

The point to be made, however, is that this percentage increase occurred prior to the increase in rentals which applied from the 1st January, 1972, except in respect of new applications lodged between the 3rd and the 31st December, 1971. I think that would be at least a reasonable reply to the second speech made by the member for South Perth.

It is quite obvious from these figures that what has, in the main, affected the number of surrenders and withdrawals is not the increase in rentals but a cut-down in exploration activity in view of the economic climate which has caused speculative interests to depart from a hitherto lucrative field.

Only an estimate can be made of the situation for 1972, and this is that of the total number of applications for 1969, 1970, and 1971—81,248—the surrenders and withdrawals could approach 40,000, although this figure is considered to be an excessive estimate, even allowing for the fact that 21,408 surrenders and withdrawals took place from the 1st January to the 30th June, 1972.

However, even if we take a figure of 40,000 for surrenders and withdrawals, relate it to the number of applications—81,248—that I have mentioned, and express this relationship as a percentage, it will be found to be 49.23 per cent.—again very close to a 100 per cent. increase during the period that increased rentals have applied.

Members may query my statement that the estimate of 40,000 surrenders and withdrawals is high when there have already been 21,408 such items for the first six months of the year, but they should bear in mind that these relinquishments are considered to be substantially in respect of ground applied for in the flush of the boom period of 1967-1970. It is therefore quite likely that the estimate of 40,000 is far too high.

The Minister also referred to the comparison of rentals charged in Western Australia with those applying in other States, but made the point that it is difficult to make an accurate comparison because of the different types of tenants. However, from what he had to say it is clear that our rentals are substantially in accord with those charged elsewhere in Australia.

In view of what I have had to say on the investigations and inquiries made by the Minister for Mines following the assurance he gave in this House on the 26th April, 1972, the motion by the member for South Perth should not be supported.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 3rd August, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.38 p.m.]: As the replies to the questions are not to hand as yet, I seek permission to supply them later in the day.

The PRESIDENT: Permission granted.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG DEPENDANTS SELECT COMMITTEE

Disclosure of Information

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.39 p.m.]: I seek leave to move a motion without notice relating to the Select Committee.

Leave granted.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.40 p.m.]: I move—

That leave of the Council be granted under Standing Order 354 for the President to authorise the disclosure, to appropriate authorities, of documents or evidence received by the Select Committee inquiring into the Treatment of Alcohol and Drug Dependants.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I agree with this request.

Question put and passed.

PRISONS

Garry Meadows Show—Drug Allegations: Ministerial Statement

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [2.41 p.m.]: I seek your permission, Mr. President, to make a ministerial statement.

The PRESIDENT: Permission is granted.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: On the 9th May, The Hon. R. J. L. Williams asked a question without notice, concerning an allegation made on the Garry Meadows' Show on 6PR on the 8th May, that massive doses of tranquillising drugs were being administered to prisoners in Fremantle Prison. In reply, I undertook to obtain the relative information requested by Mr. Williams and relate it to the House.

The radio station 6PR was kind enough to allow me to hear the tapes concerned and a transcript of the allegations have been made—copies are available should members desire to examine them.

The medical superintendent, Dr. A. Tregonning, commented on the matter as follows:—

Since I have been here, no barbiturates have been issued except to epileptics and one other trusted prisoner who receives a small dose three times a day occasionally. For instance, I have never used Pentone capsules in prison. All sleeping tablets have been cut down to a relatively safe drug, e.g. Methaqualone. Tranquillisers have been used sparingly by me, most of them needing them have been referred to the psychiatrists.

The Psychiatrist Superintendent, Dr. G. L. Rollo stated—

Occasionally someone obtains tablets of a sedative nature by illicit means. If the quantity is sufficient to affect his behaviour this attracts staff attention and leads to investigation.

Occasionally someone saves up sedative medication properly prescribed and uses the larger quantity improperly.

All staff are alert to possible misuse of drugs and the measures taken, including cautious prescribing, are reducing the problem.

A search of the records shows that in the last six months three prisoners were taken to the Fremantle Hospital and diagnosed as suffering from drug overdose. These prisoners are all under psychiatric care and were treated as psychiatric emergencies.

In view of the inquiries made, I have the utmost confidence in the staff of the prison and am satisfied that the position has in no way reached the proportions alleged.

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 2nd August.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.44 p.m.]: In view of the importance of this measure and the rumours which have been circulating throughout part of the community, at least, concerning the possible result, one could have been excused for thinking the Press galleries would be filled to overflowing this afternoon with people representing all the media in Western Australia. One might also have envisaged a huge body of interested taxpayers coming along to learn what the Government's fate might be. Instead of that there is a group of young people who will become taxpayers by the time they reach 18 and will assume the responsibilities of most average citizens of that age. The galleries are not filled with representatives of the Press to any greater extent than they normally are. I can only conclude that perhaps the Press does not think anything untoward will happen this afternoon.

Together with a considerable number of other members in the House I will avail myself of the opportunity to address you, Mr. President, upon a varied number of subjects affecting the finances of the State as well as matters affecting the electorate. This debate will ensue this afternoon and probably will continue into next week.

The first matter which I wish to mention today is the question of the time usually taken for Supply Bills to be dealt with. The Leader of the House indicated yesterday afternoon that when he and I were in opposite positions, it was always my insistence that the Supply Bill went through on the one day, usually on a Thursday. It will be recalled that at the time I doubted whether this was the case. Of course, I did not want to doubt the word of the Leader of the House, but I took a little time to find out what has happened. I researched this matter because I consider Supply Bills should not be rushed through this House, unless there is an urgent necessity for the Government to be given supply in the process of one afternoon. I can see no harm in members availing themselves of the opportunity to talk about matters which are important to them.

To look into this matter I asked for information for a three-year period when I was Leader of the House and The Hon. Frank Wise was Leader of the Opposition and for a two-year period when the present Leader of the House was Leader of the Opposition. In 1963 the first Supply Bill was introduced on Wednesday, the 7th August and completed through all its stages on that one day. A second Supply Bill in that year was introduced on the 17th October and passed on the 24th October. In 1964, the first Supply Bill was introduced on the 5th August and completed on the same day. The No. 2 Bill was introduced and completed on the same day. In 1965, the first Bill was introduced on the 4th August and completed on the same day. The No. 2 Bill was introduced on the 12th October and passed on the 20th October.

In 1966 when Mr. Willesee became Leader of the Opposition the first Bill was introduced on the 3rd August and completed on the 4th. Incidentally, the 3rd was a Wednesday. The second Bill was introduced on Thursday, the 13th October, and completed a week later on the 20th October. In 1967 the pattern was very similar. The first Bill was introduced on the 2nd August and completed on the 3rd. On the second occasion, the Bill was introduced on Wednesday, the 18th October and completed on the 31st October.

It is a matter of interest that the first Supply Bill handled by the present Leader of the House was received here on the 21st July, 1971 but the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders was not moved by the Leader of the House until the next day, Thursday, the 22nd July. The Bill was completed on the 27th July.

So members will see there has been no general pattern for the completion of the Supply Bill. I have not checked through all the years, but it seems to me that as long as the Government is not in the position to want supply immediately, when members express the desire to speak, time should be made available.

Mr. President, as you are well aware, the Supply Bill is a Bill upon which a member can address himself to any subject of his choice. Unless the Government indicates that it needs supply on the one day, there should be no necessity to hurry the Bill through.

I interjected yesterday afternoon on the question of the time necessary for the debate on the Supply Bill, because on reflection I recalled having received telephone calls when I was the Leader of the House asking whether there was any hurry for supply. On occasions I replied that there was no hurry and the Bill was treated accordingly. Therefore, I feel that members should be given the opportunity to speak on the Supply Bill.

At this point of time I would like to make it clear that Mr. Willesee has agreed that the debate on the Supply Bill can be carried over to next week. Rumours have been circulating about the treatment of this particular Bill in this House and if somebody moves to adjourn the Bill this afternoon it should not be felt that the Bill is in jeopardy.

I would like to briefly make a few comments about daylight saving. A committee was appointed this year as a result of action taken by this House earlier. The motion moved by my colleague, Mr. I. G. Medcalf, called on the Government to appoint a committee to inquire into and to make some recommendations to the Government on the question of daylight saving in the light of experience, circumstances, etc.

I have a copy of the report and I consider it is most unsatisfactory to say the least. It does not make any recommendations. All it relates about the situation is the thinking of people and organisations and of the other States of Australia. It tells of the experience of some of the Eastern States when daylight saving was first introduced. It is not really a very satisfactory report because it makes no recommendations.

I asked the Chief Secretary to tell me whether he was correctly reported in the Press in relation to his comments about the committee favouring daylight saving. The Chief Secretary told me that he was not correctly reported and that the words attributed to the committee should have been attributed to Cabinet. In other words Cabinet was in favour of daylight saving. Of course the Cabinet of this State has always been in favour of daylight saving and the members who support the Government in this State have been compulsorily in favour of it—they have had no option.

The Government has made a decision. This is party legislation and that is the end of it. I do not mind that, but I do mind the answer I was given in relation to the submission made by the motion picture industry. The Chief Secretary told us that the submission put forward to the committee by the motion picture exhibitors was prepared last year and did not include any additional information in relation to a trial period of daylight saving in Western Australia. Were not all the submissions made to the Government prepared last year? Would the Chief Secretary expect the submissions made by the motion picture industry to be any different from what they were last year? Of course not, because the circumstances are the same this year as they were last year. The position is identical.

A particular bank said that if daylight saving were not introduced in Western Australia it would lose a lot of money. This same bank was asked how much money it had lost because daylight saving was not introduced and it had to answer, "We do not know." I would not expect the motion picture industry submission to be any different from what it was last year and, of course, I would not expect the types of answers we obtained in relation to the other States.

The Chief Secretary, or whoever prepared the answer for him, went to no end of trouble to tell us what had happened in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Queensland. The Chief Secretary ought to know that the sun sets at different times in other States. The situation in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Queensland has nothing to do with the situation which exists here. I asked the Chief Secretary whether the Government was interested in the prospect of the closure of 40-odd drive-in theatres and the unemployment of 400 or 500 people as a result of daylight saving but he casually brushed that off by saying, "Nobody has been unemployed in the other States. There is nothing to fear in Western Australia." This just goes to show how far removed from reality the Chief Secretary is in a matter of this nature. It is a sad state of affairs when we are expected to accept such answers.

The report, incidentally, is not even dated. It is a report without a date. We do not know when it was received by Cabinet. We do know the date of the conference in New South Wales which was attended by the Chief Secretary. We do know that the material contained in the report of the committee did not make any difference. The Government had made up its mind. The Government made up its mind, according to the Press, despite the fact that of the great number of submissions made to the committee about three to one were against daylight saving. So it appears to me that we are having the issue of daylight saving forced upon

us again whether we like it or not. I shall let the matter rest at that point, but I felt I had to register some protest in relation to the type of answer I received to my question.

With due respect to the members of the committee—the majority of them are members of the Public Service—I feel that this report, to say the least, is slanted in favour of daylight saving. I will examine the report in greater detail when the legislation is before us.

I made reference to the Press gallery earlier this afternoon because apparently a rumour has been circulating about the ultimate fate of the Supply Bill. It has been suggested that it will be thrown out in this Chamber. Mr. President, do you know what I think? I feel this is part of a long-term campaign to discredit the Legislative Council.

Of course, this campaign really began a long time ago in the days of The Hon. Ruby Hutchinson, but now it appears to have engendered some support from a certain section of the community since the change of Government in 1971.

I understand a public meeting was called and although I did not attend it I am informed that nothing of very great consequence arose out of that public meeting. Anyway, it was not very well supported. Up to this date we have not had this campaign; this very successful promotion.

I know there was a television debate in which The Hon. L. D. Elliott took part on the one side and the Hon. Graham MacKinnon took part on the other. I would like to say here and now that Miss Elliott did a very good job that evening.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: I really won, didn't I?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We must be scrupulously fair about this.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Miss Elliott's remark is so like that which would be made by a woman!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You must be honest or chivalrous; which do you propose to be?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I propose to be both. I am certainly going to be honest. I repeat that I think Miss Elliott did very well. She had a poor lot of material to work with and she did not have a very good case to put forward—and when I say that I am not in the least detracting from my friend Graham MacKinnon. I will not say that he was better than Miss Elliott but the result was in the ballot box that was used by those who attended.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: That does not reflect the community's views.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It was the independent viewers who had to express their view and it was a case of thumbs down for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: These types of juries always vote for the *status quo*.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not talking about the quality of the programme at all, but I do think this was part of the campaign. In connection with the present situation I believe that the same people who ran the public meeting wrote a letter to the President of the Liberal Party which states—

The campaign for a democratic parliament wishes to register its dismay at the Opposition's intention to use the Legislative Council to block the State Budget. Such an action would be a flagrant abuse of parliamentary procedure. In addition, the Legislative Council has no right to reject legislation because it does not properly represent the people of Western Australia. This organisation hopes that this is, in fact a rumour, and that your party will be able to say so with conviction.

This was signed by Graham Hawkes who is the president. As this letter says there is no doubt that this is a rumour.

I think the rumour regarding the fate of the present Bill has been perpetrated by people who are interested in engendering such a rumour. The television media have had it on the air and this despite the fact that last evening when the Minister was moving for the suspension of standing orders I made a few comments as follows:—

Despite the rumours which have been communicated to me about the ultimate fate of the Bill these rumours have considerably worried me over the past few days.

I think you would have taken that, Mr. President, as meaning that I was not going to launch a full-scale attack on the Government with a view to defeating the Supply Bill before us.

I think the Leader of the House would look a great deal more worried had that been the case. I would like to inform the House that one of the news stations ran this question on the news this morning and suggested that the Government was going to be defeated in the Legislative Council this afternoon.

It is strange that none of the newspapers—at least none of those that I have read anyway—have carried this at all. They did approach the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Court) and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Des O'Neil) but it is a strange thing that they did not come to me—the one person in Western Australia who may have known of any possible

prospect of the Liberal Party taking the action suggested. In any case such action could not have been successful without the support of the Country Party.

There are occasions on which I get quite savage about the shortcomings of the Government, but I stress that nothing was done to approach me—the one person in Western Australia who may have known what was about to take place. Nothing was said about it at all.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They did not want to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right—they did not want to; because had I said I did not want to say anything about this it would have cruelled the whole damn story for the people concerned, because I might have told them there was no substance in the rumour.

The only question directed to me from a member of the Press was that which was asked about 36 hours ago. He said to me "Are you or are you not?" Because of the rumours that were going around I gave a non-committal reply.

When the president of the organisation campaigning for a democratic parliament says in a letter to the president of my party that the Legislative Council has no right to reject legislation because it does not properly represent the people of Western Australia, I would like to inform him—as I have said in this Chamber before—that if my conscience dictates to me that legislation which comes before this House in my opinion is not good for the community at large, I will vote against that legislation.

I consider myself to be properly represented in a democratic way to this House—I feel I am democratically elected. If Mr. Claughton comes back here next year he will be democratically elected.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You mean when I come back.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I said if the honourable member comes back; it was the honourable member who corrected me and said "when". I do not wish him any harm in that respect but I can assure Mr. Claughton that the Liberal Party will be hot on his heels.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You are always chasing the red herring! Claughton will finish in front.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Leader of the House should not draw me out too much on this. After the 1968 elections—and I think I have mentioned this to Mr. Claughton before—somebody to whom he wrote thanking him for his assistance in the election was not a friend of his at all; he was, in fact, a friend of mine. I was given the letter which said in part—

I see no reason why we should not take the remaining North Metropolitan seat in 1971.

Well, I am still here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Only just.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Oh no! I am here by as good a majority as was received by the honourable member.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I have never seen you try to build up your ego as much as you have done today.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would inform the Leader of the House that I am in a perfectly good frame of mind.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I know, I could kiss you! Will you go on with the Supply Bill?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would rather do that than have the Leader of the Opposition carry out the threat he has made. These are the little asides that make politics interesting and I am glad we have them from time to time.

I do not know whether anybody else in this Chamber heard this rumour that was circulating or whether they saw the contents of a letter such as I have read out, which said it was the intention of the Opposition to destroy the Government this afternoon. I heard that Cabinet knew about this. Is that right?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is wrong.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There must have been another reason for the beads of perspiration running down the brow of the honourable member.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Why? I only suffer from gout!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This goes to show how a rumour can start. What one does when he starts a rumour like this is to disrupt the work of this Chamber. It is a bad thing for the community when this sort of rumour is started. We as members would be far better employed in getting on with the job before us.

I will now deal with the Bill itself. The Supply Bill of 1972 seeks to provide the Government with a sum of \$235,000,000, and that is a great deal of money. In 1969 the amount appropriated by Parliament was only \$155,000,000; in 1970, it was \$180,000,000; in 1971, which was the first year of office of this Government, the amount was \$210,000,000, or \$30,000,000 more than that appropriated in the last year of office of the previous Government; and in 1972, the amount is \$235,000,000 which is \$25,000,000 greater than the amount last year, and \$55,000,000 greater than the amount in 1970.

When I on behalf of the Government introduced a Supply Bill for the appropriation of a sum of \$155,000,00, I saw Mr. Wise stand up in the very place where I am standing, and heard him say how generously the Government of the day was being treated. He was right, when we take into consideration the amount appropriated in the first Supply Bill which that honourable gentleman introduced into Parliament as the Treasurer of the State. On

one occasion I looked up the amount that was appropriated in that Bill, and I found it to be very small.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think the amount was about \$6,000,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is an undeniable fact that this Government is very fortunate indeed in being provided with so much money to expend. Of course, this amount is over and above the Commonwealth assistance that the Government has received; and the Commonwealth Government has been very generous to the Government of Western Australia in the last couple of years.

We have now gone through the first 18 months in the term of office of the present Government. We heard members of this Government making a great many election promises. They were told by the last Premier and Treasurer of the State (Sir David Brand) that they would not be able to keep their promises without increasing the taxes considerably. Now they find that what was said by Sir David Brand on that occasion was right. This Government has not been able to keep its election promises without increasing taxation considerably. What it has done is to blame the previous Government for leaving behind a deficient Treasury, but this matter is disputed. The present Government has blamed the Commonwealth Government for not making available the amount of money it seeks.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: As you in your turn did.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not in relation to election promises.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You termed it as the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. You were sitting in this very place that I am sitting in, and you declared the Commonwealth Government was not helping you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I told members on that occasion that the Commonwealth Government was not giving Western Australia as much as Western Australia was entitled to, and that is totally different from what I am now saying. When the Commonwealth Government will not give the assistance which the present Government in Western Australia seeks, it finds fault with the Commonwealth. Despite all that, the Commonwealth has been of considerable assistance to Western Australia. As the third string of the bow, if neither of the others strike the target, the members of the present Government blame the Legislative Council. The Leader of the House knows this is correct.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You know that is not correct. You have never seen me taking a lead in blaming the Legislative Council. I have not done that since I have been a member of this House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not talking about the honourable member, but his Government. The Premier has said

that in relation to the road maintenance tax he could not fulfil his promise because of the action of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is so.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He blamed the Legislative Council.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: He has.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He has to blame somebody. If he did not blame somebody else he himself might be held to blame. There is no doubt that the present Government has received very generous treatment from the Commonwealth. More money has been made available to it than to any other Government in the history of Western Australia.

As against that, let us see what has transpired in the last 18 months. Electricity charges have been increased by 21 per cent.; the price of pine timber for furniture has increased by 6 per cent.; payroll tax has increased by 40 per cent.; stamp duty on cheques has increased by 20 per cent.; stamp duty on marketable securities has increased by 70 per cent.; third party insurance surcharge has increased by 150 per cent.; conservancy dues on W.A. ports have increased by about 30 per cent.; mining tenements in the case of mineral claims have increased by 100 per cent., of mineral leases by 300 per cent., and of temporary reserves by 30 per cent. plus; the State Shipping Service freight charges have gone up by \$5 per ton; traffic fees have increased by 100 per cent. as a result of increases in administration charges and costs; stamp duty on conveyancing certain security documents has increased by 500 per cent.; Companies Office fees have increased by 20 to 150 per cent.; bills of sales registration fees have increased by 150 per cent.; registration of business names fees have increased by 100 per cent.; the Public Trustee allowance has increased by 60 per cent.; shops and factories registration fees have gone up by 50 per cent.; and firearms licenses fees have gone up 100 per cent.

I have a detailed list of the increased taxes and charges, but I shall not bother members with it because it is far too voluminous for me to read in full. There is page after page containing increases in administration charges and taxes which have been imposed on the people of Western Australia. In total the amount is something in the order of an additional \$38,300,000; and all this in a period of 18 months.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You did not mention the increase in abattoir charges.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have not.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: And you have not mentioned the astronomical increase in water rates.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have not, but I have mentioned the steep increase in electricity charges. We can compare our electricity bills today with those of six months ago.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are making it sound as though this is the only Government that has ever increased charges.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Am I making it sound that bad?

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Then I am doing a better job than I thought I was.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I have made many speeches like the one you are now making.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, the honourable member cannot have done so.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: My word he did.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member does not make speeches like the one I am making.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, probably a little better.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will leave that to other people to judge. Modesty is a great attribute, but I am sure the honourable member would not be aware of it to any great extent.

It is not my intention to make this Government sound like the worst Government at all. I am simply bringing home the facts; this Government is in office because it went to the people with election promises which were attractive to a percentage of the people who must have voted away from the previous Government.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The present Premier said he anticipated to be able to fulfil his election promises without any increases in taxes and charges.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is correct; does Mr. Ron Thompson remember that?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The people of Western Australia will remember it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We did not have the knowledge that the Treasury was \$7,000,000 behind when we took over.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I agree, you did not have sufficient knowledge!

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, that information was not made available.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Pardon me, but I read to the honourable member—when I spoke to this very Bill a year ago—a comment of the previous Treasurer (Sir David Brand) when he told Mr. Tonkin what the state of the Treasury would be. Sir David Brand told Mr. Tonkin that his election promises could not be fulfilled without an increase in taxes and charges. Would the honourable member deny that?

The Hon. R. Thompson: I did not hear the comment; I think I was in hospital at that stage last year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member only hears what he wants to hear. If he were in hospital he would have had an opportunity to read *The West Australian*. Obviously, he must have been in too much pain to do that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I was.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am in pain when I read of increased charges.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Real pain, or "champagne."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is one thing about it; I do not think the Leader of the House has ever bought me any champagne.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I will!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I merely point these things out because the last time we dealt with the Supply Bill I said I did not think the people of Western Australia had very much to look forward to as far as this Government was concerned other than increased taxes. Two things in life seem to be certain: one is death, and the other is the imposition of more taxes by the present Government.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: By any Government.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Particularly by this Government. I do not blame the Minister for the answer he gave to me yesterday. I asked him what further increases in taxes and charges the Government had in mind for the current financial year. The Leader of the House replied that the Budget for this year was now being framed and if any increases in taxes and charges are to be imposed they will be announced in due course.

I expected that answer, and it is similar to what I would have given myself. However, it registers with me that with the introduction of the Budget there will be more increases.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I hope not.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would be delighted if the Leader of the House could say that with more enthusiasm.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We are hoping for a change of Federal Government so that we can cut down on increases and unemployment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Does the honourable member know the greatest difficulty existing in Western Australia at the moment?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Can the Leader of the Opposition tell us?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He obviously does not know. Many people who thought that a change of Government early in 1971 was a good idea are now having second thoughts. There is no doubt that a feeling of gloom exists in Western Australia, and the Government talks gloomily.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Leader of the Opposition is mixing in the wrong circle. There is no gloom in Western Australia at the moment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member says that as though he believes it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I do.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Leader of the Opposition please address the Chair.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In that case Mr. Ron Thompson would believe anything. He obviously does not mix in the circle which I represent. My friend Roy Claughton and I represent a conglomerate electorate.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I am pleased to hear that you are so close to each other.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We represent people who are in business and who employ people, and we also represent employees. A man stopped me in a fruit shop the other day and told me that he knew me. He said he just wanted to say "Good day" but he added that one of the mistakes which the people of this State have made was to change the Government at the last election. He said he hoped there would be another election soon so that the Government could be changed. That was his opinion. Unfortunately the gloom of the State is measured in our unemployment figures which are the highest in Australia. Why is this?

The Hon. R. Thompson: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition when I speak.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I suppose the honourable member will blame the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, we are in the same situation as that which existed in 1960-61 when certain contracts ended and we had specialised building tradesmen available with no work to do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We are in the same situation now. In 1972, as we were in prior to 1959. We are starting to slip back.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: In 1979?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, 1959.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: The Leader of the Opposition said 1979.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I think I said 1959. I am conscious of my period spent in the Brand Government from 1959 to 1971, and members opposite will be conscious of their three-year period between 1971 and 1974.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: There has to be a period of three years before another election, does there not?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not necessarily. If rumour-mongers had their way—and I am not pointing to the Press—the Government would be out on its—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: What?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well, at some date earlier than expected. However, that is not my purpose in talking this afternoon. My purpose is simply to bring forward the facts. We have the highest unemployment figure in the Commonwealth, unfortunately. We are akin to Tasmania because we depend largely upon our primary industries, both rural and mining. However, the situation which now prevails in Western Australia does not exist in Tasmania despite the fact that we are in the same sort of position as we were prior to 1959. We are beginning to slip back and I regret that that is the case.

The situation which existed under the Brand Government is being reversed. We are going downhill and I am sorry to see that take place. The Government has been making promise after promise and it is now legislating to try to fulfil those promises. It is legislating against private enterprise, a part of the community which is necessary, I believe, for our welfare in general. The legislation which is being brought in has a socialistic trend.

The Government should give a lead to the people and I would like to see it introduce some spirit of enthusiasm into Western Australia in an attempt to reduce our unemployment. We could then get back to the feeling of confidence. Industry would again want to invest its millions in Western Australia. We would then be in the position of not having the highest unemployment rate in Australia, and we would know that the people were being given a lead.

The present Government could give a lead to the people, the same as any other Government, if it would go out of its way slightly. The Government announced, at one time, it would carry on the policies of the previous Government and I would like to see that done. Western Australia would then be better off than it is at the present time. We have to stop blaming other people, and stop blaming the Commonwealth Government when it does not give the State Government exactly what it asks for. The Government claims that it will do so—and so by asking the Commonwealth Government for the money.

When the Commonwealth Government says "No," it blames the Commonwealth Government for the fact that it is unable to do what it promised. The present Government blames the Legislative Council for preventing it from doing something. As far as I can see, up to date the only things we have prevented the Government from doing are introducing legislation to repeal

road maintenance tax—a Bill which no-one except a few chosen people in the community seemed to want—and perhaps introducing daylight saving.

I am anxious to see the Government giving some lead to the community but we seem to be mixed up in industrial strife and we seem to have a Government that must do as it is told. If it steps out of line it gets a message from Trades Hall, and Trades Hall brings it back into line again. One who has shown courage in this respect is a Minister in this House—Mr. Dolan. He has run into trouble with his own people, his own members, and Trades Hall, who have said, "No. You do it our way." The Government is being given directions by people who are outside the Government's sphere but closely connected with it. I think this is a bad state of affairs. The Premier makes a comment one day and retracts it on another. I do not think it makes for confidence in the community, and it certainly does not encourage people to do the sorts of things we like them to be encouraged to do.

My concluding remarks on the Bill are similar to those with which I started. This Bill gives the Government \$235,000,000 not taking into account the money the Commonwealth has given it and the increased taxes and charges I have enumerated. Next year's Bill must contain a larger sum of money.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: If you were here would it not be more?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We would not be doing the sort of thing the present Government has found it necessary to do.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: It would be more.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me finish.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I want you to agree with me for once. It would be more, would it not?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, it is likely it would be more.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is all I wanted you to say.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Does that make the Leader of the House's day?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Yes. I am happy now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Leader has his day made very easily. Of course it would be more, but I was about to say it would not be more simply because of election promises which cannot be fulfilled other than by taxing the people more or by getting the money from the Commonwealth Government, and blaming the Commonwealth Government if it will not give the money. That is the situation in which I leave the matter.

I do not know whether the Leader of the House had returned to the House when I spoke about adjourning the Supply Bill.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: No, I had not.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will not go through it all again, but in the absence of the Leader of the House I said there was no fixed pattern for the adjournment of Supply Bills and that they had been introduced on various days and finished on other days. Unless the Government urgently needs the passage of the Supply Bill on the day after it has been introduced into this House, members should be given time to address the House on matters of interest to them in connection with the Bill. I also suggested that if someone adjourned this debate at about dinnertime this afternoon that was not to be taken by the rumour mongers as being merely a delay before ultimately throwing out the Bill or bringing down the Government. To make it perfectly clear to the rumour mongers, I state that I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [3.34 p.m.]: The mind boggles at the figure of \$235,000,000, but in speaking to the Supply Bill this afternoon I want to touch on only one subject. In doing so, I would like members of this House to look around and realise that the subject I am about to mention has either had or will have its effect on at least three members in this House before their lifetime is ended. Not one of us is exempt from the thing that is called "psychoneurosis"; in other words, the lack of mental health.

It is very chastening when we look around the Chamber in any direction and realise that three of our members and one in 12 of the people in the community will at some time seek treatment for some form of psychoneurosis. It could be our wives, our children, our grandchildren, or the person next door who needs such treatment.

The division or the line between so-called sanity and insanity is such a very thin, fine thread that not even medical science can perfectly delineate it for us.

This State has an enviable record for its care of those suffering from mental disorders. The record goes back as far as 1911 to Dr. Birmingham who, at the instigation of the Government of the day, was sent abroad to investigate the latest forms of treatment for people who were mentally ill.

The stigma of mental illness started long before that, and the stigma is still with us today. We do not laugh at a person who has a broken leg. We take back into the community a person who has had a broken leg and we put him to work immediately. But it appears we are not as far-thinking as some people are about broken minds.

I do not know whether any member of this Chamber has had the unhappy experience of telling parents they have been delivered of or are rearing a sub-normal

child. In the old days such a child would have been classified as a lunatic. I do not know whether any member of the House has seen the grief on the faces of the parents when they have been told about this particular burden which they may have to carry for 40, 50, or even 60 years.

It is to the credit of many parents that they can bear this cross very well. It is to the discredit of many of them that they seem to want to sweep these offspring under the carpet, forget about them, and place them in institutions where they will be out of sight and could well be forgotten if the institution is not a humane one. It is a well known fact that today there are people in our institutions who have not seen a relative for 10, 15, or 20 years.

Nobody wants to take any notice of those who are mentally ill. Nobody wants attached to his family the stigma that somewhere in the family there is some form of mental imbalance, be it caused by disease or genetics. The report of the Director of Mental Health Services for 1971 states that 130 different types of mental disorder are being treated at our State institutions in this day and age. All those diseases have been classified. But when it comes to the acceptance of these people by the community we have a very difficult struggle.

At present it costs \$10.20 a day to keep a patient in Claremont; and it costs \$20.80 a day to keep a patient in Heathcote. Now, Mr. President, you may say that this is a tremendous cost; but, happily, these mentally ill people have been helped no end. I pay credit here to the previous Minister in the previous Government (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) who, on the advice of his officers of the day, instituted a step which greatly helped the rehabilitation of these mentally sick people. I thank Mr. MacKinnon for this with all the sincerity I can muster.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I have seen the results of the work done by his department in and around this community and I would say to the House that the State of Western Australia has much to be thankful for in this respect because I think we are streets ahead of other States.

I rise to my feet this afternoon merely to plead with the present Government to continue this work and not to let it fall to the ground—as it is in danger of falling—because of the lack of finance. I do not refer now to our accepted mental institutions; I refer to those places known as after-care homes. These homes are dotted around our metropolitan area and outside it. The people accommodated in them are those who should never have stayed behind institutional walls; who should never have been taught to put their hands behind their backs or in front of them and wander around a courtyard in one large circle—humanity we do not

want to know about. These are people who were cured of their mental illness but who were still behind the brick walls and bars which used to exist in our mental institutions.

At one time in the United Kingdom it was very popular for people to take their children on a Sunday afternoon to the Bethlehem Asylum and to poke a stick between the bars to rouse the inmates to see what fun could be gained from creating bedlam—a word which has become part and parcel of the English language. "Let us go and create bedlam at the Bethlehem Asylum." Today people who have been cured but who are not wanted by their relatives are sent to after-care homes. It is in relation to the approved after-care homes that I wish briefly to speak this afternoon; to ask the Government not to let them go for the sake of a few measly dollars which do not even compare with the vote of \$235,000,000.

A complete change has occurred in the outlook at Claremont Hospital. In June this year just over 2,000 patients from our community were on the books of the Claremont Hospital. Of those, 921 are still in Claremont receiving intensive treatment. Now for a figure which is a good one and which I am sure could be increased: At the moment 1,101 people are in outside after-care institutions. Despite all the cries from local communities that they were not going to have a mental defective colony placed in their midst, over the last three years the figure has gone from something like 50 to 1,101. This says a great deal for the work and patience of Dr. Ellis and his staff.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Before the tea suspension I was quoting to the House the cost of keeping patients at Claremont and Heathcote. These figures are shown at page 43 of the Annual Report of the Mental Health Services which is one of those that are issued annually, and some members, including myself, do not have sufficient time to delve fully into every item contained in the reports.

It will be noticed that on page 43 of this report the total expenditure of the Mental Health Services for the year ending the 30th June, 1971, was \$7,793,522; a not inconsiderable sum. I now wish to explain what happens to those people who have been patients at Claremont or Heathcote when they are cured and discharged. They need only a home which, as I said before the tea suspension, is denied to them by their relatives who either do not care, or are deceased. There are, of course, many other reasons why these people are denied a suitable home.

As a result they enter one of these after-care homes which are properly supervised by doctors from Claremont who perform a wonderful task. It has been said that the

first principle of nursing is loving care. This is something of which these patients have been deprived by their families. In fact, they are regarded by their families as being a burden, and they do not want to know them. There is no-one that I know in the community at large who has sufficient charity in his heart to look after these people. I make that remark because I wish to point to the horrific fallacy that obtains when it comes to caring for these people.

Virtually, they are taken to after-care homes in the clothes they stand up in. It then becomes the duty of the home to clothe and feed them. That is the basic duty of such a home; to keep a roof over the heads of these patients in comparative comfort. First of all, let us consider the cost of conducting such a home. It is necessary that it shall have beds and bed linen. It has to employ staff to look after these people. It has to arrange that a patient has more than one set of clothing and is given some creature comforts like an egg or a cigarette, perhaps, now and again. These creature comforts are normally provided by the relatives of a patient, but it must be borne in mind that with these people the relatives are conspicuous by their absence.

I ask the House to consider how much would be needed in this day and age to keep a person in one of these homes, or even to keep that person in one's own home. I would suggest to the House that the cost would be similar to what it is today. The Commonwealth Government comes to the party and provides a pension of \$20.25 a week. It was realised at the time that this was not sufficient, and that amount has only been increased in the last 3 months. Some three years ago the officers of the Mental Health Services made representations to the then Minister for Health—The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon—for some help. He requested help from other sources but was denied it. So the present Minister granted these patients \$1 a day, which amounts to another \$7 a week, making a total, with the Commonwealth pension, of \$27.25. That provides only the bare necessities of life. From that amount occupational therapy cannot be given to the inmates of the home. They do get medicinal therapy. The people responsible for keeping these inmates and caring for them receive only \$27.25 a week.

Earlier this year, when a deputation waited on the Minister to seek an increase in this \$1 a day that had been granted by him, they were told that the people conducting these after-care homes were working for a profit. I put it to the House that if I am going to do work in this House one may reasonably say that I am doing it for profit, although as members know, that profit is quite minimal. We cannot possibly say that those people who are responsible for 1,101 persons in

the community are caring for them for profit only. I am asking the Government to reconsider this matter and grant a further increase of \$1 a day before the whole system breaks down.

If this were done the Government would save millions a year; that is, by just handing out another \$1.101 a day, or approximately \$400,000 a year. This would avoid these patients returning to the place from whence they came and would not only give them a chance to continue to rehabilitate themselves but also the chance to become a member of the community once again. If a further \$7 a week were granted by the Minister this would make a total of \$34.25, which is not a great deal when compared with the cost of returning a patient to Claremont; that is, \$70 a week.

So, in fact, by putting those patients into after-care homes, the Government is actually saving approximately \$43 a week. Out of that amount saved I believe those people could be granted an increase in their weekly amount by the ministry. In this day and age, when we talk of social and community welfare, it is vital that this work should not be allowed to lapse. It must be borne in mind that the people who look after these patients work a 24-hour day, because the patients often require attention during the night. After 6.00 p.m. they cannot say, "We will put the patients into bed and put out the lights." That cannot be done. Continual care has to be given to the patients.

During the last three years just imagine what increases have been made to the cost of various commodities to the community at large. We hear claims for wages left, right, and centre and we hear of increases in charges in every direction. During the last 18 months we have had a 20 per cent. increase in electricity charges. All these costs have to be borne by the people who conduct these after-care homes and if we do not allow the people who conduct them to make a reasonable living as do other members of the community, it could be that these 1,101 persons now being cared for in homes will soon find themselves back in closed institutions where one will see the mortifying spectacle of their wandering around in a circle in places that are understaffed and not sufficiently supervised, and where they have no chance to rehabilitate themselves.

It was Adolf Hitler who said that mental defectives and the like should be wiped out. However, I consider that we would be murdering the souls of these people if we were to pass them back to a closed institution no matter how benevolent that institution may be. So I sincerely ask this afternoon that the attention of the appropriate Minister be brought to bear on this problem.

Before I conclude I wish to raise one other point. To cure anything is extremely costly. If we are aware of the methods of

prevention these should be looked at, and I would point out that in mental health a great deal can be done to reduce the incidence of inpatients. There is no doubt in my mind that the mental health education service performs a particularly valuable duty, especially in conjunction with the Health Education Council of Western Australia. One day, Mr. Deputy President, you and I could be performing our duties in this Chamber quite satisfactorily, and the next day we could be certified because something happened for which no-one can give any reason.

Any married members in this House would know the difficulties which are sometimes faced by wives, particularly at the menopausal period. It is as a result of this physical problem faced by women that mental hospitals claim their greatest number of inpatients. Because I am not permitted to do so, I will not go into the numbers of people who are in those hospitals as a result of irreversible brain damage due to the ingestion of some form of addictive, no matter what that addictive may be. There is very little hope once they get to that stage. It could happen to any one of us or anyone in our families.

We are living at such a speed in this day and age that the average member in the community is left floundering, and in being left floundering, he is bewildered, and because he is bewildered he becomes susceptible to any one of the 130 mental diseases. We should be spending a far greater amount of the State's money on educating people to meet the stresses and strains of this day and age.

It is no credit to us as a community that Claremont Hospital and Heathcote Hospital still exist. We will never reach the stage where we will have no use for such hospitals, but surely this Government or any other Government should be making a conscious effort to eradicate mental illness. It is a sad affair, and an affair no-one wants to discuss because it is not the right and proper subject to discuss. It is the finger of illness which points at every family and it affects one in every 12 people.

I sincerely ask this Government to devote to mental health education a far greater proportion of the \$235,000,000 we are voting to it under this Bill. We have the personnel, the willingness, and the co-operation, but, time and time again as we wander through the community we find that the finance is not available. As we progress in our treatment of these people we will require more money than we thought we would require, three, four, five, or six years ago.

It is easy to budget for a patient who will gain nothing but an existence within institutional walls, but take a patient out of that institution and the costs go on and on.

The people are human beings and they deserve humane treatment. If for no other reason than that, I would gladly support this Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [4.29 p.m.]: First of all I wish to refer to a matter which brought forth an interjection from Mr. Ron Thompson. Mr. Griffith was speaking when Mr. Ron Thompson protested and stated there was no gloom in this State.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Only in the Liberal Party!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I could easily be drawn by the interjection of Mr. Cloughton, but I will resist that temptation at the moment. I have a speech which I hope to be able to present this afternoon.

Let me return to the point I was making. Despite the evidence throughout the whole of the State, Mr. Ron Thompson, a member of the Government, states that there is no gloom. In other words he is saying there is no cause for concern; there is no need of relief in the unemployment situation; there is no need of relief in those areas of industry very seriously affected—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is a different question.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: These are, in fact, referred to in the Press as a recession.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If you keep going in that frame of mind you will be put in one of the houses which Mr. Williams spoke about.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: With great respect, Mr. President, I believe I was addressing the Chair. I was referring to Mr. Ron Thompson's comment that he felt there was no gloom in this State. If that is the situation, let me refer, by way of example, to an industry which I mentioned in the House in the last session of Parliament. That industry certainly was experiencing gloom and is still. If it is not gloom it is certainly unpleasantness in the extreme. That industry is feeling all the effects of recession, or depression—which-ever word one chooses to use.

As evidence of this I refer to the Minutes of the Proceedings for Friday, the 2nd June, 1972. I asked the Leader of the House a question relating to a Press statement apparently made by the Premier and reported in the *Sunday Times* of the 28th May, 1972, under the heading, "Relief in Sight." Obviously things must have been fairly bad to say that relief was in sight. The article reads—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin said yesterday relief was in sight for the State's heavy engineering industries.

Several projects to be announced within weeks would provide work.

As I have said, I asked a question as to whether that was a correct report. I did not receive a specific reply to that part of my question, but rather a general reply which reads in part—

- (1) to (3) The Premier had at the time—and still has—good reason to believe that substantial building requiring supplies of structural steel will take place in this State in the near future. The Government is playing its part to the utmost to restore confidence and to counteract the adverse effects to Australia's economy because the management of it by the Commonwealth Government was based on a false reading of the problem of inflation resulting in stagnation.

The answer went on to give, as evidence of that statement, of all things a report from the newspaper. The extract is from *The Australian* and reads—

... the loss in goods and services at the rate of more than \$300 million a year.

I think it is remarkable that the Premier of this State who presumably should feel great concern for the sense of confidence in the operation of industries—in this case the heavy engineering industries in particular—should use a newspaper as documentary evidence of his criticism of the Commonwealth Government, which criticism the Leader of the Opposition enlarged upon considerably. Surely a Premier has better sources of information of the economics of a country than a report from a newspaper. I suggest he used this simply for the purpose of providing a political answer to my question.

I did not ask the question as a political gesture. The report was brought to my notice by representatives of the engineering industries who wanted some indication that confidence would be restored and business would look up in the ensuing few weeks. I did not ask the question on behalf of big engineering industries but on behalf of the small ones—the small foundries and workshops around the suburbs of Perth. These are the people who are really concerned. Members can imagine—I do not need to imagine because I know—what the reaction of those people was to the answer that I was given in this House. In other words, it was no answer at all.

In subsequent weeks what have we seen to indicate that the remarks made by the Premier have been borne out? What projects have been announced since the 2nd June, 1972? There has been only one announcement of a \$42,000,000 project for C.B.H. at Kwinana. If we rely completely on the leader writers of the morning news-

paper as our sources of information on the financing of that project we could be pardoned for believing that the Government took a leading and adventurous role in that exercise. Other people in this House can speak far more expertly than I on that particular subject. I will not enlarge upon it.

There have been a couple of other projects and I refer to one in particular which received a little attention in the Press; namely, tenders for main roads construction in the north-west. Despite the state of our industries—and the heavy engineering industries in particular to which the Premier had referred—the tender was let to a New South Wales-based firm. We must bear in mind that a good many of the tenders were made by Western Australian firms—not just firms based in Western Australia—for steel and/or concrete construction. The tender which was subsequently adopted and accepted was for concrete. As I have said, this was submitted by a New South Wales-based firm. I know it has been stated by the Commissioner of Main Roads that most of the materials will come from Western Australia and, consequently, Western Australia will be benefited. Of course this is no satisfaction to firms in Western Australia which were hoping that contracts worth millions of dollars in bridge works would be retained in Western Australia.

I could also refer to the supply of pylons for the State Electricity Commission, a matter of some embarrassment to the Government. I do no more than to make this reference to it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Could those companies have carried out galvanising in Western Australia?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am afraid I did not hear the interjection, Mr. President.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Could the contractors have carried out the galvanising in Western Australia?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am not sure that is the point. I do not know whether that comment is valid or not, but the fact is that this was surely an opportunity to encourage industry in this State. Surely this is the important thing. Irrespective of whether or not Mr. Thompson's point is correct, we need greater industry in this State and need to diversify that industry. Surely the opportunity of a State Government contract would have provided the incentive for Western Australian-based industries to move into this field. This is the kind of decision by the Government which fails to instil confidence in the industry in Western Australia.

I refer to a matter which was the subject of a question without notice which I asked of the Minister on Tuesday of this week. My question related to a statement

reported in *The West Australian* as made by Mr. J. Marks. Members will recall that I asked under what circumstances Mr. Marks was authorised to make the statement. I did not think that he would have been authorised by the Government to make this kind of statement. I believe this is terribly important to the confidence and conduct of industries in this State. It was reported in the Press that, at a public gathering, Mr. Marks referred to information which was given by the Premier at a deputation the previous week. Mr. Marks was in the position to blab that information to all and sundry and to have it reported. The information concerned two mighty projects in this State. I know from my own contacts and experience that very many people in Western Australia are relying upon the two concerns, Amax and Alcoa, for an increase in, or rather a resumption of, big-scale construction works in Western Australia. As I mentioned in my question the companies are the subjects of agreements with the State Government. Yet, Mr. Marks made this kind of public comment.

I can only conclude that this was not only of considerable embarrassment to the Premier but also to the two firms involved, Amax and Alcoa. Perhaps it was also an embarrassment to other firms or members of a consortium as was suggested in that Press report.

When the Premier was asked if he had any comment to make on this statement he declined to make comment. The reason I was given in this House was that the Premier has his own personal reasons for declining to make comment. I just do not think this is good enough. When the Premier makes information like this available to a deputation he runs the risk of that information being canvassed and peddled all around the countryside. It was the subject of a public statement. This affects the employment—or the re-employment—situation tremendously and it could affect tremendous investment in these industries in Western Australia. Is this the way to conduct business? I do not believe it is.

Once again this is a factor which, in my view, leads to a feeling of instability and a lack of confidence in the management of the Government of this State. Amax and Alcoa must obviously have had some discussions with the Premier. Will they be prepared in future to discuss matters of a highly confidential nature with the leader of this Government? I could well understand it if they did not wish to do so in the future. What is to be the role of Government under those circumstances? It makes the position extremely difficult.

Let me come to a point which concerns me even more. As members know the Pinjarra refinery is within my electorate. I

know the circumstances in which many people involved in construction work find themselves as a result of the cessation of construction at Pinjarra. I know of all the movement from the district. This is not just a movement of a worker but of his whole family. This has an effect all the way down the line in terms of community activities as well as commercial life in the district. These are the things which are threatened.

I have close and personal experience of the difficulties. People are influenced by this type of statement and by the Press release which was reported in this unfortunate fashion.

I return to the point made by Mr. Ron Thompson that there is no gloom. There is certainly gloom already and it exists because of the conduct of business in this fashion. There is a lack of confidence as a result of dubious statements. I have referred to the statement made by the Premier on the 2nd June, which has not yet borne any fruit although it is the 3rd August. I have also referred to the statement which undoubtedly will affect the progress in negotiations between two mighty concerns such as Amax and Alcoa.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the answer to the last part of the question you asked?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The last part of the question I asked was—

- (3) In view of the seriously depressed state of the heavy engineering industries in this State, and the current belief within the industry that there are no major projects in prospect, what further action will the Premier take to restore confidence, and to correct that apparently incorrect belief?

There was no answer to that other than the answer I read a moment ago in which the Premier had—and, apparently, still has—good reason for believing that substantial building requiring supplies of structural steel will take place in the State in the near future. Of course, he then goes on to blame the lack of confidence upon the Commonwealth Government and its—in his words—false reading of the problem of inflation. He then supports this with a newspaper report from *The Australian*.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If a couple of the members of this House had answered the question for him he would have said there is no gloom.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. I now refer to another matter which I raised in the last sitting of Parliament, and that is the use of defoliants and herbicides. This is the question I asked on that occasion—

- (1) Has the Government received a submission from the Shire of Waroona concerning the use of

defoliants and herbicides, and their possible effect on marine life?

(2) If so—

- (a) to what authorities or departments has the submission been referred;
- (b) what acknowledgments have been made by those authorities; and
- (c) what further action, if any, is contemplated or intended by the Government?

The Leader of the House replied to (1) and (2) as follows:—

- (1) and (2) No, as far as the Department of Fisheries and Fauna is aware. However, the department did receive a letter from a private individual who is also a Waroona councillor, on the subject of defoliants and their possible effect on aquatic life.

I was a little concerned about this because I had been given to understand that an approach had been made to the Government and a submission forwarded. I would have understood the Government or the Minister taking exception to the fact that I had asked this type of question, but I followed it up with a further question on the 2nd June, 1972, as follows:—

- (2) Is it correct that the Minister for Environmental Protection at that time also administered the portfolio of Fisheries and Fauna?

I asked this question quite sincerely because at this time there were changes in the portfolios and I wished to be quite certain that the same Minister was responsible for both. I then asked—

- (3) Does the Government consider that the matter raised by the Shire of Waroona, and subsequently supported by resolution of the South West Ward of the Shire Councils' Association, is of sufficient significance to warrant further investigation?

The reply to this question was to the effect that the submission I referred to concerned detergents. The answer to (2) was, that the Minister was in fact in charge of both portfolios, and (3) and (4) were answered by the first answer referring to detergents.

I was in some difficulty then as the Government was so adamant that no submission had been received from the Shire of Waroona except in relation to the use of detergents. I then took the matter up with the shire and I said, "Surely somebody has been leading me up the garden path. I have asked questions and the Government says you have not made these submissions at all." So I asked the shire

for copies of the correspondence, and this is the letter which was dated the 8th June—

In reply to your letter of the 6th June, 1972, and in particular your request for copies of letters which have been directed to Government Departments, may I explain that apart from Mr. Armitage's letter to Fisheries and Fauna, I directed my letters to the Department of Environmental Protection. Apart from this Department, I have not corresponded to others, only to mention that as you know, the matter was brought before the South West Ward of the Shire Council's Association, the Peel Sub-Regional Planning and Advisory Committee and the Peel Inlet Conservation Committee.

Therefore, both the Department of Fisheries and Fauna and the Department of Environmental Protection had received a submission from the shire and yet when I asked the question the Government gave the reply that it was not aware that such a submission had been made. If the Government begins to feel a little embarrassed about what I am to say next I can understand that. I then obtained the copy of another letter written to the shire clerk. In his letter he states—

For your information I enclose a letter received recently from the Department of Environmental Protection together with notes on the use of 2, 4, 5 T which has been forwarded by that Department.

I am sure it will be of interest to this House to hear the reply received by the shire clerk from Dr. O'Brien, the Director of the Department of Environmental Protection, which reads as follows:—

Following receipt of your letter and the comments of Mr. J. F. Armitage on defoliants and the Murray River, I had enquiries made and wish to now advise you of the results.

He then goes on to discuss the question of pollution of this waterway by the use of 2, 4, 5-T and of various actions taken by Government instrumentalities.

Therefore, throughout the period I had been asking questions the matter was already under consideration by the Department of Environmental Protection and the Government, as a Government, was not aware of it.

On the 31st May, 1972, the director wrote to the shire in response to the shire's previous submissions.

I would like to think one could excuse this, but it is surely a serious error. On the one hand the Minister is given information to say that according to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna there has been no submission. On the other hand the submission was before the Department of Environmental Protection all the time.

I gave the Government a chance to correct this later when I asked if the same Minister handled both portfolios. The answer was in the affirmative, so clearly the Minister himself was not aware that the matter was already under consideration by the Department of Environmental Protection. Quite frankly I feel this is an appalling situation and a matter of particular consequence in view of pollution and environmental control, more particularly because it indicates a possible pollution of one of the major waterways of the south-west and it could affect one of the main aquatic sporting areas in the south-west—the Peel Inlet.

I raised this matter because the Shire of Waroona is still not satisfied that its submission is receiving the attention it deserves. With all the publicity surrounding the issue and the fact that it was raised at least twice in this House, I am a little surprised that there has been no correspondence between the shire and the department because other Government departments, and particularly the Forests Department, have taken a keen interest in the matter. At some stage some Government instrumentality should have told the party concerned that legislation was proclaimed on the 31st May, 1971. Legislation was introduced in this Chamber by Mr. MacKinnon during the term of office of the Brand Government to provide for control and protection against the aerial spraying of insecticides. However, this information was never passed on to the party concerned. The shire was never informed of possible action under the existing legislation.

Mr. Wordsworth asked the Leader of the House a question on the first sitting day—the 1st August, 1972. Part (5) of the question reads as follows:—

Has either the Federal Government or the State Government indicated that they have a policy of depopulating marginal areas?

The answer to the question is as follows:—

The State Government is making every endeavour to maintain the population in marginal areas.

I would like to ask whether that means maintaining the population in rural areas other than marginal areas and whether it fits in with all we hear about the policy of decentralisation and the development and support of rural industries. That is my first question and I would like members to keep that in mind for a moment.

I also refer to a Press report from *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 11th July dealing with the report of the Western Australian Government Railways. The article is headed, "\$12.5m. deficit." I will not read the article but clearly the Railways Department is in a very difficult situation. This fact has considerable relevance to the matter I wish to raise.

I will tell a little story which I know will be of particular interest to the Minister for Police and Transport. At the little town of Waroona within my electorate there is a small dry-cleaning business run by Mr. R. Lane and his family. It is known as the Pinjarra-Waroona Dry Cleaners. Mr. Lane and his family are very hard working and they have built up a thriving family business. They employ some eight or nine people at Waroona. Being very community-minded and very energetic and active in the local community, this family has taken part in local affairs throughout the many years they have been conducting their business. They have used public transport for their goods wherever possible. They have decentralised to North Dandalup and Serpentine.

Waroona is 70 miles from Perth, Pinjarra is 16 miles north, North Dandalup another 10 miles north, and Serpentine a further 10 miles, bringing it to within 35 miles of the city. The Lane family's businesses at Pinjarra, North Dandalup, and Serpentine are operating successfully.

As I said, the family has used public transport for cartage and it was particularly convenient for carrying articles to the agencies at North Dandalup and Serpentine. We all know that an important aspect of a modern dry-cleaning business is to get the clothes back quickly to the customers, particularly when people require their clothes clean for the weekend.

The shopper train, which left Waroona about 8.00 a.m. and arrived at North Dandalup and Serpentine between 9.00 a.m. and 10.00 a.m., was quite a convenient means of transport. However, the shopper train was discontinued and the dry-cleaners then faced a difficult situation. I might point out that the previous Government gradually downgraded the facilities at the stations of North Dandalup and Serpentine and they are now unattended sidings with the provision of a lock-up shed.

When the shopper train was discontinued the Railways Department co-operated and its liaison officer had discussions with Mr. Lane and said the best thing he could do was to put this box of dry-cleaning on a passenger bus. I would point out that the drycleaning in question was freighted in a small tea chest which was securely padlocked.

This however was not convenient because the passenger bus was not equipped to take such a box of drycleaning from Waroona to North Dandalup. It was suggested to Mr. Lane that he go to Pinjarra and send the box from Pinjarra to Serpentine. Apparently that was not convenient for the railways, one of the reasons being, I presume, that the passenger bus did not travel the mile from the main road to Serpentine railway siding.

Further alternatives were discussed and it was suggested that the best thing for Mr. Lane to do was to take his case from Waroona to Pinjarra and put it on the Australind which would travel the 10 to 15 miles from North Dandalup to Serpentine.

This was not convenient because it meant the Australind would have to stop. It is, of course, a fairly fast train and the Railways Department did not wish to inconvenience its clientele. So instead of that course being followed it was suggested to Mr. Lane that he should take his box from Waroona to Pinjarra on a Friday afternoon and place it on the Australind at Pinjarra. It was to go to Armadale where it was to be put on a goods train for delivery to Serpentine. All this was to commence at 5 o'clock one afternoon and the box was to arrive at Serpentine—10 or 15 miles away—at about 6 o'clock next morning. Having arrived at Serpentine and North Dandalup the box would then be placed in a lock-up shed.

Mr. Lane went to North Dandalup and saw his agent. He could not get into the shed because it was locked. Accordingly he went to a lady who lived about 150 yards away and told her that he wanted to get into the shed and asked her from where he could obtain a key.

She replied that she had the key and that everybody who wanted to get into the shed came to see her. He felt that this constituted quite good security. Then one particular weekend Mr. Lane was panic stricken because the people concerned said that they had not received back their drycleaning. Mr. Lane spent many hours and days trying to find out what had happened to the drycleaning without any result at all. Nobody ever found out what had happened to it. It was discovered that it had been conveyed by means of the transport referred to and it was eventually put into the shed.

The difficulty, however, was that this was not a lock up shed at all, even though it was supposed to be such a shed. Apparently there had been some difficulty with the padlock and the key had been thrown away. There was a cabinet inside the shed in which the mail was deposited. When Mr. Lane eventually got into the shed he found the drycleaning was not there; it had presumably been stolen. He had done his best to co-operate and eventually he approached the Railways Department and asked whether it would compensate him for the loss of the case. I repeat at this stage that this man at great inconvenience had used the public transport. He had gone to great pains to co-operate in connection with the complexities of the transport system to ensure that his clients would receive their drycleaning at the weekend. In spite of all this he loses his goods in the process.

He asked the Commissioner for Railways whether he would assist by paying him compensation of \$163.25 for the loss of his drycleaning. He received in reply a letter dated the 27th October written by the commercial manager which stated—

1. I refer to your recent letter in which you have claimed \$163.25 for a consignment of drycleaning from Pinjarra to Serpentine.

2. Parcels forwarded to unattended stations and sidings are accepted only on the condition that the Commissioner's responsibility in regard to such parcels ends when the parcels are left at such unattended stations or sidings. This particular consignment was delivered to Serpentine siding and placed in the shed provided on the evening of the 15th October. In the circumstances liability is not admitted and your claim is declined. However, the police department will be requested to make independent enquiries and should any information of value be received as a result I will again write to you.

Of course there has been no result whatever. The parcel was never located and Mr. Lane was faced with the situation of having to meet the loss of these goods. Incidentally this was the first and only time he had lost any goods in his long experience of conducting a drycleaning business. He told me personally that he met the claim and that it cost him approximately \$285 to replace the drycleaning that had been lost.

It may well be that these are unattended sidings and that the responsibility possibly rests with the person who is freighting the goods to ensure that they are picked up when they arrive at the siding. Mr. Lane, however, understood that lockup sheds were provided and that these would be used by the railway staff, or, alternatively that the local agent would meet the train and take delivery of the goods particularly in view of the fact that they had to be offloaded from the Australind on to a goods train—and we all know that goods trains arrive at all hours of the morning.

In these circumstances is it reasonable to expect the agent to meet the train to prevent the goods being stolen? The end result of all this is, of course, that the Railways Department has lost a lot of goodwill in this exercise and, what is more important to me, the drycleaner also lost a great deal of goodwill.

I would ask any member of this House whether he would again give his clothes to a drycleaner if on a particular occasion expensive clothes were lost by that drycleaner and the womenfolk were unable to have their clothes drycleaned and returned at the weekend. I am sure no member would again give his clothes to

be drycleaned to a drycleaner who had on one occasion lost his garments. I know I certainly would not.

Mr. Lane tells me that of all the clients he had in Serpentine at that time only one has continued to do business with him. He has lost all his other clients as a result of this particular exercise, which was no fault of his. I emphasise that these goods were lost despite all the precautions he took to ensure their safe delivery at the weekend.

I raise this matter simply to draw attention to the amount of goodwill that has been lost. How different things would have been had the Railways Department said "We are terribly sorry this has happened." But there has been no mention of an apology at all. Nobody appears to be sorry; far less are they inclined to pay a bill for \$163.

I must say that when the matter was taken up the Minister was quite agreeable to meet my colleague (Mr. Runciman) with whom I had discussed the matter. It was my intention to be present at the meeting but circumstances prevented my being able to attend.

Accordingly the drycleaner in question had to pay out \$285; apart from which he lost his clientele in the Serpentine area. Incidentally I might mention that the envelope in which the commercial manager sent his letter is inscribed O.H.M.S. and, for the further information of the members, I would point out that on the side of the envelope is an inscription which says "Send goods by rail its safer and cheaper".

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [5.10 p.m.]: Tonight I propose to speak about one of the cattle diseases which is prevalent in the State at the present time. I refer to brucellosis, which causes contagious abortion in cattle. Perhaps I should look at Mr. Claughton when I say that!

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Why is that?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: We all know, of course, that the Department of Agriculture is doing all it can to eradicate this disease but, from what I can see, the department just does not have sufficient money to carry out its activities efficiently; apart from which the cattle industry compensation fund is at such a low ebb that it cannot pay compensation even on this disease unless the person has only 3 per cent. of his cattle affected.

What astounds me, however is the fact that a friend of mine recently sent cattle to Midland and from the tail tag it was evident they had been tested for brucellosis and they were found to be reactors.

The officers concerned visited my friend's property and tested all his cattle and they found that some 28 head of cattle reacted to the test. This friend of mine usually runs about 300 head of cattle.

The officers returned later and carried out a further test as a result of which it was found that another batch of cattle on the property were reactors; but perhaps I am now getting a little ahead of the story.

After the first tests had been carried out all the cattle were inoculated with either strain 90 or strain 45/20. This slows down the process of carriers and the disease becomes less prevalent in the herd. It is however, not an eradication programme and the position now is that more than one-third of his herd has this complaint and he must now decide whether he will send them to market and accept the market price.

The disease in question does not affect the meat of the animal and he could let those animals which are infected run on his property and keep them until they are satisfactory for the meat market. However, he can no longer breed from them.

This friend of mine buys young cattle, feeds them, and eventually sells them as breeders. Anyone who has good breeders can get about \$200 a head for his cattle; but should he send the same cattle to the market he will receive only about \$130 a head.

Accordingly if this friend of mine wants to clean up his entire herd and eradicate the brucellosis from within the herd he stands to lose about \$70 a head on everything he sells. However it is not possible for him to sell his cattle as breeders now because his property is in quarantine.

So whatever cattle he decides to sell he can only sell for purposes of meat and this means that he will lose about \$70 a head if he endeavours to eradicate the disease. What astounds me, however, is the fact that no other property has been investigated.

When my friend was having his herd examined and inoculated his next door neighbour said to the officers concerned "what about coming to my place and doing a bit of testing; because it's possible that my cattle have the same complaint and I would like it cleaned up." The reply he received was "We cannot do yours now because we have not enough men. But if you send them to market and they have their blood tested and are found to have the disease we will certainly test your herd."

In the Gingin area, which is one of the biggest cattle-breeding areas adjacent to Perth, we find one herd amongst the cattle breeders being quarantined, while the other herds are not tested unless the cattle from those herds are sent to market and are found to be affected by brucellosis.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You think that is terrible?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Yes. I think that every herd should be tested.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I will help you with your submission.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The herds should be tested even if a veterinary officer has to be brought down from Geraldton. I understand that the Kimberley and the north are regarded as free areas. We have to make a clean sweep, and ensure that from a certain point the area is free from brucellosis.

The other countries of the world are trying to eradicate this disease. The U.S.A., Canada, and Britain have high hopes of eradicating the disease within several years. If they are successful they will no doubt restrict the import of Australian beef because of the presence of brucellosis in the herds.

I read a newspaper report which indicated what was being done in New Zealand. It appears that in Western Australia we have neither the trained personnel nor the finance to test a sufficient number of samples. In New Zealand use is made of the auto-analyser which can test 700 to 800 samples a day, and one man can look after the operating of the machine. Next year New Zealand hopes to be able to handle 25,000 samples a week.

I realise that to do the same thing in Western Australia will require a large sum of money but if we are to eradicate brucellosis we should be prepared to make the money available. Let us determine how many cattle have to be disposed of, so that we can rid the cattle throughout the State of this disease.

I am not saying that the Department of Agriculture is not doing its best. It has been trying to control this disease over the last three or four years. It is doing everything possible with the finance that has been made available. At present every person who makes a sale of cattle through the abattoirs has to pay a certain amount to the cattle compensation fund. I think the amount is 20c or 25c a head. The Government also matches that levy dollar for dollar. Apparently the amount derived from this source is not sufficient, and if more money is to be made available the present deduction will have to be doubled. If that is done the contribution by the Government will also be doubled. This is a national, and not a State, responsibility.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The incidence of brucellosis is world wide.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: It has been for years. We find an outbreak of this disease in the country and then it gradually subsides, but the cattle are not rid of the disease completely. There are always the carriers. Later the disease may break out again, just as it has done at the present time in this State. We have to watch the situation from every angle and take every precaution.

If \$235,000,000 is to be appropriated this year, then some of the money should be earmarked to enable steps to be taken to eradicate brucellosis. It is possible for us to get in touch with the authorities in New Zealand to find out whether the auto-analyser can be used here. I know that Western Mining Corporation is using one of these machines at Meekatharra to analyse the various minerals. I also know that one person can carry out 700 to 800 sample tests a day. Whereas previously it took two to three weeks to sample a core from a diamond drill, it now takes two to three hours. I do not know whether these machines are operated electrically, but I do know they are quite simple to operate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can anything be done to replenish the funds to enable the people concerned to obtain compensation?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The deduction should be doubled for every head of cattle that is sold at an abattoir; it should be increased from 20c to 40c. If many people are to be given compensation a tremendous amount of money will be involved. A person who sold 100 breeders at \$200 each would have to sell brucellosis-affected breeders at between \$120 and \$130 per head. In so doing he would lose \$7,000 in one season. Even by disposing of the animals complete eradication is not achieved. Reactors in his herd would still be found.

It looks to me that the producer cannot find all the money that is required. I do not know how much the Government can make available out of this year's Budget. Eradication is something on which a great deal of money should be spent. The Department of Agriculture requires more veterinary officers and more machines to test the blood samples that are taken from the herds, in order to combat the disease and eradicate it, not in 10 years' time but in four or five years' time. I think 10 years is too long, because by that time the other countries will have rid themselves of this disease and will only buy meat from countries where brucellosis in the herds has been eradicated. I hope the Minister will be able to render assistance to enable this project to be carried out. I support the second reading of the Bill.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.22 p.m.]: My contribution to the debate on the Bill will be relatively brief. In view of the fact that the Bill seeks to appropriate \$235,000,000 to enable the Government to cover the expenditure of the State, I am concerned that within the Government are Ministers who reply to questions in an unsatisfactory fashion.

For the benefit of the House I will refer to the question I have in mind. I am disturbed that people who are charged with the responsibility for expending \$235,000,000 to the best advantage of the State should answer questions in this manner.

I asked a question in three parts of the Chief Secretary on the 1st August. The first part was—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the statements attributed to the Minister for Mines and to the Chief Secretary in an article commenting upon police action in closing down bingo games which appeared on pages 1 and 9 of the South Suburban supplement of *The West Australian* on Wednesday, the 5th July, 1972?

The Chief Secretary's answer was—

- (1) I did not comment on police action as suggested by the Honourable Member.

Not in my wildest imagination can I relate that answer to my question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You would have to possess the wild imagination of the Chief Secretary to understand a reply like that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am appalled at the answer I received. I thought there had been a misunderstanding, and that in the typing of the answer the typist got it mixed with another answer to a question asked in another place. So, I asked the Chief Secretary a further question today. My question was—

With reference to the inadequate reply to my question on Tuesday, the 1st August, 1972, relating to the closing down of bingo games by police action, will he further investigate the two newspaper articles and reply to the specific items to which I referred in my previous question?

The answer given by the Chief Secretary was—

The question was answered adequately.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you regard that as a foolish answer or as an arrogant answer?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I cannot comprehend the answer, because it has nothing to do with the question I asked.

The second part of the question which I asked on Tuesday last was—

- (2) If so, does he agree that the contents of the newspaper item are factual?

The answer by the Chief Secretary was—

- (2) Answered by (1).

I could not relate that part of the answer to my question, either. The third part of my question was—

- (3) If the reply to (2) is "No" what action is contemplated to rectify the situation for the benefit of the public?

The reply of the Chief Secretary was—

- (3) It is the Government's intention to re-introduce Bingo legislation in the budget session.

In fact, I cannot relate any of the three answers to the three questions I asked. So, I repeat that I am a little concerned we should be asked to pass legislation to give the members of the Government, who answer questions in that manner, responsibility to spend \$235,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

I will give the Chief Secretary another opportunity to answer the question which I have asked, because I intend to say something about the contents of the newspaper article I referred to in my question.

Perhaps when the Government does introduce the bingo legislation as suggested in the reply of the Chief Secretary for which, incidentally, I did not ask, to the question which he did not answer—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you should repeat what you have said for the benefit of *Hansard*!

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think you are concluding that the speaker does not know what he is saying.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not suggest that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Chief Secretary will have an opportunity to tell me how he arrived at the answers he has given. He will have the opportunity to do that before the debate on this Bill is concluded.

One other point worth mentioning is a very interesting report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 20th July, headed—

Dynamite cures a St. Louis folly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You recommend that to the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Chief Secretary is rather taken aback by that heading. This report is by one, Robert Pullan. It states—

The greatest fiasco in American housing, a \$36 million slum in St. Louis is being dynamited to correct an expensive and obvious mistake.

It happened when the estate was built 18 years ago and none of the planners asked the elementary question: Will people find its apartments livable despite the award-winning architecture and the brick and glass construction that made it an innovation in its time?

Another section of the article reads as follows:—

Then, it was hailed as the ultimate in public housing, a civic-spirited and imaginative effort that won the Federal Government's architecture award for public housing and was

proclaimed in architecture magazines as a monument to decent high-rise accommodation.

Now it is a sore on the city's face, a monstrosity that deserves the condemnation of even the St. Louis Housing Authority. The authority's executive director, Mr. Thomas Costello, who is responsible for the project, calls it a "disaster."

The article continues and goes on to quote a member of the St. Louis Civil Alliance, as follows:—

"I think it was an example of the impetuosity of the American mentality. They thought they could solve the problems of the slums with the bulldozer, but nobody really thought 'What happens to those people from the demolished houses.'

"Now we are trying to dig ourselves out of the hole we made by the mistakes of 20 years ago."

I have read those extracts because members will recall that since about 1965 I have been speaking about similar developments carried on by the State Housing Commission in Western Australia. I spoke on many occasions until members in this Chamber became heartily sick and tired of the subject to which I was referring; namely, high density housing for people who had no choice but to go to the State Housing Commission for their housing.

At that time I was fighting against enormous odds because I was a supporter of the Government which was promoting the scheme. I was fighting against the criticism of my colleagues in this House and in another place, and I was fighting against the criticism of the town planners and the architects of this State. I was also fighting against the newspapers of the day, and the support I received came only by way of interjection, from time to time, from Mr. Ron Thompson. By his interjections he indicated that he felt my comments had some solid foundation.

The Minister for Housing, at the time, ridiculed me to a great extent in an article read by my leader in reply to some of the comments I made. I have the article with me but I will not read it because I would start another fight.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Surely, not with your leader?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say that. The point I am making is that the newspaper articles chose to support the scheme at the time. The State Housing Commission called for a design for high-density housing to accommodate people who relied on the State for their accommodation. The plan which was adopted in St. Louis won an American top award for architecture 18 years ago. In 1967 I read in the newspapers that the State Housing Commission had finally got approval from

a local authority to erect some of these monstrosities. I said then the very fact that *The West Australian* and the *Daily News* agreed with the proposition was reason to question it because those newspapers were being critical of everything which the Government did at that time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Critical without reason. One may be critical with some foundation.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Critical, with some very good reason.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not arguing the point.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I agree with what has been said.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If it is intended to do something about the situation here I will carry the dynamite.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Members can argue the point amongst themselves. I will read an extract from the *Daily News* of Thursday, 27th April, 1967, as follows:—

The State Housing Commission in the past has been responsible for much suburban ugliness in Perth.

Not only has it built a great many architectural monstrosities—but it has turned pleasant, shaded areas into virtual deserts.

Housing Minister O'Neil—one of the newer Cabinet Ministers—is bringing a fresh and refreshing outlook to the job.

His plan for a multi-storeyed Bentley "community" estate is excellent.

A mixture of flat buildings, single and duplex homes and other types of dwellings must mean a break in the dreadful monotony of many Commission areas.

It will mean also that many kinds of people—including the old—will live together, making the estate a community cross-section. This is socially healthy.

On the 21st April, 1967, *The West Australian* published the following:—

Use of New Ideas

In dealing with the aspects of housing that are completely within its control, the State Housing Commission has shown a good deal of imagination in the past year or so.

Its scheme for boosting development and reducing costs by providing cheap land for private building in the Medina area is a novel approach and it is now planning a new kind of community housing project at Bentley.

The Bentley project, which is similar to a scheme that is about to begin at Bunbury, offers two important benefits. By demonstrating how to

provide a wide range of house and flat accommodation and community amenities in spacious and pleasant surroundings.

The article goes on to indicate that it was a very desirable project.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If that type of project were carried on we would need many more mental institutions.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: An article also appeared in the south-suburban section of *The West Australian* in August, 1969, indicating the type of development being planned. It was headed, "A Refreshing Approach."

Another architect of some fame in Western Australia, Paul Ritter, had the following to say:—

I congratulate the State Housing Commission on the fine concept for the scheme to be built in Bentley and illustrated in *The West Australian* on Wednesday.

And so he goes on. Indeed, the Western Australian Chapter of the Royal Institute of Architects wrote a letter to the Minister for Housing and congratulated the Minister on his refreshing approach to housing people in high-density type projects.

An article published in *The West Australian* on the 20th July indicated that all the things I had said—and I repeat: I did not say them because they were the novel idea of Clive Griffiths but because of the research on the subject which I had carried out—were right, and the writer of the article agreed with me.

I previously quoted at length from a book entitled *High Living*, written by the brotherhood of St. Lawrence in Melbourne. The brotherhood had carried out an extraordinary and extensive survey of the occupants of the State Housing Commission homes in that State. However, my words were of no avail because even though not one shovelful of sand had been moved when I made my criticism I was unable to stop the project.

I still represent the area and I visit the Bentley project. I have not been able to find very many people among those who live in the 12-storied blocks who, if given the chance, would not have taken a house. The social problems which I forecast are now being experienced by those people living in the project. The people concerned had no choice because they were not able to rent accommodation on the private market. They had to accept what was provided by the State Housing Commission.

I was delighted to read in a newspaper recently that the Commission had changed its mind about the erection of an equally huge project envisaged for Stevens Street in Fremantle—an area which I know

pretty well. The State Housing Commission has reviewed its ideas. I do not know whether there was pressure from the Fremantle City Council, or whether the State Housing Commission had woken up to the fact that this sort of accommodation has certain disadvantages.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The scheme was reviewed because of representation from social workers and members of Parliament representing the area.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perhaps those responsible might have read the previous speeches made by Mr. Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They could have learned a great deal from them. I do not profess to be a genius on this subject. I was expressing common-sense views put forward by people who were experts. They were world renowned experts and they were known Australia-wide. So it was not a case of having to reject the proposition simply because Clive Griffiths put it forward.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Was it not considered that the cost of each high-rise unit would have been cheaper than the cost of a normal home?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That question starts me off again. I made the suggestion in 1967 that the cost per unit of the high-density project would be equivalent to, or greater than, single resident accommodation. My leader disagreed violently at the time but I was proved to be correct, because, in fact, they did cost more. I was using factual evidence which I obtained from housing authorities which had already constructed high-density projects. However, no-one was prepared to listen to me.

I have said previously, and I repeat, that the people who perpetrated that high-density housing project have cast a blot on the community which will last for many years. I will never retract those sentiments. I believe the people concerned have been committed to a way of life which is un-Australian and unacceptable.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Are there many large families living in the Bentley project?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Not big families, but many people with small children.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A family can have up to five children.

The Hon. F. R. White: Do elderly people have to walk up and down stairs?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I could go on for a fortnight! Pregnant women are walking up nine flights of stairs because the lifts are out of action more often than not. There are many problems.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I hope you can link this up with the Supply Bill.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That was a startling interjection.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you say "sparkling?"

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We are talking about spending \$235,000,000. I have just mentioned that the State Housing Commission has reconsidered its plan to build at Fremantle a project similar to that at Bentley. At least we will save some of the \$235,000,000. People who live in those conditions would certainly be prone to the mental illnesses about which Mr. Williams spoke this afternoon, and the expenditure on mental health and so on will come out of this \$235,000,000. So I can tie up what I am saying with the Bill.

The other day I asked this question concerning the Kwinana-Balga power line—

With reference to the resolution of this House passed on the 30th May, 1972, and in view of the item "E.P.A. backs power route" in *The West Australian* on Wednesday, the 15th July, 1972—will the Minister—

- (a) inform the House what was the Environmental Protection Authority requested to do, and by whom were the requests made;
- (b) lay on the Table of the House a copy of the report of the Authority; and
- (c) advise what action was taken by the Government in respect to the Legislative Council resolution which was forwarded to the Hon. Premier on the 1st June, 1972?

The resolution forwarded to the Premier on the 1st June, 1972, was—

That this House deplores the decision of the Government to adopt a dual route for the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line resulting in environmental desecration and personal hardship to a greater number of people than would lines installed along one route. We ask that the Government reconsider the decision after a report is made by the Environmental Protection Authority and that, in any event, they adhere to the clear recommendation of the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority not to construct the lines through, or near, the Guildford Grammar School.

That resolution was very clear and it was passed by this House.

Yesterday I heard the Leader of the House speaking about his attitude towards democracy. He said he felt that in the interests of democracy members should be allowed to speak on any subject.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: In which I was supported by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not criticising him for saying that. In fact, he was supported by me and by every member of the Chamber. The point I am making is that it was therefore reasonable for everybody to assume that it was a democratic House which upheld the principle of democracy. A resolution was passed democratically by a House of Parliament elected by the people, and on receiving the resolution the Government said—

Following careful consideration of the Legislative Council's resolution, which represents the opinion of that Chamber, the Government reaffirmed its previous decision.

Its previous decision, which is well known to members, was to do exactly the opposite of the request contained in the resolution; in other words, to run the line through the Guildford Grammar School, contrary to the recommendation of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and to run a dual route. If we are talking about democracy, I wonder what is the point in this House considering matters in a democratic way, reaching conclusions in a democratic way, and moving a resolution when the decision is completely ignored by the Government.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Democracy by numbers.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We have been elected by the people. We are not here simply because somebody suggests we should be here. We are here because the people chose us to come here and act responsibly and democratically and to reach our decisions according to the democratic methods followed in this House. Surely to goodness, when we have made a decision some notice should be taken of it.

I am concerned that the newspaper article which appeared in *The West Australian* on Wednesday, the 15th July, suggested the Environmental Protection Authority had given consideration to the dual route and had decided it would not in fact be detrimental to the environment of the region. The article also said the authority had given consideration to the line through Guildford Grammar School and had come down on the side of agreeing with the Government that the line should go through.

Because of my interest in this matter I asked in a question what the Environmental Protection Authority was asked to do and who asked it to do it. For one fleeting moment I thought the Government might have asked it to do something as a result of our resolution. I thought the Government might have said, "A resolution suggesting certain things was passed in the Legislative Council, and as a result of that we would like you, as the Environmental Protection Authority, to

have a look at it." But that was not the situation at all. I have already stated what the Government did with that resolution.

The Environmental Protection Authority looked at the proposition only because it was requested to do so by Environment 2000 and the Guildford Grammar School. That was how the authority received its instructions, and it is mentioned in the authority's report. I asked that the report to the Minister for Electricity be tabled so that we could see what happened. There is no point in my reading all the report, but the opening paragraphs read—

Re: SEC 330 KV Transmission Lines.

1. As previously advised, recent correspondence has requested that the Environmental Protection Authority investigate several facets of the proposed 330 KV transmission lines. One submission was to the effect that the entire matter of the need for both the so-called foothills and escarpment routes should be investigated. The second was the specific submission under Clause 57.2 of the Environmental Protection Act, 1971, relating to the power line structures in the vicinity of Guildford Grammar School (GGS).

2. As to the first item, namely the need for and comparative impact of the foothills and escarpment routes, the EPA has reviewed the history of the proposals and negotiations and has given consideration to the suggestions presented by me as Director of Environmental Protection, namely "The second (revised) route beyond the ranges is acceptable and . . . this line should be built initially. At the same time, effort should be made to survey a route for the second route in roughly the same path".

That was an extract from a minute Dr. O'Brien had written to Mr. Davies on the 22nd November, 1971, which was tabled in Parliament last year. I ask members to bear in mind that Dr. O'Brien said "the EPA has reviewed the history." Paragraph 2 continues—

In view of the fact that the Government, after due consideration, found this suggestion unacceptable at the time and in view of the fact that this was a Cabinet decision and that several months' work has been carried out since then, the EPA has not sought to review this particular aspect further.

That is the extent to which the Environmental Protection Authority had a look at this route. It reviewed the history of the route, pointed out the original submission to the Minister on the 22nd November, 1971, and said that because it was by a Cabinet decision that the Government found it unacceptable at the time, the authority did not bother to do anything further about it. The public of Western Australia is asked to accept this

as a proper response by the Environmental Protection Authority to a request made under the Act. It did not do anything about it at all except to say that because it was unacceptable to the Government there was no point in having a look at it.

This is the "big teeth" legislation that was supposed to protect the environment of Western Australia, but in a submission to the Minister for Electricity the director says there is no point in the Environmental Protection Authority looking into this matter because the previous recommendation was unacceptable to the Government, so the authority did nothing about it. What a strange state of affairs!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not really strange.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I was being kind. I never cease to be amazed at what people are asked to accept. Paragraph 3 of the report reads—

3. The specific matter relating to Guildford Grammar School placed a statutory requirement on the EPA to submit a report to you under Clause 57.2. Accordingly, submissions were received from representatives of the SEC at a meeting of the EPA on July 5, 1972. In addition, I met a group from GGS on July 7 and a report thereon was presented to the EPA at the meeting on July 12. Documents A27/D and A28/A pertain and are attached.

The document then goes on to say—

Furthermore and most recently, during the discussion on 7th July it was apparent that the School Council was not aware of the map which had been forwarded to the EPA by the School Bursar, outlining proposals 1, 2 and 3.

You will recall, Mr. President, that three proposals were put forward for routes across the Guildford Grammar School.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think it would be a pity for you to have to cut short your remarks. Perhaps the Minister might suggest that you be given permission to continue next week.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will not take very long; only about another five minutes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do not require permission to continue?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, I will finish in a few minutes.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I have complete faith in you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What I have to say will not take me very long, but it will be damning as far as the Government is concerned. The document goes on to say—

5. The particular environmental aspects associated with the proposed passage of the system through G.G.S. are twofold:

- (a) Aesthetic effects of the towers and the lines and the proposed easement, and
- (b) stray electromagnetic radiation from the high voltage sources.

6. On the admittedly subjective aspect of aesthetics, from the evidence available to the EPA, Proposal 2 is marginally more acceptable to the school. Proposal 3 would envisage a large tower in the near vicinity of the National Trust historic home at Woodbridge, as well as having significant impact on nearby homes and rateable lands. For these reasons the EPA is unable to find any significant justification for recommending a route different from that approved by yourself on 22nd May, 1972, namely, Proposal 2 on Plan No. T7/1/20/1.

That was the extent to which the EPA considered the Guildford Grammar proposal. The Guildford Grammar School authorities did not like any of the three proposals, but as they had to have one of the three they decided that proposal No. 2 was a little more acceptable.

The EPA did not undertake any further investigations; certainly there is no evidence of it in this document. It did not undertake further investigations to ascertain whether or not the line should be situated further east, following the other line across at Helena Vale. The EPA simply said that there were three proposals, none of which was acceptable to Guildford Grammar; but there was one which was a little more acceptable than the others. The EPA said that in view of that fact and in view of the fact that one of the routes was too close to Woodbridge it would recommend the one the Minister had already approved.

I fail to understand how the EPA can feel it has justified its investigation into the matter. Certainly it has not justified it as far as I am concerned. It would appear to me that the EPA is suffering from some sort of fear that it may invoke the wrath of the Government as it did on the only other occasion I can recall of it publicly investigating anything else; namely, the Pacminex location. That is the only conclusion to which I can come as a result of reading this document because it is clearly stated—there is not even an attempt to cover it up—that the EPA did not consider anything apart from the three proposals which had been put up already. So I hope that not very much of this \$235,000,000 is to be credited to the En-

vironmental Protection Authority because the big teeth the Government promised have turned out to be very small milk teeth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Because Mr. Tonkin will not let them take fluoride.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Possibly that has something to do with it.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: How do you account for the fact that I still have my own teeth, despite fluoride?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Because the Leader of the House has lived in the north where the water is fluoridated.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Despite you and your remarks I still have my teeth.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I simply say I am appalled that the Government should permit this document to be presented to it and that it should accept the document in view of the Government's castigation—for the want of a better word—of the previous environmental protection legislation. The Government said that legislation did not go far enough and did not do much to provide for the protection of our environment. Yet the "big teeth" legislation has permitted the EPA to simply rehash the old history; and because the Government had already indicated that it was violently opposed to any deviation of the route the EPA says there is no point in any further investigation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. D. Elliott.

QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

1. RAILWAYS

Bulk Coal Equipment at Bridgetown

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Have tenders been called, or are tenders about to be called, for the dismantling and removal of the bulk coal equipment in the railway yard at Bridgetown?
- (2) Has any consideration been given to the possibility of converting this equipment for the handling and storage of bulk superphosphate?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "No", will the Minister delay the dismantling of the equipment until the possibility of conversion for the handling of superphosphate has been examined?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes. Tenders will close with the District Engineer, Bunbury, on Monday, 7th August, 1972.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.

2. PARLIAMENT HOUSE RESERVE

Police Patrols

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Police:

What has been the nature of Police involvement by way of surveillance of the so-called Aborigines "Consulate" since its establishment in the grounds of Parliament House expressed in—

- (a) frequency of patrols;
- (b) number of police officers employed;
- (c) any other work; and
- (d) estimated cost to the Police Department?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (a) Daily during routine patrols.
- (b) None additional to those engaged on routine patrols.
- (c) Nil.
- (d) Nil.

3. PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

"Ribald" Publication

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the publication *Ribald* being sold at newsagents?
- (2) Is it considered to be pornographic?
- (3) If so, are any measures being taken to have it withdrawn?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This is a matter of opinion.
- (3) No.

4. BINGO

Legislation

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Chief Secretary:

With reference to the inadequate reply to my question on Tuesday, the 1st August, 1972, relating to the closing down of bingo games by police action, will he further investigate the two newspaper articles and reply to the specific items to which I referred in my previous question?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

The question was answered adequately.

5. MIDLAND ABATTOIR BOARD

Trading

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Since the Midland Abattoir Board was granted power to trade, what sales have been effected—
 - (a) overseas; and
 - (b) within Australia?

- (2) What purchases of livestock have been made in the same period—

- (a) within the State; and
- (b) from interstate?

- (3) As the Manager of the Board (Mr. Wilson) was reported in *The West Australian* of the 15th July, 1972, as saying "the abattoir did not intend to make money out of such buying (of stock)—nor did it intend to lose", will the Minister advise that, if the stated intention is only to operate on the export market under conditions of over-supply of stock, why there should be no intention to improve the financial position of the Midland Abattoir to the ultimate benefit of the State, and producers, in terms of killing charges?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) (a) Overseas:
 - 80 tons bone-in mutton
 - 210 tons offal
 - 13,000 carcasses of bone-in mutton
 - 250 tons offal awaiting shipment.
- (b) Pilemeats—110 tons.
- (2) (a) 10,691 sheep; Nil beef.
- (b) 653 sheep; 28 cattle.
- (3) At the time of taking over trading, the sheep industry was in the doldrums and efforts were made to increase returns to producers. The Abattoir Board will, when necessary, endeavour to improve our situation by trading, with the main thought being to see that the producer gets returns related to the ruling overseas price for his stock.

6. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Eligibility for Assistance

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

As the Rural Reconstruction Board will reject an application when they consider the applicant can receive a loan from normal banking circles, can the Board state the number of rejections on the grounds of non-viability, as these statistics are of the greatest significance when judging the need for further Government action?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

Of the 888 applications declined to date, 653 have been declined on the grounds of non-viability, 166 have been declined as "Not in need"—that is, not requiring help or able to obtain it from conventional sources—and 69 have not been eligible.

7.

CATTLE*Brucellosis*

The Hon. J. HEITMAN, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many new properties have been quarantined through Brucellosis eradication programme since the 11th April, 1972?
- (2) (a) Are properties adjoining those quarantined properties being tested for Brucellosis;
(b) if not, why not?
- (3) Has any strain of vaccine proved successful against Brucellosis?
- (4) Further to the reply to question 4 (2) (c) on the 11th May, 1972, in what district was the amount of \$674,103 disbursed?
- (5) Is the Government following a definite plan of eradication of Brucellosis?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) 158.
- (2) (a) No.
(b) Properties are only tested if there is evidence of disease.
- (3) No vaccine will eradicate Brucellosis; both Strain 19 and Strain 45/20 have been successful in reducing incidence of disease.
- (4) South West Land Division.
- (5) Yes.

8.

GRAIN SORGHUM*Imports*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of the probable unemployment caused by a departmental decision to prevent the controlled import of 2000 tons of bulk grain sorghum from the Northern Territory into Kununurra to meet the needs of an export contract worth \$228,000 per month, and that the contract will be lost to Western Australia if a permit cannot be granted immediately, will the Minister for Agriculture immediately grant the permit to Ord Beef Pty. Ltd. if the company guarantees fumigation by Australia's experts in bulk grain fumigation under the supervision of Western Australia's Department of Agriculture using Phostoxin tablets?
- (2) If not, does the Minister for Agriculture realise that—
(a) the applicants are the sole commercial growers of grain sorghum in the Ord Scheme, and that they are interested in preventing any infestation that will damage the future of their industry;

(b) the Department is getting their information on the sorghum midge from the same experts who say that the midge will get into the Ord Valley regardless of quarantine and that it is far better to have supervised controls on legal imports of bulk grain; and

(c) he will create unemployment, and jeopardise a \$500,000 per year pilot scheme involving the farming and use of grain sorghum?

(3) (a) Who are the experts in sorghum midge in Western Australia;

(b) where did they achieve their expertise;

(c) when was their research done; and

(d) what was their research programme?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1) The entry of sorghum grain into Western Australia is prohibited under Legislation.

(2) (a) Yes.

(b) I do not know who are the experts referred to. The Department of Agriculture officers get their information from all available sources, including sources outside Australia.

(c) I do not believe that this is necessarily so.

(3) (a) Department of Agriculture entomologists.

(b) General entomological training associated with reference to world literature, discussion with other entomologists and inspections in Northern Australia with entomologists experienced in Sorghum Midge problems.

(c) and (d) No midge research done in Western Australia as the pest is not present.

9.

FLOODS*Prevention at Carnarvon*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

(1) Does the Government intend to extend the present levee bank to tie into Browns Range to protect the town of Carnarvon from future flooding?

(2) If so, when is it expected work will commence?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes. Model testing to determine the best location for the levee is being undertaken in the Public Works Department's hydraulic laboratories at Floreat Park.
- (2) During the 1973-74 financial year.

10. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Applications in Ravensthorpe Area: Rejections

The Hon. C. R. Abbey for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

In view of the very high rejection rate in applications for rural reconstruction loans from those farming in the Ravensthorpe Shire, would the Minister give the latest rejection rate in that Shire, and the number of farmers involved, and indicate if it is the Government's intention to take special action to overcome the difficulties of this area?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) Rejection rate in the Ravensthorpe Shire is 74.3%. 29 farmers are involved.
- (b) The position is being examined.

11. PARLIAMENT HOUSE RESERVE

Control

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

Will he confer with the Hon. Premier to ascertain whether he was correctly reported in a news item broadcast by the A.B.C. during their State bulletin on the 22nd July, 1972, in which it in part said—"The President of the Advancement Council, Mr. Davis, told the T.L.C. officers that the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, had said that the Parliamentary Joint House Committee would have the power to order the removal of the tent by next Friday. However Mr. Tonkin had said he would use his influence to allow the tent to remain until after the Federal Budget was brought down in Canberra on the 15th August."?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

I have conferred with the Hon. Premier who has informed me that on the understanding that the Aborigines' "Consulate" established in Parliament House grounds would be removed immediately after the Federal Budget was introduced, he had told Mr. Davis and Mr. Winder that he would do his best to ensure that the tent would remain until that time.

12.

EDUCATION

Remote Areas

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

Referring to the reply received to my question on the 1st August, 1972, regarding the education needs of isolated children and their parents, would the Minister please qualify that part of the reply "The matter now rests with the Commonwealth Government"?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

The need has been demonstrated for Commonwealth assistance and it is hoped that the Commonwealth budget in August will disclose what assistance it is proposed to offer.

13.

BEEF

Statutory Marketing Scheme

The Hon. C. R. Abbey for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation in this Session for the statutory marketing of beef, or is it intended to first successfully market lamb and mutton under a statutory marketing scheme?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

The Government does not intend to introduce legislation in this Session for the statutory marketing of beef.

14.

PASTURE AND SOIL SURVEY

Gascoyne River Catchment Area

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has a pastures and soil survey been conducted in the Gascoyne River catchment area?
- (2) If so, has the report been released?
- (3) If the reply to (2) is "Yes", when was it released?
- (4) If the reply to (2) is "No", when will it be released?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) The survey was commissioned by the Pastoral Appraisal Board to whom it was presented.

15.

FISHING

Turtles

The Hon. V. J. Ferry for the Hon. G. C. MACKINNON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Does the Minister agree with recently published information indicating that turtles (as referred

to in my question on Wednesday, the 2nd August, 1972) are in danger of extinction from over-fishing?

- (2) As only two boats are involved, and the value of the fishing is regarded as so unimportant that its value is not known, would the Minister give consideration to closing the commercial capture of turtles?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) No. The exploitation is not believed to be endangering the species.
- (2) The license situation is reviewed every two years at which time a decision is made whether or not the fishery should continue. The next review will take place in 1973.

House adjourned at 6.07 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 3rd August, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

HOUSING: NAVAL BASE PROJECT

Personal Explanation

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.03 a.m.]: I seek leave to make a personal explanation in relation to a matter raised in debate yesterday by the member for Dale.

The SPEAKER: If there is a dissentient voice leave will not be granted. Is there a dissentient voice? There being no dissentient voice, leave is granted.

MR. J. T. TONKIN: It will be recalled that the member for Dale disagreed with an answer I gave to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and during the course of his remarks he said—

The Premier's answer was, "No." In fact, a report in regard to it appeared in the Press this morning, and one of the shires concerned telephoned me because it was most concerned over the Premier's reply, as it had received a telegram from the Premier stating that he would give consideration to its objections. The Premier received the shires' telegram on the 16th July and he replied on the 20th July to the joint shires of Kwinana and Rockingham.

It has been well and truly said that to err is human and to forgive divine. Both the member for Dale and I have erred.

I could not imagine how my memory would fail me to the extent that if I had received a telegram as late as the 16th July I would have forgotten it so early in August. I had a search made this morning and it transpires that the following telegram was received by me on the 16th June:—

Our councils strongly protest against proposed development of new coastal suburb north of Naval Base announced in the 'West Australian' newspaper of the 14th June stop Adequate serviced and good residential land available in Kwinana and Rockingham shires to fulfil all foreseeable needs stop The proposed new suburb will stifle expansion of the Kwinana industrial complex stop Please use all influence possible to see that this land is not developed for residential purposes

Baker President Kwinana Shire Council
Powell President Rockingham Shire Council

I replied to that telegram on the 20th June in the following terms:—

Presidents
Rockingham and Kwinana Shire Councils
Rockingham W.A.

Reference your telegram sixteenth June stop Government appreciates views expressed by both shire councils stop These have been noted and will be kept in mind in any future negotiations

So it is clear that I was in error in saying that no representations had been made. I regret the error and I thank the member for Dale for bringing it to my notice. No harm has been done because no negotiations are in course at present, and when the negotiations, if any, take place this correspondence will be brought to my notice.

I do not hesitate to apologise to the House for the error, but the fact that the member for Dale was also in error simply emphasises that we are human and errors will occur. May I conclude on this note with a quotation from Campbell's *Pleasures of Hope*—

Truth ever lovely—since the world began.

The foe of tyrants, and the friend of man.

Sir Charles Court: How lyrical can we get?

BILLS (8): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Education Act Amendment Bill (No 2).
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Minister for Education), and read a first time.