Parliament of this State.

Mr. Graham: The Australian one stands in isolation throughout the world.

Mr. Court: Just look at the Queensland results last Saturday.

Mr. Graham: What enlightened country in the world backs the United States?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I do not think the member for Fremantle requires any assistance in making his speech. I think there are quite a lot of unnecessary interjections. The member for Fremantle does, at times, tend to draw the crabs, but I would ask members to be as quiet as they can.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would like to ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER: Eighteen minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER: I was saying that many thousands of people have been killed and maimed. There are thousands of refugees in Vietnam, and that unfortunate country is being defoliated by our people and the Americans. I would like to read something which illustrates why I view this situation with such abhorrence. I refer briefly to *The West Australian* of the 23rd July, 1971, which contains a report from Washington reading as follows:—

As more and more Americans leave Indo-China, more of the half-Vietnamese children they fathered are being abandoned on the streets of Saigon.

Does it not hurt members to think we have been associated with that? The report continues—

Mr. W. Klein, the general director of International Social Services, estimates that about 5,000 children from infants to six-year olds have already been left behind by their soldier-fathers . . .

The conference produced no hard conclusions, he said, except to admit that the problem of Vietnam's orphan children was growing bigger every day.

Perhaps members opposite can sit there and accept that sort of thing with equanimity, but I certainly cannot. That is one reason why I marched in the last moratorium march, and that is why the Premier and many of my colleagues marched. That is why I marched in the previous moratorium march, and the one before that, and that is why I put my signature to a document dealing with this matter, following which the Commonwealth Police visited me. I thought secret police existed only in Hitler's Germany and wartime fascist Japan and Italy. The Commonwealth Police visited me to ask me whether I had attached my signature to the document. I stated that I had done so, and would shout it from the rooftops.

Mr. Mensaros: Did you wave a Viet Cong flag?

Mr. Court: Did you shout, "Victory to the Viet Cong"?

Mr. FLETCHER: I did not.

Mr. Mensaros: Somebody did.

Mr. FLETCHER: The fact that somebody fell into the procession and waved a Viet Cong flag has nothing to do with us.

Mr. Mensaros: You encouraged school children to march.

Mr. FLETCHER: The school children were asked to participate simply because in one or two years they will be voters. They have a right to learn these things at first hand, in order that they will understand. Not only will those children be voters, but they are also potential soldiers. Why should they not march and learn what they are in for if the existing policy is perpetuated?

What has Canada been doing? I will quote what the member for Fremantle had to say on the 20th October, 1970, on page 1381 of *Hansard*—

As I said earlier, the purpose of the Budget debate is to discuss economic matters and we usually confine our remarks to those aspects. One issue which concerns me touches on the rural industries.

Again, I was taking up the cause of the pastoral industry. To continue—

In brief, Canada has now recognised mainland China—a traditional market for Australian wheat exports. Canada has leapt across the Pacific onto mainland China and has ignored the existence of Taiwan. I am not necessarily advocating that Australia should do likewise in respect of Taiwan, but I do point out to the House that there is something like 800,000,000 people in mainland China and only 14,000,000 in Taiwan. We could continue to trade with both countries.

Further on, I said—

To my way of thinking it is not a matter of with whom we trade. China has honoured its obligations so far and

I am now concerned that Canada could presumably receive the trade which we enjoyed in the past in respect of wheat exports. If that could happen in relation to the trade between Canada and China, then it is conceivable that other countries will commence to trade in wheat which would be to the detriment of Australia, and Western Australia in particular—a portion of which I represent.

I had that to say as long ago as the 20th October, 1970.

Mr. Whitlam has attempted to retrieve the situation, and Mr. Nixon is now attempting to do likewise. I ask members opposite when they will be able to urge their Prime Minister, Mr. McMahon, to take some action.

The Press knew of the dialogue that was taking place with Mr. Kissinger, the envoy of the President of the United States. Britain and Japan also knew of Mr. Nixon's decision to visit China, but the Prime Minister of Australia received from Mr. Nixon the treatment that a sycophant deserves. Members will know that a sycophant is a snivelling crawler. Mr. McMahon was ignored, and he got what he deserved.

Mr. Court: He was not.

Mr. FLETCHER: He was overlooked not only because of his physical stature but also because of his political stature. On the other hand, the Federal Leader of the A.L.P. is a giant among political pygmies in Canberra. He took the initiative. On the 23rd July, 1971, *The West Australian* had this to say—

Mr. Gough Whitlam is six feet three inches in height but he walked ten feet tall in Tokyo this week.

The Japanese rushed to hear what he had to say.

Further down, the report says—

Top American officials also quickly met Mr. Whitlam when he got to Tokyo . . .

On the eve of his departure even the Prime Minister, Mr. Sato, invited the Australian to a conversation that centred on China.

Mr. Court: Professor Arndt said it was too much for him.

Mr. FLETCHER: The other person I mentioned is at home, rubbing his hands, deploring the situation of markets, and so on. On the other hand, our political giant is attempting to do—not only for us, but also for members opposite—what the Federal Government has failed to do. Yet all we get is vilification from our political opponents.

Mr. McPharlin: Do you agree with Mr. Whitlam's actions in connection with wheat sales to China?

Mr. Gayfer: How many extra wheat sales did he make while he was there?

Mr. FLETCHER: It is natural that there will be concern among members opposite, because Mr. Whitlam took the initiative and attempted to do something, but all we get from our political opponents is vilification. As a result of Mr. Whitlam's visit to China, even President Nixon has at least also decided to visit China.

Mr. Gayfer: I can assure you that the wheat industry does not mind this political interference.

Mr. FLETCHER: He will visit China before the next election to again enhance his political prospects. Now that Sato of Japan is on his way to China—let me make this point—perhaps Mr. Nixon might take Mr. McMahon by the hand because it is the only way that he will get there. Mr. McMahon will not take the individual initiative. He is too busy criticising Labor, as are members opposite.

Mr. Grayden: Nobody has anything against Mr. Whitlam going to China. Keep your fingers out of the wheat game.

Mr. FLETCHER: The honourable member can make his own speech later. Members opposite will not be above accepting any trade benefits that will accrue from the visit.

There is one thing that men and women, irrespective of their nationality, have in common; they need food and clothing. Whether they are Methodists, Baptists, communists, or whatever, they all need trade and I will not be above trading with anyone, their political or religious ideology aside.

Mr. Grayden: What about South Africa?

Mr. FLETCHER: In respect of the communists, they have little reason to be enamoured of our way of life. I am not a communist but, as I say, I am alarmed at what the western world has done in Asia. If one does anything to one Asian, irrespective of what country he comes from, one affects every Asian and that is another aspect which concerns me.

Mr. Court: That is the most infantile thing you have said.

Mr. FLETCHER: History reveals that Japan was suing for peace at the time that an allegedly Christian nation dropped the atom bomb on that country. If members want to argue whether they were suing for peace, do not argue with me—just look up the history books because they were suing for peace for four days and the bomb was dropped as a message of intimidation to all the world. Asia has no reason to love capitalism. We have exploited Asia for centuries and kept their masses in poverty and their feudalistic

overlords in privileged positions. It is the Labor Party's opposition to this which causes moratorium marches.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER: As I said earlier that is why the high school children marched—because they are potential soldiers and potential voters; and, as I said, millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been spent and wasted in the manner which I have described. This is the important point above all. If only we had the money that has been expended in this way to help industry now. How can members possibly sit opposite and urge the relevance of that argument? What have the Liberal and Country Parties achieved in Vietnam? The money wasted in Vietnam should have been spent in Australia, on schools, hospitals, and other essential services, and the farmers could have had what was left.

I congratulate the member for Wembley on the speech he made. I commend his opposition to apartheid—I thought he made a very good contribution to this cause—though I will say that he does misinterpret the purpose of the South African team's presence in Australia. They are foisted on the Australians by the South Africans to try to give an air of respectability to apartheid, and we have accepted them in Australia, again for political purposes, because the situation can be scored off politically. But let me say this: I believe sport was quite a secondary consideration. The team has been hidden behind barbed wire; there has been police protection. In fact, the whole thing has been a farce. They have been hidden in hotels and other accommodation.

Mr. Grayden: Who forced that?

Mr. FLETCHER: They have been hidden in all sorts of places and arising out of it all there has been a state of emergency created in Queensland. They have scored there politically.

I know people have said, "Who runs the country, the politicians or the trade unions?" I admit that this comment has been made and I will also admit that the one-day stoppage will cost Queensland \$6,500,000; 135,000 workers went on strike in Queensland, as quoted in *The West Australian* of recent date. The Press comment says that the strike will cost Queensland an estimated \$6,500,000. But what is that to the Government over there? It can keep them in office for a further time. That, I say to the member for Wembley, is the purpose of the South Africans being here and I have no doubt of this. The cricket team will come here next season and I would not be surprised if that is not synchronised to coincide with a snap election held by the Federal Government so that it will be able to capitalise on the hostility within the population of Australia because of the natural reaction to apartheid that I am sure will take place.

Mr. R. L. Young: If that was a fact, the Government would have been inviting teams from South Africa before this.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Government has invited them, Mr. Speaker, and it will see that they get here so that the matter will again become another election issue, and the Federal Government hopes it will be just as successful as the Government in Queensland. However, I will resume the argument later on another occasion.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [8.22 p.m.]: In rising to speak on the Address-in-Reply, I would like to thank the electors for re-electing me, and say I will do my best to represent them as well as I can in the next three years.

I have already spoken in respect of this matter and I intimated my displeasure at the extravagant promises of the Premier and the obvious disadvantages that will occur to Western Australia. Not only do I criticise the Premier's promises, but I also want to criticise some of the actions he has taken since his election. I refer to the publication called *Revolt*.

I believe in Western Australia, and Australia generally, communism is taking over to a much greater degree than many people realise. I know that this view is not shared by a number of members opposite.

Mr. Jamieson: You have been provoked by the member for Bunbury on this. He knows all about it. Nobody else does.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: It becomes abundantly clear why the member for Belmont was elected Minister for Electricity, Mr. Speaker; every now and then he lights up and then he blacks out again.

Mr. T. D. Evans: At least he would be more reliable than you were in your speech last time.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I believe communism in Australia is taking over to a much greater degree than most people realise, and I believe some action is necessary in the not-too-distant future if we want to stop it. Some look at communism as a dirty word and some cast it aside and take no notice whatever. I say we are much too apathetic and unless we do something about this we will gradually be taken over by this group; we will lose our democracy and obviously be headed for disaster.

Mr. Graham: The red paint pot.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The honourable member will know a lot about the red paint pot and a lot of things I have mentioned.

Mr. Graham: Tell us all about it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: After what the Minister said in answer to questions the other night, I just wonder what he is proposing to do. I believe that in this State and in Australia generally many of the demonstrations that have taken place in recent years have been professionally organised.

This is quite obvious if we have a look at this publication called *Revolt*. I have a copy here and I intend to read some parts of it. I know I will not be allowed to read it all, nor do I wish to do so, but I think some parts of it are very relevant and I think some members of the Opposition will be just as distressed as I was when they see the type of literature that is being distributed in our high schools. This is the commencement of the article—

Here we are again—**BULLSHIT DAY**. The day each year when high school students are bombarded with fascist inspired propaganda urging them to emulate the feats of the suckers who fought and died in two world wars—for nothing. The day when every school is festooned with “national” flags and “patriotic” slogans. The day when the ancient bourgeois emerge from Dalkeith and Nedlands to urge young working class Australians to carry on the sucker tradition.

Haven't we had enough? The sucker tradition started way back in 1914 when thousands of Australian men flocked to fight for the British bourgeoisie . . .

Mr. Speaker, is this the sort of literature we want distributed amongst our high schools? Is it not high time that somebody did something about this?

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was the result of 12 years of Liberal Government that this developed.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This was distributed in the high schools since March, 1971. I gave the Premier a copy of this article and other articles that were distributed by this group, Mr. Speaker—the group which organised and distributed this publication called *Revolt*. The honourable member laughed when I said that communism was taking over in this State to a degree, but some of these articles were published by people who were—

Mr. Graham: It might have come from 1140 Hay Street.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It might have come from your office.

Mr. Graham: I have an idea you were the author of it. You are only doing this for sensationalism, are you not?

Mr. T. D. Evans: After what went on on Saturday night, anything could come from it.

Mr. Graham: You must be looking for headlines tonight.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We are used to the Minister carrying on like this. He was previously referred to as the honourable member for corkscrew, and he is still carrying on in the same tradition.

Mr. Graham: What a funny girl you are!

Mr. O'CONNOR: Mr. Speaker, this article calls on the children to boycott Anzac Day ceremonies and they were to boycott the schools and organise communes. The way it is written indicates quite clearly it is done to disorganise the schools and to try to take away some of the democracy and freedoms we have. It goes on to ask the children this—

Occupy school buildings and if necessary eject the puppets (Principals and petty-bureaucrats mainly), although it is not likely that these will offer any resistance. Make sure of mass support before this step is taken—there must be large numbers of students on hand to fight off the probable attacks by the pigs.

Organize Student Communes within the occupied school buildings which can be used as a base for operations, a forum for group discussion and planning (a “soviet”—based on direct democracy), . . .

Mr. Davies: I thought communists worked under cover. They were not hiding their actions too well there.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This group is not working undercover and I wish the Minister would wait until I finish this and give some support to try to stamp this thing out in the State. I am disturbed that these articles are being distributed in our schools.

Mr. Davies: You are out for sensationalism and that is all. You are trying to imply that nobody has been aware of them and that is all. You are doing more harm by giving these people this kind of publicity from here. They are using you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If the Minister will wait a little while I will let him know what his leader did. If he just waits I will give him the full details. It asks the students to organise these communes and to take over the classrooms. It says “Wednesday, the 30th June, is national moratorium day”. Government members are great supporters of the moratorium day. As the member for Fremantle says, the revolution starts underground. This urges all high school students to stay away from school on this day. This is what the Premier supported.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No, he did not. You be corrected on that. You know exactly what he did say.

Mr. O'CONNOR: He offered to give them the half day off school.

Mr. T. D. Evans: If they had their parents' permission.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Anyway, it meant following in the footsteps of this article I have here. This says—

The Revolutionary Student Underground urges all high school students to stay away from school on this day

and join in Moratorium activities. The march through Perth begins from the Esplanade at 12.30 p.m. The morning could be used for making placards and flags for use in the March.

Mr. Burke: Is there a reference for that?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will give members the reference when I can. It asks students to abolish religious indoctrination. There are three or four articles altogether. One extract reads—

NEXT ISSUE OF REVOLT!

Will contain a continuation of the article "How to Occupy your High School." The article will deal with practicalities of revolution. It will contain descriptions of tactics of street fighting and guerrilla warfare. It will also describe the production of essential weapons for use in high school insurgency such as molotov cocktails and petrol bombs. A working knowledge of basic technique in revolt is essential if a viable student guerrilla force is to grow in Perth. Another reason why REVOLT will print this information is to crap off the education department who evidently take exception to the discussing of practicalities.

There are many more parts that I could read from this statement but I will not do so. Should any member want a copy he is welcome to it. We on this side of the House would support any assistance that might be coming from members on the other side to help us stop this kind of thing happening in Australia. The particular article to which I referred was headed, "Moratorium Day—Vote with Your Feet; vote in the street." It goes on to say—

Subscribe to the following progressive newspapers for latest reports on Indo-China, Pollution Crisis, Women's liberation, etc., "Guardian," "Direct Action", "International" (Available; Pioneer Bookshop, Bulwer St., Perth.)

I believe the newspapers referred to are distributed by the Pioneer Bookshop in Bulwer Street which, I think, has Communist affiliations.

Mr. Davies: You know it does; anyone with any sense would know it does.

Mr. O'CONNOR: When these articles came to my notice I wrote the following letter to the Premier:—

Attached hereto are copies of letters or rather circulars delivered to high schools in the Metropolitan area on Anzac Day, and left in prominent positions around the schools to be easily accessible to students.

To say the least the articles revolt me, as an Ex Serviceman and one who saw many people suffer and die during the war years so that we could

have a free Australia, it appalls me to see such corrupt articles distributed to our young people obviously in an attempt to disrupt them.

I would appreciate it if you would have the C.I.B. investigate these articles and endeavour to disclose the source of such un Australian literature.

In reply I received a letter from the Premier dated the 28th May, which reads—

With further reference to your letter of 11th May regarding the distribution in high schools of the publication "Revolt", I forward for your confidential information a copy of reports recently received from the Commissioner of Police on this subject.

You will note that it has been decided to await the outcome of the forthcoming discussion between the Director-General of Education and the Director of the Institute of Technology in relation to the student mainly concerned in the activities of "Revolt".

I immediately wrote back to the Premier as follows:—

I acknowledge with extreme disappointment, your letter of the 28th instant regarding the article "Revolt" and advising you are awaiting outcome of discussions with the Director General of Education and the Director of the Institute of Technology regarding this matter.

In my opinion this matter is of such importance that I feel a decision should not have been left to these people, but that you should have instigated an inquiry to find who is responsible for this action.

It would appear that student Graham Milner could be just a front for an organisation obviously bent on undermining our State with this vicious propaganda, and you are prepared to sit back and not take the quick and urgent action necessary.

Communism has crept into many parts of the world through apathy on behalf of many people, fortunately we are still reasonably free in Australia, but I believe you have a responsibility to the electors to endeavour to maintain a free and democratic State.

Mr. Jamieson: I suppose you would have put them all into gaol and made national heroes of them.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Regarding a recent overseas importee, this professional demonstrator should have been sent back to where he came from. That would have been the best place for him. Immediately he returned he levelled all sorts of criticisms against Australia concerning Aborigines and so on. It is a pity that these professional demonstrators are sent out by

communists and are permitted to enter countries for the purpose of stirring up trouble. It is a pity that no further action has apparently been taken in connection with the article to which I have referred. I appeal to the Premier to move in this direction to see what can be done to prevent such things happening in the future.

Mr. Davies: What would you do?

Mr. O'CONNOR: When people are inciting children, as this article is doing, some legal action should be taken.

Mr. Davies: What legal action? Do you want to put them in gaol or fine them?

Mr. O'CONNOR: If necessary, yes.

Mr. Davies: There is nothing sinister in things like that when they are published.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We do not want to finish up like Czechoslovakia or Hungary which have been ground into the dust by the communist heel. We should take what action we can now to prevent such things in the future.

Mr. Davies: You have been reading Liberal Party advertisements.

Mr. O'CONNOR: They are the only ones worth reading. Whilst speaking on the question of demonstrations I would like to make some comment in connection with the tour of the Springbok rugby team. I saw the match against the Springboks.

Mr. Jamieson: You probably had never been to a rugby match before in all your life.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is an indication of how much the Minister knows about the position. I happen to have played the game.

Mr. Graham: How many?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Not a great many, but I did see this match and I think it is a pity that our Premier and the Premier of South Australia should get involved in this type of thing and bring politics to bear on sporting events.

Mr. Davies: I think it is a pity that Bjelke-Petersen got involved.

Mr. O'CONNOR: When a team comes over to play a series of matches its members should be accepted as sportsmen, whether they be black, white, or brindle. It does us little credit to take the kind of action taken by the Premier and not give such teams any assistance should they visit us.

Mr. Jamieson: The Olympic Federation is wrong and the Tennis Federation is wrong but the member for Mt. Lawley is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am glad the Minister admits that.

Mr. Graham: He is right in his opinion.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Newspaper articles indicate that most Australians were glad to have such a team come here and to

be able to see them play. On Wednesday the 7th April, a Gallup poll was taken and this states, "Average Aussie says, 'Let us Play them.'" In 1971, 85 per cent. of the people supported the team coming here; 9 per cent. disapproved, and 6 per cent. were undecided. That indicates the thinking of the average citizen of this country.

Mr. Graham: They voted the same way in connection with Vietnam. It is totally different now.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is the position as shown by the Gallup poll.

Mr. Graham: You are a slow learner.

Mr. O'Neil: Are the 80 per cent. slow learners?

Mr. Graham: They have been misled by the Liberals.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is a pity to see the unions take the action they did in connection with a tour of this kind. It is particularly regrettable to see the actions the unions took against a man who had the courage to stand up for his principles. I refer of course to Mr. Farrow.

Mr. Graham: He would be a Liberal Party hero.

Mr. O'CONNOR: He took the action he did knowing that he would be dethroned. That is the position. We also know that a cigarette company was threatened with action by Mr. Hawke if the tour were allowed to continue with its support. It is a great pity that we should intrude politics into the field of sport.

Mr. Graham: It is time you declared yourself on apartheid.

Mr. Williams: There is a strange silence from the Minister for Works.

Mr. Jamieson: He has never been a com like you.

Point of Order

Mr. WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Minister for Works withdraw the remark he has just made when he said, "He has never been a com like you."

The SPEAKER: Did the Minister direct this remark towards the member for Bunbury?

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I do not intend to withdraw because I have a statutory declaration to the effect.

Mr. Court: From whom?

Mr. JAMIESON: From his father.

Mr. Court: What does that matter? The honourable member should withdraw. You have asked the honourable member to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, and he is defying you.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bunbury has the right to ask the question again, because he is the one involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I still ask the Minister for Works to retract the statement he has made, irrespective of whether he has a statutory declaration or not. This matter was taken up nine years ago and he well knows what the situation is. I ask you, Sir, to direct the Minister for Works to retract the statement.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bunbury has asked that the statement be retracted and I ask the Minister to comply with the request.

Mr. JAMIESON: In deference to you, Sir, I will comply, but I still have the statutory declaration in my possession.

Mr. Williams: You can have what you like.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. O'CONNOR: I was amazed and disgusted to see that the unions should take the action they did against a man like Mr. Farrow who had the courage of his convictions. These are standover tactics and we should not condone them.

I would now like to quote an incident that occurred at Bell Bros. during the strike in that complex. One man did not go on strike because he needed the money to provide for his wife and family. He attempted to drive his truck out and was stopped, after which he was pulled out of his vehicle and beaten up. It is high time that something was done about these standover tactics; they should not be permitted.

Mr. May: When did that take place?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Some months ago.

Mr. May: Why did not your Government do something about it?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister does not know what he is listening to let alone anything else. I said it was time the unions did something to prevent this type of thing.

Mr. Graham: What did the Government do?

Mr. O'CONNOR: As we all know action was taken by the unions against the Bright Spot Caterers Pty. Ltd. because that firm happened to supply food to the people who went to watch the Springboks play at the Perry Lakes Stadium. It is strange that no action was taken against the M.T.T. which provided buses for the occasion. It is obvious that the unions select the people whom they wish to attack and this is an appalling feature. As Australians we should wake up and do something about this kind of victimisation. Many people do not know what is happening. The sooner we take some action against those who indulge in these practices the better.

I did want to mention the matter of a circular which was put out by the milk vendors. I spoke to the Minister for Agriculture this evening about this matter and he has asked me to place the question on the notice paper, which I will do either

tomorrow or the day after. Because of the difficulties in employing staff and those associated with getting the milk to its destination before 9 o'clock in the morning the milk vendors issued circulars to about 35,000 of their customers asking them whether they would support the delivery of milk starting at 7 o'clock the previous evening.

Of this number 27,000 customers replied, 87 per cent. of whom supported the 7 o'clock delivery time. The Chairman of the Milk Board apparently indicated that this would result in an increase in the price of milk which, of course, none of us desires. I fail to see, however, why this should increase the price of milk, and I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to the matter in an effort to assist the milk vendors who have to work very difficult hours during the night while delivering their supplies of milk. I hope the Minister will permit people to be supplied with milk earlier so that it can be placed in their refrigerators when received. I trust that appropriate action will be taken when I put my question to the Minister.

Mr. Graham: Has the honourable member asked the Chairman of the Milk Board?

Mr. O'CONNOR: This was in the paper only on Monday and I have been busy on other matters and have not had the opportunity to do so. But the Minister could obtain the information I did. I believe the Chairman of the Milk Board was asked to comment and he declined to do so.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Be fair about this one. He was approached on a Sunday when he had no access to the figures or the information required.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Will the Minister allow me to finish? I believe he was approached and declined to comment, and I understand that since that time he has made a statement to the newspaper, but that statement has not been published.

Mr. H. D. Evans: At the time he said he was quite prepared to make a statement, but on Monday morning when he had access to the figures.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That information was not in the Press and so I did not know, but I do know the chairman has made a statement since.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Don't distort the facts. Be fair.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Did I distort the facts?

Mr. H. D. Evans: You were about to.

Mr. Williams: That is being suppositious.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Talking about distortion, I did accuse the Premier of misrepresentation and I wish to take a little time this evening to accuse the Deputy Premier of distortion and dishonesty, and I say this in connection with the Nielson report.

This person was not man enough to admit he was wrong. I asked questions of the Deputy Premier on Thursday, one being whether he would—

- (1) Advise when the PERTS report was submitted to the Government?

I will hand my copy of the question to the Deputy Premier if he so wishes.

Mr. Graham: You look after yourself. You do not have to worry about me, brother.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Someone must because the Minister cannot do so.

Mr. Graham: You are just a silly little boy, that is all—a silly little boy.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The reply to my first question was—

- (1) Submitted to the honourable member as chairman of steering committee on the 14th December, 1970.

Further on the Deputy Premier stated—

I am aware that the report was submitted to the honourable member on the 14th December, 1970, and that on the 3rd March, 1971—nearly three months later, when the new Government took office—no action had been taken.

The Deputy Premier knows that is quite inaccurate. I have the report in my hand and members can see that it is a fairly lengthy and large document. I received it on the 14th December. I then perused it and went through it with my departmental officers, after which I submitted it to Cabinet on the 18th December. Therefore I had it for four days and not several months, as indicated by the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Graham: What did you do between the 14th December and the 3rd March? What action did you take on the report during that time?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will continue and give that information.

Mr. Graham: Very good.

Mr. Cook: When did Dr. Nielson submit this report?

Mr. O'CONNOR: To me?

Mr. Cook: No. At the university.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will give the date. It was handed to me on the 14th December and I handed it to the Government, through Cabinet, on the 18th December. In his own words, in answer to the question I asked, the Deputy Premier admitted that the report was held up for approximately six weeks awaiting Dr. Nielson's return to Western Australia so that the public could be fully informed and advised.

Mr. Graham: I did not say it was held up at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The question asked was—

- (3) For what period of time was release of the report held pending the return of Dr. Nielson to enable the public to be fully advised or informed?

The answer given by the Deputy Premier was—

Approximately six weeks.

Mr. Graham: You had his report and looked at what he said. Why not act on that? You wanted to be wet-nursed by Nielson. Why did you not operate on the report?

Mr. O'CONNOR: If the Deputy Premier will wait and give me time, I will give him the information.

Mr. Court: Don't let him use your time.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I held the report for four days and not several months, as indicated by the Deputy Premier. The report was handed to Cabinet and then held for six weeks pending Dr. Nielson's return to Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Why?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The report was—

Mr. Graham: Why? Could you not read his report?

Mr. O'CONNOR: On the Deputy Premier's own information, the report was held so that the public could be fully advised.

Mr. Graham: Did you need him looking over your shoulder?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The time from the 14th December to the 30th January, when the report was released to the public, was only six weeks approximately. Therefore, the Deputy Premier admits the report was not held up in my office—

Mr. Graham: What did you do from December to March? Nothing!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier looks at those newspapers he wants to look at and forgets the rest.

Mr. Graham: Keep talking.

Mr. O'CONNOR: On the 3rd February, in a report of the Premier's election promises, which I assume the Deputy Premier read—is that correct?—

Mr. Graham: Yes; and listened to them, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR: On the front page of the newspaper of the 3rd February is the following which is an extract from a report of the then Premier's policy speech:—

He has also committed the Government to key proposals in the Nielsen metropolitan transport plan.

These include the construction of bus-only freeways on suburban rail routes and the creation of a metropolitan region transport authority.

So that is the way in which the Government committed itself on this and how it acted in this regard.

Mr. Graham: You did not make any decisions whatever.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier has only to look at the papers, if he will believe them.

Mr. Graham: I have looked at the official papers.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Fair enough, but if the Deputy Premier will look at what was decided between—

Mr. Graham: You did nothing from December to March.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I thought the Deputy Premier would at least have been honest in this regard and not try to distort the whole of the project, as he has endeavoured to do. I held on to the report for four days and it was then handed to Cabinet and the necessary action taken.

One other matter with which I wish to deal briefly concerns the problems involved in the Albany area. Most members of this House, as is well known, were concerned about the difficulties in that area, those difficulties relating to wool export and the possibility of the exclusion of ships from Albany for this purpose. During last year I called at Albany on about four occasions, and it was through my efforts and those of the leader of our party (Sir David Brand) that an approach was made to the Scandia Line, the representative of which company came to discuss the matter with the then Premier and the Albany people. It was then agreed that Scandia Line ships could come in to Albany.

I discussed with Mr. Knox and the Albany zone council a circular which indicated that if people in the area around Albany and out towards Kojonup, and so on, were anxious for wool to be carted by road into Albany, we would give consideration to the matter. We were anxious to consider it because the wool price in this State and in Australia generally was at an all-time low.

The saving in costs in connection with this project would have been about \$200,000 to the people in the area. The member for Albany himself has recently indicated his concern about this matter and about the unemployment in Albany. He has indicated his wish to endeavour to get wool carted by road to Albany in an effort to help the people in that area.

In order that the Scandia Line ships might continue to call at Albany, it is necessary that about 5,000 bales per trip be taken, and unless this number of bales is available per unit load it is very likely that the line will not call at Albany.

Many other problems are being faced in Albany not only with the output of wool but also with unemployment. The member for Albany spoke along the following lines—

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is the date of that?

Mr. O'CONNOR: He made the speech on Thursday last, during which he said—

Another proposal has been submitted which I believe would be of considerable benefit to the town of Albany. This proposal is known as the Knox plan for a change in the transport pattern in the great southern region. The plan was originally conceived a number of years ago by the Orchid Valley pastoral improvement group, but I understand it fell through. Then the Albany wool shipping co-ordinating group saw certain advantages in the development of the proposal, and it has now made a proposition to the Government through the Director-General of Transport.

He went on to say that there will be a saving of \$300,000 a year and this figure is agreed to by the Director-General.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Is it agreed to by the Minister for Railways?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Yes. There will be losses in other fields, I agree.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you know whether Mr. Knox discussed this with the Commissioner of Railways.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I discussed this as Minister and obtained quite a few details.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you know whether the commissioner was in agreement?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The commissioner had the opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Was he in agreement?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I did not discuss it with him.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You didn't?

Mr. O'CONNOR: No, because at the time the report was not back, and therefore it was not necessary.

Mr. Graham: What decision did the Minister make?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The member for Albany continued—

Yes. This plan is much more important than just a road *versus* rail question. It is much more important than worrying about precedent, and I do not believe a precedent could be established in this case owing to the special circumstances.

The member for Katanning interjected—

Have you studied the report?

The member for Albany then indicated that he had.

Mr. Cook: Why all the sudden interest in Albany? You did not have much interest in it in the last 12 years.

Mr. Graham: True.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Is the member for Albany still interested in this, and does he still support the remarks he made?

Mr. Cook: I most certainly do.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am very pleased to hear that.

Amendment to Motion

In view of the fact that the member for Albany does support his remarks I would like to move—

That the following be added to the motion:—

That as a result of the difficulties being experienced by the woolgrowers the unemployment position in Albany and the extreme importance of supplying sufficient wool to keep the Scandia Line ships calling at Albany, the Government approve granting of licenses for wool to be carted to Albany by road as in accordance with the document circularised by the Albany wool shipping co-ordinating group and dated 20-1-71.

Mr. Davies: Where is the case for the amendment?

Mr. O'Neil: The member for Albany has convinced us!

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn—Minister for Railways) [8.57 p.m.]: Like the member for Albany I am more than a little puzzled to observe the sudden concern which springs from the member for Mt. Lawley for the people of Albany.

Mr. O'Connor: I have been in constant contact with them over 12 months in connection with this matter.

Mr. Graham: For four months. You did not do anything for 12 years, but you have done plenty in the last four months.

The SPEAKER: Before the Minister continues, is there a seconder to this motion?

Mr. Graham: It does not deserve a seconder.

Mr. O'Neil: I thought the member for Albany might have seconded it.

Mr. I. W. Manning: I second the motion.

Mr. BERTRAM: I do not know what is supposed to be understood when someone says he has been in constant contact, or words to that effect, with the people in Albany for the last 12 months. The dilemma in Albany has been with us for quite a few months now. It is not a question of someone being in contact with the people. It is a question of doing something to ease the dilemma the Albany people are experiencing; and what they are experiencing at the moment is a degree of unemployment.

What did the previous Government do to help the people in Albany? I am not aware of its having done anything at all, really. Being a man of some initiative the Director-General of Transport decided to consult the organisation in Albany in order to ascertain what might be done to help the people in Albany and to stimulate business in that area. He compiled some statistics and I think he has made a report of a sort and has been into the south-west area and addressed meetings of farmers with a view to ascertaining what the people down there want to do, particularly in regard to the cartage of wool by road.

The previous Minister for Transport concurred with the efforts being undertaken by the director-general, or so it would appear, but whilst he concurred with the efforts of the director-general, that is really about as much as he did. He went out of his way not to commit himself in any way at all.

Mr. O'Connor: Do you know on what date those circulars arrived back? You obviously do not.

Mr. BERTRAM: No. Perhaps the honourable member could give us the answer. Arrived back from where?

Mr. O'Connor: From the people concerned. They arrived back on the 10th March when your Government took office. I was, therefore, not in a position to act on the matter.

Mr. BERTRAM: They were sent back by some of the people.

Mr. O'Connor: You are speaking on behalf of the Government.

Mr. BERTRAM: The member for Mt. Lawley was taking over.

Mr. O'Connor: You tell us what people.

Mr. BERTRAM: I will answer that question, if the member for Mt. Lawley does not know. If what the Director-General of Transport says is accurate, the Minister for Transport said to the Albany Wool Shipping Co-ordinating Group, "If you can demonstrate to me that a majority of the people in the area concerned are in favour of the plan, I will give it serious consideration." The plan referred to is the cartage of wool by road from certain allocated districts—defined areas—into Albany.

The Minister said that he would give it serious consideration. There is certainly no intimation that he would take any positive step, nor is there any indication of the nature of any step which he may have been contemplating. It so happens that something like 10,000 circulars were prepared and distributed. I have one of them in my hand. There is a map on the inside indicating the great southern line. Shaded portions indicate the areas to be affected by the proposals for road transport of wool.

I do not know how many of the 10,000 circulars actually reached the target of the people concerned in the area. However, I

do know that the Director-General of Transport is more than reasonably efficient and I also know that it was his responsibility to ensure that the circulars reached their target so that the people concerned might not only read them but also make a decision. On the bottom of page 3 of the circular, a line is drawn. The intention was that people who were qualified to make a decision should complete this part of the circular, tear it off, and return it. This portion reads as follows:—

I of
agree with the transport plan proposed
by the Albany Wool Shipping Co-ordinating Group.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Is there any provision for anyone who disagreed?

Mr. BERTRAM: No, there is no provision on the form for anyone who disagreed. The object was not only to get circulars to the target but also to get a response, which would be the case, from interested people. I think every reasonable and proper step was taken to ensure that the circulars reached their target. There is no evidence before me to the contrary. Out of the 10,000 circulars distributed, 285 or 286 replies were received. Those are the statistics before us.

Mr. O'Connor: How many supported it? It was 98 per cent.

Mr. BERTRAM: It was more than that. I think close enough to 100 per cent. supported it. However, 285 out of 10,000 is not a large number. I am sorry I missed a little of what the member for Mt. Lawley had to say earlier on because I was momentarily out of the Chamber. However, I think he suggested that something should be done to give effect to this plan for the cartage of wool by road. However if he were still in office and received 285 replies out of 10,000 circulars, what would he do about it? With respect, I suggest he would do absolutely nothing about it and my justification for saying this is what I have already read.

Mr. Norton: He should say "No."

Mr. BERTRAM: I will read it again. The Minister said, "If you can demonstrate to me that a majority of the people in the area concerned are in favour of the plan, I will give it serious consideration." Is there any evidence to demonstrate anything like a majority of the people? A mere handful of people have shown interest and bothered to reply. I think it is abundantly clear that even the most biased member who is listening tonight should say, if he has regard for the facts, "There is no doubt in my mind that the previous Minister for Transport would most certainly not have done anything in this case whether it be to help the people of Albany or farmers in the relevant area."

Mr. Norton: Was there any provision to vote against it?

Mr. BERTRAM: The form is unique. It simply says—

I of
agree with the transport plan proposed by the Albany Wool Shipping Co-ordinating Group.

The form makes no provision for an alternative and the recipient could not strike out the "Yes" or "No". It is a little unfortunate in its designation. In the circumstances, because of the paucity of interest—indeed, almost complete lack of interest—shown, which has been demonstrated by the figures I have given, I do not think it matters two hoots. It is not as if it is a marginal decision for or against. The support is simply not there.

Of course it is a one-eyed approach to say that in view of the dilemma in Albany we will take steps to do what is suggested in the amendment; namely, approve the granting of licenses for wool to be carted to Albany by road, etc.

Has the member for Mt. Lawley been at pains, and in fairness to members of this House, to indicate the adverse repercussions which would flow from an amendment of this kind being carried in this House? I would suggest he has not. What, for example, would be the repercussions upon the railways? What would be the loss to the State? How many hundreds of thousands of dollars per annum would be lost by the State in consequence of the cartage of wool by road instead of by rail? Has the member for Mt. Lawley pointed out to the House that farmers within a 10-mile corridor on each side of the great southern line are compelled, whether they like it or not, to have their wool carted by rail while farmers in other areas can do what they like? Farmers in other areas, if they wish, can send their wool by road to Fremantle or to Albany or they can send it by rail to either of those destinations. Why should they be given a privileged position? What evidence is there that, given this alteration, they would exercise the right, newly acquired—if the amendment is carried—to have wool carted by road to Albany? There is no evidence as to how many would do this. Habit would suggest that very many would continue doing what they have always done. They have had good service from the railways and they would continue to move their wool by rail.

The suggested corridor is 10 miles. Why should it be 10 miles? Has anyone ventured to suggest to the House why it should be 10 miles, and not 20, or 25 miles? In years gone by, and in times when there was little or no road transport, I am told that when railway lines

were being laid, they had to be a distance of at least 30 miles from the line. As I say, this was before there were efficient road transport and good roads. Now the proposition is that it should only be a 10-mile corridor on each side of the line. I think that would work unfairly. What would be the next thing to happen? We would find people who cart wool into Albany by road would then start pressing for the right to backload their vehicles with all sorts of other goods. This would mean further inroads into rail revenue; a loss that would be met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In other words, it means that you, Mr. Speaker, and I would have to pay for it. There are other and better means of coming to the rescue of the people of Albany and I am more than quietly confident that the Government will find these means and implement them in very good time.

The member for Northam recently said in this House that a Farmers' Union meeting held recently was opposed to any move to transport wool in the area concerned by road instead of rail.

The amendment which has been moved to the Address-in-Reply seems to me to be a repeat of what we were subjected to the other night when a motion, by way of an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, was before the House. At that time, those who purported to support it showed absolutely no real will for what they were speaking on.

I regret I was not here earlier on to hear the full text of what the member for Mt. Lawley had to say on the motion before the House.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You didn't miss much.

Mr. BERTRAM: I suspect this is so. I believe that any member who comes to tintacks and looks at the total position will deal with the amendment the way it should be dealt with; namely, he will vote against it.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [9.12 p.m.]: I should like to offer my support to the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley. I also indicate my support to the member for Albany on the question he put to Parliament when he asked for support to broaden the area around Albany in which free transport may be permitted.

The amendment contains two main principles. The first is to aid the woolgrowers and the second is to ensure that sufficient wool will be coming into Albany to keep the Scandia Line ships calling at the Port of Albany. Of course, the member for Albany when speaking to the debate pointed out to the House the developments that would accrue if these ships called regularly. A number of articles in *The Albany Advertiser* have also made strong reference to the situation. It has been pointed

out very clearly that road transport for wool is vital to the shipping service. In fact, the whole service hinges on the road plan because the wool which is now coming into Albany is not sufficient in itself. A greater quantity of wool must come into Albany to achieve this objective of keeping the shipping line calling regularly at the port; that is, of putting it on a permanent basis.

These are the principles which confront us at the moment and are contained in the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley. This is the issue we must consider when we come to lodge our votes on this question.

Road transport versus rail transport is something that has received the attention of the people of Western Australia over a long period of time. I remember that back in 1930 a move was made to introduce free road transport. The result was very deep inroads into railway revenue and road transport was restricted considerably. However, over the years with the experience we have gained with the passing of time in means and methods of transport, the restriction on road transport has been steadily eased. I know that one of the most forward moves that was made to ease restrictions on road transport was in respect of the transport of livestock.

This has made a great difference to the farmers. It is now possible to cart livestock—that is, cattle and sheep in particular—long distances by road transport without any restriction whatsoever. This has made a considerable difference to the economics of farmers and it has also brought about a tremendous improvement in the condition in which the stock arrive at their destination. I think it can readily be seen that if we accept the proposal as suggested by the member for Albany, and supported in this amendment by the member for Mt. Lawley, we could easily achieve the objective of getting to Albany the quantity of wool required to ensure the success of a new shipping service.

Mr. Graham: Are not the railways capable of carrying the wool?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: That is not the question at all. I think if the Government assesses this amendment on that question, the objective we seek will not be achieved. It is not a question of whether the railways can transport the product. The cold, hard facts are that road transport could cart the product cheaper and more efficiently. The fact that farmers may cart their produce by road transport is persuading many of them to cart to Albany instead of sending it to Fremantle.

Mr. Graham: Would it be cheaper by rail to Fremantle than by rail to Albany?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It all depends on which area the Minister is thinking about.

Mr. Graham: The lower great southern.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: In that case, yes. The Director-General of Transport suggests that products coming from the area defined and recommended could be taken to Albany more cheaply and more successfully by road, and so the purpose for which the suggestion was made could be achieved.

Mr. May: How does he know what the ex-Minister said when he did not speak to the ex-Minister for Railways?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I can see that the Ministers opposite have completely missed the point. They have certainly missed the point put forward by the member for Albany.

Mr. May: But you have missed the boat.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: No, I am afraid the Minister is going to miss the boat.

Mr. May: Do you want the rail freights to Harvey increased?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The Minister is going to lose a shipping service which is vital to the lifeblood of Albany, as was pointed out by the member for Albany.

Mr. Graham: Because the farmers prefer to freight to Fremantle rather than to Albany. Is that the reason?

Mr. W. G. Young: Because they are forced to.

Mr. May: The freights are still on the actual mileage.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. I. W. MANNING: With your assistance, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. It is very interesting that that comment came from the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation. He has repeated on numerous occasions since he was appointed Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation that ways and means should be found to encourage people to do certain things. These are ways and means of encouraging farmers to see that their wool is transported to Albany. Permits will be issued for the road transport of wool to Albany, but permits will not be issued for the road transport of wool to Fremantle or somewhere else. Therefore, to my mind there is a great deal of merit in this proposal.

It has clearly been stated in Albany and in the Press—and by many responsible people—that so much depends upon this proposal. The member for Albany pointed out to the House just what a contribution the proposal would make to employment in the Albany area. He also said—and I am sure the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation heard him say it—that Albany is more or less in the doldrums at the moment from the point of view of employment, and this is one way of assisting that aspect of the situation in Albany.

Mr. Graham: Why didn't the Government you supported take the action you are now advocating?

Mr. Court: It did take action.

Mr. Graham: I mean to allow road transport. Why did it not take that action?

Mr. Court: The member for Wellington is explaining the facts to you.

Mr. Graham: A do-nothing Government. Put everything to one side in the too-hard basket.

Mr. Court: We consulted the users. We did not bulldoze them like you do.

Mr. Graham: A do-nothing Government.

Mr. Court: We are interested to hear you talk.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I think the previous Government went about the task in the right way. It set an inquiry in train and the Director-General of Transport set out to make a recommendation. Had the previous Government been returned at the elections quite possibly it would have had a very close and sympathetic look at this proposal, realising what it would achieve for the Albany area. I would be terribly surprised if the member for Albany, after having submitted a case, has it completely rejected by the Government.

Mr. Graham: What makes you think that?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The tone of the Minister's remarks, and the tone of his interjections.

Mr. Graham: I was commenting on your remarks and the inactivity of the Government you supported.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The Minister's tone was that the member for Albany had been dropped cold after a member of the Cabinet subcommittee had visited the area.

Mr. Graham: The amendment you support refers to a document dated the 20th January. You were still the Government then. What did you do about it?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I suggest that we must have the support of the people who have to transport the wool in order to ensure the success of the proposal, and I am satisfied—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wellington is difficult to hear because he has a quiet voice. I think *Hansard* should have a reasonable opportunity to hear what he is saying.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It is my suggestion that the Government ought to treat this proposal very seriously indeed because it is one opportunity to include in the Address-in-Reply a matter that has been left out. In my view it could well be included in the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech.

A fine case has been submitted by the member for Albany in seeking to promote the interests of his electorate. It is most important to his electorate that some urgent action be taken instead of waiting for the Cabinet subcommittee to visit Albany, and also for the Treasurer to visit the town in his official capacity. The member for Albany has presented the case to Parliament and asked for some action. My purpose in rising to speak tonight is to offer my support to the case he has submitted.

I know from previous experience in other fields that where road transport restrictions have been eased a great saving has been achieved. I think this proposal might prove to be a fine experiment and it should be regarded in that light because it provides an opportunity to lift restrictions on road transport and to gauge the impact on the railways and railway revenue.

It has long been said that to be successful the railways must have long hauls and heavy loads. Short hauls and light loads are not a paying proposition. So the experiment we could carry out in this instance is whether this is a short haul and a light load, or a long haul and a heavy load, because these are matters which are vital to the success or failure of the railway system.

Mr. Bertram: Would you call Albany to Perth a long haul?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Yes.

Mr. Bertram: Well, there is a lot of freight travelling like that; hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth per annum.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I do not think the Minister would agree that the wool produced in the Albany hinterland should be hauled to Fremantle merely because it is a payable proposition to the railways, whilst the Port of Albany dwindles and dies due to the lack of traffic through it. This is the crux of the case submitted by the member for Albany and, to my mind, it is the crux of the amendment; that is, that the goods produced in the Albany hinterland—and other requirements, such as fertilisers—should be transported by road.

Mr. May: You feel that isolated areas should be given preference over the State, generally. Is that right?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: No.

Mr. May: Would you consider that the run from Perth to Harvey is a long or short haul?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: That all depends on whether the load is light or heavy. It is certainly a short haul with a light load. If livestock are being carted it would be a dead loss.

Mr. May: The distance is still the same, whether or not the load is light or heavy.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It makes quite a difference to the revenue of the railways. So, once again I would like to reiterate that the amendment proposed by the member for Mt. Lawley is one which is well worthy of careful consideration by this Parliament, and one which is worthy of support. I support the amendment.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [9.26 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley because I believe it is important to our transport scheme in the south.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Can you understand it?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am surprised that when the member for Mt. Lawley moved the amendment the member for Albany interjected, "Why the sudden interest in Albany?" I rather thought he would be glad of the support.

Mr. Bertram: He is.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Well, it did not sound like it.

Mr. Davies: You are supporting a badly worded amendment.

Mr. Bertram: The member for Albany does not think the amendment is dinkum.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I was rather surprised that the member for Albany was not pleased about it, because he realises that in the interests of Albany it is important that all the wool and other produce from the area surrounding Albany—a fairly large area—be shipped through the port. I feel that is a most important factor in the situation he described with regard to Albany.

However, apart from that, there is no sudden interest in the matter on the part of the member for Mt. Lawley, because he was the Minister for Transport when this report was commenced. Surely one cannot say he has taken a sudden interest; he took an interest last year.

Mr. May: He was the Minister for Railways, too; but he did not speak to the commissioner.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The fact remains that he has not taken a sudden interest, because the report was commenced last year.

Mr. McIver: He was opposed to the proposal, too.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not concerned with that. This is something which the member for Mt. Lawley had a hand in producing, and it was started last year. Of course, that is not the main point, but it gets over those queries.

The fact is that we have to face up to the economic circumstances which dictate that goods must be transported at the lowest possible cost. There is no question about that. Transportation of goods cannot be carried out by the longest or

most expensive method; we have to cut the cost. If this proposal is a way of cutting the cost and providing better services to the farmers, it is a proposal that must be carried out.

Mr. Bertram: Cutting the cost to whom?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In this case the producer.

Mr. Bertram: Are you aware that, in effect, those producers subsidise the producers on the long runs? Do you want the remote farmers to pay for the benefit of those people?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not surprised that the Minister for Railways makes some contribution on this matter because he is concerned with the running of the railways; but does he expect every part of the railways to pay? If he does, I challenge him to make the metropolitan passenger fares pay for the cost of the metropolitan rail services.

Mr. Bertram: There has never been a business yet that has been profitable in every segment.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is what I wanted the Minister to say, because it is along these lines that I am arguing; that is, people engaged in primary industries should not be expected to pay excessive transport costs.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But the woolgrowers do not support the transport of wool by road.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: They have asked for it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Did they support it at the last conference of the Farmers' Union?

Mr. Bertram: A total of 285 out of 10,000 were against it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In this letter from the Narrogin Zone Council of the Farmers' Union of W.A. Incorporated, dated the 28th June, 1971—

Mr. Bertram: They are a breakaway group.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is the motion that was passed—

That this Zone and the members of its branches approach their respective members of Parliament to have the ban on wool growers carting their own wool lifted.

The Narrogin zone council represents a very wide area and covers all the branches in the district and the proposal was supported by those branches. In regard to the question raised by the Minister for Agriculture, if he is the Minister who supports agricultural industries he should be the very one to ensure that they are serviced at the lowest possible transport cost.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You produce a motion that was passed at a general conference of the Farmers' Union.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Let the Minister produce it; I have produced mine.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I have it here.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister will have an opportunity to speak and he can produce it then.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You tell us what is in the motion passed at the general conference.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I do not have the general conference motion; I only have this one.

Mr. Bertram: That has been overruled and merged into the greater.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is dated the 28th June, 1971. The suggestion is that we should realise that there are railways and that the Minister for Railways supports them, but let him compete with any other transport system.

Mr. Bertram: Fairly compete.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister can only compete.

Mr. May: There would be no competition against the railways if they were allowed unrestricted competition with road transport. If the railways were given open competition with the road users they could not compete with rail.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If the Minister cares to look up some of the speeches that I have made in the past he will see that I have said that over and over again, so why do not the railways do so?

Mr. May: Because of what you are advocating.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If the railways reduced their freight charges on wool, many of these arguments would not arise. The excessively high freight on wool was bringing in a fair amount of revenue to the railways, because at the time the freight charges were assessed wool could stand such charges, but it cannot stand them today. Today the freight on wool is an excessive charge and there is no reason why it should be continued. The Minister for Railways should take the matter in hand with a view to reducing the rates.

Mr. Graham: What did the Minister who was in office for the last 12 years do? What did the Government that you supported do? The position that we have now is a heritage from your people.

Mr. Rushton: There was a loss of \$70,000,000 during your term.

Mr. Graham: The present position is a heritage from you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not mind how many times I have to rise in my seat because we will get away eventually. In any case, I do not think the member for Narrogin is speaking to the amendment; he is drifting from it a little.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will make sure that I do not, but this is in relation to the points raised by the Minister for Railways and also the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier has asked what my Government did about the matter, and so I will tell him. To meet the competition, my Government, in regard to the transport of wool to Williams which is 100 miles from Perth by road, and 162 miles from Perth by rail, agreed that the rail freight from Williams to Perth and Fremantle would be assessed at the rate based on road mileage. This rate has been in operation for years. That is what the last Government did. Let this Government follow the same course.

Mr. Graham: We have not altered that one iota. What are you bellyaching about?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: My Government went half-way, so why cannot the present Government go the other half?

Mr. Graham: We have been in office only a few weeks; why did you not suggest this to your own Minister?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The motion before the House suggests that the present Government should do it, and surely we are entitled to say what we consider the Government should do.

Mr. Graham: You should have spoken in your own party room.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In view of the reaction of members on the Government side of the House it would appear that I have got my message across. I support the amendment.

Rewording of Amendment

The SPEAKER: Before the next speaker rises to his feet, I would point out that the member for Mt. Lawley has resumed his place in the Chamber. The amendment is badly worded. Has the member for Mt. Lawley the amendment in front of him?

Mr. O'Connor: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the amendment should be reworded along the following lines:—

; but as a result of the difficulties being experienced by the Woolgrowers, the unemployment position in Albany, and the extreme importance of supplying sufficient wool to keep the Scandia line ships calling at Albany, the Government should approve the granting of licences for wool to be carted to Albany by road in accordance with the document circularised by the Albany wool shipping co-ordinating group and dated 20th January, 1971.

If the member for Mt. Lawley agrees with the rewording I will alter the amendment accordingly.

Mr. O'Connor: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Debate (on amendment) Resumed

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.37 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley. In doing so, I want to refer to what I consider to be a mixed-up Government.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is certainly a mixed-up amendment.

Mr. McPHARLIN: We had the member for Albany suggesting some form of assistance to woolgrowers in the Albany area, and then we had the member for Fremantle, a short time ago, criticising primary producers and woolgrowers for not saving and putting money aside; opposing the proposals which the Commonwealth Government is advocating at present in an endeavour to assist the wool industry, and registering his opposition to the use of taxpayers' money for this purpose. Again, the other night, we had the member for Northam criticising any suggestion that road transport should be used for the cartage of wool. How mixed up can they get?

We have one member advocating—which was quite a generous suggestion, I think—support for the plan being discussed this evening to assist the farmers in the Albany area and to give them a chance to help the Port of Albany by endeavouring to relieve the unemployment that exists there. This is a worthy motive. Helping the farmers to cart their own wool would assist in keeping the Scandia Line ships operating. One member pointed out that the suggestion did not come from the farmers, but from the Wool Shipping Co-ordinating Group. It is significant that the group was quite prepared to make the suggestion to assist the farmers to bring their wool to the port and so provide work for the unemployed at Albany.

I think it is appropriate at this stage to make the point that over the last six years the previous Government did not increase the freight rates on the railways. It illustrates quite clearly a genuine desire to help the primary producer to keep his costs down. I think this answers the question asked by members on the Government side of the House; that is, what did the previous Government do or not do in this respect to help the farmers?

Mr. T. D. Evans: I suggest you speak to the amendment. That is, if you can understand it.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I have been speaking to the amendment.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I thought you were answering criticism from this side of the House. That is what you said you were doing.

Mr. McPHARLIN: This amendment is quite in keeping with the policies adopted by the previous Government. I have examined the proposed measures which were printed and circularised among the farmers to gain their support and interest, and I consider that this was a genuine approach to them.

Mr. May: Only 280 replied: Only 280 out of 10,000.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Can the Minister imagine those people not being in support of the proposal?

Mr. May: I do not know; they did not answer the circular.

Mr. McPHARLIN: It surprises me that those members who support the trade union movement, and who claim that they endeavour to provide employment for members of those unions and the working people as a whole should act in this way. Here is a suggestion put forward, supported by the member for Albany, to provide more work for the people of Albany and yet the Government members are opposing it.

Mr. May: Ask the opinion of the railway men at Kellerberrin.

Mr. McPHARLIN: To hear Government members speak in this vein amazes me, because we on this side of the House can do nothing but support the amendment. With those few remarks, I wish to indicate that the amendment has my full support.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [9.43 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley. In contrast to what has been said, I am quite sincere in saying that the Minister for Railways and his department may have had an expression of opinion from the Farmers' Union that perhaps a majority of its members were opposed to this scheme.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The motion passed at the annual conference was to that effect.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I was aware of that, Mr. Minister. The position is that—as the Minister for Agriculture will be the first to acknowledge—not always is an expression of opinion by the Farmers' Union in line with the policy he adopts.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That suited you! Let's face it!

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, it suited me, but if we are to accept the motion passed at the annual conference of the Farmers' Union as the be-all and end-all of the position, the Minister for Agriculture should have abolished top cuts. I know that in the southern areas of the State the suggestion was raised, and I think the member for Narrogin made the point, that it was a long way for wool to be carted, and I would point out that this applies to the whole of our railway system. Suggestions have been made, particularly by those in the lower southern areas of the Gnowangerup Shire that, by a direct route, farmers can load the wool into the store and backload superphosphate. This would be a considerable saving to the farming community and if any member of the Government can tell me at this point

of time that any saving for the farming community is not warranted I would like to know why.

Mr. May: What about the backloading of fuel oil?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: That is done for one section of the community, the wool producers.

Mr. Bertram: Against the interests of his brother producers a few miles away.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: That does not apply. The situation is that they are within 60 miles in a direct line of the Fremantle wool-selling centre. They put their wool on the train, and it goes direct to Fremantle. In the instance I have mentioned the wool is transported in a semicircle. In its wisdom the previous Government built direct roads through this area to enable products to be transported to the Port of Albany.

In a debate on the Fitzgerald River Reserve last year I pointed out to the member for Albany that his predecessor had always been a supporter of the Port of Albany, and of the decentralisation of industry so as to assist that port. At the time the member for Albany was opposed to any development in the Fitzgerald River Reserve area, but I maintained such development would assist the Port of Albany. In recent statements which he has made he is now completely in favour of this proposal. I have not the particular newspaper with me, but the matter was reported in *The Albany Advertiser*.

The position has arisen where the member for Albany is giving his wholehearted support to the development of the Port of Albany. From the point of view of farmers within the environs of the Port of Albany, no greater saving could be effected on their wool clip than by being permitted to cart the wool on their own trucks or on trucks operated by local cartage contractors to the Port of Albany. This would effect a considerable saving to those now engaged in a very depressed industry—a saving of something like \$2 a bale. That represents the difference between the cartage of the wool by rail and by road transport.

If we reach the situation where there is never to be any competition between the railways and road transport, we will find over a period of years a gradual deterioration in the area caused by high rail freights which, incidentally, have not been increased since 1966. We will find that the railways will be replaced by road transport. For short distance haulage, the transport of wool in the long term should be undertaken by road transport. At the present time there is a 10-mile wide corridor along the Katanning-Gnowangerup line, but this will be done away with eventually.

There is no denying the point that the woolgrower in the present adverse circumstances is not allowed the privilege of effecting the saving of a few dollars by

being able to cart the wool on his own truck and backload with superphosphate from the Port of Albany.

Mr. Bertram: He does not want to do that.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Of course he does.

Mr. Bertram: Where is the evidence?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: When a conference motion is passed at a meeting of the Farmers' Union it becomes a State-wide matter. If there is only support from two or three delegates representing the southern zone they would be outvoted by the other delegates. As the member for Northam has explained, where there is direct rail transport no farmer would cart his wool by truck; that is, if he has a clip of 100 bales and a five-ton truck. If he did it would necessitate three trips. If the farmer has direct rail transport, comparable in cost with road transport, he will cart his wool by rail in one load.

Mr. May: Don't you think such a farmer should assist the farmer in the outlying parts? The rates are telescopic rates, and the short haulage assists the long haulage.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: The wool freight is probably the highest freight in the railway system. A prosperity loading was placed on wool in 1951, because of the prosperity of the industry at that time, but that loading has not been removed. However, the prosperity of the industry disappeared three or four years ago.

Mr. Bertram: Of course, this disregards inflation.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, but inflation is not taken into account in the other rail freights which have not been increased. The freight on wool has not been reduced, and the farmer is still paying a high prosperity loading on wool; yet he is denied the right to cart his wool on his own truck by the shortest possible route. In the area in question the railway system is routed in a semicircle, and the wool from Gnowangerup, in particular, is carted nearly 100 per cent. further than if it went by road transport to Albany.

Mr. May: You are not giving credence to the fact that the Railways Department assists the farmer in the transport of every other agricultural commodity. For instance, the freight on agricultural machinery is fixed at less than cost.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: The Minister might have more knowledge of this subject than I. I was not aware that the railways carted anything at less than cost.

Mr. May: What about superphosphate?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Is that freight less than cost?

Mr. May: Yes.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: It represents probably the biggest single freight in the railways.

Mr. May: It is carted at less than cost.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: What about the freight on iron ore?

Mr. May: That is not a primary product.

Mr. Graham: The freight on iron ore was decided by the Liberal Government, supported by the Country Party.

Mr. Bertram: The previous Minister should be the last person in the world to put this amendment down in his own writing, according to his statement.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I cannot be responsible for what the previous Minister has said. I am definitely of the opinion that the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley is designed to help the people in the southern areas of the State to place their wool on the market at a cheaper rate. In order to achieve that they should be permitted to transport the wool by road to Albany, and to backload with superphosphate.

Mr. May: And backload with fuel?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes. That would reduce the cost to the producer in two ways—the freight on wool, as well as the freight on super and fuel.

Mr. May: To the detriment of the other farmers around.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I do not agree, because the farmers in the small corridors are subsidising their immediate neighbours in having to pay higher freight rates. This is a great point of dissatisfaction. The sooner road transport is thrown open, and free competition between road and rail transport is permitted, the sooner will the producers in a depressed industry be assisted. That would be of benefit to Albany.

Mr. T. D. Evans: And to the detriment of the State as a whole.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: No, I do not think it will affect the finances of the State to any degree. The position is that producers who are on a direct rail route to Albany will not want to cart the wool on their own trucks by having to make three or four trips, when they can load all the wool onto the train. They will use rail transport if the cost of cartage by road and rail is the same. Where the rail freight is greater they will, of course, want to cart the wool themselves.

Mr. T. D. Evans: In other words, they want the best of two worlds.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: They want the best they can possibly get at this point of time in a depressed industry. The Minister has said that he is looking into the problems of the farmer, therefore the Government should look at this particular problem I have mentioned to render some assistance to the woolgrowers in the southern part of the State. I support the amendment.

MR. COOK (Albany) [9.55 p.m.]: I am absolutely astounded at the sudden interest the Opposition is showing in Albany. For a great number of years the people of this area have been crying out for Government help, for industrial development, for development of tourist attractions and amenities, for educational complexes, and the like; but they have cried out in vain, because in the main they have been met with a deaf ear.

Mr. Court: That is not right.

Mr. COOK: In June of last year a by-election was held for the seat of Albany and in one of the brochures we used appeared the slogan: What Albany needed was a big, long stick, about eight months long to stir up some Government action. The evidence that this was not forthcoming was that I was returned in the election this year with a much increased majority.

This sudden and astounding interest that is being shown in the Albany area is not sincere. Members opposite are attempting to use the serious economic difficulties besetting Albany and the rural areas to score some cheap, political advantage. It amounts to nothing more than that.

Mr. W. G. Young: What about the development of the Fitzgerald River Reserve?

Mr. COOK: The honourable member has absolutely confused the two issues. Apparently he does not know anything about the Knox proposals.

Mr. W. G. Young: I am not confused with the need for development of the Port of Albany.

Mr. COOK: I could refer to the development of the Fitzgerald River Reserve; I will not do so now, but at some future date.

Mr. W. G. Young: That is different altogether.

Mr. COOK: It is different, because it is not an economic proposition.

Mr. W. G. Young: Is there evidence to prove that?

Mr. COOK: There is evidence to show it is not an economic proposition, but this has nothing to do with the amendment before us.

The SPEAKER: Order! A few moments ago the member for Roe was looking for my protection. I hope that he will now accord the same protection to the member for Albany. The member for Albany may proceed.

Mr. COOK: Before I was interrupted I was pointing out that the Opposition was trying to use the situation in Albany and the rural areas to gain some cheap, political advantage. Of course, such action by the Opposition will not gain it any credit at all. I have given my support

to the scheme, and I have no compunction about doing that. If the Opposition thinks it will score a cheap, political point I am sorry to disappoint it. I would like to place it on record that anything which in the long term will be of benefit to Albany will be supported by me, and supported to the best of my ability.

As I have pointed out, and as has been recorded in *Hansard*, I said the matter was before the Government at the time and it was being considered. I know the Government will take into account the submissions I have made. We know the Government will make a decision based on the best interests of Albany and of Western Australia as a whole.

Mr. O'Connor: How hard have you tried to help the Port of Albany?

Mr. COOK: How hard has the member for Mt. Lawley tried to help Albany in the past? This is a puerile move by the Opposition, which seems to be barren of ideas. Another point which I did not raise the other evening is appropriate to be mentioned here. Great play was made of the fact that three ships will come into the Port of Albany, and sufficient inducement has to be provided for the continuation of the shipping service. It is interesting to note that the reason for so much wool being railed to Fremantle for shipment in containers was the decision made by the overseas shipping lines. It is also interesting to note that for about 12 months, from the time of the decision made to rationalise wool shipments, the Government of the day took no action whatsoever to break down the decision of the overseas shipping line conference.

Mr. O'Connor: That is not correct.

Mr. COOK: That has not been done by the Federal Government. The counterpart of the previous Minister for Transport in the Federal Government put the Australian national line into partnership with the overseas shipping lines, and chartered one of the overseas vessels. The Federal Government completely sold out the people and the farmers of Australia. The rise in freight rates that has occurred is around 25 per cent., and that is what has helped to cripple the farmers.

I am supporting a move which I think will be of assistance to these people, and members opposite are choosing to use the situation to gain some political advantage.

Mr. O'Connor: For the people of Albany.

Mr. COOK: I think I have already exposed the cheapness of this move. I do not propose to deal with it at length because as I have already stated it is a puerile move by an Opposition totally barren of ideas. The Opposition does not give any credit to me for the work I have put in at Albany. The Opposition states that many of these suggestions could have

been implemented when it was in Government. Well, why were they not implemented? If the Opposition thinks I am going to be a party to this cheap political move then it is quite wrong.

I know the Government is considering this matter and it will take my suggestions into account. I am sure the decision will be in the best interests of Albany, and in the best interests of Western Australia. As I have said, I cannot be a party to a move which is an attempt to try to score off the hardships of the people of Albany. That is all the Opposition has attempted to do this evening.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.01 p.m.]: We have heard an extraordinary debate tonight—

Mr. T. D. Evans: That can be said again.

Mr. COURT: —an extraordinary debate, and for the second time in his short political career we have seen the member for Albany turn a somersault. I remember when he first came to the House and intended to do something sensational by moving an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. The amendment concerned the Fitzgerald River Reserve, but it was an entirely different story which appeared a few weeks later when he felt the cold breath of the electors from his area.

It is quite extraordinary that only a matter of a few days ago he was leading this particular move.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would the Deputy Leader of the Opposition speak to the amendment?

Mr. COURT: I suggest that the whole debate has been centred around arguments to protect the railways against road transport rather than trying to preserve Albany. The fact is that the previous Government moved in this matter to try to retain Albany as a wool centre.

We have heard a lot of words and a great deal of propaganda from the present Government about decentralisation; it is going to work wonders. However, it will be battling to beat the performance of the previous Government which achieved the greatest decentralisation in the history of the State.

However, leaving that aside, this amendment is definitely directed at the question of Albany remaining a wool-selling centre. This is part of the original study. The then Minister for Transport, who was also the Minister for Railways, was given a direction by his Government to try to do something to preserve Albany as a wool-selling and exporting centre, and ultimately make it a great textile centre. That is when it became apparent that assistance was required.

Mr. Graham: That is why 100 people have left the Albany Woollen Mills.

Mr. COURT: Ours was the only Government which gave financial assistance to the Albany Woollen Mills.

Mr. Graham: We put a stop to the putting off of employees. It was a chap by the name of A'Court; sounds as though he might be a relative of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. COURT: He will be quick to tell you he is not. However, let us return to the real reason for the study.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Will the Deputy Leader of the Opposition repeat his previous statement?

Mr. COURT: The Minister has been stopped twice tonight by his leader. His leader is afraid of what he might say.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has deliberately made a false statement. The Hawke Labor Government was the first to assist the Albany Woollen Mills.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will stick to the amendment and avoid interjections.

Mr. COURT: Mr. Speaker, that is what I like to do. Let us return to the real reason for the transport study. There was no possibility of retaining Albany as a wool-selling centre in the revised system of international transport unless there was some way to get a different type of ship to come to Albany.

It was quite obvious that the type of container ship used in Fremantle would not go in to Albany, and because of the work done by the then Government it was found that the Scandia type of ship could be attracted to Albany under certain conditions. That was the real point. The question was how to attract wool to Albany.

The concern of the farmers, of course, was to get their wool sold and naturally if transport costs affected the situation the farmers would gravitate to the available transport facilities and market. The problem was to try to break down the trend which was setting in and develop a situation where the farmers would be attracted to send their wool in ever-increasing quantities to Albany.

As a result of the survey—now known as the Knox report—which was presented to the previous Government, it was demonstrated that by a change of policy in respect of transport into Albany, within the limits laid down in the report, the farmers would be saved a lot of money. The report, dated the 20th January, 1971, set out the saving of approximately \$130,000 per annum at the present level of operation. Of course, it was envisaged that with the increase in volume the saving would be greater. I think a figure of \$200,000 has been mentioned by the member for Albany.

A strong argument can be put forward from the railways point of view, that if something is done in one particular system there is a danger of prejudicing other people in some remote areas. However, an argument cannot be made out purely from a railways point of view. The over-all economy of the total rail system, and knowing how it would affect the total system, would be the argument used if looking at the railway operations point of view.

Throughout the whole of my experience with the railways, and particularly while I was the Minister, the pressure was always on to keep reviewing railway operations. As is known, changes have taken place. The member for Narrogin mentioned a case which was only one of many. Bases have been reached to try to deal with peculiar situations, such as the use of a direct road route instead of a circuitous railway route. This problem is with the Minister for Railways all the time.

This case was looked at as a special problem associated with Albany, and it was divorced from the total considerations of the railways. The other thing worrying the Minister and the Administration of the day was the fact that every time one touched a railway system or a road transport system one invariably ran into a crossfire from people who were afraid that a certain railway would be shut down.

The older members of this House have been through the rail closure moves which a former Labor Government initiated, and which ran into all sorts of trouble. The Liberal Party members supported the propositions which were brought forward and we also ran into all sorts of trouble. We were all glad to see the end of it.

Now, no Government will move in connection with railways where there is the possibility of closure without the support of the local populace. That is what the then Minister did. He told the Director-General of Transport that if he could get the support of the people in the area we would go along with that support. That is what the Director-General set out to do.

Mr. Bertram: But you have not got the result.

Mr. COURT: Obviously, the Minister has not been through the area in recent times. I have not struck a farmer who has not asked when the Government was going to implement the Knox report.

Mr. Bertram: The Minister will implement it when he gets the response.

Mr. COURT: So we have the situation where the proposition was put up for two reasons. The first reason was to try to preserve Albany as a wool centre—and this is the important reason—and secondly, to preserve Albany as a wool port. If Albany

ceased to be a wool port it would not be a wool centre. At the same time, it was desired to give some relief to the farmers.

That is the whole purport of the report, and the motion put forward. That is the reason why I believe we have to look at this quite separate from the point raised by the Minister for Mines—I refer to the question of the impact on the total railway system. I am very conscious of the overall economics of our railway system, but I am also conscious of the fact that many changes take place. I know that it is ridiculous to resist them. In many cases when I was Minister for Railways the commissioner pointed out to me that this or that was something we could not resist because so many changes were taking place. The member for Albany has his own ideas. In my experience if one does something in any particular area, it affects people in another area.

We have been through this before, and Governments of the day have always been very conservative in their approach to close any railway system. So I go along with this as an entirely different question, but something which would make an inroad into the railway system.

We have two bases. One is the question of giving the farmer reduced costs on an ever-increasing basis, as his tonnage goes up. The second basis is a definite move to try to direct traffic towards Albany and break the impasse which has developed.

It is quite wrong to say this is a new-found interest. It is quite wrong to suggest this is a new idea because it got to the stage under the previous government where a decision would be reached as soon as the views of the potential users in the area were obtained.

Mr. Graham: Like the Pilbara plan; all talk.

Mr. COURT: We will hear more about that soon.

Mr. Graham: I have been waiting impatiently.

Mr. COURT: If the Minister read the files properly he would know more about the situation.

Mr. Graham: The member for words!

Mr. COURT: I will conclude on this note. If this scheme is adopted—for the two reasons I have put forward—the people in Albany, the Port of Albany, and the shipping co-ordination group which was entrusted with the mission of trying to find a way of keeping Albany as a wool centre would still have a job ahead of them. Those people will have to go out and try hard to get people to look towards Albany if it is to succeed as a centre and a port. There is a great selling job to be done to induce farmers to look towards Albany. This is a means of saving the area as a wool centre and as a wool port, and at the same time giving some cost saving to the farmers. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken 2.
with the following result:—

Ayes—22

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Court	Mr. Reid
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Ridge
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Williams
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Noes—22

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brown	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. May
Mr. Cook	Mr. McIver
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moller
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Graham	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr. Hutchinson
Sir David Brand
Mr. Nalder

Noes

Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Bickerton

The SPEAKER (Mr. Toms): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

House adjourned at 10.19 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 28th July, 1971

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

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. RIDING SCHOOLS

Control

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What controls, if any, are horse riding schools subjected to in this State?
- (2) Is he aware that the R.S.P.C.A. would like to see tighter control over riding schools in Western Australia?
- (3) Is it the intention of the Government to consider legislation relating to horse riding schools?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Regular visits are made by Police Officers, who ensure that there is no ill-treatment of animals.
- (2) No—no approaches have been made.
- (3) Not at present.

TRAFFIC

Control in Country Areas

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Minister for Police:

In view of the statement reported to have been made by him in *The West Australian* dated the 24th July, 1971, concerning the proposed takeover by the Police of the control of traffic in which he said "We are not going to make money out of this—it's going to be an expensive proposition"—

- (1) What does the Minister consider the additional annual cost to the State will be?
- (2) Could he enlarge generally on the statement "it's going to be an expensive proposition"?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

As the Hon. Mr. Griffith is well aware, the passage which he quoted was part of a statement which I made, criticising completely irresponsible allegations by the President of the Wickiepin Shire as to the Government's motives in seeking to take over the control of traffic in country areas.

I strongly reject any thought or inference that costs should be of prime consideration when lives are to be saved on the roads.

The answers to the questions are—

Estimated additional costs of traffic control on a State-wide basis:—

- (1) Establishment costs (exclusive of housing)—\$591,990.
Annual running costs—\$689,500.
- (2) Costs include staff, buildings, motor vehicles, radio and traffic control equipment, but do not include the cost of providing additional housing which cannot be estimated at this stage.

3. RURAL INDEBTEDNESS

Action by Government

The Hon. N. McNETT, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What is the estimated total debt commitment of the farming industries in Western Australia?
- (2) Is it considered that the rural indebtedness is beyond the capacity of the industry to service under present and foreseeable circumstances?