

been to change the number of sitting days during which action could be taken to move for a disallowance, and if this amendment was meant to apply to other than major amendments, the Bill before us now would have referred to an amendment to subsection (2) of section 32.

However, because the amendment does not mean to apply to new schemes as such, and applies only to the amendment of such schemes, section 33 is the one to be amended. I think we could go on and on but at this stage I will toss in the towel.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Claughton seems to be making an issue of whether this applies to a revocation of a scheme or to an amendment of a scheme. Once again I do nothing more than to refer him to the words of the amending clause; that is, clause 2 which we are currently debating. We are referring to a proposed amendment to a scheme; there is no reference to a revocation, so I will leave it at that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not see any point in carrying the debate further at this stage. I simply ask that the Minister, during the third reading stage, should clarify the points we have raised. He has told us that the Bill applies only to a substantial amendment to a scheme, but I am wondering whether a revocation is an amendment or something more substantial.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: If it were a revocation, the period would be 21 days. Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.01 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 18th September, 1974

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

WATER SUPPLIES

Dunsborough and Quindalup: Petition

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [4.33 p.m.]: I present the following petition from residents of Dunsborough and Quindalup—

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

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia, do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Govern-

ment of Western Australia will support the extension of a reticulated Water Supply to the Dunsborough and Quindalup areas.

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

The petition contains 63 signatures. I have read the petition and it does conform with the rules of the House.

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

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 236).

QUESTIONS (41): ON NOTICE

1. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Urban Farms: Financial Relief

MR BATEMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

In view of the extreme financial hardship, brought about by the increase in council rates, to urban farmers whose land was rezoned from rural to urban by the introduction of the Canning-Armadale corridor scheme—

- (a) are amendments being planned by his department to the Local Government Act to give financial relief to these urban farmers;
- (b) if not, why not?
- (c) if so, when will the amendments be introduced, and what relief can be expected?

MR RUSHTON replied:

No. Section 548 (3a) of the Local Government Act at present enables councils to grant relief by imposing a lesser rate on urban farmland.

The Government has implemented its policy commitment and has created the Rate Review Committee to look into the whole question of rating, etc. The terms of reference are—

A committee of inquiry to inquire into all forms of rates and taxes attached to land valuation and in particular to examine—

- (1) What are the anomalies of the present system of valuations used for—
 - (a) land taxes;
 - (b) metropolitan region improvement tax;
 - (c) local authority rating;
 - (d) water supply, sewerage and drainage rating?
- (2) Can the anomalies be rectified? If so, in what manner?

- (3) Examine and report on the advantages and disadvantages of—

- (a) annual value base;
- (b) unimproved value base, for existing rates and taxes imposed.

- (4) What are the advantages and disadvantages of—

- (a) a flat annual charge for each zoning of land;
- (b) a rate or tax using as a base personal gross income of all occupiers of a residential unit and the gross income of occupiers of commercial and industrial properties?

- (5) Report on other alternative rating and taxes bases which could be used.

- (6) Recommend the use of the most appropriate base or bases to give the most equitable treatment of tax and ratepayers on the basis that those with the greatest resources should make the greatest contribution.

- (7) What system of applying a rate or tax to the base should be used for—

- (a) land tax;
- (b) metropolitan region improvement tax;
- (c) local authority rating;
- (d) water, sewerage and drainage rating?

- (8) Should a uniform scale of charges for water, sewerage and drainage be applied to the whole State? If so, is it a feasible proposition?

- (9) Examine and report on the heavy relative burden placed on initial developers and occupants of land and recommend any corrective action required.

- (10) Report on any other improved method by which the Government may raise revenue to meet the cost of administration, debt servicing, operating and maintenance expenses for essential services provided by State and local authorities.

2. COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRES

Establishment

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

- (1) Is it expected further community health centres will be built similar to those at Busselton and Mandurah?

- (2) If so, can he advise where these are likely to be located?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Proposals have been put to the Federal Government for three more community health centres to be funded as to capital cost on the basis of 75% by the Federal Government and 25% from State sources.

- (2) South Hedland, Geraldton and a metropolitan suburb yet to be decided.

3.

TOWN PLANNING

East Victoria Park School Site: Zoning

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

As the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning had advised he has approved the rezoning of the East Victoria Park primary schools' site, is he now able to advise—

- (a) whether the site has been sold;
- (b) what will happen regarding the resiting of the schools;
- (c) when this is likely to occur?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) No, negotiations are still proceeding.
- (b) In the event of the negotiations reaching a satisfactory conclusion, it is anticipated that a replacement school will be constructed on the new site in Beatty Avenue. Other Government schools in the locality will also absorb some of the pupil population from the East Victoria Park schools.
- (c) It should be possible to have the new school fully operational within a year of the present negotiations being successfully concluded.

4.

LAND

Warnbro Sound: Town Planning Policy

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

- (1) Have talks been held with the Rockingham Shire Council regarding detailed use of land in the Warnbro Sound area?

- (2) (a) If so, with what result;
(b) if not, is it intended to so do?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) I have discussed the area with representatives of Warnbro Sound Conservation Committee and Shire of Rockingham.

- (2) Further discussions with council and the Advisory Committee on Beach Erosion are necessary before finally determining future use.

5. TOWN PLANNING

Shopping Centres

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

- (1) Of the 22 submissions for development proposals for shopping centres received by the MRPA since this procedure was required, how many have been—
- approved without alteration;
 - approved with some alteration;
 - deferred;
 - rejected?
- (2) How many in each category were—
- under 5 000 sq. ft (or approximate metric equivalent);
 - between 5 000-10 000 sq. ft;
 - between 10 000-20 000 sq. ft;
 - over 20 000 sq. ft?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (a) 3.
 - (b) 6.
 - (c) 9—includes also those which are currently before the authority.
 - (d) 4.
- (2) (a) to (c) No applications under 20 000 sq. ft are required to be submitted to the authority.
- (d) 22.

6. RUBBISH DISPOSAL

Report: Maunsell and Partners

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

Will he table a copy of the report by Maunsell and Partners commissioned by the MRPA regarding refuse disposal, please?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Yes.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 237).

7. RUBBISH DISPOSAL

Report: Metropolitan Planning Committee

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

Will he table a copy of the report on rubbish disposal prepared by a technical sub-committee of the metropolitan refuse disposal planning committee, please?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Yes.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 238).

8.

TOWN PLANNING

Agencies: Interrelationship

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

Will he table a copy of the report and minutes mentioned in his Press statement of 30th August last, relating to inter-relationship of various planning agencies?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

No. This planned co-ordination and restructuring of planning agencies is an internal study which is continuing towards implementation of the Government's promise to review planning administration and co-ordination.

9.

WILDFLOWERS

Licenses for Picking

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

- (1) How many licenses have been issued for the picking of wildflowers for—
- scientific;
 - other, purposes?
- (2) What are the "other" purposes referred to?
- (3) When were licenses first issued?
- (4) What are the conditions under which the licenses are issued?
- (5) Is Pine Valley Flowers a licensee?
- (6) If "Yes" can the license be deputised to employees or contract pickers?
- (7) Is there any intention to amend the Native Flora Protection Act this year?
- (8) How many prosecutions have there been for contravention of the Native Flora Protection Act?
- (9) In respect of which sections were the prosecutions made?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) For the 1973-74 year there were—
- 35 authorities issued for scientific purposes.
 - 59 licenses issued to 29 different applicants for commercial picking.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No record is retained of when licenses were first issued but it is assumed that they date from 1936 when the Act was assented to.
- (4) Licenses are issued subject *inter alia* to—
- payment of prescribed royalty;
 - being confined to a specific area;

(c) the type and quantity of wild-flowers to be picked being specified.

(5) and (6) Yes.

(7) Revision of the Native Flora Protection Act is planned but it is not anticipated that legislative action will be taken this year.

(8) There have been no prosecutions for contravention of the Native Flora Protection Act in the last five years but 7 warnings for illegal picking have been issued.

(9) Answered by (8).

10. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Discretionary Advances

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

When considering amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, would he direct his attention to vesting in insurance companies liable to pay compensation on behalf of insured employers a discretion to advance from moneys due to a worker or former worker, a sum reasonable in the circumstances, to meet a special need of the worker or former worker for a capital sum, without recourse to redemption processes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Yes. Consideration will be given when amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act are proposed.

11. RAILWAYS

Kalgoorlie Booking Office: Upgrading

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

(1) Has a decision been made to enlarge the Kalgoorlie railway booking office and upgrade facilities for staff and patrons?

(2) If "Yes" would he give some details?

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

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No. The Railway Department is presently evaluating such a proposal.

(2) The proposal envisages the use of rooms under the main roof of the existing station building, which will become vacant about October 1974. A large public waiting area with ample access to booking facilities is proposed.

(3) A decision whether the work will proceed is dependent upon the availability of finance.

12. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Report of Examining Committee

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

(1) What are the terms of reference which have been issued to the expert committee examining the implementation of the Government's pre-school education scheme?

(2) When is it expected the report of this committee will be completed?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) The task allocated to the committee was to advise the Minister to ensure that the Government's programme was based upon the soundest educational principles and practices.

(2) For the time being the committee is operating as a standing committee.

13. MANJIMUP SCHOOL

Extensions

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

(1) Have tenders for the extensions and renovations to the Manjimup primary school been called, and if so, what is the tender price which has been accepted?

(2) When will work commence on the project?

(3) Will the work be completed before the commencement of the 1975 school year?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) Documents are anticipated to be available in early October following which tenders will be called.

(2) Work is likely to commence before the end of November.

(3) Extensions should be available for occupancy at the beginning of second term in 1975.

14. WATER SUPPLIES

Rates: Increase

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Is it correct as stated on an open line radio station last week that—
(a) water rate charges have been increased;

(b) the charges for excess water used have been increased;

(c) the household allowance before excess was assessed has been reduced?

(2) If (1) (a) and (b) are "Yes" when did these rises come into effect?

(3) If (1) (c) is "Yes" on what grounds are the reductions based?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) Yes.
- (2) 1st July, 1974.
- (3) The price of water was increased from 6.15c to 8c per kilolitre.

15. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Charges: Increase

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Electricity:

Does he anticipate any further increase in the electricity charges to consumers before the onset of next winter?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I certainly do not anticipate further increases.

One could, however—as distinct from anticipation—use one's imagination to envisage a situation when a sustained or even accelerating inflation might necessitate different price structures in all goods and services. This will largely depend on the Commonwealth's fiscal and economic policies and whether the general loan and revenue grants to the State will follow inflationary monetary values or not.

16. *This question was postponed.*

17. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND MINING

Foreign Ownership

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Was he correctly reported in *The West Australian* of 20th August, 1974 that "all the major industrial projects in WA would be 50 per cent Australian-owned by 1980"?
- (2) Is the word "industrial" meant to include the mining industry?
- (3) How does this statement tally with the Bureau of Census and Statistics report that foreign ownership and control of the Australian mining industry rose further in 1972-73?
- (4) What does he know that enables him to say with confidence that the trend will be reversed in such a short time?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Substantially, Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The relationship of the reference to 1972-73 to the plans for the future, is not understood—especially as there were Labor Governments in Canberra and Western Australia at that time.

- (4) On 4th September, in answer to a similar question (No. 23) from the Member for Mount Hawthorn, I replied as follows—

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

We will negotiate for majority Australian ownership, either in the short-term or the long-term, wherever Australians are willing or able to contribute the funds.

Our initial objective will be a majority Australian ownership in all major WA projects by 1980.

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

Already negotiations have been commenced in selected cases towards achieving this objective. For reasons which I would hope would be obvious to the Member, I am not prepared to nominate the specific industrial projects involved.

18.

TEACHERS

Promotion without Transfer

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister investigate the possibility of promoting primary and secondary State school teachers without necessarily transferring them to another school?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The Education Department has considered this question on a number of occasions.

It would not be possible to implement the proposal without affecting the interests of the schools to which the promoted teachers had been appointed. Further, in many cases teachers could be retained in positions for which they are not qualified or experienced.

19. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Production Figures for Last Five Years

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

Will he please advise the increases or decreases in production figures for each of the following industries for each of the last five years on a percentage basis—

CSBP

AIS

BP

ALCOA

Western Mining Nickel Refinery?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The Member should know that my department has no statutory obligation to obtain production or any other figures from companies.

Some figures are obtainable from the Companies Office according to the provisions of the Companies Act.

The Commonwealth Department dealing with statistics issues, from time to time, general figures of production but not for individual companies which is specifically prevented in the relevant Commonwealth Statute.

The Member is advised to seek this information from the companies concerned.

20. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Cockburn Sound: Discharge of Gypsum

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What industry or industries discharge gypsum waste into Cockburn Sound?
- (2) What is the map reference (latitude and longitude) of the precise position of the gypsum waste in Cockburn Sound?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Fertiliser industry.
- (2) A buoy, set 91 metres west of the centre and on the western extremity of the gypsum accumulation is located at:

Latitude 32° 14' 20" south,
longitude 115° 45' 11" east on
chart AUS 117.

21. COCKBURN SOUND

Mercury Deposits in Fish

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) Further to his answers to question 34 of 12th September, 1974 regarding tests for mercury deposits in fish, of the 36 samples taken in Cockburn Sound in 1974, how many were taken from each of the areas bounded by the following references—

latitude 32° 08.4' S.
longitude 115° 42.2' E.
latitude 32° 08.4' S.
longitude 115° 43.4' E.
latitude 32° 10.6' S.
longitude 115° 42.2' E.
latitude 32° 10.6' S.
longitude 115° 43.4' E.

- (2) What were the results of each sample and which area did it come from?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) All samples were taken from a rectangular area bounded by the given latitudes and longitudes.

(2) Results.

Sample No.; Fish;	Mercury (p.p.m.)
F.201—Crab	0.05
F.202—Shark	0.08
F.203—Stingray	0.40
F.204—Shark	0.10
F.205—Shark	0.04
F.206—Shark	0.04
F.207—Stingray	0.20
F.208—Shark	0.08
F.209—Shark	0.06
F.210—Liver Stingray	0.04
F.211—Stingray	0.10
F.212—Crab	0.04
F.213—Crab	0.06
F.214—Flathead (composite)	0.20
F.215—Flathead	0.40
F.216—Skipjack (composite)	0.04
F.217—Whiting (composite)	0.05
F.218—Skipjack (composite)	0.10
F.219—Flounder (composite)	0.04
F.220—Flying fish	0.05
F.221—Flying fish	0.07
F.222—Flying fish	0.06
F.223—Goatfish (composite)	0.05
F.224—Bream (composite)	0.04
F.225—Flathead	0.02
F.226—Flathead	0.40
F.227—Flathead	0.10
F.228—Flathead	0.50
F.229—Flathead	0.10
F.230—Butterfish	0.06
F.231—Butterfish	0.10
F.232—Skipjack (composite)	0.08
F.233—Leatherjacket	0.04
F.234—Leatherjacket	0.04
F.235—Yellowtail	0.04
F.236—Whiting	0.05

22. HEDLAND HIGH SCHOOL

Shifts System

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

- (1) What is the reason for the Hedland school adopting a shift system?
- (2) Do the children have lunch breaks all together or are they divided?
- (3) Do the children have recess together or are they divided?
- (4) What effects, if any, has this had on the social aspects of their school life?
- (5) On what facts does he base his answer to (4)?
- (6) Why is there only one school in Western Australia operating on this system?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The prime reason was the lack of sufficient bus transport to permit all high school students to start school at the one time.

However, there have been some substantial educational benefits provided by the new method of timetabling.

- (2) Lunch breaks are divided.
- (3) Recess is taken together from 10.00 a.m. to 10.15 a.m.
- (4) While there is strong support on the school staff for the form of timetabling which has been adopted, it is admitted that it is more difficult to arrange voluntary activities during the lunch break.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) Any school which wished to do so after consultation with parents, teachers and students, could adopt a pattern of staggered opening and closing times. The innovation has been explained to principals and other schools may adopt it in 1975.

23. TAMMARS *Garden Island*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) What monitoring has been done on the numbers of tammars on Garden Island?
- (2) Has any action been taken to protect the Garden Island tammars since the completion of the Garden Island causeway?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Researchers associated with the University of Western Australia and the Department of Environmental Protection have made test counts of tammars and made some trappings to investigate the condition of the animals.
- (2) The tamar is a protected animal under the Fauna Conservation Act. Since the building of the causeway there has been no additional measure taken except that the appropriate Commonwealth authorities are aware of the need for great care to ensure the protection of the species.

24. ROADS *Cats' Eyes Indicators*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Which roads in Western Australia are now fitted with "cats eyes"?
- (2) (a) Is it proposed to extend this facility to all Western Australian highways;
- (b) If "Yes" when;
- (c) If "No" why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Roads in Western Australia provided with raised, reflective pavement markers at the present time are as follows—
- (a) Mitchell Freeway and Narrows interchange—on the basis of complete simulation of all lane lines.

- (b) The Causeway eastern interchange and Stirling Highway between Bay View Terrace and Keane Street—on the basis of augmenting line marking.

- (2) (a) These are experimental sections involving both freeway and urban highway which are at present being assessed on the basis of night time effectiveness against cost of providing these raised, reflective markers.

Any extension of such raised, reflective marker provision will depend on the outcome of the assessments.

- (b) and (c) Answered by (2) (a).

25. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Cockburn Sound: Discharge of Gypsum

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) Is it a fact that the gypsum waste currently being disposed of in Cockburn Sound contains phosphates, lead, mercury and cadmium?
- (2) Is he aware of any modern procedure used elsewhere in the world to recycle the above, before disposing into the ocean?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes—but whether this is important to sea life in the sound and health standards is still being evaluated as indicated in answer to question No. 47 of 7th August, 1974.
- (2) No.

26. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Cockburn Sound: High Metal Samples

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) Is he aware of concern expressed in the *Weekend News* on Saturday, 14th September, relating to the high metal content in samples from Cockburn Sound?
- (2) Is there any indication that industries in the Kwinana area may be responsible for this high metal content?
- (3) (a) Have there been any large spillages of either nickel, cadmium or lead in the last few weeks;
- (b) what spillages have occurred;
- (c) what was the result detalling material lost, amount lost and where it went?
- (4) What tests have been carried out on the bore water in the Kwinana area over the last two years?

- (5) If "Yes" to (3), have any changes been noted since such spillages?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) High content not proven but under investigation.
- (3) (a) No.
(b) Mainly small oil spillages.
(c) Various petroleum products in small quantities treated by non-toxic dispersants.
- (4) This matter is best directed to my colleague, the Minister for Water Supplies.
- (5) Answered by (3).

27. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Hydrogen Sulphide: Production

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

- (1) Is H₂S being manufactured in the Kwinana industrial area?
- (2) If so, where?
- (3) Is H₂S a deadly gas?
- (4) How many accidents have occurred in the Kwinana area in the last 18 months involving H₂S?
- (5) What safeguards are being used to ensure that accidents do not occur in the plants and to protect the nearby residents?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) At the nickel refinery.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) None.
- (5) Chemical plants of this type have safety controls at every stage. This plant was approved by the Air Pollution Control Council and special continuous air monitoring at the refinery boundary has been conducted since March 1971.

28. JOHN FORREST SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Hall

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the long delay in meeting a deputation with respect to the promised provision of a hall for the John Forrest Senior High School is causing annoyance amongst those concerned?
- (2) When will the Minister meet with the deputation?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The Minister is aware that there has been some delay in meeting a deputation with respect to the

provision of a hall/gymnasium at the John Forrest Senior High School.

The whole matter of providing halls/gymnasiums to schools is being considered in relation to the Government's policy of making greater community use of school facilities and the Crown Law Department was asked to examine the situation, particularly in relation to the problem of local authorities and the Education Department spending moneys on joint facilities, with a view to recommending a course of action to overcome these problems.

The Minister has, today, received a report from the Minister for Justice on the matter, which will be considered as soon as possible.

- (2) The Minister has previously indicated his willingness to meet a deputation to discuss the project at John Forrest Senior High School but did ask that it be deferred pending the result of the examinations mentioned in (1) above. As the report has now come to hand, the Minister has indicated that he will be available to meet a deputation on Monday, 30th September.

29.

SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Administration, and Policy Making

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Education Act so as to provide for the implementation of the announced policy to encourage greater participation by the community in the administration and policy making of primary and secondary schools, including the development of school councils?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No amendment of the Education Act is necessary.

30. MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

Shortage

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the shortage of doctors in Geraldton and in a number of other country centres?
- (2) Has he considered a scheme by which a number of medical students would spend part of their final year in residence in major regional hospitals?

- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what conclusions has he drawn?
- (4) If "No" to (2) will he consider such a scheme?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) No. Final year medical students would not help to relieve the medical staff shortage in country centres, and in fact because of the supervision and teaching required their presence could make the situation worse. Consideration is being given to the employment of residents at selected centres but this is a complex matter requiring careful negotiation.

31. RAILWAYS

Geraldton Marshalling Yards

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What time schedule is projected for the establishment of new railway marshalling yards in Geraldton?
- (2) Has a site been decided upon for such marshalling yards?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what is the location of the site?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No time schedule has been determined for the provision of a new railway depot at Geraldton.
- (2) The question of provision of a site is one of the matters under review by the Geraldton Regional Planning Study. I am informed that the study group expects to complete its report prior to the end of the year.
- (3) Answered by (2).

32. FISHERIES

Crab Licenses

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Has any decision been made regarding determination of limits of operations by licensed crab fishermen operating at Busselton?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) would he give detail and what organisations have been advised?
- (3) If "No" to (1) as this matter was raised some six weeks ago when is a decision expected?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) to (3) Following the meeting between the Director of Fisheries and representatives of the Busselton Shire re professional crab fishing at Busselton, the director

has sought further information with a view to specifying, as a condition attaching to a license, a closed area to professional crab fishermen on either side of the Busselton jetty and a limit on the number of crab drop nets per fishing unit allowed in the open waters.

This information is now at hand and a report will be before me within the next week. A decision will then be made immediately and the Busselton Shire advised.

33.

DAIRYING

Costs: Survey

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the dairy industry cost survey include butterfat producers?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) Who authorised the inquiry and for what purpose is the information required?
- (4) Will he give assurance that butterfat producers will be included in this survey?

Mr Stephens (for Mr McPHARLIN) replied:

- (1) No.
 - (2) and (3) The survey was specifically commissioned for the purpose of providing information to the Dairy Industry Authority for a current price review of market milk in accordance with section 49 (i) (a) of the Dairy Industry Act.
- The Dairy Industry Authority requested me as Minister responsible to arrange for the rural economics and marketing section of the Department of Agriculture to carry out this survey.

- (4) The Bureau of Agricultural Economics is presently surveying the manufacturing and market milk sectors of the dairy industry for the Industries Assistance Commission. Access to this data will be possible and the findings will be examined.

34.

COLLIE DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Additions

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are the Collie District Hospital additions, which I officially opened in March this year, now open?
- (2) If not, would he please advise when the additions will be available for use?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) There has been delay because of the bankruptcy of the mechanical sub-contractor. It is hoped to have final works carried out next week and for the building to be ready for occupation by 30th September.

35.

TRAFFIC

Accidents: Causeway

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Since the completion of the overway and ramps at the eastern end of the Causeway, Victoria Park, how many accidents have occurred involving—
 - (a) vehicles;
 - (b) pedestrians?
- (2) Would he detail the number of accidents which have occurred in the above categories during daylight and at night?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) Thirteen vehicles,
(b) One pedestrian,
since opening date 7th March, 1974.
- (2) Eleven vehicle accidents during daylight hours and two at night. The pedestrian accident occurred during daylight.

36.

URANIUM PILOT PLANT, KWINANA

Environmental Protection Report

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Prior to the establishment of the small uranium pilot plant at Kwinana were the possible adverse effects on the environment investigated by the Department of Environmental Protection?
- (2) If so, what was the resultant determination?
- (3) If not, what were the reasons for not investigating this matter?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The Department of Environmental Protection was not requested to report on this matter: the supervision of radioactive substances under the Radioactive Substances Act 1954-64 has been exercised in this instance by the radiological branch of the Department of Public Health, an officer of which has inspected and approved the small facility at Kwinana.

37.

MINERAL CLAIMS

Newmont Pty. Ltd.

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) In connection with Newmont Proprietary Limited's application for mineral claims Nos. 45/7195 to 45/7200, 45/7248 to 45/7250 in the Paterson Range area, will he advise if a decision has been made regarding these applications?
 - (2) If so, what was the decision of the department?
 - (3) If not, when can a decision be expected?
- Mr MENSAROS replied:
- (1) No.
 - (2) In this case the department—as the Member well knows—does not make a decision, only a recommendation.
 - (3) The Minister will make a decision—based on the best advice available—in the near future.

38.

TRAFFIC

Motor Vehicle License Fees: New Scale

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Traffic:

Has the relevant department under his control issued instructions regarding the application of new motor vehicle license fees, and if so, will he table a copy of such instruction?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Yes, and a copy will be tabled.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 239).

39.

NORTH AND SOUTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOLS

Resource Centres

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

- (1) When was the decision made to provide a resource centre at the North Kalgoorlie primary school?
- (2) When is it likely that such a centre will be constructed at South Kalgoorlie school?
- (3) On what date was the South Kalgoorlie parents and citizens' association last advised that lack of finance precluded the construction of a resource centre at present?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 1973.
- (2) Consideration will be given when further fund allocations are made.
- (3) 6th May, 1974.

40. SOUTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

Completion of Building

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

- (1) Is the Minister in receipt of a letter dated 13th September, 1974 from the secretary of the South Kalgoorlie school parents and citizens' association expressing concern at the lack of progress in the building development at the South Kalgoorlie primary school?
- (2) Is 15th October next still regarded as the completion date for the building operations at the school?
- (3) If not, why, and what other date is now considered?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Shortage of materials and certain labour problems have combined to cause delays.
The earliest realistic completion date is now considered to be mid-December.

41. SOUTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

Fence

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

Has a decision been made to complete fencing of the South Kalgoorlie school grounds in accordance with a report and recommendation made by his predecessor subsequent to a visit to the school in March of this year?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No decision has yet been made.

QUESTIONS (10): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. FEDERAL BUDGET
Impact on State

Mr GREWAR, to the Premier:

Would he please advise the House of his reaction to the Federal Budget in terms of—

- (1) its impact on producers; particularly farmers and miners;
- (2) its impact on people whose children attend non-Government schools;
- (3) assistance, if any, to the States to help overcome their budgetary problems?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I thank the honourable member for notice of the question.

Mr Bertram: Who drafted it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Do not members opposite think the member for Roe has an interest in matters rural? The answer is—

- (1) The Federal Budget fails to recognise the problem inflation is presenting for producers. It does nothing to stimulate production and restrain cost increases which are essential moves if we are to avoid economic disaster.

The farming community will be hit by higher costs for superphosphate, fuel, telephones, and postage at a time when incomes from wool and meat are falling.

Miners will be particularly hard hit by the abolition of the partial tax exemption on income from certain minerals and proposed changes in the deductibility of expenditure on mine development.

It is clear that the Commonwealth Government intends to continue its attack on the primary industries that have contributed so much to the economic development of the nation.

Mr May: It must be grievance day.

Sir CHARLES COURT: To continue—

- (2) The cut from \$400 to \$150 in the allowable deduction for education expenses is a vicious attack on people at all income levels who choose to send their children to non-Government schools. The Federal Government appears to believe in the myth that only the wealthy send their children to fee-charging schools, whereas the opposite is true. Many people on limited incomes make great sacrifices to give their children an alternative education and this attack on them and on the non-Government school system will, I am sure, be bitterly resented.

- (3) The Budget gives the lie to statements made by the Prime Minister at the June Premier's Conference that the Federal Government would have to exercise restraint in its expenditure programmes and could not afford to help the States in their struggle to meet greatly inflated costs.

The Federal Government has shown callous indifference to the needs of the States and has gone on a spending spree with the taxpayers' funds—

Mr A. R. Tonkin: On education, yes.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —that can only add fuel to the now rampant fires of inflation and further worsen the financial position of the States.

2. FEDERAL BUDGET *Impact on Farmers*

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

My question has reference to the answer he has just given. In view of the very sorry picture he has now painted for the farmers, is it his intention to advise them to apply for the old age pension or get off their farms as he did a few years ago?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I cannot recall advising farmers to take the old age pension and get off their farms. I have no intention of advising them to do that at the present time, although I know already quite a number of farmers are being forced to get their sons to apply for unemployment relief as a result of the desperate position of some farming communities.

If the Federal Government keeps to its present policy some farmers will be forced not only to go onto the pension, but also, in some other cases, people will be forced to go onto unemployment relief.

3. EDUCATION

National Conference on Isolated Children

Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was the Minister aware that a conference was held in Brisbane from the 3rd to the 6th September, dealing with isolated education, pre-school education, and other matters?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes" did he receive an invitation to attend or to send a delegate to participate?
- (3) What was the purpose of the conference and under whose auspices was it arranged?
- (4) Apart from the State member for Ascot, how many parliamentary representatives attended from other States?
- (5) What was the total number of delegates in attendance and how many were from Western Australia?
- (6) By whom were the travelling and other expenses of the conference met?
- (7) Is the Minister aware that Government members, who represent nearly all of the remote areas of

the State, were not given an opportunity to reflect the views of isolated families at the conference?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) An invitation to nominate a delegate was addressed to the Education Department.
- (3) (a) To explore the theme of pre-school education of isolated children.
(b) The conference was arranged by the Queensland Education Department using funds provided by the Commonwealth Government.
- (4) and (5) An official list describing the identity and affiliation of delegates was not issued at the conference.
- (6) The fare and expenses of the departmental delegate were paid by the Education Department. Information is not available as to the extent of assistance available to other delegates.
- (7) The Education Department was not responsible for the issue of invitations. However, the organisers published an advertisement in *The West Australian* drawing attention to the conference and inviting participation by interested individuals.

4. EDUCATION AND CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Federal Budget Proposals

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

Can he express his Government's attitude towards the Australian Government's decision to greatly increase expenditure on education and to deliberately refrain from increasing regressive taxes; to ease the burden on low income earners through taxation; and, further, can the Premier please advise this House whether he favours the Federal Government's introduction of a capital gains tax?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I am afraid I cannot thank the honourable member for any notice of the question, but just from memory, as he gave the question, and if I remember correctly, the first question relates to education. Of course, we always welcome expenditure on education and we sincerely hope it will be possible for us to use this money without having an intolerable burden imposed on it with tied conditions.

Secondly, the honourable member wants to know the reaction of this Government regarding what he claimed—if I remember correctly—the failure of the Commonwealth Government to add to the regressive indirect taxes, or words to that effect, presumably meaning such things as sales tax, and the like.

Naturally I welcome the fact that the Commonwealth Government did not load the people with further taxes in this field. What I regret is that it did not do what its advisers suggested; that is, to reduce some of them and take some of the cost pressures off the community at present as some aid to abating inflation.

The third question, if I remember correctly, was in relation to income tax. Of course we welcome the modest reductions, but we would have been much happier had the Federal Government made a reduction which would have been more acceptable so far as the workers are concerned, because the total saving at the highest level of saving is, in my opinion, not sufficient to be a great inducement to encourage wage restraint. No doubt the honourable member has studied the Budget, and he will quickly realise that in the pay envelope section of income tax collections, the Commonwealth itself has this year budgeted—and I emphasise that this is in the pay envelope section of income tax collections—to collect over 45 per cent additional income tax this year in spite of the reductions which are said to amount to something like \$450 million, but which in the eyes of the experts will be nothing like that, because as inflation continues and wage levels rise, many of these workers will move up into another and higher tax bracket.

The fourth question asked by the honourable member relates to capital gains tax. I have not had a chance to study in great detail this part of the Budget, but I believe it will be a tax that will be a tremendous discouragement to thrift and a tremendous disincentive to private enterprise. I know that some people have varying views on capital gains tax. There will be instances when it is warranted, but if the honourable member studies the Commonwealth's proposal he will find it will be a fairly vicious tax and will prove to be a disincentive to enterprise and thrift.

5. LOAN COUNCIL ALLOCATION

Increase

Mr CLARKO, to the Premier:

- (1) What is Western Australia's share of the 10 per cent increase in the State Government Loan Council programmes announced in the Federal Budget?
- (2) Will this additional allocation make a significant contribution to the State's resources in 1974-75?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I thank the member for Karrinyup for some notice of this question, but if I may interpolate for a moment, I wish to say that I am not quite sure whether I covered all the points that were raised by the honourable member who asked the previous question. However, if I did not, he can let me know by way of interjection. The answers to the question asked by the member for Karrinyup are—

- (1) \$8 606 million.
- (2) Although I welcome the increase I should point out that the Prime Minister has foreshadowed a shortfall in semi-governmental borrowings and, accordingly, a substantial part of the additional allocation will have to be held in reserve in order to cushion this likely shortfall. As a result, any net gain from the 10 per cent increase is likely to be minimal and, in fact, if the shortfall is considerable, as it now threatens to be, the total amount available for the 1974-75 programme will be less than that approved at the June, 1974, Premiers' Conference.

6. RECREATION, SEWERAGE, AND TV-RADIO LICENSES

Federal Budget Proposals

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

Can he express his Government's attitude towards the Australian Government's decision to greatly increase expenditure on recreation; to provide his State Government with considerable funds for sewerage works, and to remove the burden on many low income earners by abolishing radio and TV license fees?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the honourable member—

Mr Jamieson: He has started something now.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Let him keep going; wait till I finish the answers.

Mr Jamieson: We are getting it all down in *Hansard* and we will use this as good stuff.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does. In answering the first part of the honourable member's question dealing with recreation, of course we welcome additional money for recreation. However, again I emphasise that I hope we get it on conditions that are tolerable and not under conditions which tie the State Government to a situation where it cannot afford the matching money, or on a basis which undermines the autonomy, and the rights and responsibilities of local authorities. On the score of sewerage, again we welcome the money, and again I emphasise that we sincerely hope that the conditions will be such that we can live with them; and I also hope we can get the right to spend this money in areas other than the metropolitan area, because there are some areas outside the metropolitan area which are desperately in need of sewerage and the conditions currently laid down for a town with a minimum population of 20 000 does not, of course, particularly help Western Australia.

Mr Jamieson: It has been brought down to a figure which is a lot better than 60 000.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: May I add that the Whitlam Government has expressed itself to be a great decentralisation Government, but the great upsurge of expenditure in this field is directed towards urban needs.

Mr B. T. Burke: No-one wants to live in the country because that is where the Country Party supporters live.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope that is recorded in *Hansard*. I hope it is printed in block letters.

The third question related to radio and TV licenses, and I am glad to see that this fee has been abolished. However, I would rather have seen moves of greater significance taken so far as the future stability of our economy is concerned.

7. PRE-SCHOOL AND CHILD-CARE CENTRES

Federal Budget Allocations

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Does his Government welcome the very substantial increase in the amount of money made available for pre-school education centres and child-care centres as announced in the Federal Budget last night; and will he indicate to the House what Western Australia's share of that additional money is likely to be?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the honourable member, naturally we want all the money we can get for pre-school education centres and child-care centres, and I emphasise again that I hope it is made available on conditions we can live with, and that the Commonwealth Government will not tie us to conditions that will send us broke. I cannot answer off the cuff what Western Australia will get as its allocation, but I can assure the honourable member that it will be well applied.

8. TV-RADIO LICENSES

Federal Budget Proposals

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that the Australian Government has abolished radio and TV licenses, and having regard to the desire of the State Government to increase State charges, is it the intention of the State Government to impose radio and TV license fees in Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I could give a very biting answer to the honourable member's question, as he has been a Minister and would be expected to understand something of the rights and responsibilities of respective Commonwealth and State finances and should know the answer—but I will not. We have no current intention of stepping in to this particular field where the Commonwealth Government has moved out.

9. MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSE FEES

Increase

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Traffic:

This question relates to papers that were tabled today regarding license fees.

According to these papers, the relative paragraph reads—

Renewals of licenses expiring on or after September 30th, 1974, attract the new fees.

Would it not be reasonable to allow those holders of licenses that expire on the 30th September to pay at the old rate?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Not having had any notice of this question, I ask that it be put on the notice paper.

10.

SEWERAGE

Country Connections

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

Arising from an earlier remark he made which stemmed from a prior set of answers he gave in this House, my question is—

As sewerage, as a percentage of the number of dwellings in the metropolitan region was 51 per cent in 1961, 43.6 per cent in 1965, and 39 per cent in 1973, can he indicate the country towns that have a higher priority, when taking into consideration these figures for the metropolitan region?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the honourable member I would not be prepared to make such a statement off the cuff, but I should imagine that the honourable member, being a representative of a country electorate, would be just as keen as I am to see some of this money spent outside the metropolitan area, and I suggest that if he wants to pursue the matter further it is an appropriate question to put on the notice paper.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Dress in Chamber: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER: Before proceeding to grievances I want to make some comment about dress. I have noticed that some members have left their coats off in the last few days of sitting. Speakers before my period in this office endeavoured to keep the standard of dress in the Chamber as high as possible.

My immediate predecessor, Mr Daniel Norton, did permit members to take their coats off, provided they wore long-sleeved shirts and ties, and provided that the conditions were oppressive and difficult to cope with, I am sure most of us want to follow a standard of dress that is regarded as reasonable in this House.

I would like to take a similar stand to that which my predecessor took; that is, on really hot, oppressive days members would be permitted to take their coats off.

However, if today some members want to retain their present mode of dress so be it; but I would ask that in future they keep their coats on for as long as is reasonable. I have some sympathy for those members, because I found the hot weather this week to be very oppressive.

I do ask members to co-operate in this regard. I am not trying to be dictatorial at all; I just want to gain the co-operation of members on that feature. It would be preferable if members keep their coats on, but if the weather conditions are so oppressive that members feel distressed then by all means they should take their coats off.

PESTICIDES

Ban on Use: Grievance

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [5.17 p.m.]: I want to raise the question of pesticide residues in this grievance debate. This is a matter which I have raised on several occasions in the House by way of questions. In particular, I am concerned with what the House should regard as the use of rather loose language.

Firstly, I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 28th August, in which the Minister for Agriculture is reported to have said—

The WA Agricultural Department had banned their use on crops for human consumption and on pastures.

I do not believe that the use of the word "banned" in that case was at all accurate. In my view a ban would suggest that it is not possible to use the pesticides; and in that instance the Minister for Agriculture was referring to the chlorinated hydrocarbons, such as DDT, aldrin, and dieldrin. The fact is that anyone is able to purchase these compounds over the counter, and apply them to his crops.

In this regard I asked a question in several parts of the Minister for Agriculture. One part of my question was—

(7) What is the precise nature and legal effect of the ban on crops for human consumption and on pastures referred to in the article?

The reply of the Minister was—

(7) An effective restriction on such usage is obtained by labelling requirements under the provisions of the Health Act. Labels may only bear approved instructions for use and must carry toxicological warnings.

The affixing of a label to a bottle can in no way be regarded as constituting a ban on the use of the contents. It is not a ban to label the contents of a bottle in such a way as to indicate the purpose for which the contents should be used, the recommendation on their use, and a warning of their danger.

I would like to quote briefly from an article which appeared in the *Time* magazine of the 2nd September. It is headed, "The Dieldrin Dilemma" and states—

Recently, after a year of still-unfinished hearings, the Environmental Protection Agency announced that it plans to order a halt in the production of aldrin and of a related Shell pesticide, dieldrin. Reason: the chemicals present "extremely high cancer risk".

That shows the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States has planned to order a halt in production. I suggest that is the only way we can bring about a ban; that is, if actual production is halted.

It is not correct for the Minister for Agriculture to talk about a ban on the use of these pesticides in Western Australia, because it is possible for anyone to buy dieldrin, aldrin, and DDT; and then to use those compounds on his crops. There may be a label recommending the usage of the compounds. I believe the Minister used the word "ban" very incorrectly. This gave an assurance to the people of Western Australia which, no doubt, the Minister wanted to give. However, he has no right to give that assurance, because there is no ban on the use of these pesticides and they are being applied to crops without very much control.

In the report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 28th August, to which I have already made reference, the Minister for Agriculture is also reported as having said—

Because of that, agricultural authorities had ensured that such chemicals were phased out of use in situations where they could end up in food or people.

As a result of that I asked the Minister for Agriculture the following question—

- (5) By the use of the term "agricultural authorities" did the Minister specifically refer to the WA Department of Agriculture?

The answer of the Minister was, "No". In other words, he talked about the agricultural authorities phasing out the use of these chlorinated hydrocarbons, but he misled the public by saying they were being phased out throughout the world. Controversy was raging in Western Australia on the use of these pesticides. People were entitled to think that the reference included Western Australia but it did not according to the Minister's answer.

In another part of the same question I asked the Minister for Agriculture—

- (8) What information does the Minister have on the analyses of breast milk that enables him to state confidently that nursing mothers were being "unnecessarily alarmed"?

- (9) Will he inform the House of such precise information?

The reply of the Minister in part was—

The House will recall that the corresponding figures for the more recent survey have been somewhat lower than this, namely, 0.12 ppm. and 0.007 ppm. respectively.

In the first case it was the DDT mean; and in the second case it was the dieldrin mean. I believe it is not possible to give such an assurance, because those figures, although very low, represented the mean of seven cases, including one case at Kununurra with a high level of DDT and dieldrin. In fact, those figures represented the mean of six cases.

Statistically, a mean is worthless if it refers to only six or seven analyses of breast milk. To support this contention I would refer to the 1971 report of the National Health and Medical Research Council, which advises the Australian Government. At page 8 the following appears—

The survey has demonstrated that there is a need for further analyses for dieldrin in particular food groups. Until a much larger number of samples are analysed it would not be possible to validly comment on the relevance of results in an average diet.

It would not be possible to comment validly, because insufficient cases were analysed. Let us see in that instance how many samples were analysed; we find that the number totalled 240 samples. The National Health and Medical Research Council set out in its report—

Until a much larger number of samples are analysed it would not be possible to validly comment . . .

Yet we find that the Minister for Agriculture assured the people of Western Australia that there was no need to worry, and he based that assurance on seven cases, or if we exclude the Kununurra instance, on six cases. This number of cases is not high enough to warrant any comment being made. I would ask the Government to make sure before it gives assurances to people on health matters to base them on reasonable information which has statistical validity.

I would urge the Government to take four steps which I believe would remedy the position, and bring Western Australia into line with overseas trends, because overseas countries are really banning the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two more minutes.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The four steps which I propose are, firstly, that the advisers to the Department of Agriculture should stop advising the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons, such as the use of dieldrin to combat the black beetle in potato crops. They

should advise people to use organophosphorous compounds which contain a much higher level of toxicity than chlorinated hydrocarbons, and which are much more effective in destroying pests. Furthermore, they break down in the soil over a shorter period of time.

Secondly, I would ask the Department of Agriculture to institute tests on various foods, such as apples, potatoes, cereals, and milk. Thirdly, I would urge that when the department makes these tests, the results should be made available readily to the public, rather than be extracted from the Government like a dentist extracts teeth.

Fourthly, the Government should stop using the misleading term "ban" unless in actual fact a ban is imposed; in other words, it is not possible for the public to buy these pesticides over the counter. It is misleading for the Minister to use the word "ban" in that context, and he should only use the term in its proper sense.

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [5.26 p.m.]: I do not feel qualified to comment on the points which have been raised by the member for Morley. He referred to a matter which concerns the Minister for Agriculture in particular. However, it appears to me that some of the points raised should be referred to the Minister for Health, as well as the Minister for Agriculture.

I undertake to refer the subject of the grievance to the Ministers mentioned, and to request them to examine the proposals which the member for Morley has put forward. I can give the honourable member an assurance that the Minister for Agriculture, in making the comments which have been reported in the newspaper mentioned, had no intention of misleading the House or the public of this State.

TOWN PLANNING

Subdivisions: Grievance

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [5.27 p.m.]: My grievance is directed to the Town Planning Board and to its frequently changing policies, and I shall indicate how they have affected my electorate and the Shires of Capel, Busselton, and Augusta-Margaret River. I emphasise that the points I am raising are not necessarily confined to the areas I represent; they also affect other shire districts throughout Western Australia. To confirm the points I raise I give examples of three subdivisions which have been approved by the local authorities concerned and ultimately they were objected to by the board for various reasons.

The final result has led to a breakdown in co-operation, and to a large extent to complete frustration, because of the varying policies of the board. To date, the success rate of appeals has been excellent, and one can count the failures on the fingers of one's hand.

However, the work on the appeals has taken up a great deal of my time and effort. Furthermore, it has also taken up a great deal of the time of the applicants and the shires concerned, as well as the officers of the Town Planning Board and finally the Minister, because there has been a clear lack of understanding on the establishment of policy and planning guidelines for all the parties concerned.

My concern now reaches far greater proportions following questions asked in the House towards the end of August. These questions related to the policies of the board in relation to coastal subdivisions in the area stretching from Bunbury to Cape Beaufort, which is near Augusta.

My concern was further heightened by the headline of a report in the *Busselton-Margaret Times* of the 5th September, "Dampier put on coastal progress". This has caused concern throughout the area.

In answer to yet another question asked on the same day, and relating to the same matter, the board indicated that the policy it had enunciated was publicly announced for the first time. This is causing a great deal of confusion.

I contend that at least it should have been reasonable for the board to have had consultations and discussions with the shires concerned, before making this announcement. However, that was not the case. I strongly object to the bureaucratic type of decision that has since eventuated. Irrespective of whether this decision comes from Perth or Canberra, I fail to see how an organisation like the Town Planning Board is able to control entirely the destinies of these localised areas.

The decision was made without discussion, without consultation, and without a full understanding of the problems which local shires are facing. If the board and the shires concerned had met and discussed the matter I believe guidelines could have been established which would have been to the mutual benefit of all concerned. However, that was not the case.

I raise these matters because of the confusion which has existed in the past regarding decisions and policies which the board has enunciated from time to time, and I intend to refer to some particular items.

In August, 1972, the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River received guidelines relating to rural subdivisions. The shire was seeking subdivisions of this type at that time. In order to appreciate the situation members need to have a mental picture of the geographic makeup of the shire. It comprises some 236 000 hectares, of which approximately one-third is alienated, leaving two-thirds of the area as national parks, forestry reserves, cave reserves, and so on. In other words, the Government held approximately two-thirds of the land.

The policy enunciated was that no rural subdivision should be approved within one mile of any beach or river, within one mile of any major road, within 10 miles of any major or growing town, or within five miles of any other town. The mental picture is that the coastal land is basically Crown land, the agricultural land is five miles in width, and between those two areas there are two major roads—the Caves Road and the Bussell Highway—and then there is the State Forest area. If the policy of the board was to be followed the only subdivisions which could have been allowed would have been in the forestry areas, and I have no doubt the Minister for Forests would not agree to such subdivisions. If he did, certainly, no-one would want to live in those areas.

The point I am making is that the policy has changed since it was first set down in August, 1972. Another policy was put forward and then, as late as last month, yet another policy was enunciated. There have been three changes in two years! Regarding subdivisions in the Busselton Shire, outside reticulated areas, these have been subject to appeal, counter appeal, and counter counter appeal. The reason for the appeals has been the policy for the provision of reticulated water services before subdivisions are granted, even though the applicants for the subdivisions had met the local authority requirements, and the requirements of the Public Health Department, and even though only 20 miles away in the neighbouring shire—which is subject to the same policies—a Government-controlled subdivision at Gracetown was proceeding merrily along without any water requirements whatsoever. These are the areas of policy frustration about which I am speaking.

Another classic case concerns an application by a farmer in the Capel area. He has a farm of 300 acres and he wishes his sons to settle on the farm. The farmer desires to subdivide the property so that his sons can acquire the necessary finance to set up their own homes. They want to retain the family farm unit.

This particular case has been before the board, but the application has been refused. The local authority has subjected the application to close scrutiny and has given its approval but the board's refusal has been on the basis that other blocks of land which the sons can buy are available in the area. I do not believe that is a valid enough reason for refusing the subdivision.

The SPEAKER: The member has another two minutes.

Mr BLAIKIE: I believe there is an urgent need for the Minister, in the company of senior officers of his department, to visit the areas I have mentioned in order to discuss and rectify the various problems I have raised. Those problems

are certainly very real. It is most important that the role of local authorities is clearly defined and enunciated, because if local authorities are to function they must have responsibility. I believe they will respect their responsibility as I know they have done in the past.

However, that is not the position at present. If the situation continues the changing policies of the board will frustrate and negate the very grass-roots people upon whom we depend so much.

I raise this grievance in the sincere hope that the Minister will conduct an investigation into the points I have raised.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) (5.36 p.m.): I am sure the question raised by the member for Vasse is of considerable interest to all members in the Chamber. I am conscious of his vast interest in the subject he has raised because he has brought more issues to my attention than has any other member in this Chamber.

I understand the objective of the grievance raised by the member for Vasse. I am sure he would be aware that members of the Town Planning Board have visited the area in question to fully acquaint themselves with it.

Since I have had the privilege of holding the portfolio of Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning and Minister for Local Government my objective has been to involve local government in planning at every step. Only today I received confirmation from the Busselton Shire of development in its area where agreement had been reached between the Town Planning Board and the local authority. Environmental matters had been raised which caused some further concern. I sought confirmation of the attitude of the local authority and on the advice I have received today its attitude has not changed.

The involvement of local government is all-important. I am aware of the conflict which exists between the development and preservation in the member's areas. I believe there is no better way to become acquainted with the problems than to visit the areas concerned and for that reason I intend to visit Busselton, accompanied by officers of my department, to examine the problems which confront the local shire. I intend—during October—to acquaint myself at first hand with the problems which have arisen, and have been mentioned by the member for Vasse today. Steps should be taken to co-ordinate an approach towards resolving the difficulties which arise.

The member for Vasse may not be aware that since I have been the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning I have become very much aware of the different points of view which exist relating to the many applications and appeals

which have come to me concerning the area of land between Mandurah and Bunbury. I have taken the initiative in an effort to determine the future use of land which is adjacent to the Old Coast Road. It seems that the same approach could be used regarding the Bunbury, Capel, Busseton, and Augusta-Margaret River coastal areas.

The member for Vasse can be assured that as time allows I will act to obtain a first-hand knowledge of his area. I have already visited the district on one occasion but one cannot appreciate all the needs of an area during one visit. On my second visit I will have my departmental officers with me and I will endeavour to take the initiative, the same as I did with regard to the area adjacent to the Old Coast Road. I think that approach could do much towards removing uncertainties regarding future development.

It is very necessary to advance our planning so that local authorities can proceed with confidence. On this occasion I acknowledge the keen interest of the member for Vasse in the subject he has raised. As I said, it is my intention to visit Busseton, and other areas as necessary, to become better acquainted with town planning problems. If necessary, I will be prepared to take the same initiative as I did with regard to the area adjacent to the Old Coast Road between Mandurah and Bunbury in an effort to assist.

PENSIONERS

Motor Vehicle Licenses: Grievance

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [5.41 p.m.]: Firstly, I want to refer to replies given by a Minister in this House to questions asked of him, and similar replies given by a Minister in another place. I will also refer to statements made by the Government in connection with the same subject raised in the questions.

My grievance concerns the Government's policy regarding concessions for pensioners generally and, especially, concessions in relation to increased vehicle license fees. It will be recalled that previously I mentioned I had written to the Minister for Traffic on the 23rd July last when the Government announced that it intended to increase license fees. I asked the Minister whether pensioners would receive any concession when the license fees were increased. A question I asked the Minister for Transport, on the 31st July, was as follows—

- (1) Was the Minister correctly reported in *The West Australian* of today's date, where he was quoted as saying he is investigating possibilities of pensioner exemption from proposed increases in motor vehicle license fees?

- (2) If the answer is "Yes", will he please explain why he informed me by letter dated the 22nd July, 1974, following a submission I made on behalf of pensioners in connection with the matter, that he cannot extend concessions to aged pensioners?

The Minister replied—

I thank the honourable member for notice of his question. The answer is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Subsequent to the letter referred to, Cabinet has set up a committee to investigate whether some special action can be taken to assist pensioners with the payment of vehicle license fees.

The important part of that reply was that Cabinet had set up a committee. From that point the matter was again raised in another place. The Leader of the Opposition, in the other place, queried the Minister representing the Minister in this House, regarding concessions for pensioners, and the Minister said—

... Cabinet has set up a committee to investigate whether some special action can be taken to assist the pensioners with the payment of the vehicle license fees.

The matter was again raised on the 10th September, in the other place. Because of the complexity of the question of concessions to pensioners, apparently the Opposition in another place was not happy with the reply given by the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. The Minister representing the Minister for Transport, in the other place, said—

As stated in the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Transport, the Government has appointed a committee to investigate the whole question of concessions to pensioners.

Note, the committee was to investigate the whole question of concessions to pensioners. That statement was made on the 10th September.

Because of the confusion which existed with regard to the answers given in this House, and the attitude of the Minister in another place, the matter was again raised on the 11th September. The Minister in the other place, representing the Minister for Transport, said—

I have had many applications from pensioners' organisations for concessions of various kinds and the Government's intention is to set up a good and capable committee...

The Government's intention was to set up a good and capable committee.

Then, a most staggering statement was made when this matter was again raised in another place. In reply to the question

asked by the Leader of the Opposition there the Minister representing the Minister for Transport said—

No committee was set up to look into the reduction of license fees to pensioners.

I ask members to note: No committee was set up to look into the reduction of license fees to pensioners. This is a very alarming situation. When the Minister in another place was asked what had been done about the setting up of this committee, the Minister representing the Minister for Traffic in another place said—

The committee is in the process of being formed. We are awaiting the return of people who are outside the State at present so that we may obtain their consent to serve on this committee.

This is a very strange situation.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: That is putting it mildly.

Mr T. H. JONES: I believe it is true to say that both Houses of Parliament have been misinformed. Someone should be answerable for this misdemeanour. It seems there is little liaison in the Cabinet. On the 23rd July I wrote to the Minister for Traffic because of my concern about the impact of this legislation on pensioners. In his reply to a question on the 31st July, he assured me that the committee had been set up. The Minister in another place said that the Government was considering the setting up of a committee, and then he said that the committee has not been set up. These are contradictory remarks. The Minister in one place says the committee has been set up and the Minister in another place says it has not been set up.

In *The West Australian* of the 17th of this month, just a day ago, under the heading, "Pensioners problems to be studied", we read—

The State Government will set up a committee—probably next week—to inquire into concessions and benefits for pensioners in WA.

What a state of affairs!

Before the legislation came to Parliament I expressed concern about the impact on pensioners of increased license fees. I wrote to the Minister and I was informed that the Government could do nothing about concessions. I then found, following a Press statement, that the Government had somersaulted. In answer to my question of the 31st July, the Minister told us that a committee had been set up to consider the matter. Then when the leader of my party in the other place queried the Minister representing the Minister for Traffic, he was told that nothing had been set up. A few days after that the Minister in another place made the statement that the committee was in the process of being formed.

We then see by the Press statement in *The West Australian* of the 17th September that the Government will set up a committee. What are we to understand? Surely the Government can put up a better performance than this. Surely it can relay information between Cabinet members. Surely a Minister in this place should tell a Minister in another place what is happening in this place. I realise this is a lot of "places", but I must conform with Standing Orders. I feel my criticism is justified.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is not too late for the Government to do something about this matter, as well as about the problems of pensioners generally. When I spoke to the second reading debate of the Traffic Act Amendment Bill I said that the 65 per cent average increase in license fees is too big an impost for the pensioners.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr T. H. JONES: Especially as often a pensioner uses his car just to go to golf, bowls, or church, once a week. I implore the Government to do something before it is too late.

There should be greater liaison between the Minister in this place and those in another place. It is not good enough for a Minister of the Crown to tell me in this House that a committee has been set up and then a Minister in another place tells my leader there that the committee has not been set up. This is all in *Hansard*. We then have the Press statement of the 17th September that the Government intends to set up a committee next week to inquire into benefits for pensioners. This is a sham. I plead with the Premier to pull his Ministers into line and to see that they do not give misleading statements. That is my grievance.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Traffic) [5.50 p.m.]: I guess we have just seen a sham.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I did not hear the member for Victoria Park.

Mr Davies: I told you to stick to the facts.

Sir Charles Court: You did not say that the first time.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Collie did write to me some time ago, although I do not know the date of this letter.

Mr T. H. Jones: The 23rd July.

Mr O'CONNOR: I take it that is the right date. I wrote back to the honourable member saying that no concession for pensioners was envisaged at that time. I reply to many letters, and I cannot remember all the dates. A week or so later

Cabinet decided to set up a subcommittee to investigate ways and means of helping pensioners. I advised the member accordingly. This subcommittee eventually came back with a recommendation to Cabinet that another committee be set up to inquire into the problems of pensioners and to report on ways in which pensioners could best be helped in this field. I do not think there is any conflict with my remarks in this Chamber and the remarks of the Minister in another place. Cabinet appointed a subcommittee—

Mr T. H. Jones: The reply referred to a committee, not a subcommittee.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, a subcommittee was set up.

Mr T. H. Jones: You said a committee had been set up, not a subcommittee.

Mr O'CONNOR: Surely a Cabinet subcommittee is a committee. If the honourable member wants to quibble about a small matter like this, we will be here for a long time. When I replied to the letter of the member for Collie I said that the matter had not been considered. Following this a Cabinet subcommittee was set up to bring in a recommendation. The recommendation was for a further committee made up of responsible people interested in the affairs of pensioners to investigate the matter and to report to Cabinet. I believe I have nothing to answer for and that the facts given in another place and in this House are in order.

RURAL AREAS

Attitude of Federal Government: Grievance

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin) (5.52 p.m.): I rise as much in sorrow as in anger to say something about the implications on rural communities of the Federal Budget delivered last night. I really believe, and I am certain the House will agree, that I am speaking of a Federal Government which does not know the real effect of its decisions, and which does not want to know.

In the short time available to me I do not intend to comment on the figures and predictions for unemployment, the rate of inflation, or the millions of dollars going into the mushrooming Government departments. I only wish to draw the attention of this House to one of the remarks made by the Federal Treasurer in his complementary statement. He said—

This will be a year of social progress.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr P. V. JONES: There, Sir, lies the basis of my grievance. Members all know the old premise that we are all born equal. Unfortunately, we have a Government in Canberra dedicated to the ideal that some are more equal than others.

Mr Bertram: You are confusing this Federal Government with the previous one.

Mr May: How can some be more equal than others?

Mr P. V. JONES: The Federal Government is doing its best to prove some are more equal than others. I wonder whether the farmers at Holt Rock are looking forward to a year of social progress. I wonder how the people in the small rural communities who are dependent on the primary producers felt when they read the news that they were in for a year of social progress.

Mr Skidmore: Haven't they had any good seasons?

Mr P. V. JONES: Do the small country business people who provide the needs of the rural communities really think they are in for a year of social progress? Mr Crean, in his infinite wisdom, managed to bring out one little beauty. He spoke about a farmer who wished to provide for a roof over the head of his widow when he dies. When the farm is passed on to the deceased farmer's son, the son will be asked to pay a capital gains tax. I wonder whether those who suggest some are more equal than others would like to comment on that?

Mr Skidmore: I see nothing wrong with it; that would be my comment.

Mr P. V. JONES: A farmer's house will now be subject to a capital gains tax.

Mr Skidmore: It will apply not only to the farmer.

Mr P. V. JONES: The Federal Government does not seem to care at all about the implications of its policies. It does not seem to understand or comprehend in any way whatever, the make-up of rural communities. I am not talking about farmers alone, I am talking about anyone who lives in a rural community—the farmers, the business people they support, and even the people in the metropolitan area who buy their products. Each individual in a rural community is dependent upon the other. It is not an impersonal kind of situation at all. In fact, this unique factor has given the people in the rural community the will and spirit to cope with the increasing burdens the Federal Government is imposing upon them.

Mr Carr: Do you think they should have special treatment?

Mr P. V. JONES: As such a large proportion of our population live in the metropolitan area, the Federal Government does not worry or consider the rural communities. I ask: When will this situation be reversed? When will the Federal Government attempt to understand that as productivity and rural incomes decline, the effects will be felt right throughout the whole community. It will not be just the rural communities which are depressed; those effects will be felt by everyone. And yet Mr Crean, in his infinite wisdom—

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr P. V. JONES: —has indicated that the Government is prepared for a declining level of productivity. I wonder for how long our nation will endure a system which is prepared to accept a declining level of productivity. The Government believes we can go on like this forever.

There is absolutely nothing in the policy of the Federal Government to generate productivity. Of course, the Government must accept the decline because it is doing nothing about it; it is generating nothing. There was no provision in the Budget to produce any incentive for anyone in the rural community to go out to do anything.

There is nothing at all in the Budget to breathe new life into any rural community or into any primary industry. I will give one example of a statement made by Senator Wriedt. Some months ago at a conference in Canberra he said he agreed that the removal of the concession for water conservation improvement last year was perhaps an error—a kindly way of saying that the Government was wrong. He told us he would press for its reintroduction. However, I listened in vain last night to see whether there would be any incentives for the new land farmers. I believe members will agree that we are experiencing—if I may use the word we heard used quite often in the recent election—a lot of polarisation of city areas against country areas.

Mr Grayden: You can say that again.

Mr Skidmore: That is a figment of your imagination.

Mr P. V. JONES: The honourable member will not face up to the facts. Labor is doing its best to betray the rural community.

Mr Jamieson: You are not doing anything to help it, either.

Mr P. V. JONES: The Federal Government is continuing its policy to divide each State and the entire country by producing two groups of people. When will the Federal Government be prepared to learn that we are not two groups of people? We are one country and together we make up this nation.

Mr Jamieson: People who live in "grass houses" should not throw stones at the Prime Minister.

Mr P. V. JONES: The Government should understand that we are trying to be part of this nation so that we may take part in the unbounded prosperity in which all of us should be sharing; but instead of this, we listen to remarks such as "Mr Munday is preparing for an autumn offensive".

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes remaining.

Mr P. V. JONES: I wonder where this "offensive" will take us. We listened to statements about how many more benefits will flow to such-and-such a section of the community and so on. All that people in the rural community want is to be allowed

to share in the prosperity and the advancement of this nation. Nobody should want, demand, or ask for anything more than that and the nonacceptance of that principle and the lack of support, encouragement, and incentive for that purpose represents the basis of my grievance.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall—Minister for Agriculture) [6.02 p.m.]: I should like to commend the member for Narrogin on his grievance because I believe his speech reflects the feelings of country people; they are feeling frustrated and their confidence is being undermined. As the honourable member said, last night's Budget did nothing to promote confidence in the industries in country areas. I believe that various aspects of the Budget indicate that the Treasurer must be misguided. One such aspect, of course, is the reduction of the allowable deduction for education expenses from \$400 to \$150. This will have an impact on those people who have no other way of providing education for their children but to send them away to school; people who live in the country are not all rich.

Mr Skidmore: That is not so.

Mr McPHARLIN: Members opposite seem to consider that everyone who lives in a rural area and who works in a rural industry—

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, in the course of a reply to a grievance is it permissible for the Minister to introduce new material which is irrelevant to the preceding debate?

The SPEAKER: Very strictly speaking, the honourable member is correct. However, the field is so broad that I cannot stop the Deputy Premier from speaking as he is doing.

Debate Resumed

Mr McPHARLIN: The general grievance was centred around the impact of the Federal Government's policies on rural industries and on country people generally.

Mr Jamieson: You had better get used to it because the present Federal Government will be there for a long while yet.

Mr McPHARLIN: My criticism of the allowable education deduction is a fair criticism.

Mr Bertram: What are you going to do about it?

Mr McPHARLIN: So many penalties are being imposed on country people that a lack of confidence and a feeling of frustration is in evidence. I believe the member for Narrogin made the point that it is evident country people have no incentive to produce and carry on in the way we have known them to carry on and contribute to the economy of our country ever since it was first settled. Agriculture and primary industries form the very basis of

our economy and the policies that are being adopted are destroying rural confidence and are doing nothing to promote the incentives and confidence which are so necessary to keep people in the country areas and to give us the security we desire and need as a nation.

The member for Narrogin offered very pertinent criticism. As he said, the Federal Government did nothing last night in its Budget to promote the interest and enthusiasm that is so necessary.

Mr Bateman: Tell us about the fruit growers and their subsidy. Do they not live in the country?

Mr McPHARLIN: Another grievance related to this area is the matter of a floor price for wool. The member for Narrogin pointed out the lack of incentive provided in rural districts and this is one such area. Due to inflationary trends, the floor price of 250c a kilo for clean wool is no better than the price which obtained in the depressed years of 1970-71. If members opposite understood the industry—

Mr H. D. Evans: This policy has been introduced for the first time. It has never operated before.

Mr McPHARLIN: —they would find that 250c a kilo, clean, comes back to about 125c a pound greasy.

Mr Jamieson: Understand! You would not know.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition would not know. He would not understand. He does not have a clue about primary industry and he never has.

Mr Jamieson: What would you know about this? How would you know anything about this? That is how stupid you are. You do not know what you are talking about!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McPHARLIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not listen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: That is how stupid you are!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: That is how stupid you are!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McPHARLIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not have a clue.

Mr Jamieson: That is how stupid you are!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition not to make persistent, repetitive interjections. It is most disorderly. I have asked him on a couple of occasions not to do so. He just made three repetitive interjections and I ask him not to do it.

Mr McPHARLIN: The grievance aired by the member for Narrogin was not before time. I believe those people who represent country areas should be loud and strong in

their protests against the policies which are being adopted by the Federal Government because those policies are undermining the confidence of our community in our economy.

Mr Moller: Why don't you acknowledge what has been done instead of being merely critical?

Mr McPHARLIN: The people who produce the wealth of our country are being undermined. If the member for Mundaring would listen for a moment, he would know that all over Australia the people in country areas are stirring. We have seen it in the past months.

Mr Moller: Why don't you acknowledge what the Australian Government has done for the country areas?

Mr McPHARLIN: This stirring is gaining momentum. Generally, people who live in country areas are not easily stirred; they are very loyal, law-abiding people.

Mr H. D. Evans: What about Forrest Place?

Mr McPHARLIN: They are not easily stirred, but they are stirring now all over Australia because of the treatment which is being handed out by the Federal Government.

Mr T. D. Evans: And you are stirring, too.

Mr McPHARLIN: None of us would like to see this situation erupt into violence but I believe there is a real fear of this because of the actions of the Federal Government and its disregard for these people.

Mr Jamieson: You are always talking about law and order.

Mr McPHARLIN: I commend the member for Narrogin for bringing this grievance to the notice of the House because, not only in Western Australia but also in the other States, the country people are stirring. They need our support and we on this side of the House will do our best to ensure that they receive that support.

The SPEAKER: Grievances have been noted.

ACTS AMENDMENT (JUDICIAL SALARIES AND PENSIONS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and read a first time.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Appointment of Standing Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 4th September, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

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

MR BARNETT (Rockingham) [6.10 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved a fortnight ago by the member for Morley which seeks to appoint a standing committee for the purposes of examining Bills with environmental consequences which come before the House. I was concerned to hear the Minister say during his reply that he felt the current legislation was satisfactory. I propose this evening to make a few points and to show the House that what the Minister said is not true and that, in fact, it is far from the truth.

Increasingly, people are becoming aware of the environmental consequences of legislation passing through this Parliament. In fact, I wonder whether the Minister is aware that more people in Australia are financial members of conservation groups than are members of the major political parties. There is no question that the public is becoming increasingly aware of environmental problems. Of course, I must restrict my discussion to the problems which arise in Western Australia. Rather than go wide of the mark, I prefer to remain a little parochial; I shall deal firstly with problems pertaining to Western Australia and, secondly, with matters of great concern to people in my electorate.

There can be no doubt that the massive industrial complex at Kwinana is very important to the economy of this State. Its financial contribution to Western Australia has been great and it has been responsible for the employment of many hundreds of workers from my electorate and from neighbouring electorates. There are very few good things that can be said about an industrial complex and I believe that, virtually, I have said all that can be said in favour of such a complex. It employs many people and it encourages the influx of money into the economy, both directly and indirectly.

However, tonight I should like to discuss some of the bad things which have occurred under current legislation and to show members that the situation is not at all satisfactory. There is no question that all States have legislated for the protection and conservation of fauna; however, in this field our record has been quite dismal. In fact, it has been terrible. Fauna has been subject to slaughter over the last 100 years, either for profit or whenever there has been a remote possibility of interference with primary production. I will read members a list of fauna which has been declared rare and likely to become extinct.

Sir Charles Court: You are reading all the rest; you might as well read that, too. Mr Speaker will be after you.

Mr BARNETT: I want to read the list because, otherwise, the Premier would not know the situation. Since 1911, as many as 55 birds, mammals and reptiles have been declared rare and likely to become extinct. Mr Speaker, could I ask that this list be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The **SPEAKER**: No, if the honourable member wants the list to appear in *Hansard* he must read it.

Mr BARNETT: The birds which are likely to become extinct are—

Noisy Scrub Bird
Bristle-Bird

Mr Stephens: That sounds like the member for Balga.

Mr BARNETT: The list continues—

Rufous Bristle-Bird
Black Grass Wren
Western Whipbird
Ground Parrot
Night Parrot
Naretha Blue Bonnet
Cape Barren Goose
Freckled Duck
Partridge Pigeon
Burdekin Duck
Red-tailed Tropic Bird

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr BARNETT: Before the tea suspension I was reading a list of the animals and birds that are likely to become extinct. This information was supplied to me by the Fisheries and Fauna Department. I will continue to read as follows—

Peregrine Falcon
Princess Parrot
Grass Owl

Mammals

Barrow Island Euro
Crescent Nail-tailed Wallaby
Spectacled Hare Wallaby
Western Hare Wallaby
Banded Hare Wallaby
Brush-tailed Rock Wallaby
Rothschild's Rock Wallaby
Woolle
Boodie
Broad-faced Potoroo
Gilbert's Potoroo
Little Barred Bandicoot (Marl)
Pig-footed Bandicoot
Dalgyte (Rabbit-eared Bandicoot)
Rusty Numbat
Dibbler
Little Red Antechinus
Long-tailed Dunnart
White-tailed Dunnart
Troughton's Dunnart
Narrow-nosed Planigale
Kimberley Planigale
Rock-haunting Ringtail
Scaly-tailed Possum
Big-eared Hopping Mouse
Long-tailed Hopping Mouse
Dusky Hopping Mouse
Stick-nest Rat
White-tipped Stick-nest Rat
Western Mouse
Shark Bay Mouse
Gould's Native Mouse
Shortridge's Native Mouse
Dugong

Reptiles

Western Swamp (Short-necked)

Tortoise

Salt-water Crocodile

Freshwater Crocodile

All those birds, mammals, and reptiles, are declared either extinct or likely to become extinct; indeed some of them have never been seen since 1911.

While the Kwinana industrial complex cannot be held responsible for the disappearance of these birds and mammals, nonetheless it is an important factor to be considered in the setting up of a standing committee.

Some of the features for which the Kwinana industrial complex is responsible, however, are, firstly, the high bronchitis risk at Medina and in this connection I would like to quote from *The West Australian* of the 29th May, 1974, as follows—

A WA health survey report says people living in Medina run a high risk of respiratory diseases and chronic bronchitis.

The report was compiled by three WA doctors—Dr P. G. Holt, Dr P. B. Prigrove, and Dr K. J. Cullen all of the department of microbiology at the Perth Medical Centre—from a survey that began in September 1971.

Under current legislation bad planning practice has allowed this sort of thing to occur. The residents of Kwinana beach are also well aware of the bad planning practice under current legislation which the Minister has assured us is quite satisfactory. All the residents have to be bought out. Yet the Minister for Conservation and Environment two weeks ago said that current legislation was satisfactory.

Mr Stephens: Environmental legislation.

Mr BARNETT: This is environmental legislation and it should cover everything relating to the environment. There is little doubt that as a result of bad planning in the Kwinana industrial area serious environmental consequences have ensued. If there were a standing committee on the environment in this House it would have discussed this aspect in the first place. I am pleased to see, however, that at least something good is happening in current legislation.

A recent study has shown that this bad planning is responsible for air pollution at Naval Base, an area that was to be set aside for residential purposes and has now been found to be unsuitable for human beings to live in. An area which is probably causing most concern to the people in my electorate is Cockburn Sound and, as members know, I have asked several questions on Cockburn Sound. On Tuesday, the 27th August, at page 872 of *Hansard* I asked the Minister the following question—

- (1) Further to his reply to my question 13 on 20th August, 1974 wherein he stated that detailed

hydrological studies were carried out prior to construction of the Garden Island causeway, would he please advise what studies have been undertaken since the construction?

- (2) If a report is available, will he please table it?

The Minister replied—

- (1) Studies have been undertaken since the construction of the causeway jointly by the Commonwealth Department of Housing and Construction and the Fremantle Port Authority into the presence of trace elements.

In answer to my request that the report be tabled the Minister said—

- (2) Yes, please refer to page 15 Section 4.3.1 of the Cockburn Sound Ecosystem Report, Spring 1973 (published in May 1974), the extract of which is tabled.

I ask members to take particular note of the Minister's answer which said "the extract of which is tabled". I ask members to bear that in mind when considering the next question I asked the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna on the 4th September, which reads—

- (1) Is it a fact that whilst the Garden Island causeway has not changed the flushing rate of the water in Cockburn Sound, the production of industries centred on the sound has increased appreciably since the building of the causeway?

- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) by what amount has production increased;
- (b) has this had the effect of increasing the effluent discharge into the sound;
- (c) what action does the Government propose to remedy the situation?

I will not read all of the answer but part of it reads—

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

In other words the Minister indicated there had been no increase in production. I was unable to have the *Cockburn Sound Ecosystem Report Spring 1973* tabled in the House; I was merely asked to refer to page 15 section 4.3.1 of this report.

Mr Stephens: The section which was specifically relevant to your question.

Mr BARNETT: However, I was very fortunate to obtain a copy of the full report a few days ago.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Minister has been found out.

Mr BARNETT: Page 15, section 4.3 reads—

Probable Cause of Eutrophic Phenomenon.

But this was not given to me in the report that was tabled. Immediately afterwards, not even on the next page, but in the very next paragraph of the section—paragraph 4.3.2—the report reads, “Increased Industrial Output”. At this point I would ask members to bear in mind that the Minister said there was no increase in production. The report continues—

There appears to have been a substantial increase in output from some of the industries during the 1972-73 period.

Mr T. J. Burke: The Minister has misled the House.

Mr BARNETT: He certainly has. I will continue to read the report to indicate just how much the Minister has misled the House. The report continues—

This increased industrial activity could be expected to have increased the amount of waste discharged into the Sound.

The Minister was well aware of what I was after when I asked my question, but he has grossly misled the House by saying there was no increase in production. Some of the figures from the following page prove this to be the case. The part in question is headed “Imported Products Fremantle Outer Harbour (Tons)” and states—

Year	Phosphate	Sulphur	Limestone	Coke
1969/70	194 090	48 921	59 146	436 717
1972/73	318 198	94 411	155 170	534 702

Mr O'Neill: That was after the causeway was completed.

Mr B. T. Burke: In the case of sulphur it almost doubled.

Mr Stephens: Would you go back to your question.

Mr O'Neill: As I have said, it was after the causeway was completed. You should know how to ask questions if you want them to be answered properly.

Mr BARNETT: The report continues—

The above figures show a marked increase in the amount of raw material consumed by two of the major industries having outfalls into Cockburn Sound.

Mr O'Neill: On dates before the causeway was completed. Your question said after the causeway was completed.

Mr BARNETT: On the 4th September the Minister answered my question.

Mr Stephens: What was your question?

Mr O'Neill: You should frame your question better if you want the correct answer given.

Mr BARNETT: The question was well framed. I have already read it and the Minister's answer was “(1) and (2) No.” This is what the report from which I have quoted is all about.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You cannot get out of it that way. There is no hope of your getting out of it that way.

Mr BARNETT: I will make this copy of the report available to members so that they may read it for themselves.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: It is my copy!

Mr BARNETT: Page 17 of the report states—

It is also reasonable to assume that the substantial increase during the 1972/73 period . . .

Mr O'Neill: A reasonable assumption, not necessarily a fact.

Mr BARNETT: The reason I make that point is that current legislation does not permit us to be given the facts. Several Ministers have stated in this House that they cannot give the figures of increased production in Cockburn Sound so how is it possible for me to be given figures of waste discharge into the sound?

The Minister is not interested in setting up a standing committee, nor is he interested in protecting the environment of Western Australia. The Minister is fortunate enough to have been given what I consider to be one of the most important portfolios in this House.

Mr T. J. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr BARNETT: He has, however, grossly misused his responsibility and has misled the House by giving the information he has.

Mr O'Neill: The honourable member has misled himself.

Mr BARNETT: I would like to quote an article which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 5th September under the heading “Alarm over sea filth”. The article reads—

Three top Italian health officials risk incrimination for “neglect of duty” for failing to check pollution levels at holiday resorts near Rome.

In many places pollution is not only many hundred times higher than the official danger level, but it can be seen.

I wonder how long it is since the Minister has been down to my electorate and had a look at Cockburn Sound.

On Sunday I was very fortunate to have a couple of hours off and I thought I would go to Rockingham beach and have a swim. Two years ago I could stand on the Rockingham jetty—

Mr Rushton: You are neglecting your electorate.

Mr BARNETT: As I have said, two years ago I could stand on Rockingham jetty and although the water was eight feet deep I could just about count the grains of sand on the bottom. On Sunday I was battling to see two feet under the water.

Mr Clarko: You should have your eyes tested!

Mr BARNETT: I certainly would not dare swim there. The water was atrocious, but the Minister has tried to imply in this House that all is well and that there has been no increase in production so how on earth could there be an increase in the effluent discharge. How would he know? Where would he obtain his figures?

Mr B. T. Burke: The Minister spells conservation with a "k".

Mr Rushton: The honourable member has been polluting my old electorate since he took it over.

Mr BARNETT: Quite frankly the Minister has grossly misled the House and he has done this consciously. Therefore he should either apologise or resign from the position of Minister because he is no longer fit to continue in that capacity if he persists in answering questions with a disregard for the health and well-being of the people of Western Australia. The Minister said that this has occurred under current legislation which he says is perfectly adequate. I am positive I have shown him that it is not perfectly adequate so why does he not change his mind and give a little thought to the matter and have a little guts and agree to the establishment of a standing committee?

Mr Rushton: You should have a look at some of your election propaganda and see who told the untruths.

Mr BARNETT: If the Minister for Local Government has a reasonable comment to make in relation to the subject we are discussing, I would like to hear it.

From most of the conservation bodies in Western Australia we have received tremendous expressions of support for the establishment of a standing committee, and I am sure that when they find out exactly what we are trying to do, if the Minister does not knock it on the head tonight, we will receive even more support—100 per cent support—and well the Minister knows it.

I turn now to what I consider would be some of the advantages which would accrue if the Government were to agree to the establishment of a standing committee as suggested by the member for Morley. Any conservation matters raised in this House would be studied by the committee and members should not lose sight of the fact that one of the members on the other side asked a fortnight ago who in the House knew anything about conservation or the environment. It is obvious that the Minister for Conservation and Environment does not know anything about the subject, but other members, particularly some on this side, do so and they would be prepared to assist members on the other side and let them know of the things they may be able to do to improve the lot of Western Australia. Such a procedure would certainly make this House more businesslike and would not allow the

type of action which has been evident in the last fortnight during the debate on the fuel and energy legislation.

Mr O'Connor: We had a pollution-free period last night.

Mr Stephens: Do you think it would overcome the verbal pollution experienced here?

Mr BARNETT: The Premier said that this was a public place even like Forrest Place, but those people cannot say anything here in the House. However, they would be able to approach a standing committee to express their thoughts and feelings, and any matter they felt strongly about could be discussed.

Two weeks ago the Minister said he believed that the present legislation provided ample opportunity for public participation and he implied at the time that the Environmental Protection Council with its 14 members would be far more able to deal with environmental problems than would a standing committee of members of this House. He gave the names of the 14 members and a list of the qualifications necessary for them to be members of the council. I would like members to have a guess as to how many were required to have a knowledge of conservation and the environment. Two only.

Mr T. J. Burke: Not enough.

Mr O'Neil: Who appointed them?

Mr BARNETT: They could be appointed from anywhere. All of the 14 members should have a knowledge of conservation and the environment.

Mr O'Neil: Who appointed them? No answer was the stern reply.

Mr Stephens: You are implying that those members know nothing about it, but if a standing committee of members of Parliament were appointed, it would be composed of experts.

Mr BARNETT: This matter is so important—

Mr Stephens: It is so important that last year your party did not support the idea of standing committees anyhow.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Cut it out. That is not so at all.

Mr O'Neil: You did not put them into effect.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: How could they in two months? Be reasonable.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BARNETT: Last week in the corridor of Parliament House the Minister asked me who had been writing my questions and I said, "I have, why? Are they worrying you?" He replied, "No, they are not." Obviously the Minister has been rubbed up the wrong way.

Mr Stephens: I beg your pardon! Get to the facts. You initiated—

Sir Charles Court: You start quoting corridor discussions and you will be in trouble. You had better ask your leader about that.

Mr Stephens: Be honest about it. You asked me if your questions were rubbing me up the wrong way.

The SPEAKER: Order! We must not have repetitive interjections.

Mr BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The Minister also stated that provision is made for the EPA to hold a public inquiry. I agree with him that such a provision exists, but do members know what that provision is? It is that the EPA "may" make known its policy with regard to certain developments. It may, but it does not have to; it just "may".

Mr B. T. Burke: There is no chance of that under this Government.

Mr BARNETT: I agree with that comment. Under this Government there is no chance whatever of that occurring.

I know that the last few minutes have been a little heated because I touched on a subject close to my electorate.

Mr Stephens: Get back to reading section 37 of the Act and you will find there is also a—

Mr BARNETT: I will tell the Minister what I have read. I do not want to read the Act. I have read the *Cockburn Sound Ecosystem Report, Spring 1973* which the Minister refused to table. That report clearly indicates that what the Minister has said in this House represents a gross misuse of the truth.

Mr Rushton: Fancy you making such a nonsensical statement. You will find inferences and misquotations all through your election propaganda.

Mr Stephens: The honourable member got the answer to the question he asked.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BARNETT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister would be prepared to table the full report, or will I table the photostat copy I have so that members on the Minister's side of the House will know that what I say is the truth?

Mr Grayden: Why table it if you have a copy?

Mr Stephens: I have tabled the relevant part.

Mr BARNETT: Page 15.

Mr Stephens: I tabled the relative portion.

Mr Sodeman: Did you ask the Minister to table the complete report?

Mr BARNETT: Yes I did. Does the member for Pilbara desire me to read the question again?

Mr O'Connor: Why do you want the report tabled if you have a copy?

Mr Taylor: So that it will be public information.

Mr BARNETT: The question I asked was—

If a report is available, will he please table it?

The Minister replied—

Yes, please refer to page 15 Section 4.3.1 of the *Cockburn Sound Ecosystem Report, Spring 1973* (published in May 1974) . . .

Mr Stephens: I did not refuse to table it.

Mr BARNETT: On the same page the report points out that there has been an increase in production.

Mr Stephens: I told you where it was and I tabled the appropriate portion.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There must not be interjections from several members at the same time.

Mr BARNETT: The last few speakers have demonstrated that the Minister has grossly misled the House. I think what we have said has illustrated the fact that we have a terrifically strong case for the establishment of a standing committee.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr BARNETT: And I ask Government members not to oppose this motion just for the sake of opposing it, but to give it a lot of thought. They may not like what I have said tonight.

Mr O'Neill: We do not believe most of it.

Mr BARNETT: But the people of Western Australia would like a committee on conservation and the environment. Such a committee would not cost this House anything. It would involve some members opposite in a few extra hours of work, but I think that would be well worth while. It would certainly be something of which this Parliament could be very proud.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Do you think they object to the thought of the extra work?

Mr BARNETT: I certainly hope the Government members vote in favour of the establishment of the committee.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [7.56 p.m.]: I wish to support the proposal of the member for Morley for the establishment of a committee on conservation and the environment. I think the member for Morley, when introducing the motion to the House, indicated the very wide effect that the environment and its conservation have on all of us. He dealt at length with many aspects of the problems with which we were faced in an endeavour to ensure that whilst we are here on this earth we should as much as is humanly possible, make the best use of the environment and do everything possible to conserve it.

Many problems are associated with the environment and these a committee could analyse. Also it could study all the reports available from various committees dealing with this very question. We have the Clean Air Council which is an air pollution control council operating under the Clean Air Act. Other committees operate in connection with the conservation of fauna and flora in many of our national parks and reserves.

Recently an expedition to the Prince Regent River Reserve in the north established that there was a tremendous potential for the protection of fauna and indicated that at all times the area should be kept in its natural state and not be sullied nor soiled in the usual way in which man goes about destroying the heritage left to him.

If we consider the problems associated with the Fitzgerald River Reserve in recent years when a company saw fit to cut an unauthorised road in the reserve with a view to opening it up to mining, we will realise that that company mutilated the reserve in such a manner that it will take many years for the reserve to recover from the damage.

The Kalbarri national park which surrounds the Murchison River area is well known to many people as a magnificent park and it needs the protection of a committee which, in an unbiased manner, can set about evaluating those things which we would like to be protected and kept as our heritage for the future. The Kalbarri National Park Board would be well versed in the problems associated with that park. I do not wish to detract from the importance of that particular board. But what is necessary is the collation of all facets of the subject which requires a tremendous amount of effort by members in this House when a matter of environmental protection comes before us.

It is virtually impossible to be aware of all of the aspects of the environment. The member for Morley dealt extensively with the use of pesticides and the effect they have on many of the streams in the south-west. He also dealt with increasing salt encroachment in the water catchment areas, which is a problem. We are aware of the problems in a broad sense but not in a technical sense. If we had a knowledgeable committee which could analyse reports and inform both sides of the House on these problems, it would obviate a lot of the debate on these issues in the House, because we would be able to contact the members of the committee on matters of environmental protection and ascertain before we came into the Chamber what should be our line of approach in regard to these matters.

I support the formation of a committee because the environment and its conservation is a very big issue. It is far too wide and has far too many problems associated

with it to allow it to rest in the hands of the few, and for that reason at least we should become better informed.

I remind the House that a few days ago I asked a question of the Minister regarding solar and tidal energy. It was not asked idly. I asked the question because I am becoming increasingly concerned about nuclear reactor power stations and the amount of waste emanating from those stations, to the detriment of all mankind. I would like to refer to an article which appeared in *The Reader's Digest* of this month. It is entitled "The Awesome Problem of Nuclear Wastes", and I think it is worth incorporating in *Hansard*. It reads—

They call it "the thousand-year problem." It begins with a rusty-brown fluid that rolls and churns inside huge underground tanks. Drop for drop, this darkish liquid—"high-level" radio-active waste—is one of the most hazardous, long-lived substances on earth. Produced when the spent fuel of nuclear reactors is recycled (and reusable uranium and plutonium are separated out), it is so laden with radioactive substances that it will self-boil for years from the heat generated in decaying.

One might say, "It doesn't matter. It is in a container. Let it boil. What the heck! It is no worry of mine. I will not be here in 200 years. Let somebody else worry about it." But there will be people here in 200 years, and there will be people like the member for Morley and other speakers on this side of the House who support the formation of a committee on the ground that through the committee they will become more knowledgeable.

Some of the figures are staggering in the extreme when we express in everyday language what this nuclear waste means and what we will do with it. Some people in America had the queer idea of putting it underground in some of the unused mine shafts. It leaked through the subterranean crevices and channels and appeared in a lake. It killed all the fish and made the lake sterile. It became a lake of nuclear waste. This is not fantasy. These things happen, and we should know about them. The article continues—

By the year 2000, the growing use of nuclear power for electricity is expected to generate the equivalent of better than 225 million litres more. This waste will be at least ten to 30 times as radioactive as that at Hanford.

This material is 90 times more powerful than the bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima. It does not disappear; it stays around. It will be with us for many years. It cannot be dissipated and we cannot get rid of it because we are accumulating it far more quickly than we are able to dissipate it. The energy in the nuclear wastes will be dissipated only by nature itself. Its radioactivity is so violent that it would

take thousands of years to get rid of the waste which exists in the world at the present time. There are terrifying quantities of potential radioactive waste which will become a threat only if it escapes into the biosystem.

A committee could well look at this problem. Although we do not have the problem in Australia at present, there are people in Australia today who are advocating that type of power station and radioactive nuclear fission, which will pollute because we cannot get rid of the waste. To this day, no way has been found of doing anything with it. This is a question which a committee could look at to see whether we can be better informed on and better understand the problems associated with this aspect of our environment. The article continues—

The oldest of those tanks are now wearing out—and leaking. The most serious occurrence was at Hanford in 1973, when a leaking tank was not detected from approximately April 20 to June 8. About 435,000 litres of high-level waste soaked into the ground. So far as can be determined, no waste came within 30 metres of the local water table, and thus serious consequences were avoided.

It might be true that on that occasion no problem of a polluted water table developed. Nevertheless, this is another avenue of conservation which the committee could look at.

In connection with water tables in the metropolitan area, one possible source of pollution which a committee could look at and inform us about is the proposed Pacminex refinery, which was the subject of an EPA report. The EPA advised the Government that the refinery should not be built in the Upper Swan Valley but should be built on the present site at Muchea.

Let us look at the problems of pondage associated with such undertakings. A committee would be better informed about this matter than I am but my understanding of it is that the caustic soda solution which is a residue from the treatment plant must be stored in an impervious clay-bound pond to allow of its recycling back to the plant for reuse. Eventually the pond becomes full of caustic sludge, which is to be retained in the pond for all time.

It has been suggested that later on the pond could be filled in and covered up with soil, and that crops or clover could be grown on it or it could be turned over to pasture, and all would be well. I am not sure that will be successful, and perhaps some country members might be able to tell me how they would grow pasture on a pond. We will finish up with an impervious clay-bound pond from which caustic soda solution cannot leak into the water table. If it is leached out it will be released into the water table in the metropolitan area. Hydrological investigations

reveal there is a slim chance that this will occur. Crops cannot be grown on it because rain accumulates in the pond, and it is very important that it should not be leached out into the underground water supply. Questions were asked about the amount of potable water available to us. My recollection is that underground water supplies will provide between 30 and 40 per cent of the metropolitan water in the future.

That is how I understand the problems associated with pondage from such an undertaking as Pacminex. If we had a committee which would enable us to be better informed when discussing a project such as this, I would not be standing up here without knowledge but I would have gone to the committee to inform myself so that I would not propose something which might be entirely wrong. To me, it is a very basic principle that if people wish to protect the environment they should first of all learn what it is all about, and a committee would achieve such an objective. It would cover all the aspects of conservation, not only in regard to water supplies but also in regard to national parks and the air.

Air pollution is a matter which is readily understood by all. We have only to go down to Kwinana to see the atmosphere polluted by the smoke belching out of many of the chimney stacks. At a public meeting one very learned person stated the EPA because what it said in regard to Kwinana in its report in 1967 would not bear the light of day. A committee could inquire into the Kwinana mess and inform this House. The person who made the report in 1967 said, "It does not matter. Smoke can be belched out of the Kwinana Refinery area and it will end up in the Darling Range area, in someone else's back yard." The member for Kalamunda has indicated his concern, and why should he not? We are speaking about the very essence of conservation. It is of no use being lulled into a sense of false security and playing politics on the question of our environment. If we do that we are doomed. We reap what we sow in regard to the environment. No Opposition or Government should turn its back on that question.

For this reason a committee would be a wonderful thing because the environment affects everybody, whether he be Liberal, Labor, Democratic Labor, National Alliance, or Country Party. It affects people of all political creeds and should therefore be a conscientious responsibility of all parties. If we did not want a committee for anything else, at least the setting up of a committee on conservation merits the deepest consideration of this House to see whether it can be made to work in order that we may be better informed on the problems associated with our environment.

There are other issues involved—and I will not touch on all of them, but they are all germane to the motion before the House. I note a report was prepared by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and released on the 29th August, 1974. This is in the form of a Press statement by Mr Neil Hawkins, the chairman; and it deals with the question of refuse disposal. This is a tremendous problem in the metropolitan area and it is one a committee such as that proposed could well investigate and inform the House of its findings.

What is the situation in regard to the disposal of our waste? Goodness only knows, we in Australia put more waste in our rubbish bins than do the people of any other nation in the world. What is the sum total of all that waste so far as the Perth City Council is concerned? It has no areas available for the disposal of waste, and so its trucks must go to my electorate and place the waste in landfill areas in Midland, because that is the closest area available; and it will not last forever and a day.

What are we going to do about this problem? How do we tackle it? I certainly do not know much about it, apart from what I read when I try to inform myself.

There are many complex problems. I refer to the many gases emitted from decomposing waste after it has been buried. These, in turn, are pollutants of not insignificant quantity. In America some of the gases emitted by the decomposition of waste have been used to fire boilers for the purpose of burning further waste.

I am uninformed in this respect. I have hazy ideas of what the problem is all about. A committee could do a tremendous amount to inform members on this question. Two reports are available: the Maunsell report and another report which I suggest the Minister has under his control, because I believe it was prepared by his departmental officers.

I have touched on only a few of the problems of conservation. To me the subject is of such complexity that the appointment of a committee is an absolute must if we are to be able to tackle the problems.

One could perhaps refer to the pollution of our waterways. In a previous address to this House I referred to the pollution taking place in Koongamia, where effluent from leach drains and septic tanks is being drained down a gully and into the Swan River rather than allowing it to accumulate in the backyards of the residents. This is a question of values: who will suffer most? Will the Swan River suffer the most as a result of this pollution, or will the residents and their children who are walking around in what is practically raw effluent be the worst affected?

So we pollute our waterways and rivers. The Swan River Conservation Board carries on an eternal struggle with industry in

its endeavours to keep the river free from pollution. We also know Cockburn Sound is being polluted and that a problem of great magnitude exists there as a result of the disposal of industrial waste. From questions asked in respect of that expanse of water we find this pollution is causing the destruction of seaweed which, I understand, is necessary to hold the sand in the basin so that it does not move into the navigable channels, necessitating continual dredging.

How do we overcome all these problems? I do not know, but I am of the opinion that the appointment of a committee would be a tremendous advantage to all of us. As I have said—and I think it is worthy of repetition—in the world in which we live conservation is our problem as individual people and not as political parties. We must make an honest effort to ensure that we leave this world in a better condition than it was in when we came into it. But unless we are prepared to attack the problem in an honest and sincere way by setting up a committee of experienced members who will be able to inform the House when Bills concerning the environment come before it, we will not be able to achieve a better balanced attitude in respect of our environment.

One could quote many problems associated with air pollution and the gases emitted from the stacks of brickworks, pottery yards, and other places.

Mr Sibson interjected.

Mr SKIDMORE: The remark I just heard is the type of remark I would expect from someone who is not worried about the present situation in his own town in which blasting is being carried on in the harbour. That blasting is causing distress to many people whose homes are being damaged, and it could also affect the environment. So the member for Bunbury should be concerned with the question of the conservation of our environment, and he should take an active interest in an endeavour to see that a committee is set up so that he may be better informed.

For quite some time I was privileged—and I deemed it a privilege—to represent the Trades and Labor Council on the Air Pollution Control Council. We dealt with many varieties of pollution of the air. The number of areas covered by that council is staggering. I retained my file in respect of the council, but I will not quote all of it because I do not have time. However, I would like to refer to some of the questions which worried us, and worried me as a layman—because that is what I am when it comes to the question of how we prevent fluoride emissions from the chimney stacks of brickworks.

I find this question is worrying many people throughout the world; it worries the Minister, and it certainly worries me. What can we do about it? Do we simply build

huge chimney stacks so that the emissions fall on someone else's property and then say it is no longer our worry? This seems to be the general tendency.

Mr O'Connor: I think it is better falling on their own property.

Mr SKIDMORE: Of course, that is one solution; we could do what the Midland Brick Company does. It buys all the vineyards around it and says, "It does not matter now because it is all my property." That company thinks it has got rid of the problem, but the poor vineyard owner who has had his livelihood taken away from him and has been forced to sell his land at depressed rates because it is now only dirt, must try to start all over again. This is not only pollution of the mind, it is pollution of the way of life of men.

Mr Nanovich: What was the opinion in regard to the Pacminex refinery?

Mr SKIDMORE: I left that some time ago. If the honourable member would care to see me later I will tell him all I know about the Pacminex refinery and all that Dr Donnelly does not know about it.

With regard to the emission of sulphur dioxide and fluoride, it was found that the vines in areas adjacent to the Bristle tile-works in Caversham showed a high level of fluoride. We found the same thing in Armadale. Cattle there were tested for fluoride, and the level in their bodies was high by international standards. This is a most vexatious problem.

The Midland Brick Company, to its credit, has endeavoured over many years to control the emission of fluoride from its stacks and tunnel kilns. It has considered many methods of doing this. An expert committee was set up to study this problem, composed of the following people

Dr D. D. Letham (Chairman).

Assoc. Prof. G. A. Bottomley.

Mr L. J. Brennan.

Mr L. Jones, Department of Agriculture.

Mr M. Hughes, Government Chemical Laboratories.

Dr H. H. Macey.

Mr R. A. Powell.

Most of those men are officers of the Public Health Department, and all are interested in the matter before the House. They are experts, but obviously their knowledge is not presented to us as members of Parliament. Their opinions and findings come to us through the Minister, who presents them to us in a condensed, summarised form; and we accept that as being the criteria upon which we should establish our values in respect of conservation. But surely we are not doing our job as members of Parliament if we are not sure of our values.

I was a member of the Air Pollution Control Council for some 18 months, and I did not for one moment accept that everything possible was being done by everyone concerned in the matter of protecting our environment.

Members may recall the environmental pollution which occurred in recent years as a result of the cement works at River-vale, and the tremendous battle successive Governments had to get the company concerned to toe the line and to ensure it was not polluting surrounding homes. In that area residents could hang a 6 ft. by 4 ft. sheet on the line and then later nail it on the wall as asbestos, so great was the pollution falling from the chimney stack of the cement works. All that was necessary was a shower of rain to precipitate the hardening of the pollutants, and the problem occurred. Virtually nothing would grow in the area. The company finally overcame the problem by the installation of electrostatic precipitators—I think that is what they are called—which actually removed the deleterious particles from the stack emissions. That proved to be the right answer, but it took years of effort to achieve it.

One might say that the environment and its protection is a matter which should concern all of us. We should put aside our political beliefs in an effort to see whether a standing committee would not be an advantage to this House and to our State. Surely if we had such a committee it would be able to keep us better informed in respect of problems associated with the many aspects of our environment.

I conclude on the note that I sincerely trust members of the Government will be able to exercise a conscience vote on this motion. I suppose it would be easy for each of us to lean on our individual political persuasions and say, "My party is adopting this policy", or, "Our party is adopting that policy" and then put our heads in the sand and hope the bogey of conservation will disappear and that we will not spend sleepless nights.

I could not live in a situation such as that, and I would have many sleepless nights if I felt we did not have the desire to leave behind us a world better than it appears to be at the present time. I sincerely believe that a standing committee on the environment and the conservation of our flora and fauna would be a tremendous step towards ensuring that we leave behind us a better world for those who will follow us.

I commend the motion to the House and I ask members to give grave consideration to my suggestion that they be allowed to exercise their votes along the lines that this is a matter far above the question of our political affiliations; it is a question of our quality of life, and I hope members consider it in that fashion.

MR. JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.29 p.m.]: I support the motion, perhaps for reasons different from those of some other speakers. However, before entering into an explanation of those reasons, I would like to make a few general comments. I know the Commonwealth Government is concerned about this matter. I understand Dr Cass has as late as today given an indication that \$9 million will be available to the States for studies on conservation and the environment, as a result of the recent Federal Budget.

This is a big departure from the situation that existed at the time I first became a member of this Parliament when the only positive environmental despoliment was that which was referred to recently by the member for Swan; that is, the cement dust from the Swan Portland Cement Works. This was the subject of complaints made many years ago in this House by the then member for Middle Swan who later became the member for Belmont. I am referring to the late James Hegney who conducted a great deal of research and did a great deal of worrying on behalf of the residents who lived in the vicinity of the cement works because of the experience they had with this industrial establishment.

As the member for Swan has pointed out, because of the electrolytic precipitation and other factors the effluent coming from the stack of those works has diminished. The main reason the effluent is not as bad as it was previously is that now the diminution of the effluent is mainly due to the fact that various amounts of building lime and other elements produced at this particular site are less likely to cause environmental pollution. Further, the production of cement from the works is not as great now as it was in the past.

I will now proceed to a situation that was brought to my notice when I was Minister for Works. I was presented with a report by the Fremantle Harbour Trust on the situation that existed in Cockburn Sound. That trust had given to a firm a commission to submit a report and it was somewhat alarming. The report pointed to the problems of sea grasses and other features being affected by the effluent deposited in the sound from industrial establishments. In retrospect, I am sure that had we studied the position in greater detail than we did at the time we would not have been so anxious to introduce those industries to this State; that is, in weighing the benefits the State would enjoy, compared with the problems those industries have created not only for us but also for posterity.

However the mistakes have been made, and whether they have been made by the ilk of the present Government or by previous Labor Governments is not a matter for argument at this moment. We have

to overcome the problem, and the member for Morley has suggested that this may be done by the creation of a parliamentary committee. I suggest there could be many worse propositions than that which could be considered by the House. This is one of those problems that could be put before the democratically elected persons whose responsibility it is to make determinations on what is right for the general public.

Mr Nanovich: Will you tell the House what you recommended and what you suggested when you, as Minister for Works, met a deputation from representatives of local government who recommended the formation of a committee to investigate the problems of local authorities?

Mr JAMIESON: I have known the honourable member for so long that I listened to what he had to say long enough for him to put his foot in it. He knows so little about beach erosion.

Mr Nanovich: And you know absolutely nothing.

Mr JAMIESON: We know so little about the problem ourselves. Even foremost scientists who have had a little to do with conservation and the environment, do not know a great deal. We have had a great deal of experience in regard to what has happened with erosion along our coastline. Natural phenomena have occurred. For instance, in the Busselton area alone it was noticed during the years from 1835 to 1855 that the coastline changed by a distance of some 400-odd feet. This was definitely measured. Man had done absolutely nothing to cause that change. That is not a matter of environmental despoliation. This is a matter that scientists have been trying to unravel for years; they have been trying to find the reason for these phenomena.

It is true that, when men construct groynes which are not natural, with the drift along our coastline, this causes many problems. As a former Minister for Works, Mr Speaker, you should be well aware of this. By the construction of a groyne one problem is solved, but more are created. However, in general terms, the sand drift and the problems that occur up and down the coastline have little to do with man's despoliation of the environment. This is a different matter altogether. Once man steps in to try to alter the course of nature we are surely involved in a great deal of money; a great deal more than anyone can provide in a State Parliament. That is a problem of a different character.

The problem we seek to overcome is one that man creates and which he can avoid. As I understand it this is the proposition of the member for Morley; that is, to set up a committee that will call witnesses to give evidence and to investigate and determine whether in the best interests of the

public—bearing in mind that we are elected representatives of the people—such programmes should be proceeded with.

Mr Blaikie: Will you give credit to the present Government for what it has already done by means of various committees?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not think they will get very far.

Mr Blaikie: But they have at least gone that far. When you and your colleagues were in Government you did nothing.

Mr JAMIESON: I do not agree with the honourable member. They are solving a few local problems, but the overall problem is too great. For the member for Vasse to consider the various aspects and just how they will affect a little of his territory in Vasse, he has to look at the whole problem of global oscillations, changing tides, and the changes brought about by the role of the sea bed. These are matters that are quite beyond the appreciation and comprehension of a lay person. These are factors that must be considered before a determination can be made on how changes in the coastline occur. If I may digress a little into this sidetrack, which I must say has nothing to do with the motion, but which is probably important in our understanding of the situation, one has only to see what has happened at Eucla. Many years ago the old telegraph station was situated well away from the sandhills. Man has done absolutely nothing on that coast to cause the area to alter, and yet the sandhills have moved right over the tops of quite tall eucalypts and the trees are now hardly visible in comparison with the situation when they first started to grow in that area. In that instance nature itself has created a problem of beach and soil erosion which we do not find easy to explain.

Those who would rush in and say, "Put a groyne here and put another one there", only create additional problems for the Government if their wishes are granted. The building of such groynes may solve the immediate problem, but they can create more and greater problems far distant from the groyne itself. I suggest members should have a look at Long Point to see the damage that has been done as a result of building a groyne at Mandurah. Other problems have occurred 17 miles from this point. The building of the groyne has altered the beachfront in the immediate vicinity of Long Point. This is one instance where we could say that because of man's activity the coastline is being despoiled.

However, as I have pointed out there are many factors that are beyond the comprehension of man and beyond what a Government may do even with the expenditure of millions of dollars in trying to overcome the problem. Nevertheless there are steps that can be taken to improve the situation. I am not one of those who are referred to as "greenies"; who are keen

to get up in arms because an old building may be pulled down or the dredging of a part of the river may take place which they consider to be wrong. All these moves have to be placed in their proper perspective.

Whilst I was Minister for Works I had the unfortunate experience of being responsible for a number of men being put out of work as a result of the over-zealous activities of people interested in the environment who wanted to protect the situation which I did not believe should be protected. I am referring to what happened in Lucky Bay in the area represented by the present Minister for Works where, with the aid of old photographs that were produced, the people concerned convinced me as Minister—and no doubt convinced many other people as well—that it was desirable to renourish the beach because of the problems that had occurred as a result of man's activities in damming up the rivers which did not allow a free flow of water during the winter months. They claimed that as a result of this there was less cross-movement of water during the wintertime than there would have been had nature been left to its own resources.

I thought that the proposition these people placed before me was rather sound, but because of the announced opposition to it we were forced to abandon the idea.

Similarly, there was a proposition to carry out some alterations at the junction of the Helena River with the Swan River which would have tidied up the area and made it capable of being used in a reasonable way, bearing in mind that when the area was originally established very few people were living in close proximity to it and the effect they had on the flow of the river was negligible. Despite the fact that the experts worked out a workable scheme, the opposition to it was so great that they had to recant and as a consequence, to this day the dredge *Stirling* is up on blocks because we cannot find enough places to dredge as a result of too many "greenies" wanting to protect the environment. When a population of 700 000 or 750 000 people is settled on or about the banks of a river immediately the river foreshores and the environment are adversely affected and the only means available to correct any errors that have been committed is to make some mechanical adjustments.

If people get up in arms about mechanical adjustments they will finish up with the type of environment they do not want to live in. Therefore I see a great deal of merit in the appointment of a committee as suggested by the member for Morley which will be similar in nature, but different in character because of the functions it would perform, to the Public Accounts Committee. It would be a committee that could call witnesses and investigate any proposition put up to it from time to time by the Environmental Protection Authority if it felt that a public inquiry was needed.

These propositions could be put before a committee that is appointed by both Houses of the Parliament of Western Australia and it would be able to make a determination on behalf of the people of Western Australia.

If we fail to do that we will meet with constant harassment, where people will agitate against a certain project whether or not it is justified. The Administration would have to backpedal, if in the ultimate the project is regarded as being detrimental to the community in the future.

The other aspects relating to nature I appreciate very much. One would appreciate them if one attended the lecture which was arranged by the Forests Department a couple of weeks ago, and which was attended by some members of this Chamber and another place. By attending that conference one would become aware that the problems created by man have to be mechanically repaired by man.

One of the great needs of the past was the opening up of land. The tendency in the early days was to open up a great deal of land for rural pursuits; to cut down trees; and to disregard what that would do overall to the economy, the water supplies, and the general conformation of the land. I refer to salt encroachment and the other problems caused by the action of man.

We are now readily aware of the mistakes that were then made. I do not know why man in those days did not observe more closely the results of his actions. Maybe he was out to make a living, and to do this he had to hew the virgin bush. In doing that he had scant regard for the future welfare of the community; he seemed to have a regard only for the immediate future and for the needs of his family.

I am sure that in the future when land is to be opened up, some sort of impact study will be carried out. In the ultimate such an impact study should be referred to a parliamentary committee, as suggested by the mover of the motion. Such an elected body should be responsible for the consequences of any backlash from the electors. I do not think it is fair for departmental heads, who have to do the bidding of their Ministers, to be saddled with this responsibility.

One of the problems affecting the metropolitan area is the extension of the Kwinana Freeway. We should refer this sort of impact study to the proposed parliamentary committee. If on balance the project is found to be beneficial to the population of the metropolitan area despite the fact that certain desirable features would be destroyed or changed, then the project should be proceeded with subject to the approval of the committee.

On the other hand, if on the evidence brought forward it is found that certain other steps could reasonably be taken—especially if such moves do not involve the State in any great financial commitment—then maybe the alternative steps that are recommended could be adopted.

As I see the picture now, the Main Roads Department accepts the Stephenson-Hepburn plan as the base plan for the development of the metropolitan area. It proceeds with proposals put forward, and develops them in the way it thinks best and as being the most economical. When the department does that it could face all the problems in the world. Any pressure from the public is aimed at the particular branch of the Public Service; in this case it would be the Main Roads Department. In the case of conservation of the beaches the responsibility would lie with the Public Works Department and in the case of other projects with other departments.

Quite often I have seen people become very excited about the reclamation of a bit of territory from the Swan River. On the other hand the provision of many acres which resulted in the filling in of the marshes of the Swan River in the vicinity of the old Maylands airport did not receive one comment from the Press or from any other source. The people at that time accepted the fact that by such reclamation a deep water section of the river would be created for people to engage in aquatic sports. A project which reclaims some acres of the Swan River shore to provide a reasonable depth in a stretch of the river for water sports could have been the subject of some environmental study by a parliamentary committee.

It is all very well to say that we have the Environmental Protection Authority and the commissioner to look after environmental matters. In the final analysis they should not be expected to bear the brunt of the decisions that are made. We, as members of Parliament, must accept the responsibility, and finally the elected representatives on the Government side—I refer to the Ministers—have to accept the responsibility. I do not think the responsibility should be cast on them, when we have an opportunity to establish a parliamentary committee system.

There is no reason that such a parliamentary committee should not be established. In answer to those who ask why such a system was not established when we were the Government, I say that the history of my record in this regard is good. As the responsible Minister I introduced a Bill but we could not obtain the support of the then Opposition to enable the committee which I envisaged at the time, as well as a series of parliamentary committees, to be appointed and given statutory standing. The move was strongly opposed by the then Opposition. As a consequence I did not proceed with the proposal, and I allowed the measure to be defeated on the voices. Despite that, on reflection, people will agree that the action I proposed then was necessary in the public interest.

When there is a necessity to establish a committee, be it a committee to deal with the environment or any other matter, we in this Parliament should have the power to pass legislation to establish it; and thus enable the committee to make regulations and to take all the other steps that are necessary in order that it may function for the benefit of the people.

If we are not prepared to go along with that sort of attitude we will run into trouble; ultimately the Administration will also run into trouble because it will have to bear the burden of responsibility, as projects are brought forward from time to time.

Although I am not in full accord with the ideas of the mover of the motion in respect of environmental matters, I suggest the motion is a good one. People of 20 years or so ago had very little knowledge of and concern for the environment, but now they seem to have gone to the extreme of being overcautious. This is probably a good state of mind for the public to adopt, because if people are overcautious they will become the watchdogs of the State and, indeed, of the Commonwealth, to ensure that the generations which follow us will not be left in a complete mess in respect of the environment, and will have a world in which it is worth while to live. By adopting that attitude the people will ensure that the world of the future will not become an industrial morass or quagmire. We owe a debt to posterity to support the establishment of a committee such as this, so that it may be able to function with the aid of the parliamentary representatives of the people and make the necessary determinations.

Of course at times such a committee will make mistakes. In making their decisions the committee will have to face up to the electors, if it fails in its efforts. I suggest it is a good move. I support the motion, and I hope that it receives the plaudits of the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moiler.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

UNEMPLOYMENT

*Want of Confidence in Government:
Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 11th September, on the following motion by Mr J. T. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition)—

In the opinion of this House, because the Premier said if given the opportunity to perform he would solve the problem of unemployment within six months, and would be prepared to stake his reputation on success and

as the State Government has proved incapable of preventing the serious increase in unemployment which has taken place and is fast approaching a record level since the Government assumed office, it no longer has the confidence of this House.

To which Sir Charles Court (Premier) had moved the following amendment—

Delete all words after the word "because" with a view to substituting the following—

the policies of the Commonwealth Government have—

- (1) seriously aggravated inflation to a point where it has become a national economic crisis,
- (2) forced the State Government to impose steep increases in taxes and charges with the prospect of more to follow if the State financial position is to remain stable,
- (3) withdrawn incentive from basic primary producing agricultural and mining industries,
- (4) frustrated resource development programmes and damaged public confidence,
- (5) forced up interest rates to unprecedented levels with devastating results for home buyers and industrial expansion,

it has produced a disturbingly high level of unemployment with, on its own admission, worse to follow. For this the Commonwealth Government is deserving of the condemnation of this House and further, in the opinion of this House, the Commonwealth Government should expedite the programme of Commonwealth-State co-operation offered by the States to prepare a national strategy to defeat the present scourge of inflation.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [8.57 p.m.]: I am not a thin-skinned fellow.

Mr Blaikie: You can say that again!

Mr B. T. BURKE: In fact, I try very hard to ignore the barbs and the arrows that are flung at me from the other side of the House. It is for this reason that I have been ample in my forgiveness of the Premier during the past few weeks, when he referred to me as "Smarty Pants" and as "Billy Bunter". I have not even bothered to take his remarks seriously, because I know it was all in good heart and that the Premier sometimes becomes a little intolerant when he is presented with difficult situations.

In an effort to demonstrate to the House that he has a mortgage on the ideas that originate here, and on the innovations with which we are confronted, the Premier has moved swiftly into reverse, by moving an amendment to the censure motion that we presented to the House. But little did the Premier know that having moved the amendment he was forced to frame it prior to the presentation of the Budget by the Australian Government. Besides not knowing the effect of it, I believe the Premier was unable to conceive that the Australian Government would do such an excellent job with its Budget.

Sir Charles Court: You had an idea that the Federal Government would do a rough job.

Mr B. T. BURKE: In keeping with my tolerance and with my inability to conceive that the Premier means the things he says about it, I propose to help him out of the predicament in which he finds himself. The Premier has moved an amendment, which he had ample opportunity to outline prior to the introduction of the Budget. The Budget has now been brought down in an excellent fashion, and the Premier is in dire peril of ending up with egg on his face.

I would like to foreshadow to the House an amendment on the amendment which I shall move. It is an amendment on the amendment which I expect the Government to accept wholeheartedly, because it should realise that the amendment on the amendment fits in with the sorts of things the Premier meant to say. In fact, I would not be surprised to see the Premier withdrawing his amendment in favour of mine.

Mr T. D. Evans: I hope the Premier does not second your amendment on the amendment, and then move to amend it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The amendment I shall move seeks to delete all words that appear in the Premier's amendment after the words "the policies of the Commonwealth Government" with a view to inserting the following words in lieu—

as expressed in an excellent Budget brought down in the Australian Parliament on September 17th, 1974—

Sir Charles Court: How silly can you get!

Mr Jamieson: You started this, and you cannot expect to get out of it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Unfortunately in the course of reading out my amendment on the amendment the Premier interrupted me, so I will have to start it again. The words I propose to insert in lieu are—

as expressed in an excellent Budget brought down in the Australian Parliament on September 17th, 1974, has—

- (1) Shown sincere concern for the underprivileged by increasing dramatically Gov-

ernment spending on education, social welfare, Aboriginal welfare, child care, and health.

- (2) Stated quite clearly that it will not tolerate the evils of unemployment as a solution to economic problems.

I perceive a disquieting reaction from the Government benches.

Sir Charles Court: Just displaying a little humour.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The next two or three parts of my amendment will convince the Premier that he should withdraw his amendment. To continue—

- (3) Seriously impeded inflation by decreasing direct taxes on lower income earners, promoting wage restraint by increasing real income, and by refraining from increasing regressive indirect taxes.

Mr Clarko: By leaving the country and turning off the light.

Mr B. T. BURKE: To continue—

- (4) Provided solid leadership in the face of continued provocation by the Premiers of Western Australia and Queensland in concert with conservatives throughout the nation.

Further, that this State Government is deserving of the condemnation of this House by virtue of its inflammatory and divisive attitudes as expressed by its leader and his deputy, and by its failure to co-operate with the Australian Government's efforts to provide a worth-while solution to unemployment, having failed to honour its promise to solve the problem within six months.

It may be that we can curtail this debate very easily and very briefly if I pause and allow the Premier to signify his acceptance of my proposal.

Sir Charles Court: You arrogant little fellow; just carry on.

Mr Jamieson: The member told me the Premier would say that, at the tea suspension.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Balga.

Sir Charles Court: We have to have our amateur trials every private members' day, and the member might as well have his turn.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I think you must agree, Mr Speaker, that this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

Sir Charles Court: I hope the member has sent a copy of his speech to the Press, as he usually does.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I said earlier that I am not thin skinned.

Sir Charles Court: We know that.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I refuse to be provoked by the Premier; I will adhere to the ruling which you, Mr Speaker, have so often handed down in this House, and that is that we should discuss the subject before the Chair.

I am aghast that the Premier, when offered this avenue of escape from the dilemma which is of his own creation, has merely reverted to calling me "arrogant". I have sincerely and genuinely offered the Premier a chance to escape the mistake he made but he has reverted only to personal abuse. However, I am not thin skinned.

As the Premier has indicated he will not accept my proposed amendment, it behoves me to prove my point to the House. Let me first take the question of education and the reference I will make is to the words contained in the motion which will be passed by this House if my amendment is accepted.

The Australian Government, in its 1974 Budget, has provided for an increase of 78 per cent in expenditure on education—78 per cent.

Mr T. J. Burke: Incredible.

Mr B. T. BURKE: In fact, the amount to be expended on education by the Australian Government is to be \$1 535 million. Perhaps the Premier will now agree that the motion should be amended.

Sir Charles Court: Did the member not read Beazley's comments? He wanted \$200 000 just to fight inflation.

Mr B. T. BURKE: One of the problems created by the previous Liberal Government was that it spent so little on education that so few people learnt to read. Under the Australian Government plan technical and other education is to receive \$49.1 million, and extra assistance for secondary and tertiary students will cost \$7.2 million more than has been spent in the previous year. Universities and colleges of advanced education will receive an increase of 56 per cent to \$8.1 million. Does the Premier sincerely wish to challenge the merit of that plan?

Mr Bryce: No, he will knock it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: So, the proposition we will soon be discussing is whether the Australian Government has shown a sincere concern for the underprivileged with regard to education. I think it has been proved without doubt that the Australian Government has stated education is of paramount importance, evidenced by the magnitude of its expenditure in this area. Now the Premier displays a sudden change of mind because when asked earlier this afternoon whether he agreed with the education proposals of the Australian Government he said that he welcomed them. That is what the Premier said.

Sir Charles Court: We welcome the extra money for education, of course.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier said he welcomed the expenditure on education and I am pleased to agree with him. I will now move on to social welfare to see whether the Australian Government has shown sincere concern in this field. For dependent children the benefit will rise by 50c per week to \$5.50 per week. Supplementary rent allowances to pensioners are up \$1 to \$5 a week; and orphans' pensions are up \$1 to \$11 per week. There is to be a three-year programme, at \$10 million per year, for grants to States to construct pensioner dwellings. Is that sincere concern—or is the Australia Government such an ogre? It has proved by its attitude towards the most needy area that it has a sincere concern for the underprivileged.

Mr Sodeman: It is being totally incompetent.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I do not intend to be drawn by the comments from members on the Government side of the House because I have a job to do. The increase in the subsidy for organisations providing personal care to aged people will rise from \$12 to \$15 per week.

Mr Rushton: The Federal Government has wrecked the economy of the country.

Mr B. T. BURKE: What a marvellous move on the part of the Federal Government and yet members on the Government side here have illustrated, by their interjections, that they do not agree.

Mr Rushton: That is right.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The handicapped children's benefit will rise by 50c to \$3.50 a day, and an allowance of \$10 a week will be payable to parents for a handicapped child who is cared for at home. There will be a grant to national family planning organisations which will be increased by \$75 000 a year. An amount of \$11.8 million will be made available for structural adjustment assistance for people directly affected by Government decisions.

Is the Premier still positive that he does not wish to accept my proposed amendment? In fact, when the Premier was asked if he agreed with the expenditure on recreation by the Australian Government he said he welcomed it.

Sir Charles Court: As long as it did not have conditions attached which would cripple us. The member should tell the whole story, and not half of it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I will give the whole story later when I move to condemn the inflammatory and divisive attitudes expressed by the Premier.

Sir Charles Court: After your effort we will not support anything. The country is reeling under the present Administration in Canberra, and you know it.

Mr Bryce: Some of the Government's selected concerns might be reeling.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I said that I am not thin skinned.

Sir Charles Court: People like you never are.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I must remark on the difference between the expression on the Premier's face now, and the expression when he introduced his amendment.

The SPEAKER: The member has five minutes.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier was smiling so much I thought the top of his head would fall off.

Referring now to Aborigines, there is to be an increase of \$64.9 million for an advancement programme which will now total \$163.6 million.

Mr Ridge: Some more for unemployment benefits.

Mr B. T. BURKE: An amount of \$75 million will be provided to begin a programme of child care starting no later than the 1st January, 1975. What a terrible Government! How remiss it is; perhaps it could have made \$100 million available. The former Government gave nothing.

Mr Rushton: The Government does not worry where it gets the money from.

Sir Charles Court: All in phoney dollars.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Under the heading of health—and I suppose mental health will interest the Minister for Local Government mostly—

Mr Rushton: That will fit your standards.

Mr B. T. BURKE: To continue: the Australian Government will provide for health a sum of \$28 million in 1974-75 as part of a five-year programme to upgrade public hospitals in the States. Free equipment and supplies for stoma appliances and home dialysis will be provided.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Is this the Budget which the Premier called all froth and bubble?

Sir Charles Court: I will say it is.

Mr B. T. BURKE: There will also be an increase of \$327 000 in the Flying Doctor subsidy.

Mr O'Connor: It will take away the airports.

Mr Rushton: There will be nowhere to land.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I do not believe the Australian Government could find enough money to give Broderick his highway patrol.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The Government has not worked out what it will cost yet.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is frightened to start.

Sir Charles Court: You will be surprised; we will shock the Opposition.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The second part of my amendment, which requests the Premier to withdraw his amendment, sets out that the Australian Government should not tolerate the evils of unemployment as a solution to economic problems. Here we must become serious because we must touch on the traditional ploy of the Conservatives, which is to throw 200 000 people out of work to fight inflation. Once again, the hungry mouths will help to line the pockets of the profiteers.

That will not be the case with the present Australian Government. Under the heading of "Labour and Employment" an extra \$8.8 million will be made available for apprenticeship training and that will ease responsibility in the field of unemployment. The expenditure on urban and regional development will increase by 172.7 per cent to \$390 million for sewerage extensions, development of growth centres, and land commissions.

If the Premier still maintains that he does not wish to withdraw his amendment I suggest he is being purely pig-headed. Nevertheless, he asked me to quote him in full when he gave qualified support to the Budget this afternoon.

The Premier said certain things and I say he should be condemned because of his inflammatory and divisive attitude expressed during his consideration of the Australian Government's performance.

Here we have the Premier who has been presented with a magnificent Australian Budget. The Premier personally has the opportunity to solve many of the State's problems through the broad influence of the Australian Government in financing certain fields.

Sir Charles Court: You silly boy. You will be the only one in Australia saying that. Even Bob Hawke has reserves.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Before we find out whether any conditions are attached to these sums of money, the Premier says, "I hope there are no conditions attached which will make us unable to operate under the schemes to be introduced."

Mr T. J. Burke: The king of the knockers!

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier does not wait to find out whether conditions are attached. The Premier does not even know whether conditions are likely to be attached to these sums of money.

Sir Charles Court: We have a fair idea from the past.

Mr Young: We are going on past performances.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington) [9.16 p.m.]: Lacking the verbosity of the member for Balga, I would like to support the Premier's "pig-headedness", and I support—

Mr B. T. Burke: Did you say, "the Premier's pig-headedness"?

Mrs CRAIG: Yes, as the member for Balga said. I support the Premier's motion, and in particular paragraph (3) relating to the withdrawn incentive from basic primary producing agricultural and mining industries. To support my argument I will quote from today's *The West Australian* and the article on the Federal Budget headed, "Not much for the farmers". I can only say, "You're telling me!" I would have hoped that the underprivileged people mentioned by the member for Balga who are to be helped by the Federal Government might have included the farmers. However, this is clearly not to be the case. The article in *The West Australian* reads—

Rural organisations looking to the Budget for primary industry incentives will be disappointed.

Agriculture hardly rates a mention.

WA is to get \$4.6 million of the national allocation of \$30 million for rural reconstruction.

I ask members, "Where will that go?" This is an extension of the Federal Government's attitude to rural problems.

Mr Jamieson: It will probably go for rural reconstruction.

Mrs CRAIG: To prove it is an extension of the attitude of the Federal Government, I would like to quote from an article headed, "The Budget and rural industries". It reads—

The table below provides some details of the first Federal Labor Budget in more than 20 years. The estimated expenditure on rural industries for 1973/74 is compared with the actual payments in the two previous years. Overall, agriculture can expect about 20 per cent less than last year and 40 per cent less than in 1971/72.

Someone more clever than I am has yet to estimate how much less the payments will be in the year 1974-75.

Much comment has been bandied about this House in regard to the removal of the superphosphate bounty, but very few of the speakers have come down to actual specifics—how the removal of the bounty will affect the producer and the consumer.

Mr T. J. Burke: How it will affect the Deputy Premier!

Mrs CRAIG: I would like to give a few simple instances of the effect of the removal of the bounty. To fatten steers in country that runs at the rate of one steer to 3 acres, the cost of superphosphate will be \$15 a head. If any members wish to argue with this figure, it can be broken down in this way: superphosphate will cost \$60 per tonne spread on the farm after December when the subsidy is removed. The superphosphate is applied at the rate of one bag to the acre, so it is very simple

to work out that it will cost \$15 to spread superphosphate over three acres—sufficient to run one steer.

Mr Barnett: Who says that is the right figure?

Mr O'Connor: Who says it isn't?

Mrs CRAIG: The farmer who supplied the figure works in close association with the Department of Agriculture. I am sure we are all very aware of the fact that far more investigation must be carried out in regard to tissue and soil analysis. However, that is for the future. The farmer whom I am quoting is applying superphosphate at the rate now recommended. In the past he has been a most efficient farmer and I am sure he would be quite prepared to let members look at his figures. Whilst he did have a viable enterprise, he no longer has one.

In irrigation country the cost per head for fattening a steer will be much closer to \$30. If that is not inflationary, I do not know what is.

Let us consider the case of a small farmer who operates his farm alone. He owns 400 acres in an irrigated area, and his farm has run as a viable proposition, fattening beef alone, since 1945.

Looking at this man's figures for the year, we see his farm is running at a loss. This man prided himself on his study of the markets and he has always bought for specific markets after careful survey. He conducted his usual careful survey last year and he bought in cattle at a live weight rate of 19.7c per pound. This is accurate costing because the sales were made over scales. He bought 280 beasts at an average cost of \$155 per head. The farmer held these cattle for nine months and sold them two weeks ago for 8.4c a pound. Now had there been no labour cost involved, and had the farmer wanted nothing for himself, he would still have been faced with the shire rates of \$700 on his 400 acres, and with the irrigation and drainage rate of \$2 000. He also spread superphosphate, but at a lesser rate than was recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr T. J. Burke: Are you going to give an example for every year back to 1945 now, or will you depend on that one?

Mrs CRAIG: No, I will not do that, but I could.

Mr T. J. Burke: You cannot just quote one year.

Sir Charles Court: Listen to the great farmer from Perth over there!

Mr T. J. Burke: Simple logic tells us we cannot take just one year.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs CRAIG: I am speaking of this one year because it happens to be the time of the big crunch in the meat industry *in toto*, and I do not think Opposition members are aware of this.

A Government member: They would not have a clue.

Mrs CRAIG: Much has been said about unemployment; do not members opposite realise that these rural policies will have an adverse effect on unemployment?

Mr T. J. Burke: You told us of one example.

Mrs CRAIG: What about the 80 workers put off from the abattoirs at Harvey and then the extra 25 workers put off? It is these very workers that the Opposition is supposed to support.

Mr H. D. Evans: Is not the shortage of meat markets caused by embargoes?

Mrs CRAIG: Let us look at the milk market. It is commonly thought that people in the whole-milk industry are on a good thing. Perhaps they were in the past, but they too are being caught in the escalating costs spiral. No Opposition member would deny the fact that the men on these properties are rich when they die. I will admit that, but they do not have very much money whilst they are alive.

Mr Jamieson: Who told you that?

Mrs CRAIG: I can think of one farmer who has a 1 000 acre holding. He runs a whole-milk and beef enterprise side by side. He raises and fattens calves for beef as well as running his dairying business. As well as his shire rates, irrigation and drainage rates of \$4 000, he spends \$10 000 per year on fertilisers and \$2 500 on calf feed. His cost of production per gallon is 41.8c and he receives 54c per gallon. However, once the superphosphate bounty is removed, the extra payment for superphosphate will add 3.01c per gallon to the cost of producing a gallon of milk.

Mr Hartrey: The cost of milk will go up.

Mrs CRAIG: Clearly he cannot support that increase. Now the member for Boulder-Dundas tells us the price of milk will go up. It has already—we have just had an interim price rise of 2.65c per gallon.

The farmer to whom I am referring looks after his labour. He has always tied his men's wages to the wages of the truck drivers who deliver the milk. This has been a good thing to do. In the past when the price of the whole milk rose, he increased the men's wages by \$10 per week. This year he has been forced to cut his labour down from five to three units. When he received his last interim price rise, it was insufficient to add \$10 to each man's wage. Some farmers, like this man, try to look after their labour.

Let us now take the case of an older farmer who had been running sheep and who decided to turn to beef. He did not make his decision lightly; he was well advised by economists. Every marketing session he heard on the wireless told him how

magnificent the beef market was, and that it was projected to go on and on. He was told, "You have no worries. You can borrow money safely." So many farmers, as well as the man of whom I am speaking, borrowed money for beef. How can they repay it now with the escalating interest costs? They cannot even sell their cattle for what they paid for them, and they have no hope of repaying the principal. What do they do? Do they leave their farms? If they leave, where do they go? I suppose they could go onto unemployment relief, but what happens to the debt they still have? The position of these farmers can only get worse, not better.

I say to members that these farmers are caught in a policy that was brought down in Canberra. It seems to me that this policy was devised to bring farmers to their knees and to obliterate the rural economy. I do not think Australia can survive without the assistance of its rural industry. We must not forget the contributions of this industry in the past, and the contributions it is willing to make in the future.

Mr Jamieson: We will buy rice from Indonesia!

MR MOILER (Mundaring) [9.26 p.m.]: When the Premier foreshadowed his amendment to the motion of the Leader of the Opposition he was in typical form. He went to the trouble in the amendment to mention his own inadequacies but he then placed the blame for them on some other party. Like the previous speaker, I wish to refer to paragraphs (1) and (2) of the amendment which reads—

the policies of the Commonwealth Government have—

- (1) seriously aggravated inflation to a point where it has become a national economic crisis,
- (2) forced the State Government to impose steep increases in taxes and charges with the prospect of more to follow if the State financial position is to remain stable,

The Premier admits that this Government has brought in vicious increases, but he refuses to accept the responsibility of his position as Premier to do anything to counter taking these steps.

Sir Charles Court: You realise why these actions were taken.

Mr MOILER: Does the Premier deny his responsibility for the situation this State is in? Does he deny the waste of money he is causing with his stupid attitude and his refusal to listen to reasoned arguments against his education proposals?

Sir Charles Court: What money has been wasted on education?

Mr Ridge: There have been no reasoned arguments from the other side of the House.

Mr T. J. Burke: Where are you about to get the money from?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MOILER: I hope the Minister's contribution to debates will not be by way of interjections alone. I hope he will get to his feet occasionally.

Mr Ridge: That will be on too.

Mr MOILER: The Premier must accept that money will be wasted with the re-channelling and redirection that has taken place in the Education Department.

Sir Charles Court: What has taken place?

Mr MOILER: The Premier plucked from the sky the idea of sending five-year olds to school.

Mr Sodeman: How much money has been wasted?

Mr MOILER: When the State Budget is introduced—

Mr Sodeman: If the money has already been wasted, it cannot come out of the Budget.

Mr MOILER: —we will see how it compares with the Budget the Australian Government introduced last night. I anticipate that the State Budget—except where the Australian Government contributions permit the Premier to water down increases—will be again a vicious attack on an already suffering public.

Mr Nanovich: If the Commonwealth Government was supposed to have done so wonderfully well last year in regard to education, what did your Government do over the last three years?

Mr MOILER: Let us compare the actions of the Premier over the past six months with the actions of the Australian Government. The Australian Government is the first Federal Government to accept responsibility for education within Australia. It has made a genuine attempt to improve the education system in this country. The Premier talked about having conditions placed on money granted to the States for educational purposes; it is proper for conditions to be placed on this money because the Australian Government is determined to see that it goes where it is most needed.

Mr Nanovich: What about salaries?

Mr MOILER: Just hold on; the honourable member will get his answer. In accordance with the recommendations of the Karmel committee, in this year alone \$8.1 million will go to Western Australian schools in the form of general building grants. In answer to a question a couple of weeks ago, the Minister revealed that some 52 primary schools in this State will benefit from general building grants recommended by the Karmel committee. It is interesting to hear country members opposite continually crying poverty.

Mr Rushton: Whose money is it?

Mr MOILER: Of the 52 primary schools which will benefit by the Karmel funds, where \$3.5 million will be provided in this year alone, 31 schools are situated in country areas.

Mr Sibson: That does not pay the cockies' interest bill, though.

Mr MOILER: The honourable member is determined to look after the cockies, but I doubt whether many of the children of the cockies he is always crying about attend primary schools in the country. They would be attending the large private schools in Perth. However, the average person in country areas will benefit by the allocation of these funds. This is one area where the State Government and the Australian Government differ greatly.

Mr Sibson: Are you talking about high schools or primary schools?

Mr MOILER: Had the honourable member listened he would know that I said primary schools.

Mr Sibson: Not many children from country areas would attend primary schools in Perth.

Mr MOILER: Thirty-one country primary schools will benefit by the allocation of these funds. The member for Narrogin, who spoke earlier during the grievance debate and complained about the Commonwealth Government doing nothing for the country areas, might be interested to learn that the Narrogin Primary School will receive \$177 000 and that many other schools in country towns throughout the State will benefit by this allocation of funds. This will save the State Government the necessity to find finance to undertake improvements in these schools, yet the Premier is always anxious to blame the Australian Government for every ill that occurs in the country.

Mr Cowan: It is also long overdue.

Mr MOILER: These funds have been used to upgrade the schools in question.

Mr Rushton: Who do you think provides the funds for the Commonwealth Government?

Mr MOILER: The point is that the Australian Government is the first Government which has accepted the responsibility for this and for many other situations which it acknowledges it should take steps to correct.

The member for Balga mentioned the additional funds granted to the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

Mr Rushton: The Government is taking airports away from country areas. The Royal Flying Doctor Service will have nowhere to land.

Mr MOILER: For the next three years the service will receive capital subsidies of up to \$800 000 and an operational subsidy of \$2.1 million. This money is being

provided for the people who are living in the outback and who, supposedly, never receive a cracker.

Mr Rushton: How illogical it is to take the airports away.

Mr MOILER: The airports are not being taken away. The Royal Flying Doctor Service most certainly will be able to reach the sick and the injured in the outback areas.

Mr Ridge: That is, if the people in the outback can afford to maintain their aerodromes at reasonable standards.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! I request the honourable member to contain his remarks to the motion before the Chair, which is to delete all words after the word "because".

Mr MOILER: I was under the impression that Mr Speaker had indicated to an earlier speaker that, as this was a wide-ranging debate, latitude would be allowed.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You may give reasons why all that is in the censure motion should remain.

Mr MOILER: Let us compare the actions of the Australian Government with those taken by the Premier. We have seen vicious increases in vehicle registration charges and variations in answers given by Ministers in this House and in another place. In fact, a Minister in another place referred to the "affluent pensioner".

Mr Shalders: The Australian Government did not even answer my letter when I wrote it about pensioners; that is how much that Government cares.

Mr Bertram: You have no confidence in your representatives over there. They are all asleep, and you do their work for them.

Mr Skidmore: You probably sent your letter to the wrong Minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mundaring is on his feet.

Mr MOILER: For the first time, the State Government is aided and abetted by an Australian Government which is accepting responsibility for the welfare of the people within Western Australia. If the Premier had better allocated his priorities in the past—

Mr Skidmore: I did not know he had any.

Mr MOILER: —these vicious increased charges would not have been necessary. Yet the Premier has indicated that we can anticipate further increased charges.

Sir Charles Court: That is right, and it is a result of the pressures and directions of your colleagues in Canberra.

Mr MOILER: The Premier speaks of these vicious colleagues of mine. He claims that we on this side of the House were responsible for the return to office of the Australian Government; we are proud if in some way we were responsible for the return of the Labor Government. Since

Labor gained control of the Treasury benches, age pensions have increased from 20 per cent of seasonally adjusted average weekly earnings to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings.

Mr Sodeman: But what has inflation done to that?

Mr MOILER: Pensions are at their highest level in the history of Australia.

Mr Sodeman: What a farce!

Mr MOILER: It is not a farce. What is farcical about pensions having an effectively greater purchasing power?

Mr Sodeman: It is a farce. Increases must be related to inflation.

Mr MOILER: The pension must be assessed as a proportion of average weekly earnings; it is the only way we can look at these things.

Mr Sodeman: But you gave 5 per cent on the one hand and took away 20 per cent on the other. How farcical!

Mr MOILER: The member for Balga has already mentioned the subsidies provided by the Australian Government to aged persons' homes. The basis of that subsidy will change from a \$2 to \$1 subsidy to a \$4 to \$8 subsidy. In this financial year alone this will mean an increased cost of \$1.8 million to the Australian Government. What a vicious sort of Government we must have in the Australian Parliament!

Mr Rushton: They raped Western Australia to give us back a little bit.

Mr MOILER: The Australian Government has relieved the State Government of responsibility in the area of nursing homes; it will accept losses in running costs of nursing homes conducted by nonprofit organisations.

Mr Sodeman: Is the Commonwealth Government prepared to do that with the railway system?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

Mr MOILER: If the Premier would co-operate, instead of continually trying to blame someone else for his own inadequacies and shortcomings, the situation would be different. Instead, the Premier claims to be able to do everything but within six months can produce no tangible evidence of having done anything beneficial for this State.

It will be interesting to compare the forthcoming State Budget with the Budget introduced last night by the Australian Government. I believe that this Government's Budget will continue attacks on the average Western Australian.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [9.42 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment. Australia is in the middle of probably its second greatest economic crisis. Of course, the credit for this is due to the Labor Government in Canberra.

Mr Bertram: Prove it.

Mr CLARKO: Twenty-three years of Liberal-Country Party Government produced an economy which was looked up to by virtually the entire western world.

Mr Bryce: Stop-go economic policy!

Mr CLARKO: For 23 years the Federal Government maintained an inflation rate of 3 per cent.

Mr Skidmore: That does not prove anything.

Mr CLARKO: The present Australian Government in record time has managed to take the inflation rate from the level of 4 per cent which applied when it assumed office in 1972 to a level of 20 per cent. This was very skilful of the Labor Government; it was a great achievement to get inflation to that level so quickly.

Mr Bryce: Where do you get your figures from?

Mr CLARKO: The entire world was looking at Japan's inflation rate, while ours was pushed to a level of 20 per cent.

Mr Bryce: Where do you get your figures from?

Mr CLARKO: The Budget brought down last night anticipated an inflation rate of the order of 20 per cent.

Mr Bryce: Of the order! That is a different matter to having an inflation rate of 20 per cent.

Mr CLARKO: Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Blaikie), I would be happy to stop and ask the member for Ascot to tell me what he considers to be the approximate current inflation rate.

Mr Bryce: I asked you where you got your figures and you said it was anticipated that inflation would be "of the order of 20 per cent".

Mr CLARKO: The member for Ascot has not answered my question. If he does not have the gumption to answer it, will he please keep quiet?

Mr Bryce: Will you please tell me the basis for your figures?

Mr CLARKO: Will the member for Ascot tell me what is the approximate inflation rate in Australia today?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The honourable member for Karinyup will address the Chair.

Mr CLARKO: I am sorry, Mr Acting Speaker. I think I have shown conclusively that the member for Ascot cannot tell me what he believes to be the approximate inflation rate in Australia.

Mr Rushton: He would not have a clue.

Mr CLARKO: He is unable to do so. The member for Ascot is one of the few members opposite with a unit or two of economics, so we can imagine what the rest of them think about this matter.

I should now like to refer to the *Daily News* of the 31st July, where the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in this State, a man who possibly may lead that party one day, said that we should "let inflation run". He said that Chile had an inflation rate of 1300 per cent. He said that what was wrong with certain people in Australia and his colleagues in Canberra was that they had made the mistake of trying to do something about inflation.

Mr Skidmore: There is nothing wrong with the policy adopted by the Federal Government.

Mr CLARKO: Oh, we all know that the honourable member's knowledge of economics is pretty small. I have already tried to deal with the only member opposite who has any economic qualifications. However, in the case of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, his answer is to let inflation run.

The record of the economy is that for 23 years Australia had an inflation rate of 3 per cent under a Liberal-Country Party Government, but the present Federal Labor Government has taken the inflation rate up if not to 20 per cent yet, then say 15 per cent. I could quote the latter figure as being the rate for this month, but if I am to give the figure for 12 months hence, then in view of the Budget which was brought down last night my figure of 15 per cent will be very inaccurate.

What is more, when last year the inflation rate in Japan was 20 per cent all the economic critics of the world regarded it as being the most unstable economy for any modern industrial trading nation.

Some members opposite have said there are points within the Federal Budget. I agree. We cannot have a Budget which rips \$16 000 million from the Australian taxpayers, and not expect the Government to allocate some of the money to worthy causes. The present Federal Government is poor in terms of economic knowledge, that has been proved, but occasionally it must—and not always by accident—make money available in certain social welfare areas.

I do not criticise it for doing that, but what it has done is to push along certain social welfare programmes at a much greater rate than the economy will stand at the present time. That will help a few people, because in real terms the proportion of the Australian people who are genuinely in need is relatively small. The Federal Government is helping those people, but is letting the average Australian worker go to the wall.

Members opposite should ask the housewife who goes to the supermarket what she thinks about the Budget of the Australian Labor Party, or its management of the economy. I am sure she will tell them what she thinks about that. Ask this of the ordinary man who has been given

a tax reduction. If we look at the figures we find that a person in receipt of a salary of \$4 000 a year will receive a tax reduction of approximately \$100.

In fact, that person will probably receive a wage of about \$5 000 in the coming year, because if he does not he will not be able to live. What happens is that on an income of \$5 000 this person will pay \$200 more in income tax. I challenge members opposite to say that a person on the level of skill justifying a salary of \$4 000 now, will pay less tax in the current financial year than he did last year. It is a great lie. I submit it is incorrect to say that these people will be given a reduction in income tax. They will not, unless we keep them down to their present level of wages.

The present Federal Government which claims to be the great defender of the worker is putting the worker in a worse position than he has ever been in. Some people claim that inflation is imported; I agree that some of it is imported, but imported inflation does not account for the level of inflation that exists today.

I shall compare the rate of inflation with the rate in South Africa. In doing so I expect a retort from the member for Balga. The inflation rate in South Africa in 1972 was 3 per cent per annum.

Mr B. T. Burke: In that country they shot some people at Sharpeville.

Mr CLARKO: Since that time the inflation rate in that country rose from 3 per cent to 6 per cent.

Mr Bryce: There is slave labour in that country.

Mr B. T. Burke: How much was the rate of inflation in China?

Mr CLARKO: In Australia the inflation rate rose from 4 per cent to about 15 per cent. That is the extent to which the rate has increased. Today Australia has gone from a situation where its inflation rate was lower than that of the United Kingdom, the USA, and Canada, as well as certain well-managed European countries, to a situation where the inflation rate has reached a level higher than that of those countries.

If members opposite have any knowledge of economics they will realise that the Budget introduced by the Federal Government last night will not reduce the level of inflation. I challenge any member opposite to tell me that it will reduce the level. This is the major problem today, and nothing is being done by the Federal Government about it.

The Federal Government, which claims to be a great friend of the worker, got \$12 000 million in revenue last year, and this year it will get \$16 000 million. Will the pensioners who have given great support to the Government receive one more dollar under the Budget? I say that not one more dollar will be given to them.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Federal Government only granted them an increase of \$5 a week a month ago.

Mr CLARKO: Instead of granting the pensioners an increase, the Federal Government is working out various means to control the manner in which our money is to be spent. This affects not only the pensioner, but also the young person who is raising a family and endeavouring to educate his children properly. These people are members of a country which has the greatest rate of home ownership in the world.

The Federal Government is saying to these people, "We are generous and we will give you a reduction of a few hundred dollars in income tax on your housing interest payments". The Government fails to understand the real situation, and in this regard I will give an example of a person in my area. He was seeking to build a home and approached a bank.

Mr B. T. Burke: What was his name?

Mr CLARKO: Under the arrangement that person would have to pay about \$125 a month.

Mr B. T. Burke: How tall is he?

Mr CLARKO: In the latter part of last year the interest rate was increased, and at the time the monthly repayment was increased to \$150. The monthly repayment now will be \$192. It does such a person not a great deal of good to receive a few dollars a year in reduced income tax for interest payment, when he has now to find \$192 instead of \$125 a month!

The Deputy Prime Minister of the Federal Government is a doctor of economics, but he received the degree a long time ago, and perhaps that is the reason he is behaving so poorly now. Building costs have increased by 2 per cent a month, and by 25 per cent in the last 12 months. According to the figures which have been worked out by the Education Department, the cost of a school this year will be 55 per cent greater than the cost last year. That is, the expenditure in the field of education on which the Federal Government is spending a great deal of money is being wasted, because of its inability to manage the economy.

Not only has the level of unemployment risen to the order of 100 000 in August, but according to the estimates it will reach the level of 150 000 to 200 000. What gross hypocrisy it was on the part of the leaders of the Australian Labor Party to refer to the economic policies of the previous Federal Government as "stop-go economics". At least such stop-go economics were 1 000 per cent superior to what has happened in Australia in the last year and a half. Now we find the inflation rate is getting completely out of hand, and the position will get worse.

A Labor spokesman will say that a solution to inflation is massive unemployment, but Labor will not do that. Unfortunately for him Dr Cairns seemed to have picked up an old text book for he said, as was reported in the *Daily News* of the 21st August—

To imagine that inflation could be checked without unemployment was to "misjudge the nature of the system completely," he said.

Those were the remarks of Dr Cairns, the leading economist within the Australian Labor Party.

I bet that not only the person who is put out of work, but also the 15 to 17-year-olds who will be leaving school at the end of this year, will not vote Labor. What would they think as they go from door to door to seek jobs but finding none, as their fathers did in the 1930s? That is the situation which has been created by the Australian Labor Party.

There is no need for the inflation rate in Australia to be at its existing level. Perhaps the rate should be half or two-thirds of what it is. It should be nowhere near the rate of 15 per cent, and rising to 20 per cent. The unfortunate aspect is that the Budget accepts that rate of inflation.

The member for Swan is wanting to interject. I am sure he would not know the difference between a deficit and a surplus Budget.

Mr B. T. Burke: He knows what a slow learner is! Everything you know can be written on the back of a Bex tablet—

Mr CLARKO: I acknowledge that interjection, because it is the cleverest the honourable member has made but is still not very clever. What about the position of a person who is unemployed, and who has a son or daughter about to leave school? What about the position of the ordinary small businessmen? I know of one such case.

Mr B. T. Burke: What is his name?

Mr CLARKO: The member for Balga knows this man. He took over a small draper's shop which had three employees. He built up that shop so that it employed five workers. In view of the present economic situation he might have to put some of them off. There are scores and scores of small businessmen around Australia who are placed in a similar position, and who are hanging onto their staff, hoping against hope that something would come out of the present Budget; but nothing has. The only thing is that the people will pay more tax.

If the Australian Labor Party was genuine in its claim that it is looking after the worker, it would have exempted income tax on incomes up to \$3 000 per year or even \$4 000 per year. If it is really a friend of the worker it would do that. Let us take the figure of \$10 500 which is the level of income below which a lowering in

the rate is proposed. According to an article in *The Australian* on the 17th September, the middle-income earner is one who is in receipt of an income of \$7 000. That figure will not last long, and as each day passes it will be increased. This supposedly great Federal Government has allowed the figure to be set at \$10 500. That is not consistent if the Government wants to hit at the rich or the middle-class.

In today's issue of *The West Australian* appears a report which states—

The Budget appears to do nothing to combat inflation—either demand or cost-push.

One of the first debates I heard in this House was from two members of the Opposition. One of them said that inflation was due to demand pressures, and the other said it was due to cost-push pressures. One of my colleagues, who interjected, pointed out this complete difference. Liberal Governments manage the economy better, and that has been proven. The working man gets a better go from Liberal Governments. He is able to build a home, to acquire a car, and to educate his children.

Mr H. D. Evans: Does the Henderson report agree with that?

Mr CLARKO: In the areas where I have acknowledged more money could be provided, especially in the field of education to which \$1 535 million has been allocated, schools will get \$234 million more this year, and universities and colleges of advanced education have been allocated \$818 million. In my opinion the figures should be the other way round.

Mr Bryce: Your political party is opposed to the entry of the Commonwealth.

Mr CLARKO: I have given the honourable member a chance to answer the question I put to him. I asked him that twice. He merely grabbed his books and his mass of files, but he could not find the answer. I suggest that he should now give me a go.

What Australia needs is a reduction in the expenditure of the national Government, and active encouragement of the private sector. In particular the Federal Government should try to do something about increasing productivity in Western Australia.

In today's *Daily News* the Leader of the Opposition (Mr J. T. Tonkin) suggested the Budget could indirectly help to control inflation and get workers to restrain their actions for increased wages. I shall wait to see whether that will come about. I do not think that this Budget is fair to the workers he represents; I also represent the workers of this State.

I say that this Budget will do nothing to abate wage claims because people on the lowest wages cannot stand up to this deliberate attempt—and this is the crux of the

matter—by the Australian Government to ruin the national economy because it wants to take it over. In today's paper Mr Crean is reported as having said that the private sector is subdued and this will give the Australian Government an opportunity to move into that area. Of course, being a socialist, that is what he wants. I have been associated with elections for years, but I have never seen a Labor candidate indicate that he was a socialist candidate.

Mr T. J. Burke: Did you?

Mr CLARKO: No, I am a Liberal.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKO: Do members opposite know what a capitalist is?

Several members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: I have shown that members opposite are not correct. They have been talking about a party of wealth and privilege. I was a teacher, as was our honoured Speaker, and I do not know too many teachers who have become people of wealth and privilege.

In today's paper the Assistant Director-General of Education said—

There was nothing spectacular or particularly noteworthy in the grants allocated to W.A. apart from the technical education grants.

I think the assistant director-general would have some knowledge of that area. A school which would have cost \$250 000 to build last year, will cost over \$400 000 this year.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the two members involved refrain from the luxury of cross-Chamber conversation please?

Mr Skidmore: My apologies, Mr Speaker.

Mr CLARKO: In its Budget the Government should have cut its expenditure overall, and I believe the Treasury advised it to do this. There should have been a real and significant cut in taxation, particularly for the low income earners. Some steps should have been taken to help the Australian family, particularly in regard to increased deductions for wives and children. This area has not been touched for many years, but something should have been done about it this year because we are experiencing the highest inflation rate on record. Someone said that the inflation rate in 1951 was higher, but it is certainly a record rate at present.

Something should have been done with regard to housing loans. The present interest rate policy is of no use because the current inflation rate is higher than the interest rate. While that situation prevails, anyone with an elementary knowledge of economics knows that a person will borrow money if the inflation rate is higher than that at which the money can be borrowed.

All that the inflation rate is doing in real terms is hurting the ordinary Australian who is trying to set up his house in an Australian suburb. That is the person who is suffering and of course the suffering is also experienced by the members of his family.

We must also attract overseas capital. We all know the ridiculous situation which existed when the Federal Government made the absurd stipulation that a substantial sum of money should be placed in a Government reserve account, attracting no interest. Of course recently, because things were really getting out of hand, the Government amended that policy and reduced the amount to a nominal figure. It did not have the courage to abolish the requirement completely, but the percentage remaining was not of real significance in terms of what it was claimed to do.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has four more minutes.

Mr CLARKO: We need to again attract overseas capital back. I want to point out that the Federal Labor Government has shown its knowledge of economics is not very good, while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has stated that we should let inflation run. That is his way to solve the problem of inflation.

In 1959, when the Brand Government came into office in this State, the level of unemployment was the highest of any State in Australia. Within three years the Liberal Government had reduced it to such a level that it was only a little higher than the level in New South Wales and Victoria. Two further years later our level was the lowest in Australia.

I also want to point out the situation which existed in 1960-61 in Western Australia. During the Tonkin Government's regime a great deal was said about the tough times experienced. However, the downturn which that Government experienced was much less than the downturn experienced by the Liberal Government in 1960-61.

Mr Taylor: Check your figures.

Mr CLARKO: I would ask the member for Cockburn to study the unemployment figures for 1960-61 and compare them with the figures during the time he was a member of Cabinet. He will find that the Australian economic down-turn was greater in 1960-61.

During its first three years the Brand Government went through a period of economic hardship much greater than the hardship experienced by the Tonkin Government, yet at the same time the Brand Government raised Western Australia from the struggling economic mire into which it had fallen during the previous six years under the Labor Government to a situation where magazines like *The Economist* and leading journals of the world

were writing about Western Australia as being a place in the sun and a State on the move.

This is why such great progress has been made in Western Australia's tertiary education and why the Murdoch University was opened yesterday. It was all due to the tremendous growth and progress in the 1960s as the result of the better economic management of the people by the Government of that time.

Mr T. D. Evans: Don't forget the export license.

Mr CLARKO: I am glad the honourable member reminded me of that. I can recall all the criticism made of the royalties—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKO: I remember all the criticism made of the royalties imposed at that time, but it was interesting to read in an economic journal only two years ago about the royalties imposed by each State. Can members imagine which State had the highest average level? It was Western Australia.

Mr May: Because we increased them, that is why.

Mr CLARKO: I am talking about the previous term. What I say in conclusion is that the motion refers to the state of the economy and the amendment refers to how the policy of the Federal Government is seriously aggravating inflation to the point of a national economic crisis. This is abundantly true and unfortunately the only factor which emerges, particularly in the light of last night's Budget—apart from what has occurred in the months since December, 1972—is that the Australian Labor Government does not intend to change its particular economic management. This will be to the detriment of the ordinary Australian Joe Blow.

MR OLD (Katanning) [10.08 p.m.]: To say that the private sector is confused would be the understatement of the year and despite the risk of derision from my counterparts on the other side of the House, I intend to return to the rural sector, but in doing so I do not intend to talk only about farmers—

An Opposition member: That will be a change.

Mr OLD: —because people other than farmers live in the rural sector, including many small and large businessmen. My colleague dealt very efficiently with the economic situation and I would like to refer briefly to its effect on my area.

The Federal Budget and the economic policies of the present Federal Government have done nothing to assist either farmers or businessmen outside the metropolitan area. Because of rapidly rising costs and fluctuating incomes in rural areas, we

find ourselves in the position that liquidity is at an all-time low. Requests to the Federal Government by the States for assistance to local authorities for rural reconstruction and unemployment relief have been met with deaf ears. The answer given to our Premiers when they requested assistance of the Federal Government was that they should go home and raise their taxes. This the Premiers did and taxes have been raised not only in Western Australia, but in all other States, to an almost intolerable level.

If we consider that we have reached the peak we are deluding ourselves because costs are still rising and there is no indication that they will stop. Last night's Budget certainly has done nothing to assist in the cessation of the escalation of these costs.

Mr T. D. Evans: I think the member is starting to believe that propaganda.

Mr OLD: I am, indeed, and it is time the member opposite and his counterparts started to believe it also.

Mr T. D. Evans: I do not believe in anything fallacious.

Mr OLD: The exporting industries have been very badly hit. Export is the heart of the rural economy, and the rural economy is the heart of Australia's economy. Do not let us lose sight of that fact. The start of the decline in the export industry was the revaluation of the dollar by the Federal Government. That move proved to be a mistake and we lost some of our traditional beef export markets. As a result, as was so ably pointed out by the member for Wellington, people engaged in rural industries have been placed in an untenable situation. They are unable to get a return for the investments they made only 12 months ago. People who were relying on their investments so that they could survive—and following what was a good rural year—will be faced with a frightening taxation bill next year. They will receive very low incomes and face very high costs, and there is no chance that they will get themselves out of trouble.

Mr Skidmore: They have always been in trouble.

Mr OLD: And they always will be while this sort of business goes on under the present socialist regime.

On top of the revaluation of the dollar we had the brilliant removal of the subsidies previously available in rural areas. I refer to freight subsidies, and the withdrawal of the subsidy on freight for fuel and superphosphate.

Mr H. D. Evans: Has the subsidy on superphosphate been removed yet?

Mr OLD: No.

Mr Taylor: Then it has not affected the economy.

Mr OLD: It will affect the economy, and the price of superphosphate will be doubled.

Mr T. D. Evans: Does the member blame the Australian Government for the price doubling?

Mr OLD: No, I do not, but I do blame the Australian Government for not going ahead immediately in an endeavour to encourage development of the natural resources we have in Australia. I blame the Australian Government for not encouraging the mining industry to produce our own superphosphate. There is no doubt the reserves are here, just the same as we have oil reserves.

We know the position with regard to the price of oil. It will not be very long before we have to import crude oil because the known reserves in Australia will last only till 1980. Unless a very energetic programme of exploration is put into operation immediately we will find ourselves importing Middle East crude oil at a very high cost. Members can rest assured that the price of petrol and petroleum products will double. The withdrawal of the incentive to the exploration companies has led to the withdrawal of oil rigs from our coast, where, undoubtedly, plenty of oil is still available and waiting to be discovered. When our known reserves of oil peter out the situation will be frightful and costs will escalate even further.

Mr Skidmore: Geologists do not bear out your statement that more oil is available.

Mr OLD: That is the honourable member's story.

Mr Skidmore: No, it is the geologists' story.

Mr OLD: One of the greatest blows to the people living in rural areas was the increase in telephone rentals, and the increase in the charge for the connection of telephones. I have a case in my own area where a farmer has just built a new house. His son has taken over the old house to which the telephone is connected and the farmer has asked the PMG Department to extend the telephone to his new house. It is to be a party line. However, he is to be charged for the distance over and above 5 kilometres from the exchange, which is in the vicinity of 10 kilometres. If this is not an unfair crack of the whip for country areas I would like to know what is.

The present condition of our rural industries is due to the effect of the policies of the Federal Government, and the Budget which was introduced last night will do nothing to assist those associated with rural industries. Indeed, the Budget will help to cripple the country.

On that note, I support wholeheartedly the amendment moved by the Premier.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [10.15 p.m.]: I oppose the suggestion that all the words after the word "because" be deleted from the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The motion put to the House by the Leader of the Opposition contains a great deal of substance which is well and truly worthy of our consideration and support.

I would point out to members that the motion which the Premier seeks to amend contains four specific facts. Firstly, it refers to the fact that the Premier stated—and he restated it on many occasions—that if he were given the opportunity he would solve the problem of unemployment within a period of six months. The new members to this House may not have had an opportunity to read the back copies of *Hansard* to see on how many occasions the Premier made that statement. However, they may well recall the articles which appeared in the media, and in which the Premier made his repeated claim: all he wanted was an opportunity and within a period of six months he would solve the unemployment problem.

The second fact in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition is that the Premier indicated quite clearly that he would stake his reputation on the success of his statement and claim.

The third statement of fact is that since the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government came to power in March, 1974, there has been a serious increase in unemployment in this State.

The fourth statement of fact, contained in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, is that the level of unemployment in Western Australia is currently approaching a record.

Those four statements of fact are combined with an expression of opinion which I believe, at the outset of the debate, would have been wholeheartedly supported by members in this House; that is, in the light of these facts the House could no longer have confidence in a Premier who makes such statements. Since he has been in office it has been proved that he is unable to substantiate the promises he made.

It is important that these statements of fact be substantiated and I draw the attention of members to the comments of the Premier which appear at page 2579 of *Hansard* for 1972, wherein he made the claim that if he were given the opportunity to perform he would solve the problem of unemployment.

Mr Young: Does the member consider that we have been given an opportunity to perform?

Mr BRYCE: The Government has had six months.

Mr Young: But have we had an opportunity to perform?

Mr BRYCE: The Government has a majority in both Houses of this Parliament. It was given that opportunity. However,

in 1972 the Premier was suffering from a fit of pique and indignation after being thrown out of office and he made his rather wild claim and promise. He said that if he was given an opportunity to perform he would solve the unemployment problem. In answer to an interjection from the then Attorney-General, in which the Attorney-General asked how long it would take to solve the unemployment problem, the Premier said, "Within six months of getting back into office." At this stage, I think it is about one week short of six months. That is the first statement of fact which the Premier is unable to deny.

The second statement of fact is that on page 2579 of vol. 3 of *Hansard* for 1972 the Premier also said—

I would be prepared to stake my reputation on success.

The third statement of fact in the motion which was moved in this House by the Leader of the Opposition is that since the Court Government has been in power in Western Australia there has been a serious increase in the level of unemployment.

I am not aware that during the course of this debate so far anybody has indicated precisely what the increase in unemployment has been in Western Australia during the six months that the Liberal Party-National Alliance coalition Government has been in office. I do not intend to weary the House with a long and tedious list of figures but for the sake of the record I believe I should quote the figures in the monthly return which indicate quite clearly that there has been a serious increase in unemployment.

The number of unemployed in Western Australia in April, 1974, was 6 593; in May there were 6 566 unemployed; in June there were 7 782 unemployed; in July there were 9 752 unemployed; and in August there were 11 318 unemployed. It is interesting to note that in the six months the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government has been in office in Western Australia the number of people unemployed has jumped from just over 6 000 to 11 300.

I begin to wonder, as I am sure many other members of the House must do, whether the Premier is exactly the same man who sat here in 1971. Can this possibly be the same character—the man who at that time screamed from the roof tops, in his fit of indignation and pique at being removed from office, that the sole responsibility for unemployment lay at the feet of the State Government? It must be borne in mind that I was elected to this Parliament at a by-election in the latter part of 1971, when unemployment was a very important question; and the present Premier was repeating day after day that the principal responsibility for unemployment lay at the feet of the State Government.

Sir Charles Court: It did then, too.

Mr BRYCE: It did then! That is the basis of his excuse. The man lacks consistency because in those days, with a

Federal Liberal Government and a State Labor Government, it was argued that the responsibility for unemployment lay solely at the feet of the State Government. Now, of course, the circumstances are different. The member for Karrinyup indicated that the circumstances are different. The Premier said the circumstances were different. Of course, they are different. The difference is that there is now a Federal Labor Government and a State Liberal Government. Because of the embarrassment that consistency would cause, it must now be argued that the circumstances are different.

Now, of course, the Liberal-Country Party Government is in office and is faced with the responsibility of producing the goods and fulfilling the promises made to the people of this State by the Premier. He said, I repeat, "Just give us six months." He has now been given the six months and he has failed miserably. As I have just indicated with authentic figures, the number of unemployed in this State has nearly doubled during the six months the Premier has been responsible and at the helm of affairs in Western Australia; and he knows it well.

Sir Charles Court: Have not your colleagues in Canberra accepted the responsibility for the present Australia-wide situation?

Mr BRYCE: Did the Premier's colleague in Canberra—namely, Billie Mackie Snedden—accept responsibility for throwing 200 000 people out of work in 1971? And in 1972, when the effects of that Budget were raping the State in an unemployment sense, did the Premier acknowledge that the Snedden Budget of 1971 was one of the principal reasons for so many people being out of work in Western Australia?

Sir Charles Court: I do not acknowledge it. If you had had the initiative then you could have got the boots into them.

Mr BRYCE: I will not be intellectually dishonest, as other people have been in this debate. I have never argued that the sole responsibility for unemployment lies at the feet of the State Government. I argued in my maiden speech in 1971, and repeatedly throughout 1972, that when there are world economic trends and very meaningful and important national economic decisions are being made, the State Government has limited opportunity to solve unemployment. The difference between my argument and the argument the Premier puts is that the Premier was less than fair and he knows very well that all he was doing was taking any opportunity and using any argument and excuse he possibly could in order to get back into power; and he knows very well he was not being consistent.

The fourth fact outlined in the motion moved in this House by the Leader of the Opposition is that Western Australia's current level of unemployment is far

approaching a record level. I would like to quote from the statistics briefly because nobody else has bothered to do so during this debate and I believe they, too, should be recorded.

In April, 1974, 1.42 per cent of the work force in Western Australia was unemployed. In May of this year the percentage was also 1.42. In June it jumped to 1.68, and in July to 2.10. The latest monthly return indicates that unemployment stood at 2.20 per cent in August. With that type of factual information neither the Premier nor any of his Ministers can deny that since they have been at the helm of affairs in Western Australia the percentage of the work force which is unemployed has rapidly approached a record level. I understand that since the last war the highest level of unemployment in Western Australia was something less than 3 per cent—about 2.81 per cent. It is now rapidly approaching a record level, and the actual number of people who have been thrown out of work has almost doubled in six months.

The reason I emphasise this point is that all who were members of this Chamber in 1971, 1972 and 1973 will remember that the man who sat in the seat right in front of me continually argued that the first responsibility for solving unemployment lay at the feet of the State Government. I said then, and I say it again now, that there are very serious limitations to what a State Government can do to solve unemployment when international and national economic trends spill over the borders of those artificial lines which have been drawn on a map to indicate State boundaries.

The principal arguments used by the Leader of the Opposition, as he was in 1971, seemed to hinge on the fact that in 1961 a certain situation marked the industrial take-off of Western Australia—there is no question about that; I have never doubted or questioned it—and that situation more than any other enabled this State to avoid the high level of unemployment that was sweeping other States.

Of course, the present Premier assumed the proportions of a hero because of this. He kept referring to the 1961 situation. He said repeatedly, "We rode out the storm in 1961; give us a chance again and we will prove we can ride the storm again. We will fly in the face of international economics. We will fly in the face of national economic decisions and national economic trends. We will prove that unemployment can be solved by a State Liberal Government."

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr BRYCE: If I appear to be harping on this point it is because—

Mr O'Neli: You are!

Mr BRYCE: —the Premier knows better than any other person that he repeatedly made these totally unfair and unrealistic claims in 1971. He is now faced with the position where he ought to be delivering the goods, and he knows as well as I do—

Sir Charles Court: To put you out of your misery, I will say very definitely that I said those things; I meant those things, and they would have been done now if only we could get rid of your friends in Canberra.

Mr BRYCE: I have already submitted to the House that this is always the Premier's argument—there has been a change in circumstances—if he does not have everything his own way. I suggest he should stand up to prove he is a man of substance and to prove he is worthy of being the Premier of Western Australia, rather than becoming the finest exponent of "excusism". He cannot deliver the goods. Just because he is not getting everything his own way he is behaving like a spoilt child and blaming someone else.

Mr Sodeman: Someone else who cannot produce the goods.

Mr BRYCE: The interesting thing about the debate of 1971 is that we, on the Government side, repeatedly asked the then Leader of the Opposition to explain his famous method to solve unemployment on the State scene. I would like to give the House a list of his lofty theories, and I remind members that he is a master of generalities. His theories were—

To work hard seven days a week;

To hang on, and this is what we did in 1961;

To get out and get things done;

To put our shoulders to the wheel;

Mr Davies: And our nose to the grindstone!

Mr BRYCE: To continue—

And to create a stable economy.

These were the lofty ideas of the present Premier who was the Leader of the Opposition in those days. This was his solution to the unemployment problem when Western Australia had a Labor Government. I suggest that he should now use his lofty economic principles rather than hiding behind a cloak of excuses for not producing the goods and for not fulfilling the promises he made.

The "magic man" theory was very convenient, and it was probably a clever political argument to use whilst in Opposition. The then Leader of the Opposition posed as "magic man". He propositioned the people of Western Australia that because he was a man of destiny all they needed to do was to change the Government and he would solve the unemployment problem in Western Australia. He has proven he cannot do this, and he ought to be big enough to admit it rather than hide again behind excuses. He says now,

in 1974, Canberra is to blame. In 1971, when we had a rural recession, an international economic shakedown in the currency system throughout the western economic world, and we were suffering from the effects of a drastic deficit Budget brought in by Mr Snedden in 1971, the Premier swept all these things aside and said that they were of no account whatsoever and that unemployment was a State responsibility. Now, because his methods have failed, he feels inclined to blame the Government in Canberra for inflation. He says the situation is different from the situation in 1971—that is the excuse he uses.

I suggest to the House that we are rather pleased the Premier is behaving in this way because we feel his actions will work to our political advantage. During the lead-up to the last election campaign we saw the Premier gain the reputation of being the greatest knocker ever. No matter what the Tonkin Government did or planned to do he knocked it, denigrated it, and destructively criticised it. Of course, when this message was conveyed properly to the people in the metropolitan electorates, the vote for the Liberal Party was down to billy-o.

Now I am going to suggest to the members of the House that given three years and enough rope, the Premier will be regarded from one end of the State to the other as the man of excuses. The people are already sickening of his "excusism". One cannot pick up a newspaper without seeing some comment made by the Premier blaming Canberra or someone else because he is not getting everything his own way. He is no longer the sole leading actor in the destiny of our State. Because he is not getting everything his own way he is beginning to blame Canberra at every opportunity. This will ultimately work to our advantage as the people wake up to him.

Adjournment of Debate

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) [10.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment of debate) put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks during Division

Sir Charles Court: I thought we were going to get this out of the way.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: This is pretty rough.

Mr Young: The Whip made arrangements with your concurrence.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No he did not.

Mr Young: Every private members' day you make the arrangement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Point of Order

Mr J. T. TONKIN: On a point of order, I ask for a withdrawal of the remark as it is offensive to me and there is no basis for it. If the honourable member does not withdraw the remark, I will go and punch his nose.

Mr YOUNG: I will apologise to the Leader of the Opposition because obviously what I did say was offensive. The arrangement was made, however, and he knows it.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I ask for the withdrawal of that. The arrangement mentioned was not made because when I asked my Whip to move the adjournment of the debate he told me he could not move it because he had already spoken. The Government will come at anything.

Result of Division

Division resulted as follows—

Ayes—20	
Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moiler
(Teller)	
Noes—25	
Mr Blaikie	Mr Mensaros
Sir David Brand	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Connor
Mr Cowan	Mr Old
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Neil
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurence	Mr Young
Mr McPharlin	(Teller)
Pairs	
Ayes	Noes
Mr Harman	Mr Watt
Mr May	Mr Rushton

Motion (adjournment of debate) thus negatived.

Debate (on amendment to motion) resumed.

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) [10.40 p.m.]: Hail the dictatorship! This incident is, of course, another indication of what we will see from now on; that this Government will use out of hand its numbers on every occasion to dictate what will occur.

Sir Charles Court: Don't you know what arrangements were made by the Whips?

Mr T. J. BURKE: No-one seems to know what the Whips arranged. They are at present outside the Chamber with the Leader of the Opposition trying to arrive at some understanding. Probably we will find even the Government Whip did not know what was going on.

Sir Charles Court: Of course he did. He is just about driven mad by you people changing your minds.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Perth is entitled to speak; but if he speaks, I suggest he speak to the amendment before the House.

Mr T. J. BURKE: It was my intention to speak to the amendment to the motion when the matter was next before the House; and I considered probably that would be next week. By way of explanation, the Opposition Whip asked me to move the adjournment after discussion with the Government Whip, and he indicated to me that the only reason he could not move the adjournment was that he had already spoken.

The SPEAKER: Order! That division is past history. I have been lenient and tolerant in regard to speeches made on this amendment, which is to delete from the motion all words after the word "because"; but I cannot endure this any longer. I would suggest that the member for Perth speak to the words proposed to be deleted after the word "because". He may talk about the words to be deleted and those proposed to be inserted and compare them if he wishes, but he must speak to the amendment.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It was my intention to direct my remarks to what motivated the Leader of the Opposition to move this very reasonable censure motion against the Government. In the light of what has occurred in this Parliament in recent days I felt I was justified in explaining the reason for the position in which I find myself at the moment. We do not really know yet why I have been forced into the position of having to proceed with my speech tonight.

However, I will endeavour to follow speakers on this side of the House who have, in a very reasoned manner, shown the Parliament that the censure motion on the Government, which the Premier in typical fashion will now twist by using his strength of numbers, having exercised once again complete disregard of an understanding of arrangements between Whips, his dictation of the Parliament—

Withdrawal of Remarks

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, I find those words offensive because they are not true. I ask that they be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The words used by the member for Perth are offensive to the Premier, and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Could I have the particular words, Mr Speaker?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the honourable member wishes to be pedantic I suggest we get them from *Hansard* so that we ensure we have the right words. I understand that is in accordance with Standing Orders. Then we can make sure the right words are withdrawn. No arrangement was broken, and that is what was said.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Perth prepared to withdraw the words the Premier finds offensive?

Mr T. J. BURKE: Do you intend to get the words from *Hansard*, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Very well.

[The *Hansard* report having been obtained.]

The SPEAKER: The *Hansard* report is as follows—

However, I will endeavour to follow speakers on this side of the House who have, in a very reasoned manner, shown the Parliament that the censure motion on the Government, which the Premier, in typical fashion will now twist by using his strength of numbers, having exercised once again complete disregard of an understanding of arrangements between Whips, his dictation of the Parliament—

I understand the words the Premier wishes to be withdrawn are "complete disregard of an understanding of arrangements between Whips". Are those the offensive words?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, Sir.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Mr Speaker, I am quite happy to withdraw those words.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr T. J. BURKE: It became apparent to me that I would have to proceed with this debate only when we obtained a reaction from the Premier—and subsequently, of course, from members opposite. In the circumstances, I am happy to proceed with my support for the censure motion moved against the Government and my complete opposition to the words the Premier would include in the motion. I will refer directly to his amendment. He proposes to insert the following words—

- (1) seriously aggravated inflation to a point where it has become a national economic crisis.

In view of the circumstances, I do not have the appropriate Press cutting in front of me; but it will be recalled that a few days ago a statement appeared in the Press comparing the rate of inflation in various relatively prosperous countries, and our rate of inflation is 17th on the list. So when we consider the matter in a global sense the position is not all that serious; when it suits the Premier he will put it in those terms. The situation is not as relevant to the motion as he would have us believe.

There has been talk of the Commonwealth forcing the States into increasing taxes and charges. My understanding of this is that there was an agreement, either formal or informal, between the States to increase their charges. It has happened in

all States, and is irrelevant to the fact that in Western Australia the rate of unemployment has increased at a much greater rate than that applying in other States. Since this Government came into office, unemployment has increased by 100 per cent. Because of the circumstances of this debate, I do not have the exact figures in front of me, but I believe that if members opposite checked the statistics they would find that we lead Australia in the rate of increase of unemployment—this in a State led by the present Premier, the man who said when the Labor Party was in Government in Western Australia that, given six months of leadership, given his pipelines, and his magic charms, he would have the unemployment problem under control. He has about two weeks.

It is patently obvious that the Premier is neither able to bring nor interested in bringing unemployment under control. As I have suggested, the motion of censure was prompted by the Premier himself going off at the mouth in past times as to his ability to control and dictate—I use the word “dictate” reservedly—not only unemployment but everything else in this State. Perhaps the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill is evidence that the Premier realises that the six months is not long enough.

I refer to part 3 of the Premier's amendment to the censure motion relating to the lack of incentive to primary producing, agricultural, and mining industries. We heard some wonderful examples of this tonight from the members for Katanning and Wellington. They referred to the rural areas and were very careful to use statistics which related to only one year. I asked them to spread their statistics over the years to give us a true indication of the situation.

Let us face it, statistics for one year do not show anything; we must consider statistics over a number of years before we have a real indication of the situation.

Mr Ridge: You have never had inflation running in previous years as it has run this year.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Yes, but in fairness I requested the members, if they were going to use statistics, to use the statistics for a number of years.

Mr Sodeman: The member for Ascot used statistics relating to a period of only six months.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am not concerned—

Mr Sodeman: You should be concerned.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Of course I am not concerned. I am debating what was said in reference to clause 3 of the Premier's amendment to the censure motion.

Mr Sodeman: Yes, but you were giving us back-up facts as well.

Mr T. J. BURKE: If the honourable member wants to stand and support his Premier, I will be pleased to listen to him. Perhaps the member for Scarborough, if he stays long enough, can stand and support his leader. However, the member for Wellington was not prepared to explain to us why the person to whom she referred as being in some difficulty was prepared to remain where he was since 1945. Although the member for Katanning was a little fairer, likewise, he was not prepared to generalise over the entire period these people had been involved in rural enterprise. Let us face it, in every sort of enterprise there are good times and bad times.

Mr Laurance: You had to worry about God before.

Mr T. J. BURKE: God or a dictator—the honourable member can suit himself.

Mr Laurance: I was referring to God, not Gough.

Mr P. V. Jones: Are you referring to clause 3 of the Premier's amendment?

Mr T. J. BURKE: That is right.

Mr P. V. Jones: Are you saying that there is incentive?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I do not really understand that interjection. Perhaps the honourable member could write it down and I will let him have a written reply. Neither of the two members to whom I have referred was prepared to give us the full picture. Of course, they disregarded the fact that last year or the year before we came out of a rural recession.

The SPEAKER: The member has five minutes remaining.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Following this recession there were boom times in the rural sector. The Australian Government is doing its level best to promote the rural industry. It has guaranteed the price of wool; no-one in the rural sector could complain about that. It is a very good move with which I wholeheartedly agree. Two or three years ago the rural sector was confronted with wheat quotas, but that situation no longer exists. Perhaps it coincided with the return of an Australian Labor Party Government. Perhaps it was in part due to the fact that we were not prejudiced about selling our wheat to China but were prepared to compete with Canada to open up markets in this and other areas. Of course, the farmers themselves will not complain about that situation.

Mr Cowan: Australia's trade to China has dropped since the Federal Labor Government took over.

Mr T. J. BURKE: If the member who interjects could confirm that Australia's wheat trade with China has dropped, I will be prepared to listen to him.

Mr Cowan: It has dropped in all areas.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am talking about wheat. Of course, the honourable member does not contend that because it is not so.

Mr Cowan: It is.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Clause 4 of the Premier's amendment states—

frustrated resource development programmes and damaged public confidence, . . .

The only concern of the Australian Government is for the people of Australia. It wants to see this and future generations left with more than holes in the ground. Let us face it, the Australian Government has forced overseas interests to buy our raw materials and our natural resources at a much higher price than applied when the Liberal Government was in office in Canberra. There was little argument about these higher prices because these people realised that they were getting our minerals cheap. The Premier of Western Australia gained a great reputation for opening up markets for our resources. I am quite certain that I too could gain a world reputation if I set about selling Kalgoorlie gold at \$5 an ounce.

Mr Hartrey: You would soon finish up in the boob, as well.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Clause 5 of the Premier's amendment to the censure motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition states—

forced up interest rates to unprecedented levels with devastating results for home buyers and industrial expansion, . . .

I do not have the advantage of the economic knowledge of the member for Karriinyup, but my simple understanding of the situation is that the Australian Government was forced to compete with the friends of the Premier, who were fighting for the very high interest which was available on short-term loans. Of course, this has been followed by the difficult situation in which we find ourselves today.

This motion is a true censure of the Government and was prompted by the attitude and statements of the Premier over many years. He had a lot to say about what he was going to do when he got into Government—what he was going to do with his pipelines, with his Pilbara plan and with all the other miracles he was going to work.

Sir Charles Court: You have plenty of time; keep going.

Mr T. J. BURKE: The Premier is quite unable to do anything about the situation existing in Western Australia at the moment; he is displaying his complete incompetence. The motion of censure is a considered motion; the amendment should not even be considered.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is—

That all words after the word "because" in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition be deleted.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—26

Mr Blaikie	Mr McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr Mensaros
Mr Clarko	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Connor
Mr Cowan	Mr Old
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sibson
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr F. V. Jones	Mr Stephens
Mr Laurance	Mr Young

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Watt	Mr Harman
Mr Thompson	Mr May

Amendment thus passed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Days and Hours

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [11.03 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, could I, with your indulgence, advise members of the sitting times after Royal Show Week, because I will not be here tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: Is there any objection? As there is no objection, I call on the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have conferred with the Leader of the Opposition about sitting times after Royal Show Week. It is customary to change the sitting hours about that time. It is anticipated that the Budget will be introduced on Thursday, the 3rd October, and for that reason I suggest we do not change the sitting hours for the first week after show week. However, from the following week, which will commence on Tuesday, the 8th October—and resolutions will have to be passed in due course—I think it desirable that the hours of sitting shall be as follows—

1. Tuesdays—commence at 4.30 p.m.
2. Wednesdays—commence at 2.15 p.m.
3. Thursdays—commence at 2.15 p.m.

4. Sittings at night; that is, after 7.30 p.m., be on each of these days as required.
5. Private members' business to have priority over Government business—apart from questions and formal business—from 2.15 p.m. to 6.15 p.m. on Wednesdays.

Mr Jamieson: You might also let members know that there shall be no sittings during the week the Constitutional Convention is held.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for reminding me of that. The other week that Parliament will not be in session will be the week commencing Monday, the 4th November, when 12 members of the Parliament will be in Adelaide for the Constitutional Convention. Therefore that will take another week out of our sitting times. However, as the session continues and we see how the Budget debate progresses, we can concede how the sitting times can be varied without placing any undue pressure on members at the end of the session.

House adjourned at 11.06 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 19th September, 1974

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Show Week

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Justice:

What are the arrangements for the sitting of the House for Show Week, which is next week?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for having given me notice of the question. I am able to inform the House that, as is customary, it is the intention that the House will not sit during Show Week. Therefore it is my intention at the conclusion of business today to move that the House do rise until the following Tuesday which will be the 1st October. Members are probably aware that arrangements have been made in another place regarding sittings after Show Week. However, for at least the first

week after Show Week our sittings will remain as normal. In the light of experience during that week we will make further arrangements but, if any alteration of sitting times is found to be necessary, I hope to be able to give members at least a week's notice of such alteration.

2.

TAKARI SCHOOL

Members of Parliament at Opening

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was an official opening held of the resource centre and canteen at the Takari Primary School, Hamersley?
- (2) If so, is the Minister aware that an invitation was not extended to me as the representative of the area?
- (3) Will the Minister ensure that local members are invited to any future official openings for such buildings?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes, there was an opening. It was arranged by the local headmaster as I recall, and I received an invitation to perform the opening ceremony for the resource centre and the local mayor, I think it was, performed the opening ceremony for the canteen.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes, I will issue a general instruction that when any such function is held, all local members are invited. I thought it was normal procedure anyway.

3.

TOWN PLANNING

Subiaco Development

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

Following the comments regarding lot 160, Onslow Road, Subiaco, the Minister indicated he would forward them to the Subiaco council for comment. Would he advise whether that was done and whether a reply has been received?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

I sent the speech of the honourable member to the Minister involved (Mr Ruhston). It was then sent to the City of Subiaco. I have not been around for the last week, as members may know, and I am not aware whether a reply has been received. Today is my first day back on the job and naturally I have not been able to catch up with everything. I thought I had sent a memo to the honourable