

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 9th August, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (57): ON NOTICE HEALTH

1.

Medical Officer: Mt. Magnet

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Health:

What negotiations are in process to provide a medical officer for the Mt. Magnet district?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The Shire has arranged to advertise and the department will do everything possible to assist in recruitment.

2. OESTROGEN

Treatment of Male Sex Offenders

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

- (1) Are there desirable consequences to be obtained from the injection of male sex offenders with oestrogen?
- (2) Will he advise the House of any disadvantages of such treatment?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) and (2) There is no available information within the department that suggests the suitability of this treatment.

3. PIGS

Artificial Insemination

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Have any experiments been carried out by officers of the Department of Agriculture into artificial insemination of pigs in Western Australia?
- (2) Have any experiments been carried out by veterinary officers or others not under the control or jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture into artificial insemination of pigs in Western Australia?

- (3) If the answers to (1) and (2) are "Yes" can he give any indication as to the success or otherwise of the experiments?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Departmental experiments have been successful. Inseminations carried out in a large commercial herd have also been successfully accomplished.

4. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

*Request to Prime Minister:
Correspondence*

Mr. NALDER, to the Premier:

Will he table letters to, and replies from, the Prime Minister on the request to hold a conference of State Premiers to discuss road maintenance tax?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Yes. Attached for tabling are—

- (1) Copy of my submission to the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference in February, 1972.

- (2) Copy of reply from the Prime Minister dated 24th May, 1972.

The papers were tabled. (See paper No. 268).

5. PINJARRA HIGH SCHOOL

Extensions and Improvements

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What extensions and improvements are being provided for the Pinjarra Senior High School for the 1972-73 year?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of the improvements?
- (3) Will the extensions be completed for the beginning of the school year in 1973?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) (a) A laboratory and storeroom, tenders for which have been called.
- (b) Conversion of the administration block.
- (c) Conversion of cloakroom to senior master's office and store.
- (2) The estimated cost is \$30,000.
- (3) Every endeavour will be made for works to be completed by January, 1973.

6.

ABATTOIRS

*Boyup Brook: Decision on
Establishment*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the present situation as regards the possible development of an abattoir at Boyup Brook?
- (2) Does the Government agree that the proposition is a feasible and economically viable one?
- (3) When can it be expected that a decision will be made by the Government as regards financial assistance?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) A decision has been made, but the parties concerned have not yet been advised.

7. UNEMPLOYMENT

Relief: State Funds

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

Adverting to question 6 on 3rd August, 1972—

- (1) Was the source of finance from the State's 1971-72 works and housing programme found for unemployment relief in fact from or through the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) If not, which projects were deferred to allow redirection of State funds for this needy purpose?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes. All State works and housing allocations are received through the Commonwealth.
- (2) Answered by (1).

8. PRICES CONTROL

South Australian Legislation

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Prices Control:

Would he enumerate the list of goods and services controlled under South Australian price control legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

As the list of "declared" and "controlled" goods and services in South Australia is extensive, I am tabling a list for the information of the Member.

I have prepared 50 copies of the answer in the hope that members will avail themselves of the information.

The list was tabled. (See paper No. 269).

9. FIREARMS

Legislation and Regulations: Amendment

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

- (1) To clarify the actual position for concerned members of the public would he say if he intends to bring forward a Bill to amend the Firearms and Guns Act, 1931 and/or amend the Firearms Regulations, 1931 during this session of Parliament?

- (2) Has the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia been told of any changes to be introduced?

- (3) If there is to be a change, what are the circumstances making these amendments necessary?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mr. Pow, State Secretary of the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia (W.A.), has been made aware of the nature of the proposed amendments.
- (3) The Firearms and Guns Act has been in force for over forty years and requires to be brought up to date.

10. POLICE

Household Valuables: Identification Number

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

Will the Minister examine the possibility of the Police Department co-ordinating and publicising a project which would lead to—

- (a) the progressive engraving of household goods electronically; and
- (b) the introduction of a scheme whereby the fact that goods were so engraved would be indicated on the premises concerned?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

No. It is considered that such a project should not come within the ambit of police work at a time when other responsibilities demand a higher priority.

11. MARINA

Two Rocks: Location

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Works: Where would the proposed marina at Two Rocks be sited in relation to the existing jetty and groyne?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

The marina at Two Rocks as proposed by Yanchep Estates Pty. Ltd. is located from 314 metres (1,030 ft.) to 981 metres (3,220 ft.) along the shoreline northwards from the present Two Rocks jetty abutment.

The nearest artificial groyne is 5.1 kilometres (3½ miles approximately) southwards from the jetty abutment within sight of the Yanchep lagoon.

12. WHEAT PRODUCTS

Price Fixation

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

- (1) When was the present committee under the Wheat Products (Prices Fixation) Act constituted?
- (2) Who are its members and by whom were they nominated?
- (3) What increases in wheat products prices have been ratified and/or recommended by the committee and when?
- (4) What previous increases in the price of bread occurred in each of the three years immediately prior to the establishment of the present committee?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) On 28th January, 1972.
- (2) Mr. W. Adams, Auditor-General, as Chairman, Mr. Donald Walter Cooley, and Mr. George Edward Ledger, all nominated by the Minister for Labour. However, in the case of Mr. Ledger the Bread Manufacturers (Perth and Suburbs) Industrial Union of Employers was invited to submit the name of a person known to have specialised knowledge of the industry.
- (3) As a result of the recommendation of the committee, maximum prices for bread fixed by proclamation on the 1st March, 1972 are as follows, the increases over the prices generally prevailing being 1 cent in each case:—
 - 2 lb. ordinary loaves—23 cents.
 - 1 lb. ordinary loaves—12 cents.
 - Sliced and wrapped 24 oz. milk loaves—27 cents.
 - Unwrapped 24 oz. milk loaves—24 cents.
 - Sliced and wrapped 2 lb. loaves—27 cents.

The price of sliced and wrapped 1 lb. protein increased loaves was fixed at 23 cents, this not representing an increase.

- (4) From 1960 to March 1972, prices were not controlled and followed those recommended by the master bakers.

On 17th March, 1969, all varieties of bread with the exception of the 1 lb. ordinary loaves were increased 1 cent per loaf.

On 2nd January, 1970, the 2 lb. and 1 lb. ordinary and ordinary milk loaves were increased 1 cent, and sliced and wrapped 2 lb. ordinary loaves, sliced and wrapped

milk and sliced and wrapped protein increased loaves increased 2 cents in price.

On 21st December, 1970, 2 lb. sliced and wrapped ordinary loaves, 1 lb. sliced and wrapped protein increased loaves and sliced and wrapped milk loaves were increased 1 cent in price.

On 12th August, 1971, all varieties of loaves now controlled in price, with the exception of the 1 lb. ordinary loaves, increased 1 cent in price.

13.

EDUCATION

School of Arts

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are any plans in existence for a new school of arts?
- (2) If so, will he detail them?
- (3) If not, what is proposed?
- (4) Are any changes being contemplated in regard to the present arrangements?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) and (2) It is presumed that the question relates to the Art Department, Perth Technical College (James Street). There are no definite plans for a new school.
- (3) It is proposed that the Art Department will be included in a new technical college to be built as part of the cultural centre.
- (4) Enquiries are being made as to the availability of additional accommodation in the vicinity of the existing school.

14.

HOUSING

Building Societies Legislation: Committees

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

- (1) Have there been any committees formed to examine matters relating to building societies legislation in this State with particular regard to interest rates?
- (2) Would he detail the members of any such committee, when it was established and the nature of its recommendations?
- (3) Have any decisions been made as a result of any reports or recommendations submitted, and, if so, what are they?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Two enquiries have been instituted by the Premier to examine building society legislation, including questions relating to interest rates.

(2) (a) Committee of—

K. M. McKenna—Acting Registrar of Building Societies,

R. B. MacKenzie—General Manager, State Housing Commission,

R. F. Boylen—Assistant Under Treasurer,

D. J. Whitely—Chief Inspector, R. & I. Bank,

appointed 20th August, 1971 and reported to the Premier on 21st January, 1972.

(b) Committee of—

B. S. Brotherson—Registrar of Building Societies,

H. W. Sorensen, C. F. Gooch, I. A. Wilkins, K. D. McKenna—Members of the Building Society Advisory Committee,

R. D. Warren—Housing Industry Association,

R. W. Clohessy—Building Trades Association of Unions,

D. M. Davis—Treasury Department,

appointed 14th April, 1972. Report is expected to be submitted to the Premier today; 9th August, 1972.

(3) No.

- (3) An amount of \$2,500 has been made available for shorter courses, preferably to be based in country centres.

16.

EDUCATION

School at Cervantes

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Education:

Is it the intention of the Education Department to establish a primary school at Cervantes in 1973 or 1974?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

Yes. It is expected that the school will open in 1973.

17.

CREDIT UNIONS

Legislation

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

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to control credit unions in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, what has prompted such legislation?
- (3) If such legislation is to be introduced, will it be circulated to credit unions seeking their opinions, with a provision for ample time to consider any proposed amendments?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) to (3) There is no intention at this time to introduce legislation but the entire matter of consumer credit will be considered. Rightly, this question should have been directed to the Minister for Consumer Protection.

15.

EDUCATION

Farm Management Foundation

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What grants have been made to the farm management foundation towards the cost of running its courses?
- (2) What conditions were attached?
- (3) What finance is being made available for the current calendar year, and what are the conditions applicable?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) \$6,400 in 1971.
- (2) The fund was to be administered by a committee having the power to make grants and, if necessary, review the scheme.

18.

BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL

Library: Rebuilding

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What stage have plans reached for the rebuilding of the Belmont Senior High School library?
- (2) When is it anticipated work will start on the new building?
- (3) When will the building be ready for use?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) An architect has been commissioned and plans are being finalised.
- (2) and (3) Tenders will be called as soon as possible and it is anticipated that the building will be completed by the commencement of the 1973 school year.

19 and 20. *These questions were postponed.*

21. PRICES CONTROL LEGISLATION

Application to Selected Goods and Services

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Prices Control:

- (1) Is he correctly reported (*Daily News* of Monday, 7th August) as having said "But the aim of the Bill was to examine and, if necessary, set rates on selected items only—primarily those goods and services in general demand by the public"?
- (2) Would he enumerate the goods and services to which he referred?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) As far as I am able to recall, the words are substantially those used with the exception that the tenor of my thoughts on the Bill would more likely have been with the words, "if necessary" transposed. The words would read, "But the aim of the Bill was, if necessary, to examine and set rates on selected items only—primarily those goods and services in general demand by the public".

- (2) The Member should himself be able to think of some numbers of items in general use particularly those which are manufactured and/or sold by a single company or group of companies. To assist him he may refer to the list of goods which, under South Australian legislation, has had prices fixed and/or are declared goods, and which list was conveyed to him in an earlier answer.

I trust he will appreciate that to name products and/or industries before there had been any complaint and/or review and/or consultation other than the expression of the personal view of the Minister would be undesirable.

22. EDUCATION

Guidance Service: Extensions

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Has it been considered to extend the guidance service to country areas so that students, especially in remote parts, could have more frequent and easier access to guidance officers?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

Yes. Thirteen new positions for guidance officers have been advertised in country areas.

23. PRICES CONTROL LEGISLATION

Inclusion in Policy Speech

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Labour:

In view of his claim that the Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill had been outlined in the election policy speech by the Premier, would he please indicate where and in which terms this legislation has been foreshadowed in the policy speech?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

Under the general heading of Price Control and Consumer Protection the following statement was made, and I quote:—

"Failing action being taken to enable price control to operate on a Commonwealth basis, we propose to institute a system of selective price control similar to that in operation in South Australia".

24. WATER SUPPLIES

Tunnel: Canning Dam-Roleystone

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What additional trunk mains will be required to carry the extra water to the city from the new tunnel to be constructed between Canning Dam and Roleystone?
- (2) Which route will the new trunk mains follow?
- (3) When does the board expect to phase out the present open channel?
- (4) Does the water board intend to rehabilitate the land recently cleared for the construction of the 54 inch main through Roleystone and Kelmescott?
- (5) Will he advise the planned timetable for the construction of the remaining feasible hills storage dams including the Wungong and upper Canning dams?
- (6) How much water is at present held by the Dandalup pipe head dam and the dam under construction?
- (7) What will be the storage capacity this year of the Dandalup dam under construction?
- (8) Will he table the feasibility study prepared supporting this project?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Continuation of the 54 in. main recently completed between Roleystone and Gosnells.
- (2) Alternative routes are still being investigated and depend on existing and proposed road patterns.

- (3) Not yet determined.
- (4) Yes. Restoration would be related to the purpose for which this and adjacent lands is intended.
- (5) Current planning provides for construction of the Wungong Dam to commence not later than spring of 1974 with completion by winter of 1977. Completion of a dam at the upper Canning site is planned for 1979-80.
- (6) There is no significant storage at the pipe head. Storage in the South Dandalup dam on 8th August was 1,300 million gallons.
Daily flows from the pipe head average 8 million gallons per day through the year.
- (7) Approximately 30,000 million gallons.
- (8) There are limited supplies of this report and these are in continuous use. However, the Member may by arrangement with the General Manager of the Metropolitan Water Board inspect a copy of the report at the board's office.

25. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Industrial Land at Naval Base: Rezoning

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Will the major amendment to the metropolitan regional plan of rezoning the industrial land at Naval Base for residential purposes come before Parliament for approval?
- (2) If not, what authority will enable this rezoning to proceed?
- (3) What is the expected estimated return to the Crown from the sale of this 1,500 acres of industrial land at Naval Base?
- (4) (a) From whom have objections been received to the announced development of this new residential suburb other than the shires of Rockingham and Kwinana;
(b) has the State Housing Commission protested because of its financial commitments to the Kwinana region?
- (5) Will he please table the file relating to this new suburb?
- (6) Does he consider this Naval Base development will cause the industrialists, residential developers and financiers to withdraw their support from neighbouring projects and influence others away from new developments in the area?
- (7) When does the Government intend that site work on this project will commence?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority will certify, as provided in section 33 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, that in its opinion the proposed amendment does not constitute a substantial alteration to the scheme.
- (3) This would not be known until offers for purchase and development of the land were received, and one of these accepted.
- (4) (a) Alcoa of Australia (W.A.) Limited did advise their concern to the proposal on the grounds that certain road deviations involving their interests could be affected, and their belief that residential development should not be permitted in close proximity to the Kwinana industrial area.
(b) The attitude of the State Housing Commission had been explained by its General Manager at a meeting of the Land and Housing Consultative Committee held several weeks prior to the announcement on 14th June, 1972.
- (5) No, because of confidential negotiations at this stage.
- (6) No.
- (7) On the assumption that the project proceeded, site work would commence as soon as practicable after an offer to purchase was accepted.

26.

TOWN PLANNING

Schemes: Approvals

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

What local authority town planning schemes—

- (a) were approved prior to 1st March, 1971;
- (b) were approved between 1st March, 1971 and 31st July, 1972;
- (c) are yet to be approved?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The state of metropolitan town planning schemes in the three categories requested is as follows:—

- (a) Claremont—30-3-67.
Cottesloe—12-7-63.
City of Fremantle No. 1—15-7-58 (superseded by No. 2—20-8-70).
Gosnells—10-5-68.
Nedlands—28-4-67.
Peppermint Grove—22-3-61.
South Perth No. 1—28-6-62 (now superseded by No. 2).

- (b) Kwinana—11-3-71.
Mosman Park—31-5-72.
Serpentine-Jarrahdale—
17-11-71.
South Perth No. 2—28-1-72
(replacing No. 1).
Melville.
- (c) Armadale-Kelmscott.
Bassendean.
Bayswater.
Belmont.
Canning.
Cockburn.
East Fremantle.
Kalamunda.
Perth City.
Stirling.
Subiaco.
Swan.
Rockingham.
Mundaring.

The Wanneroo scheme was approved on 4-8-72.

27.

CATTLE*Compensation Fund*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the amount of the cattle compensation fund as at 30th June, 1972?
- (2) What are the compensable diseases for which benefits from the fund are available?
- (3) What amount has been paid out of the fund for each of the compensable diseases over the past five years?
- (4) What is the estimated growth of the fund for 1972-73?
- (5) Are any moneys paid out of the fund for any cause other than the compensable cattle diseases?
- (6) If so, will he give details?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) \$367,507.57.
- (2) Tuberculosis, brucellosis, actinomycosis.
- (3)—

	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
	\$	\$	\$
Tuberculosis	39,513	105,174	173,051
Brucellosis	Nil	Nil	Nil
Actinomycosis	Nil	Nil	Nil
	1970-71	1971-72	
	\$	\$	
Tuberculosis	123,069	106,605	
Brucellosis	33,760	732,353	
Actinomycosis	Nil	4,605	

For years 1967-1971 compensation for actinomycosis was included in the tuberculosis compensation figure.

- (4) Estimated receipts (sale of carcasses, stamp duty, State contribution, interest from investments) \$460,000.
- (5) Yes.

- (6) For following purposes, in connection with control and eradication of disease—
 - (a) Veterinary practitioner fees for tuberculin and brucellosis testing.
 - (b) Costs of brucella vaccines and cattle tail tags.
 - (c) Cartage of blood samples.
 - (d) Sundry minor costs such as equipment, valuer's fees and data processing.

28. CANNINGTON HIGH SCHOOL*Gymnasium*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that Cannington Senior High School has now been relegated to 10th place in priority for the provision of a gymnasium?
- (2) If not, what is the order of priority for this work to be done?
- (3) Is it also a fact that one of the reasons this gymnasium has not been proceeded with is lack of Commonwealth funds for education facilities?
- (4) If (3) is "Yes" how can it be justified that all high schools which have been built since Cannington Senior High School have been fitted out with gymnasiums?
- (5) Were these schools financed from Commonwealth funds?
- (6) If (5) is "Yes" then why was not a sum set aside for the completion of the gymnasium at Cannington Senior High School and what reasons can be given for relegating this senior high school to 10th place in priority for this work to be done?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Two high schools which were established in 1957 were selected for the current year. Beyond this point an absolute order of priority has not been published.
- (3) There is no Commonwealth grant for the specific purpose of building school halls.
- (4) All high schools built since Cannington have not been provided with halls. Of sixteen such schools, only four have halls and four have a covered area in front of the canteen to serve for physical education.
- (5) No.
- (6) Not applicable.

29. **PRICES CONTROL
LEGISLATION***Eastern States: Items Covered*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Prices Control:

- (1) In respect of his excessive prices legislation—will he lay on the Table of the House a list of those items which are the subject of price control and/or which are "prescribed" goods or services under—
 - (a) the South Australian Prices Act 1948-57;
 - (b) the New South Wales Prices Regulations Act;
 - (c) the Queensland Act in respect of the fixing of prices?
- (2) Have the lists referred to in (1) (a) been added to or amended in any way since the defeat of the Playford Government?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Copies of the South Australian Prices Act, 1948-1970, the New South Wales Prices Regulation Act and the Queensland The Profiteering Prevention Acts are tabled for the information of the Member.

In respect to "declared" and "controlled" goods and services:—

- (a) a list of "declared" and "controlled" goods in South Australia has been tabled in respect to question 8.
- (b) with respect to New South Wales, verbal advice to the Western Australian Department of Labour is that "hundreds" of commodities and services remain declared under the Prices Regulation Act. However a list of these has not yet been received. Price control operates on bread and motor spirit. I am also informed that an arrangement exists under which the flour millers advise the Prices Commissioner of proposed increases in the price of flour.
- (c) there are at present no goods or services "declared" or "controlled" in Queensland, but existing legislation allows for this at any time.

- (2) Not according to information received from South Australia.

The papers were tabled. (See paper No. 270).

30. **BUSSELTON PORT
Costs and Revenue**

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Further to question 39, 2nd August, what were the costs involved to operate the Port of Busselton as a port, apart from maintenance, in each year since 1965?
- (2) Would he detail revenue earned by the Port of Busselton in each year since 1965?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Operating expenditure (excluding maintenance)—

	\$
1964-65	1,133
1965-66	989
1966-67	1,614
1967-68	2,352
1968-69	3,091
1969-70	3,152
1970-71	3,109
1971-72	3,676.

- (2) Revenue—

	\$
1964-65	4,505
1965-66	9,016
1966-67	3,505
1967-68	4,182
1968-69	2,350
1969-70	614
1970-71	504
1971-72	670

31. **ARGYLE DOWNS
HOMESTEAD***Funds for Relocation*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the source of funds to be used under the proposal by the Brand Government to proceed with the transfer of the Argyle Downs homestead near the Ord River dam?
- (2) What source of funds is proposed by the present Government when the reconstruction is finally undertaken?
- (3) If a different source of funds is proposed by the present Government, why has a change been made?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Partly Tourist Development Authority funds with balance from State loan funds.
- (2) and (3) No decision has been made.

32. **CO-OPERATIVE BULK
HANDLING LTD.***Grain Terminal at Kwinana*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Does the State Government have any control or influence over Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.?

- (2) If so, what is the extent of control or influence?
- (3) What is the name and address of the firm designing the proposed \$45 million C.B.H. development at Kwinana?
- (4) What efforts have been made by C.B.H. or the Government to ensure that the maximum amount of equipment and construction of the C.B.H. complex will be developed in Western Australia?
- (5) Have tenders been called for any stages of the development; if so, to what stage of development have tenders been called?
- (6) What steps are to be taken by the designers to ensure that Western Australian companies are afforded every opportunity to tender for the various works?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Minister for Agriculture is responsible for the administration of the Bulk Handling Act.
- (3) MacDonald, Wagner and Priddle, Consulting Engineers, 33 Colin Street, West Perth.
- (4) It is the policy of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to make items in its own workshop as far as possible and accept local tenders for the balance of any project.
- (5) Yes. Tenders have been called and accepted for dewatering, compaction and piling of the site.
- (6) It is a C.B.H. standing instruction to their consulting engineers that Western Australian companies should be given every opportunity to tender for any work.

33. BUSSELTON PORT

Closure

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he or any of his Ministers advised the Shire of Busselton of the Government's intention to close the Port of Busselton?
- (2) Has the Government made any arrangement for providing alternative employment for men involved through the decision to close the Port of Busselton?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" will he detail arrangements?
- (4) What is the number of men involved through port closure?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Not personally, but the Minister for Works arranged for the Under Secretary of the Public Works Department to inform the Shire Clerk of the proposed closure of the port.

- (2) The Minister for Works has publicly given an assurance that alternative employment will be offered for the 8-man maintenance gang in other departmental activities.
- (3) Details are still being worked out.
- (4) Insofar as the Public Works Department is concerned, the 8-man maintenance gang is all that is involved.

34. WATER SUPPLIES

Tunnel: Canning Dam-Roleystone

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it correct that the proposed tunnel through the hills will actually be used for carrying the water through the hills or will it be a tunnel through which the necessary pipes are located?
- (2) If the tunnel is to be used for the actual conveyance of the water, does he anticipate any serious construction problems due to faults in the rock structure, etc.?
- (3) (a) What is the relative capital cost of bringing the water by pipeline without tunnelling as compared with the proposed tunnelling method;
(b) what is the difference in operating costs?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes. It will be a pressure tunnel. Pipes are not required.
- (2) No. In tunnels of this type, specific sections may require special treatment including lining.
- (3) (a) A minimum sized tunnel estimated at \$3.5 million would require pipelines costing \$5.4 million for the same hydraulic capacity.
(b) Based on experience in other States it is not expected that there would be any significant difference in operating and maintenance costs.

35. RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Relief: Commonwealth Financial Assistance

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many men have been employed in departments under his jurisdiction with financial assistance from the Commonwealth rural unemployment scheme?
- (2) What is the amount of financial assistance involved?
- (3) In what departments and what category has employment been provided with Commonwealth financial assistance?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

Department of Agriculture:

- (1) Approval has been given to employ 197 men. Because of turn-over the number of individuals could fluctuate.
- (2) Expenditure to 31st July is \$144,175.
- (3) Department of Agriculture including Agriculture Protection Board.

Forests Department:

- (1) 115.
- (2) \$121,458.58.
- (3) Hardwood management.
Softwood plantation pruning.
Raising nursery stock.
Roadside improvement and tourist development.

36.

RAILWAYS

Timber Cartage from Busselton

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the tonnage of timber railed from Busselton in each year since 1965?
- (2) How much revenue has been earned by the Railway Department in the carriage of this timber during this period?
- (3) Would the Minister give details of railway personnel employed at Busselton in 12 months ended 30th June, 1972?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Year ended 30th June—

		Tons
1965	16,132
1966	17,832
1967	24,683
1968	19,173
1969	14,476
1970	14,362
1971	10,612
1972	9,381

- (2) Year ended 30th June—

		\$
1965	40,062
1966	92,492*
1967	118,890
1968	111,442
1969	91,701
1970	87,825
1971	65,187
1972	58,784

*Freight increase from October, 1965, which has affected the figures.

- (3) The following staff were employed at 30th June, 1972, and this would have been fairly constant during the year:—

1	Station master.
1	Station relief officer.
1	Goods clerk.
1	Clerk.
2	Junior traffic officers.
1	Guard.
1	Checker.
1	Goods porter.
1	Porter—temporary.
1	Driver.
1	Fireman.
1	Ganger.
1	Leading repairer.
5	Repairers.

19 Total

37.

STATE FORESTS

Timber Royalties

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the formula used to assess forest royalty rates?
- (2) What is the maximum and minimum rate of royalty levied on jarrah at mills situated at—
 - (a) Busselton;
 - (b) Collie;
 - (c) Manjimup;
 - (d) Dwellingup?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Royalties are initially fixed by auction or tender under provisions of the Forests Act.

It is necessary to reappraise royalties from time to time. These adjustments take account of current markets and the location of the permit or license in relation to the market, the mill and the various services available to it.

\$ \$

- (2) (a) Busselton 3.95 to 5.90 per load
- (b) Collie 3.75 to 4.00 per load
- (c) Manjimup 3.10 to 4.40 per load
- (d) Dwellingup 4.50 to 4.80 per load

38.

MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR PENSIONERS

Free Transport

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) What has been the cost to the Government to allow free transport to country pensioners requiring specialised medical treatment in the metropolitan area?

- (2) How many country pensioners—
 (a) applied;
 (b) were approved,
 free travel assistance on medical grounds to the metropolitan area in the 12 months to 30th June, 1972?
- (3) Is it a fact that the Government requires country pensioners to undergo a means test before issuing free travel as per (1)?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Approximately \$1,600 for the period 1st July, 1971 to 30th June, 1972.
- (2) (a) 143.
 (b) 143.
- (3) No. Any pensioner eligible for full pension benefits is eligible for free travel as in (1) above.

39. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Environmental Protection Report

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority considered in depth the overall route for the 330 kV Kwinana-Balga power line?
- (2) Is it true that the only detailed report carried out by the Environmental Protection Authority deals mainly with the section of the line in the area of the Guildford Grammar School?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) and (2) I draw the Member's attention to the position which is outlined in a submission by the chairman of the E.P.A. tabled in this chamber on the 1st August, 1972, part of which reads:—

As the need for and comparative impact of the foothills and escarpment routes, the E.P.A. has reviewed the history of the proposals and negotiations and has given consideration to the suggestions presented by me as Director of Environmental Protection, namely, the second (revised) route beyond the ranges is acceptable and ... this line should be built initially. At the same time, effort should be made to survey a route for the second route in roughly the same path. (Extract from Minute tabled by the Minister, November, 1971).

In view of the fact that the Government, after due consideration found this suggestion unacceptable at the time and in view of the fact that this was a Cabinet decision and that several months

work has been carried out since then, the E.P.A. has not sought to review this particular aspect further.

40. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Environmental Protection Report

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority considered in depth the overall route for the 330 kV Kwinana-Balga power line?
- (2) Is it true that the only detailed report carried out by the Environmental Protection Authority deals mainly with the section of the line in the area of the Guildford Grammar School?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) and (2) I draw the Member's attention to the position which is outlined in a submission by the Chairman of the E.P.A. tabled in this Chamber on the 1st August, 1972, part of which reads:—

As the need for and comparative impact of the foothills and escarpment routes, the E.P.A. has reviewed the history of the proposals and negotiations and has given consideration to the suggestions presented by me as Director of Environmental Protection, namely, the second (revised) route beyond the ranges is acceptable and ... this line should be built initially. At the same time, effort should be made to survey a route for the second route in roughly the same path. (Extract from Minute tabled by the Minister, November, 1971.)

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

41.

HEALTH

Cigarette Smoking

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is a study being made by officers of his department into the health hazard of cigarette smoking?
- (2) If so, what progress has been made?
- (3) Does he intend introducing legislation designed to reduce cigarette smoking?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Regulations requiring warnings to be printed on cigarette packets have been promulgated. By agreement between the States the Commonwealth Government has passed legislation requiring warnings regarding the dangers of cigarette smoking to follow all advertisements on radio and television.

zoning of more than 80 acres which will enable the area to be subdivided into half-acre building blocks?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) The department was opposed to this subdivision but withdrew its opposition for reasons given in (4) (b).
- (4) (a) Existing facilities are in close proximity to a feeder stream to the Victoria reservoir and are considered to be a potential source of pollution. The new location was the only acceptable site available. As it is close to the perimeter of the Lower Helena catchment area, it is considered that there will be no pollution problem.

(b) In the interests of keeping pollution of the catchment of the Lower Helena dam to a minimum the department is opposed to all further subdivision of rural land in this catchment. The 80 acres to which the question refers juts into an existing urban area and strong representations were made by the local authority in the interests of orderly planning that this area be rezoned. In view of these representations formal opposition was not pressed. In the case of Mrs. Colgan's land no similar circumstances exist.

42.

LAND

Building Blocks at Carilla

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is the Carilla townsite situated on the catchment area of any public water supply?
- (2) If so, on which catchment is the town placed?
- (3) When will further building blocks be released in this townsite?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Lower Helena catchment area.
- (3) No proposals exist for creation of a serviced subdivision at Carilla.

43. PICKERING BROOK SPORTS CLUB

Relocation

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it true that \$82,500 of public money is to be expended to move some of the facilities of the Pickering Brook sports club from a M.W.B. water catchment area to the catchment area of the Lower Helena pipehead dam?
- (2) Is it true that his department opposed the subdivision of land owned by Mrs. Colgan in Walliston on the grounds that the four lots that would result might lead to pollution of water stored in the Lower Helena pipehead dam?
- (3) Is it true that his department has not opposed the rezoning of in excess of 80 acres of land on the Lower Helena pipehead dam catchment area that will result in the land being subdivided into half-acre building lots?
- (4) Will he give his reasons why—
 - (a) the Pickering Brook sports club is to be moved at a cost of \$82,500 from one water catchment to another such area;
 - (b) opposition to subdivision of Mrs. Colgan's land was made when, at the same time, no opposition is made to the re-

44.

MINERAL CLAIMS

Acreage and Applications

Mr. GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the total acreage of mineral claims that were in force in Western Australia as at—
 - (a) 31st December, 1969;
 - (b) 31st December, 1970;
 - (c) 31st December, 1971;
 - (d) 30th June, 1972?
- (2) What is the total acreage of mineral claim applications that were pending approval or otherwise as at the above dates?
- (3) What is the total acreage of mineral claims, and mineral claim applications which were either surrendered or withdrawn in—
 - (a) 1969;
 - (b) 1970;
 - (c) 1971;
 - (d) the first half of 1972?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. May) replied:

Acres

- (1) (a) 31st December, 1969 1,376,104
- (b) 31st December, 1970 5,344,357
- (c) 31st December, 1971 7,593,074
- (d) 30th June, 1972. Not available at present. Figures are only completed once annually and to obtain an accurate figure at this juncture for the date specified, would require several weeks of detailed work, as liaison with all country mining registrars would be necessary.

- (2) These particular statistics are not kept. However, estimates for the dates specified are—

Acres

- (a) 31st December, 1969 5,668,050
- (b) 31st December, 1970 14,477,960
- (c) 31st December, 1971 9,308,710
- (d) 30th June, 1972 4,294,320

- (3) The estimated total acreage of mineral claims and mineral claim applications which were either surrendered or withdrawn is as follows—

Acres

- (a) 1969 248,820
- (b) 1970 1,186,970
- (c) 1971 5,213,910
- (d) the first half of 1972 6,208,320

45. DECENTRALISATION OF INDUSTRY

Incentives

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Are the maximum incentives available to companies prepared to decentralise being offered to attract industries to establish in Albany?
- (2) Are these incentives available equally to both minimum and maximum profit ventures?
- (3) If "No" to (2), does this mean the Government wants to attract minimum profit ventures into the country and save the more profitable industries for the metropolitan area?
- (4) What propositions, if any, is the Government currently considering for the establishment of an industry at Albany?
- (5) What essential facilities are the biggest handicap against attracting industry to Albany, and what steps are being taken to overcome these problems?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Because the extent of the application of the Government's decentralisation inducements depends upon the circumstances of each case, it is not possible to generalise on this question.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) There is only one proposition which has been submitted to the Government and that is being examined.
- (5) Requirements vary from industry to industry. However, it is generally considered that Albany is well endowed as a location for industry.

46. *This question was postponed.*

47. MEAT INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Establishment

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the meat industry authority, as recommended by the Towns and Austen report, been appointed?
- (2) If not, when is it intended to set up this authority?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Meat Industry Advisory Committee is currently examining this matter but has not yet made a recommendation.

48. PASTORAL LEASES

Kimberley: Rentals

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Considering the Pastoral Appraisal Board based its re-appraisal of Kimberley lease rentals on only 75% of the estimated stock carrying capacities, does it not infer there is uncertainty as to the ability of the properties to support the "adopted carrying capability" which is referred to in the board's report?
- (2) Of the 105 properties listed in the report, how many are known to be maintaining stock numbers at the adopted carrying capability?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) At the time of reappraisal there were (17) properties maintaining stock numbers at the adopted carrying capability.

49. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Zone Development Committees

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for the North West:

- (1) As he has indicated that Members of Parliament will be eligible to serve on northern zone development committees, will he advise the method by which Members may be appointed?
- (2) Are any present serving Parliamentarians members of any of the zone committees?
- (3) If "Yes" will he give details?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) The northern zone committees are going through a re-appraisal period, and as previously indicated, their membership is being reviewed to ensure the most effective representation within a manageable committee structure.

Mr. O'Neil: If any.

Mr. GRAHAM: I paused because I thought I heard an interjection. I thought that occasionally there might be a pearl of wisdom from the other side of the House, but that would be a rare occasion. To continue with my answer—

The chairman of the respective committees will make submissions in regard to membership from time to time, and recommendations for appointment of members will be made to me by the Co-ordinator of Development and Decentralisation.

- (2) Yes.

- (3) Eastern Goldfields-Esperance zone
—T. A. Hartrey, M.L.A.

Central south zone—W. A. Manning, M.L.A.

South-west zone—M. C. Williams, M.L.A.

Central north zone—Hon. J. L. Hunt, M.L.C.

50. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Borrowing Power

Mr. LEWIS, to the Treasurer:

As local authorities are now authorised to borrow up to \$400,000 each year, will this authority be extended to the Country High School Hostels Authority to enable it to more effectively cope with accommodation problems?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

A Bill to amend the Country High School Hostels Authority Act to permit borrowings in excess of \$300,000 in any one year is to be introduced shortly.

51. DECENTRALISATION OF INDUSTRY

Incentives

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Has the decentralisation review committee or the Government given consideration to granting incentives to metropolitan industries who purchase manufactured goods from country regional industries?
- (2) If so, what are the results of these considerations and when might they be implemented?
- (3) If not, does the Government and/or the committee intend to consider this subject, and, if so, when?
- (4) Apart from monetary considerations, are there any valid reasons why a Government could not give incentives to industry and commerce through a reduction of the various State charges and taxes, e.g., payroll tax, stamp duty on cheques, land tax, and other such charges, to encourage greater development in country regions?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) No, but it is believed that the policy of assisting the country manufacturer direct is preferable as this should allow him to reduce his costs accordingly.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) See (1) above.
- (4) Other forms of assistance are considered preferable.

52. ABATTOIRS

Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Government Guarantees

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Government still giving consideration to financial guarantees for all three or any one of the proposed T.L.C.-U.F.G.A. abattoirs?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) when is a decision likely;
 - (b) what is the amount involved in each case; and
 - (c) what are the reasons for the delay in making a decision?
- (3) If "No" to (1) what are the reasons?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) A decision has been made but the parties concerned have not yet been advised.

53. HOUSING

Vacant Premises: Number

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Housing:

What was the number of empty State Housing Commission homes as at—

(a) 31st March, 1968;

(b) 31st July, 1972?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

The assumption is that the Member refers to Collie. The figures for Collie are:—

(a) 24.

(b) 58.

54. WILSON INLET

Sand Bar

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Will he table the departmental reports on the opening of the Denmark bar?
- (2) Who are the organisations or individuals who have objected to the opening of the bar against the cliffs?
- (3) What advantages are presented for the cliff channel as against the deeper and wider eastern opening?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No organisations have made representations but objections have been received from a number of farmers and fishermen.
- (3) Advantages presented by Denmark persons are:—
 - (a) a channel near the cliffs would restore the original natural outlet and improve ingress for fish;
 - (b) Shire planning for the development of the Denmark bar area would be better served.

55. SHEEP AND CATTLE

Thefts

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

- (1) How many sheep and cattle have been reported stolen in Western Australia—
 - (a) in the year ended 30th June, 1972;
 - (b) for the previous five years?
- (2) What are the proven numbers of sheep and cattle stolen in both periods?
- (3) How many prosecutions have been made relating to these offences in these periods?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(1) (a) 1,960 sheep, 35 cattle.

(b) Year ended 30th June:

	Sheep	Cattle
1967	Not available.	
1968	1,922	10
1969	1,664	17
1970	2,186	29
1971	4,728	118

(2) It is not possible to conclusively prove the number of sheep and cattle actually stolen.

(3) Year ended 30th June:

	Sheep	Cattle
1967	2	3
1968	3	11
1969	4	Nil
1970	3	3
1971	5	5
1972	6	3

56. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Staff

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the number of staff working on rural reconstruction applications on 1st April, 1972 and 1st August, 1972?
- (2) How many were employed on a full-time and part-time basis for both periods?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Work is divided between the authority's own office (administration, security preparation and records), the Department of Agriculture (assessment applications and investigations of field problems) and the Rural and Industries Bank (security registration and accounting).

Number employed are:

(a) 1st April, 1972	
R.R.A. Office	7
Department of Agriculture	12
The R. & I. Bank	30
(b) 1st August, 1972	
R.R.A. Office	8
Department of Agriculture	4
The R. & I. Bank	30
(2) (a) Full-time: April	11
August	11
(b) Part-time: April	38
August	31

57.

HEALTH

Medical Officer: Meekatharra

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has a medical officer been appointed to the Meekatharra Shire district?

- (2) (a) If so, would he disclose the name of the appointee and when it is anticipated that he will take up his appointment;
 (b) if not, would he indicate what prospects there are of obtaining a medical officer for the Meekatharra area in the near future?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) (a) Not applicable.
 (b) No immediate prospect but the department will continue its endeavours to recruit.

QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

"Points on Environment"

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

I preface my question by referring to a question that was asked last week regarding a pamphlet that was distributed and is headed "Points on Environment. An information leaflet for the public prepared by Environment 2000, a Western Australian Organisation Formed to Safeguard Man's Environment in the Future." The Minister gave an answer to this question, and I am wondering whether he is able to advise the House as to whether he has been able to locate the author of this pamphlet which contains a reference to myself and to two other persons.

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Dr. Pottinger, Secretary of Environment 2000, is most concerned that this pamphlet has been distributed as purporting to have come from that organisation. It did not put out that pamphlet. At the time she went through the telephone book to ring up all the subscribers named P. Sullivan and all those named Hardman, who I believe are mentioned on the back of the pamphlet. Apparently these persons had something to do with its compilation. She did not have any success up to the time of ringing me, and since then she has spoken to me about this matter. I did receive a further copy of the pamphlet. I know it was posted from Claremont. I will get in touch with Dr. Pottinger again to ascertain whether she has had any success in her inquiries.

Sir Charles Court: She has telephoned me to assure me that Environment 2000 was not involved.

2. TOWN PLANNING

Swan Location 74: Rezoning of Lots

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Town Planning:

In view of the postponement of questions 19 and 20 on today's notice paper because of difficulty in identifying the lands referred to, how was the Minister able to answer the questions yesterday in relation to the same lots?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The honourable member seems to think that these questions were postponed because of difficulties in identifying the land. I do not know how he has got that impression.

Mr. O'Neil: Because the Minister said so.

Mr. DAVIES: The honourable member should check with *Hansard*.

Mr. O'Neil: I have not a copy of your answer.

Mr. DAVIES: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would check *Hansard* he would find that I asked that the questions be postponed so we could check some information on a title. We know where the land is. The reason for the postponement was that—

Mr. O'Neil: There is something sinister.

Mr. DAVIES: —we wanted to find out what relationship Miss McMahon had with the land, and this was part of the question asked. We are trying to identify this from the Titles Office.

One of the officers who was to get the information was not in the office until after 2.00 p.m. He rang me at 2.15 p.m. but I had to leave to attend a 3.00 p.m. function. He was obtaining the information and I thought it may have been here by now.

Mr. O'Neil: Why not tell me that at the time?

Mr. DAVIES: If the nasty mind of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to think there is something sinister—

Mr. O'Neil: There is.

Mr. DAVIES: —I would again inform him that the reason the questions were postponed was that the information was not available, and that is what I said. I wanted to explain that to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition but he was late in arriving in the House.

Mr. O'Neil: I was here when you asked that the questions be postponed.

Mr. DAVIES: Then you should have heard what I said.

Mr. O'Neil: There is something sinister in the answer.

3. WATER SUPPLIES

Tunnel: Canning Dam-Roleystone

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

Referring to question 24(8) on today's notice paper concerning insufficient copies of the feasibility study, in order that I might see the general manager would he agree to my taking a copy off this report for my own use?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Most certainly.

4. PREMIER EXPORTS PTY. LTD.

Operations of Company: Inquiry

Mr. NALDER, to the Premier:

Is he in a position to answer the question I asked without notice yesterday which he was not able to answer then? The question was as follows:—

- (1) Is it correct that an ex-principal of Wool Exporters, whose company was involved in a Royal Commission in 1969-70, is now involved in a company named Premier Exports Pty. Ltd.?
- (2) Is it correct that Premier Exports Pty. Ltd. have ceased business operations and a large sum of money has been lost on the buying and selling of wool in Western Australia?
- (3) Can he inform the House whether—
 - (a) farmers,
 - (b) wool exporting firms,
 - (c) associated agents,
 - (d) financial institutions,
 - (e) overseas buyers
 are involved in the loss?
- (4) Have any complaints been made to the Police Department concerning the activities of Premier Exports Pty. Ltd.?
- (5) In the public interest will he confer with the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police and initiate an immediate inquiry into operations of the company?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I had to postpone this question yesterday because of inadequate time to ascertain the reply. How-

ever, I am now able to inform the Leader of the Country Party as follows:—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This information will not be available until the inquiries by police officers are complete.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) Yes, and are under investigation.
- (5) As the matter is under investigation by the Commissioner of Police, the question of any further inquiry should await his report.

The Registrar of Companies will co-operate if required.

5. ARGYLE DOWNS HOMESTEAD

Funds for Relocation

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Works:

Arising from his answer to question 31 on today's notice paper in which he said, "(1) Partly Tourist Development Authority funds with the balance from State loan funds," will he be good enough to check this answer and advise me accordingly, perhaps tomorrow, because I understood originally there was a plan whereby this could be absorbed as part of the cost of the dam and therefore there would be no strain on State loan funds? A changed decision may have been made before the change of Government. But my understanding was it would not involve a burden on loan funds and it was because of a change in that decision subsequently, that embarrassment resulted.

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I undertake to make a check, but as I recall the situation the Leader of the Opposition asked some questions on this last year and it was indicated it would be a charge on the State; but as far as I can reflect on the matter there had been some thinking on the part of the Commonwealth that it would not be obliged to this. However, I will check and advise the Leader of the Opposition.

6. ABATTOIRS

Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Government Guarantees

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

Relating to question 52 on today's notice paper, could he advise when the parties concerned will be advised of the decision and when the decision will be made public?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

As I anticipated the curiosity of the member for Bunbury would not be satisfied by the answer given to his question, I am able to inform him that a written reply is in the course of preparation in my office and it is expected it will go out tomorrow. When I am of the opinion that sufficient time has elapsed for the parties concerned to have received the notification, I am prepared to make the decision public.

HIRE-PURCHASE AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

Honorary Royal Commission: Printing of Report

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [5.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the report of the Honorary Royal Commission into Hire-Purchase and Other Agreements be printed.

In support of my motion I wish to state that a great deal of work was involved in the investigations and inquiries made. Quite a number of persons and organisations came before the commission to give evidence, various publications were presented as submissions, and numerous reports were examined. Considerable interest has been taken by many members of the public and many organisations and, following the announcement that the report had been tabled, a considerable number of requests for a copy of the report have been received. For this reason I am moving this motion. The inquiry lasted from last September until quite recently and a great deal of interest was displayed by people from all walks of life. This is understandable because of the subject matter of the inquiry.

The members of the commission did a great amount of work and study involving a terrific amount of time in order to compile the report.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. McPHARLIN: At great inconvenience to themselves at times they put in many hours of study, investigation, and examination of the submissions made, and they have made a worth-while contribution.

If the report is printed and distributed a greater number of people will be able to examine it and make some worth-while and, perhaps, constructive criticisms of the recommendations made. We hope that at some future date the recommendations will be considered in any appropriate legislation that may be submitted to this House.

Adjournment of Debate

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Works) [5.23 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

Mr. O'Neil: This is only the printing of a report!

Mr. McPharlin: You are not going to print the report?

Sir David Brand: They do not know whether they will print it or not!

Motion put and passed.

Debate adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [5.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the report of the Committee be adopted.

Question put and a division called for. Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks During Division

Mr. O'Neil: We must get some sense into this place!

Mr. Graham: What's the matter with your liver?

Mr. Jamieson: Carter's Little Liver Pills required!

Mr. O'Neil: You won't even allow the printing of a Royal Commission's report! What is wrong with you?

Result of Division

Ayes—20

Mr. Bateman
Mr. Bertram
Mr. Bickerton
Mr. Brown
Mr. Bryce
Mr. Burke
Mr. Cook
Mr. Davies
Mr. H. D. Evans
Mr. Fletcher

Mr. Graham
Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Lapham
Mr. McIver
Mr. Moller
Mr. Sewell
Mr. Taylor
Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Blakie
Sir David Brand
Sir Charles Court
Mr. Coyne
Mr. Hutchinsonson
Mr. Lewis
Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Nalder
Mr. O'Connor

Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Reid
Mr. Ridge
Mr. Runciman
Mr. Rushton
Mr. Stephens
Mr. Thompson
Mr. Williams
Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Ayes

Mr. Jones
Mr. May
Mr. T. D. Evans
Mr. Brady
Mr. A. R. Tonkin

Fairs

Noes

Mr. Gayfer
Mr. Grayden
Mr. E. L. Young
Dr. Dadour
Mr. Mensaros

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed.

Report of Committee adopted.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE*Dual Route: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 2nd June, on the following motion by Mr. Thompson:—

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

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.30 p.m.]: I shall break up my address into two parts. Firstly, I shall say a few kind words to the Government and then I shall tell it the facts of life in connection with this issue.

I wish to record my appreciation of the Minister for being kind enough to receive a deputation from the Gosnells and Armadale-Kelmscott Shires. Although it did not go as well as we had hoped, we appreciated his courtesy in receiving us.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. RUSHTON: The deputation was pleased to have the opportunity to express certain points of view.

At the outset I state that in no way do I blame the S.E.C., from the general manager down through all the staff, for what is happening in connection with this subject. It is purely Government meddling, procrastination, and secrecy.

Mr. Jamieson: Ha, ha!

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister might scoff, because he believes the pylons are "majestic." We will hear more about this as we proceed.

It is as well to look at the motion to begin with so that we do not transgress and the subject matter is in the minds of all members. I refer members to the motion, as it appears on the notice paper. It will be apparent that the motion gives us scope to discuss the power line in detail.

First of all I will look briefly at the history of this and then develop it as it relates to my own area, the electorate of Dale. At the moment there is a certain amount of confrontation on this subject. I might add that, with the passage of time, there could well be more reaction,

because the surveying of the route is not yet finished. People will become aware that one of the plans which we saw is not being adhered to. In fact, the power line is taking a different course. A fairly wide margin does not seem to worry the Government, but it certainly worries people who have been given to understand the route would be on a certain line. It is most unacceptable to people to have surveyors moving in all directions across their properties. The blame for this whole mess can be sheeted home to the Government.

Before the present Government took office, the shires were invited to participate in discussions and suggestions. Public meetings were held at Kalamunda. To my knowledge I have attended every one and I am aware of what has taken place. The previous Premier (Sir David Brand) gave the assurance that, had we won the election, the Environmental Protection Authority would have reviewed the whole issue of the 330kV transmission route before a Government decision was taken as to where it would be located. We felt that was a fair suggestion to make. We were confident—as I think the people were reasonably confident—that this was a practical way to tackle a vital issue. The people felt reasonably secure.

Even though there was a change of Government, the people would have expected the present Government to be conscious of the need for environmental protection because of all the talk on the part of the present Government about environmental protection. In fact, I think guarantees were given; it was certainly implied that the Tonkin Government would go to the nth degree in connection with environmental protection. It was expected that the Government would make a decision with full knowledge of what the Environmental Protection Authority had recommended.

Since that time, we have full knowledge that the Government has disregarded the Environmental Protection Authority. It has disregarded the director of the authority which was set up for this purpose. This is hard to understand, and we have had no explanation at all. We can understand why the Environmental Protection Authority and its director have not done anything; the Government has made a decision over the top of them. The authority has not been asked to make a full report.

To go back some time, I asked the Minister two questions on this subject. I think it was last November. In answer to my questions the Minister said the director had been asked for a report and had made a verbal one—a verbal report on a matter like this!—that the first route should be at the back of the scarp and

that the second should be surveyed and placed alongside in due course. No regard was paid to this recommendation. A report on this subject by the director (Dr. O'Brien) dated the 30th July, 1972, was recently presented to the House. In this he says that the authority has not gone ahead with the report because Cabinet has directed otherwise. Cabinet has made a decision, and it would be futile for the authority to go ahead and make a recommendation now.

From what I read here, the authority has endorsed what Dr. O'Brien said; namely, the 330kV transmission line should be around the back of Kalamunda going over the range between Gosnells and Kelmscott. It is difficult to understand this attitude on the part of a Government which professes to be interested in environmental protection. I know of other projects where the Government has declined to invoke the Environmental Protection Authority to research and review them with the object of making a report.

This makes all the Government's former pronouncements on environmental protection hypocritical and I am sure the public must understand how palpably weak and how neglectful of the public interest the Government is. The Government should be condemned for what it is doing in connection with this project. The very fact the Government will not tell people why it is adopting this attitude and is being so pig-headed is somewhat puzzling. We will surely have to draw the answers out of the Government over a period of time. We will have to probe to obtain that information because, although we have a little information to date, we certainly do not have enough. From the beginning of its administration the Government has disregarded the Environmental Protection Authority, and this is deplorable. I think this will go down in history as yet another of the actions of the Tonkin Government which is totally unacceptable to the people.

At this point it is pertinent to mention the confrontation which is occurring in the electorate of Dale, because it relates so directly to this issue. Before proceeding with that, I will mention that I have received letters regarding Guildford Grammar School. I realise others are closer to that issue and I will limit myself to the project in my own area, the electorate of Dale. The Tonkin Government's administration has fallen down completely on this matter.

I now refer briefly to that part of the development which has caused so much concern in my area. This is a matter which has gone on for a long period of time, because the shire has been involved since 1969, before the present Government came

into office. I will be brief but, chronologically, the record is as follows:—

22nd October, 1969

Armada-Kelmscott to S.E.C.
Shire does not welcome these lines.
Request location pylons be indicated on ground and pylon types used be most inconspicuous.

This is only a warm-up. To continue—
November, 1969

S.E.C. to Armada-Kelmscott advising Council will be kept fully informed of types and position of pylons.

26th November, 1970

M.R.P.A. to Armada-Kelmscott advising meeting of all affected local authorities 20th January, 1971, and inviting send one delegate.

29th December, 1970

Armada-Kelmscott to M.R.P.A.
Lines be confined to plains and foothills . . . Southern line along Thomas Road be run westward of M.R.P.A. route, perhaps proximity Liddlow Road and two lines follow Allen Road . . .

So it goes on. This has been continuing for quite a long time. To continue—

25th January, 1971

Town Planning Board to Armada-Kelmscott enclosing minutes of meeting. Groves (Gosnells) suggest combine two lines along Allen Road.

Had this been adhered to there would not have been confrontation in our shire. To continue—

3rd March, 1971

M.R.P.A. to Armada-Kelmscott enclosing drawing E.350 eastern alternative.

Members can see that this goes on and on. Members will also see from the records that the shire eventually accepted what it believed would be a practical site for the transmission line; that is, along Allen Road between Gosnells and Armada-Kelmscott. The shire went forward on this understanding and people had begun to accept the route of the power line as marked on a map, a copy of which I also received. It is now said the detail on the map was not good enough, but it clearly showed the route of the power line along the Allen Road reserve through Armada and Kelmscott.

It was very disconcerting when surveyors came along and started to move about in the middle of properties. Rumours spread very quickly. All sorts of explanations were given, but I might add that some of the comments were not kindly.

This involved what was taking place in the shire next door. Clearly, as I mentioned at the outset, the line was to go through open undeveloped country. The next thing we knew was that it was going over the top of homes and through heavily built-up areas, one of which had been subdivided for many years. It was also to go through developed agricultural land. This decision was very hard to understand.

When we undertook further research, it was also found that the southern leg of the power line was to go through the future town planning corridor. We know that a decision has not yet been made as to whether Perth should develop in corridors or as a directional network, but surely we need to be a little cautious when we are providing something for the future.

The Minister said yesterday he was determined on a certain line for the erection of the power lines. However, I am hopeful that the people will tell the Government what they think about the Government's action and we may have a change of power line route and Government.

I will return to the deputation we had to the Minister. Although the department was advised of the deputation, which included a few residents as well as shire councillors, when we reached the Minister's office the residents were not admitted. These residents had come forward in good faith to put the people's case as they saw it but were not allowed in. This was possibly the only sour note associated with the deputation.

A point was made by the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire Council that although the power line was to go right over the top of homes and developed properties within its boundaries, it had made numerous attempts to obtain information and very little had been forthcoming. The shire had plotted a course on maps from the notices which the residents had received and a fairly accurate plan of the route of the intended power line was thus evolved.

At this meeting it was disclosed by the neighbouring shire that it possessed a plan which showed the route of the power line over the top of this quite well-developed country in the Armadale-Kelmscott area. I would say at this point that I have no battle with the Gosnells Shire Council. I respect what it is attempting to do because it is upset at the proposed dual route within its boundaries. One line is to go across the front of the escarpment and the other one over the hills. The Gosnells Shire Council submits that the lower escarpment route is objectionable, and of course the council has to make a plea on behalf of the residents. It says one route is sufficient and someone else can share the burden.

Because of the Government's strange action, there is conflict between the two areas. This is totally unnecessary because we readily accept that the Gosnells Shire Council wishes to be relieved of the lower escarpment route. The council would be content with one route over the back of the Darling Range. The 330 kV power line should run along the Allen Road reserve, or just north of it.

When one looks at the map which was presented yesterday, it is interesting to see what is taking place. The Minister very kindly presented me with what he considers is his final decision. Unfortunately for the area, this morning in good faith the media reported the Minister's decision under the heading, "Power way decided." The article reads as follows:—

The Minister for Electricity, Mr. May, said that the route approved was along Allen Road.

Of course I received many telephone calls today. People thought we had at last received full consideration, but when one looks at the map the route is not as good as we had hoped. The new plan is certainly an improvement on the old one, and I believe that the expression of public opinion and the representation by the shire councils and myself have brought about some reasoned thinking as far as taking the line away from the heavily built-up areas and directing it through open space is concerned.

If one looks at the map one will see that there is no need for the continuing confrontation. A very large undeveloped area of about 1,044 acres lies just to the north of the route to which the Gosnells Shire Council objects. Why is the route to go right through the highly developed properties on the south when the map very clearly shows this undeveloped area? As it nears the railway line and Albany Highway, just before the Lake Road crossing, the power line route bends to take it across small properties. Of course one can understand the concern of the owners of these relatively small holdings. Many people have moved to these properties to be free of built-up areas and obnoxious structures. Right near the boundary of these small holdings is something like 1,000 acres of undeveloped land and yet the power line is to come onto their small acreages. Some of these consist of only two acres and one is one acre, no roods, and six perches. It is hard to understand just why the route goes through these properties. Of course, the general rumour is that the land on the other side of the fence is under option to big development companies and they have influenced the decision. This suggestion is most unacceptable to me, but if this is the way the Government works, it should be condemned at this very moment.

Mr. Graham: You have a filthy mind.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am just saying what the rumours are.

Mr. Graham: It is contemptible to suggest it.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not think any of the members would accept action like this.

Mr. Graham: A few rumours are circulating about the honourable member but we would be most indecent if we repeated them.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am not saying anything about the Minister.

Mr. Graham: You are saying that we are subject to the wishes of large developers.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is for the Minister to answer, not me.

Mr. Graham: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am simply saying that people who own small holdings cannot see why the power line must stay on their side of the fence and not go into the undeveloped land.

Mr. Jamieson: If the route went through the undeveloped land you would say, "Why isn't it on the other side?"

Mr. RUSHTON: Be consistent, Mr. Minister!

Mr. Jamieson: Be honest.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have not been dishonest on this or on any other issue. What is dishonest about my presentation?

Mr. Jamieson: Rank dishonesty.

Mr. RUSHTON: One very interesting development has occurred because of the recent change in the route. People previously represented by the member for Clontarf have attempted to get in touch with the Minister and just cannot do so. These people had trouble before when there was a land resumption for main roads purposes and the present Minister encouraged them to do all they could to improve their position. He gave them every help and now they cannot get near him.

Mr. Jamieson: Who, me?

Mr. RUSHTON: No, do not be so sensitive. I said the present Minister for Electricity. The Minister for Works was Minister about two moves ago.

Mr. Jamieson: I cannot see where the Minister for Electricity's electorate comes close to this land.

Mr. RUSHTON: I said Cannington. The people now at lot 321 owned a property on which they ran horses at Cannington. They ran into difficulties over a land resumption and moved to an area where they could establish their horse property. Now the power line is to cross their working-out areas and track facilities. If the

route is shifted a few hundred yards onto the Allen Road alignment it will not be objectionable to the people who have spent their time and money on development.

The deputation was told that the route of the power line could not go further west because of the airport. I would like to make the suggestion that the power line could go further west. This is open country and the Government could give the same consideration which it was prepared to give along the escarpment and the foothills—that is, to keep the height of the power line down to 78 feet.

I see that the member for Canning is taking a very great interest in my speech. I hope he stands up and supports me and the member who moved the motion. I know his area will be very badly inconvenienced. I am aware that he has received deputations and petitions and I hope he will give the motion every support.

Mr. Bateman: I did not criticise the routes through Dale, Riverton, and Fremantle. So I do not think I will protest now. Your Government was in office at that time.

Mr. RUSHTON: I just did not pick up the last comment.

Mr. Jamieson: You would not need to—it was a hot one.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am very pleased that the member for Canning is interested.

Mr. Hartrey: That is only politeness.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would be more encouraged if he indicated his support. This matter is of vital interest to his electorate.

The Gosnells Shire Council made all sorts of representations to obtain redress against the decision. I am sure the constituents of the Canning electorate would appreciate their member's support of the motion. The Government would not tumble as a result. This would do no more than redress a wrong. I hope the honourable member at this late stage will indicate to us that he will vote for the motion which is of vital interest to his own area.

At this point of time it is interesting to note that the Ombudsman is investigating individual complaints. What is the value of the Ombudsman if his investigations and decision cannot have some effect on a matter such as this?

Mr. Jamieson: How do you know? You are prejudging the Ombudsman as you prejudge everything else. You are prejudging his decision.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister for Works made a very interesting interjection. Only yesterday the Minister for Electricity presented me with a final plan, and here and now I am supposed to be prejudging the Ombudsman.

Mr. Jamieson: He is unlikely ever to get a final plan with all the scavenging you have been up to.

Mr. RUSHTON: At the present time the Ombudsman is investigating the individual complaints.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you know that he is doing this?

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How many?

Mr. RUSHTON: People who contacted me today said that the Ombudsman or his deputy went out to the area yesterday. I hope the Premier will take an interest and see that justice is done.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am taking a close interest in your statement because I did not visualise that the Ombudsman would investigate this type of thing.

Mr. RUSHTON: I imagine the complaint of an individual against transgression on his property by the S.E.C. is surely something to be investigated.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Not unless it can be shown that the action is unjust and would cause hardship to the person concerned.

Mr. RUSHTON: They are claiming that it is causing hardship.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: They may ask him to carry out an investigation, but they have to establish that there is need for such an investigation before the Ombudsman carries out an inquiry.

Mr. RUSHTON: Have they not a right to put forward a request for an investigation?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: They have the right to put anything before him, and it is then his responsibility to determine which inquiry he will pursue and that which he will not.

Mr. RUSHTON: And what will happen then?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: He will report to Parliament.

Mr. RUSHTON: How can he make a report to Parliament unless he first carries out an investigation?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you have to investigate every complaint made to you before you make up your mind whether it is justified or not?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier has not given him time to come to a decision; he is at present making up his mind. He is a gentleman who will report to Parliament and not to the Government. He is an independent agent, and he will not be dictated to by the Premier.

Sir Charles Court: This is a boomerang that is coming back. It looks as though he will get his fingers rapped.

Mr. RUSHTON: Here we have a strange situation. The Ombudsman will take advantage of something the Government introduced as a remedy to meet a situation such as this, yet the Premier is implying that he has no right to investigate the matter. We also have the situation where the Environmental Protection Authority was established to investigate a matter such as this. We know on very good authority that the Environmental Protection Authority was quite happy to report on it, but Cabinet made a decision, and the Environmental Protection Authority is unable to carry out an investigation because Cabinet has put it in a farcical position. This is the situation we have reached with the 330kV power line which will extend from Kwinana to Balga.

Sir David Brand: They are having teething troubles.

Mr. RUSHTON: If the present Government had only taken notice of what the previous Government intended to do all this trouble would have been obviated.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What was that?

Mr. RUSHTON: I stated earlier what the previous Government's intention was; that is, Sir David Brand undertook to have this 330kV transmission line vetted by the Environmental Protection Authority before the work was proceeded with.

Mr. Jamieson: But he had no power to give that undertaking.

Sir David Brand: No power?

Mr. Jamieson: There was no power under the Act for the Environmental Protection Authority to inquire into that undertaking. Its franchise was specified and this transmission line did not come into it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: It is interesting to hear the interjection made by the Minister for Works, because we had an assurance by the then Premier that this would be done, and no member on this side of the House, or even on the other side of the House, has ever implied that Sir David Brand never kept his promises. Now we have been told by the Minister for Works that the then Premier would not have been able to give that undertaking.

Mr. Jamieson: He made that promise illegally if he did make it, for the Act did not allow it to be done.

Mr. RUSHTON: Of course it did.

Mr. Jamieson: You say, "Of course it did," but the legal people say it did not.

Sir David Brand: The same legal people advised us in regard to it.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is of no use the Government talking about the big teeth of the Environmental Protection Authority when Cabinet completely disregarded it.

Mr. Jamieson: This matter was not even within the scope of the Environmental Protection Authority.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister does not think it could have been done?

Sir Charles Court: If the Government of the day had told the authority to do it it would have been bound to do it.

Mr. Graham: And hang the law!

Mr. RUSHTON: In the legislation proposed it was understood that the authority had full power to do this. Here we definitely have an environmental project and yet, when it comes to a decision, dental decay and everything else sets in to destroy the big teeth of the Environmental Protection Authority.

I am sure everybody is concerned that this 330kV transmission line is hardly under way as yet, and each time an attempt is made to commence the work it is bogged down because of a conflict on the local scene. At this point I wish to record that I am totally unhappy about the position that has been created. First of all it was anticipated and negotiations were entered into with the shire. Then, as a result of whatever took place, the route of the transmission line was shifted south to cut through developed homes and property. Then, following strenuous representation, the route has been taken back a considerable distance, but it will still interfere with many small holdings, which is totally unnecessary.

The present Government has much to tell this House in regard to what it is doing. I know that if the Minister for Electricity were present he would say that he put forward proposals which were considered by the shires, and that the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire accepted the changes. I know that the shire did this at that point of time, because it felt that if it did not accept them the transmission line would be constructed over the top of their development area. After the shire had reconsidered the route it asked me to reopen negotiations and I put this proposition to the Minister, but he refused my request.

The route of the line as at present proposed is still unnecessarily intruding on the properties of many people instead of being built through country where it would not interfere with anybody. Even at this late hour, if the Government reconsidered its position, as is requested in the motion before the House, and acted in accordance with the recommendation put forward by the Environmental Protection Authority, I believe Gosnells would not feel the necessity for this power line to be built either on or south of Allen Road.

I think it is fair to say that this power line is the most unhappy event in the administration of this Government. It is something which shows the Government

up for what it is. At this point of time it is reasonable to reflect that in the early stages, one of the recommendations made by the S.E.C. was that the route was to go around the back of the escarpment and not in the front of it. Then it became an issue with the shires concerned and other people. Then we had a good deal of discussion about the recommendation made by the Environmental Protection Authority which was disregarded by Cabinet, following which we had the proposal to split the line, with the interference which stems from it.

I strongly object to the route to be followed by the line through the Dale electorate in the Armadale-Kelmscott-Gosnells district when, without any hardship or without any reduction in the efficiency of the line, it could revert to a route along Allen Road or just north of it which would be regarded as being satisfactory to the people in my district. Be that as it may, now is the hour for the Government to reconsider what it has done wrong and give close attention to this motion; namely, to refer the matter to the Environmental Protection Authority without its being influenced by the "Big Brother" attitude of Cabinet in making a decision. Instead, the Government should say to the Environmental Protection Authority, "You have a free hand to report to us as to what is the best route and we will take your recommendation into consideration when we make our final decision" and that will be the end of the matter.

It is obvious that the Government intends to remain quite secretive on this whole issue. The reason for its action should be explained to the public, because the Government should be heartily condemned for what it is doing.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Works) [6.10 p.m.]: I am sure that if this transmission line were to be built via the South Pole, the honourable member who has just resumed his seat would still oppose it on environmental grounds, and no doubt we could all do so on similar grounds. It would not matter on which spot the S.E.C. decided to construct this transmission line, it would still not suit everybody, and it would certainly not suit the member for Dale.

Mr. Rushton: That is not true.

Mr. JAMIESON: That is true, and this has been the case right from the time this line was first mooted. I do not know of any other project that has been more thoroughly examined, re-examined, and examined again, with the route being changed from one position to another. The main reason that no final plan can be developed that will ensure the minimum interference with some people is this constant interference.

Mr. Thompson: Why don't you put it to the E.P.A.?

Mr. JAMIESON: This is a project that should not be referred to it. The decision to go ahead with this undertaking was made long before that authority came into existence, and the honourable member will realise that we should not rely on it to sort out a problem that existed before the authority was established. The honourable member may well ask it to inquire into the reason that during the depression years walls were built around the Swan River; something that happened before the authority was brought into existence, and the authority might have recommended against it if a recommendation from it had been called for.

Mr. Thompson: Relate that to the Guildford Grammar School situation.

Mr. JAMIESON: That school has the weakest case of any body.

Mr. Thompson: The E.P.A. reviewed that section of the line.

Mr. JAMIESON: The situation is fairly clear—

Mr. Thompson: But the point is that the E.P.A. should review it.

Mr. JAMIESON: —on the matter of humanities, as to whether we should pull down some old lady's home, as the honourable member is seeking to do, rather than leave the route where it will not affect anybody. This is the true situation, and is one of the 30 situations that would occur if the honourable member had his way. He has examined the route to be taken by this transmission line.

In speaking about examining the areas through which this transmission line should be built, I would point out that no area has been so thoroughly examined by people in authority as this one has. The Premier, the Deputy Premier, myself as the Minister at the time, and The Hon. J. Dolan, spent the greater part of one Sunday clambering over the Darling Range to inspect all the suggested routes, following which it was finally agreed among us that we could not see any great objection to the final proposal put forward by the State Electricity Commission. Then there had to be some slight variation in order to give some consideration to small individual properties.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. JAMIESON: Before the tea suspension I was saying I felt that all that reasonably could be expected to be done had been done in regard to the location of this power line. We could argue for a long time, this way, that way, or some other way.

I am reminded, of course, that in this House in 1968 when the present Opposition was in power my colleague from Fre-

mantle moved a motion dealing with a somewhat similar matter. I had a look at this at the time.

Mr. Rushton: What is the similarity? Is it towers and wires?

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about.

Mr. Graham: Neither does he.

Mr. JAMIESON: Despite the fact that the main objection to the motion was with the towers, the introduction of those things associated with it, and the transmission lines through East Fremantle, were also matters that were dealt with. This is evident from the honourable member's speech.

At the time this was seen to be objectionable. Indeed the issue became an emotional one; meetings were held and protestations were made, and the Mayor of Fremantle wanted everybody's head—probably he is still after my head.

Despite all this, however, I am sure that sweet reason prevailed on that occasion and there is now no great objection to these lines which exist and cross the river at that point.

I looked in vain to see whether any of the speakers had spoken on that point. There were a few interjections from the member for Dale which indicated that he felt it unreasonable to expect the S.E.C. to spend a sum of money on alteration, because he said in one of his interjections that there was a great deal to be done and that higher priorities were involved.

The honourable member felt that rather than spend more money on altering these plans the priorities had to be taken in order of merit. He also felt there should not be any consideration of the motion moved by the member concerned. I took the line at the time, as I do now, that we were faced with the problem, as we always are in a modern society, of having to provide the necessary facilities in life while at the same time having to look after the environment.

If some people had their way it would be all environment and no comforts. There would not, however, be too many electors who would be prepared to go along with that. As a consequence we have to take the good with the bad. There are some people who no matter how well they might be treated will always consider they have been badly treated; indeed, they will fight to the bitter end to achieve their point of view.

I do not blame them greatly for this. I admired my colleague's opinion—I shared an office with him—but I argued quite often with him that it was not possible to have a modern society and not be faced with the problems which would repeatedly come to the fore.

In his final point my leader said that if East Fremantle were Dalkeith this power line would not be positioned where it was proposed it should be positioned. With that thought he left the question with members.

Here again it was my leader's opinion that the power line would be better positioned somewhere else. In cases like this the other person's pasture is always grayer—not greener—and it is better to have these things put somewhere else rather than where it is planned to put them.

I have indicated that after having dealt with the considerations presented by me at the time, Cabinet had a look at the position and a group of Cabinet Ministers inspected the site; they considered the entire proposition, after which they came down on the side of the S.E.C. They felt what was finally proposed was the best compromise that was available to the people of Western Australia.

I have had a good look at this, and as I have said a dozen times, if matters are duplicated and one goes south through the forest there are people who will object for environmental reasons. If these lines are spread through an area where there is less vegetation, somebody will say it is environmentally unsatisfactory because they have to look through the wires to see the birds on the hill; they look to the city and it is possible they might see a reflection on the wires.

All these problems must be expected in a modern city; we just cannot get away from that fact. I was in Canberra recently and while looking out of the motel window one morning I saw on the north-western section of the city—Black Mountain I think it is called on which the TV transmitter towers are situated right across the entire scarp—there were huge towers running to the various hydroelectric schemes that were serving Goulburn or towns further to the north.

As members know, the people in Canberra have a very high regard for environment and in some cases they go to great lengths to create suitable environments; sometimes the environment they do create is out of this world.

There was no objection to these towers and yet they were within a mile of the centre of the city. They were gigantic towers but they did not look absurd or incongruous; nor were they obnoxious, and nobody suggested they were desecrating the holy city of Canberra. Those towers now form part of the features of modern-day living.

I have never been to Japan, but in the pictures I have seen I find that in the background along their mountains exists a series of pylons. We must appreciate the fact that these pylons bring comfort to people, they provide them with electricity,

and any objection people may have as to their being an inconvenience is, I am sure, more often in their minds than a matter of reality.

In the ultimate a greater number of people must be served by the provision of electricity to various areas. I do not know how we can overcome any problems that might exist, but the problems as I saw them at the time, after I had kept out of the debate, were the result of my not having a very clear knowledge of the matter at the time.

I indicated this to the deputation which came to see me on Friday, the 3rd September, last. On that day I received a deputation from the Council of the Guildford Grammar School, and I indicated to them that I did not have a very clear knowledge of the power line at the time. I had specifically asked the S.E.C. not to involve me in the dispute, because I would be the Minister to whom appeals would be directed after the final decision had been made. It was not until after the final decision had been made that I suggested the Cabinet Ministers should have a look at the situation that was complained about.

There were complaints from Gosnells and other places and the suggestion apparently was that if these things could be placed in some other area it would be all right; they just did not want them in their particular area. But the final complaint with which I had to deal was that presented to me by a deputation which came to see me. The deputation made a written submission together with an oral submission and it was that which started the confusion.

The main reason for the objection voiced by the deputation was the hazard these pylons would present to the boys attending the Guildford Grammar School. I am sure all members know the location of Guildford Grammar School; the school could not be in a more hazardous or worse position—not in any circumstances; not even if one tried to make the circumstances worse. On one side there is a railway line. There is also a hazard between the living quarters and the school proper—hazards which one would normally try to avoid. I do not say that the school deliberately set out to establish these hazards; it was just caught up with modern development; they just developed that way. As a consequence, the school is confronted with innumerable and difficult problems.

Their main complaint, backed up by Mr. Winship, who is an engineer in his own right, was contained in sound arguments for defeating the school's submission, when it was pressing for undergrounding the lines. Mr. Winship told the school it was just not on. He clearly told us that he

thought the two lines should go via Bellevue Road. He said that the S.E.C. was going to run a line in this area initially and with all due respect to the owners some of the properties were dilapidated.

That may have been so, but let anyone try to shift 20 or 30 of the constituents in the electorate of Swan—and I refer to the pensioners—and see what success he will have. Such a move would come up against all sorts of problems. Many of these people will, of course, have lived there all their lives. They will not want to move at this stage of their existence because it could be a disturbance from which they would never recover.

As a result we had to consider the most humane way to overcome the difficulties and to ensure that not one person would be physically affected by the lines proposed through the Guildford Grammar School unless, of course, there was an attempt to climb the towers. This appeared to be the main objection. It was said the boys would climb the towers; but with the discipline which exists at the Guildford Grammar School, I wonder whether this statement is factual; because I know the authorities there watch the interests of their charges very keenly. I am sure that any of the boys with reasonable intellect would obey the instructions they received, particularly if they were told that certain pylons were not to be climbed. These pylons would not be obscured or out of the way; they would be visible from the cars using the streets, and if anyone was found to be climbing any of the pylons an alarm would surely be sounded.

I had a series of these pylons running through a densely-settled part of my electorate and there has been no complaint about any attempt to climb them; and I should imagine that the children from the East Victoria Park area would get up to just as many tricks as those living in any other area.

Mr. Davies: Careful.

Mr. JAMIESON: I have not known of a single attempt made by a child to climb the pylons in question. Yet we are told that the Guildford Grammar School boys will be climbing all over them.

Mr. Winship said there had been many instances in Great Britain where this had occurred. This is possible; they may be more adventurous in Great Britain than they are here. They may have fewer trees for the boys to climb. There are possibly many reasons why they should transgress in this way. From my experience I would say—and I would be interested to hear an interjection from the member for Canring—that this move would in no way affect the actions of children; they would not go out of their way to climb the pylons in question.

Mr. Bateman: They go through Lynwood, and one is 12 yards from the entrance to the Lynwood Hotel.

Mr. JAMIESON: Even drunks do not climb them! It was agreed that the pylons would be doubly secured with a security fence—and there would be only two in the Guildford Grammar School grounds in any case. I thought I had gone as far as a Minister was entitled to go in offering protection. There was no suggestion that the area concerned would be developed immediately, and the only plan for development which had been made available to myself and the commission showed that the area which the lines would traverse would be an ornamental lake. No doubt the lake was proposed as a compensation basin into which the water could be drained at a later date. That, of course, is a little airy-fairy because the cost of filling would have to be weighed against the economics of shifting the school. That is a problem which the school will have to face up to at some future date.

I do not know that the Environmental Protection Authority would grant a permit on the basis of allowing sanitary land fill in that area. The environmental protection people are very much against that type of fill because it enriches the water and causes excess weed growth in the rivers. So, in becoming involved with the Environmental Protection Authority, the principals of the school could run into a great deal of trouble by thinking along those lines. If the principals of the school tried to develop the area by carting in five feet of fill I think they would find it would not be a feasible proposition. They would be far better to shut the school and move somewhere else.

Those are the comments I wish to make. In this case, as was also the case when the member for Fremantle moved his motion, there has been a lot of emotion. Once emotion is brought into an argument it is difficult to get any sense or reason out of people who are involved. Those people will say that a pylon is a monstrosity; it would not matter if one installed gilded towers, they would not change their minds.

The people at Fremantle were not going to have the towers at any cost. It was said that the boys at H.M.A.S. *Leeuwin* might climb the towers. The boys in that area are fairly active and judging by recent experiences they come up with all sorts of things. However, that has not been the general pattern and it has not been necessary to pull any boys down from the towers.

We all travel down the Swan River periodically and unless we suddenly look up and realise we are going under the power lines at East Fremantle we do not even register that they are there.

Sir David Brand: Shades of the arch-way!

Mr. JAMIESON: That was another sad story which is now in the past. I speak to people who live close to power line towers, and I also rely on my own experience in the Riverton area where the pylons are constructed through housing areas. Admittedly, they are constructed along a cleared swathe, but there has been no experience of danger from them, and no complaint from the people who live in the area. People do not see them as being objectionable once they are constructed. The lines are fairly high and well out of reach, and not the same as a post which obstructs a driveway, or becomes chatty with age.

The pylons are placed in such a way that they have a limited effect on human life. As a consequence, I say that the environmental protection people would be very loth, I should imagine, to go into the situation at this juncture. It would be wrong to bring them in after the decisions had been made on the various routes. Instructions have been issued as a result of an examination by experts and recommendations by authorities. We must also remember that one of the features of our hills area is the intenseness of the bushfires.

In view of the experience in Adelaide earlier this year, when bushfires caused a disruption to electricity services, this point should be considered. The system which has been decided on will function more efficiently and consistently than any alternative system.

I cannot see any justification for the motion. I was the Minister in this Government when the situation developed. It has not changed much since I changed portfolios. There have been a few modifications so that the routes deviated around and away from some properties. However, fundamentally the routes of the pylons are the same. My opinion on this matter has not changed since October, 1968, when I found myself in a division list consisting entirely of people from the other side of the House.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [7.52 p.m.]: I wish to add a few words to this debate because over the last few months we have certainly learnt everything there is to know about the subject matter of the motion before us. There cannot possibly be many more words to say on the subject.

It seems to me that those who have everything they desire seek out matters about which they can complain. I know for a fact that many people would welcome power lines or water pipelines running through their properties, or along the boundaries of their properties. Those people would be prepared to go to much inconvenience in order to get the facilities.

It seems to me that we have had a lot of discussion and debate on a matter which hardly justified the time given to it. When the power lines are erected they will probably sag two or three feet lower than would normally be the case because of the weight of the debate which must hang on them.

I have certainly learnt a lot about what can be said on small matters. That is about all I wish to say on this subject, but I want to draw the attention of the Government, and others who are concerned, to the fact that we have plenty of places in this State where the people would welcome power lines and water pipelines, and many other such facilities.

Mr. Jamieson: Well said.

Mr. Bickerton: I think the member for Darling Range has gained all the political mileage he wanted, and that he will not want any more discussion.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [7.54 p.m.]: Might I first of all comment on what was said by the member for Narrogin. I would suggest that the amount of money which is now available for the distribution of power in country areas will be reduced because the commission will spend more money on the lines through the hills. More money will be spent on the split route than would be spent if the lines were constructed along one route.

This motion was introduced in the House on the 12th April, and so it has been on the notice paper for some time. However, I make no apology for bringing the motion forward, and for supporting it. I recall the words of the Premier—I think it was the first speech I heard him make in this House—when he sought to encourage young members to adhere to their points of view, even though there may be some opposition to them.

Mr. Bickerton: He said, if they believed in them.

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, I believe in my views.

Mr. Bickerton: You have one person on your side.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: I adopt a responsible attitude in this regard. The State Electricity Commission Act is very cruel in some respects. I believe it is cruel because it contains no provision for individuals to lodge appeals against proposals put forward by the State Electricity Commission. Despite what was said by the Minister in this House, the power lines under discussion are the first of their type which will affect the people in the manner I have pointed out. Power lines are usually installed along street alignments, and there has not been the incidence—as there will

be in this case—of power lines being installed across private property. As a result of the construction of these power lines some real hardship will be caused to many people.

Section 38 of the Act provides only for local authorities to make appeals to the Minister. A little earlier there was mention of the involvement of the member for Fremantle when he moved a motion in this House in 1968. His motion concerned the construction of power lines across the river at East Fremantle. I hope the member for Fremantle has listened to the debate very carefully, and I hope that when the vote is taken he will be on our side.

Sir David Brand: He will.

Mr. THOMPSON: I think he will. I also believe his involvement in the previous motion, and the controversy raised at that time, had a profound effect on the decision-making of the State Electricity Commission. I am sure the commission decided then that it would not place itself in the position of having to face controversy after controversy over the installation of power lines. I think the commission decided that the next power line would be the daddy of them all, and would not require duplication or upgrading in the future.

Mr. Fletcher: I would point out that the then Government opposed my motion. I can see myself sitting in your seat!

Mr. THOMPSON: That may be so. I would like to consider, again, the contents of my motion. Firstly, I ask the House to deplore the decision of the Government to split the route. Secondly, I ask the Government to reconsider its decision after a report from the Environmental Protection Authority. Thirdly, I ask that the Government adhere to the recommendation of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority not to take the line over the Guildford Grammar School.

My main contention and concern in this matter is that the Government of the day decided to put one line through the foothills, and a second line east of the escarpment, instead of constructing both lines along one route. The Government has tried to justify its decision by referring to the fire which occurred in South Australia earlier this year. I do not think that argument justified the decision by the Government because for a long time we have had bushfires in Australia. That is a weak argument.

In 1968 the State Electricity Commission, after consultation with local authorities, decided to take both lines around the back of the hills. After the controversy which has occurred in the intervening period, the Government decided to compromise by putting in two lines. I do not think that is much of a compromise. There

will still be a five-chain reserve through the foothills section, because when the compromise decision was reached the Government decided to reduce the height of the towers in the foothills section from 140 feet to 78 feet. However, it must be borne in mind that the design of the towers is such that the reduced height will mean that the capacity of the lines cannot be increased.

It is therefore true to say there will still be two lines through the foothills, and, despite the fact that the Minister said a while ago that one line on a three-chain reserve would have less impact—and I admit it would—it is also a fact that ultimately there will be two lines through the foothills and a five-chain reserve will be necessary to accommodate them.

Mr. Jamieson: What is your definition of "foothills"?

Mr. THOMPSON: The area of Maida Vale.

Mr. Jamieson: That is hardly foothills.

Mr. THOMPSON: What does the Minister call foothills?

Mr. Jamieson: I would say it is very clearly the coastal plain. It is lower there than towards the coast.

Mr. THOMPSON: As far as I am concerned, the foothills area is Forrestfield, Maida Vale, and the Helena Valley.

Reference was made earlier to undergrounding this cable. I have never at any stage suggested that the whole of this line could be undergrounded. I think it was rather naive of the Minister to say when announcing the compromise decision that within 10 years it may be feasible to put the lines underground, thus avoiding the necessity to duplicate the lines through the foothills. He knew then, as he knows now, that even if that course were technically feasible it would certainly be economically out of the reach of the State Electricity Commission. I do not believe the member for Narrogin would stand by and see this cable undergrounded at something like 30 times the cost when an aerial line already existed through the foothills. I therefore think it is quite apparent that there will be two lines through the foothills.

Some people have said to me that it may not be necessary to put two lines through the foothills, and that within 10 years power will be generated north of the city and the two lines will not be required. If that is the case, where is the justification for the construction of 140-foot towers at the present time?

The 140-foot towers will carry conductors on one side of three cross-arms to meet the demand in the near future, and it is anticipated that within 10 years conductors will be erected on the second side

of the cross-arms to accommodate the increased capacity. If it will be possible to carry the whole load on the 78-foot towers in the future, there is no justification for erecting 140-foot towers elsewhere. Despite what the member for Canning said earlier tonight, I imagine he would prefer to see towers 78 feet in height than towers 140 feet in height.

On the 24th July the Minister for Electricity was interviewed on radio by Garry Meadows. I would like to quote from that interview.

Mr. Jamieson: Once this cycle is finished he will close down his session because he will have nothing else to do.

Mr. THOMPSON: Garry Meadows said to the Minister—

Now, there's also a point, Mr. May, that in the future there is going to be an extension of the power along, particularly along the front of the scarp and that there will be another row going there.

The Minister said—

No, this is wrong because we will be making provision on the existing transmission line for all power to be included on the one line, there will be no extension or no duplication of the line.

That is not true, and the Minister would know that.

A while ago I made reference to the S.E.C. or the Government justifying the splitting of the route because of the possibility of interruption to supplies as a result of fire. I would point out that quite a few transmission lines—in fact those that carry the bulk of the power from Muja to the northern terminal at the present time—pass through the forest. I wonder how many times power supplies have been interrupted as a result of fire. I believe we are spending a great deal of money to prevent outages from causes that may not exist.

If we reflect on what happened last year, we will find we had a drastic interruption to the power supply because of industrial unrest. Surely our power supply can only be as stable as the transmission system and the relations between the men who fire the boilers and generate the power and their employers—

Mr. Jamieson: We cannot build out those faults. We can build out others. There is a difference.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not think there is justification for spending that sum of money on splitting the lines for that reason.

When the Minister for Electricity spoke to the motion I moved in this House, he indicated that the previous Minister for

Electricity had not been involved. However, I point out that it appears from a comment that was made by the member for Greenough—who was then the Leader of the Opposition in this House—that the Cabinet was involved; and in fact the Cabinet made a pronouncement. As far as I am concerned, whether or not the Minister for Electricity was involved at that time is not very important.

The person who was involved was the Minister for Environmental Protection, bearing in mind that at that time the Liberal Government had enacted environmental protection legislation which provided for some protection to be afforded to the people in the area. The Premier of the day unequivocally gave an undertaking *via* myself to a public meeting held at Kalamunda in January of last year.

The Minister for Works has said there was no power given under the environmental protection Act that was enacted by the Liberal Government. I believe there was power and that something would have been done about the matter.

Mr. Jamieson: Quote the power that covered this.

Mr. THOMPSON: If the Minister of the day asked for a report on a particular matter—and I believe there was provision for him to do so—the authority was duty bound to provide it.

Mr. Jamieson: It stated the matters on which he could ask for reports.

Mr. THOMPSON: We differ on this point; but I believe the people of this State had the benefit of environmental protection under the previous legislation. The Minister does not think so.

Mr. Jamieson: Not in respect of this matter. I do not say it did not exist in regard to other matters. I would not argue that.

Mr. THOMPSON: I now come to the Guildford Grammar School section of the line. In an exchange in this House in the early part of this session the Minister for Works made an accusation that the Guildford Grammar School authorities intended to subdivide the land held by the school in the area which would be affected by the power lines. I would like to put the record straight on that score.

A quarter of a century ago the Hamersley family decided they would make available to the Guildford Grammar School the area of land in question. The Hamersley family said that under certain terms and conditions upon which they would agree later, the land would go to the school. That was the first time the Guildford Grammar School authorities knew they would have access to that piece of land. In December, 1968, a formal contract was entered into between the Guildford Grammar School and the Hamersley family for

the school to pay a number of instalments, and upon completion of payment the land would be transferred into the name of Guildford Grammar School.

Those facts clearly indicate that the Guildford Grammar School authorities could have had no knowledge whatever prior to entering into a contract in regard to the land that the S.E.C. proposed to construct power lines across that land.

The land then became available to the Guildford Grammar School, and one of the members of the council of the school was an architect and town planner who offered his services free of charge to make suggestions to the council as to how it could best develop the area. It so happened—as with a number of these *gratis* jobs—that the offer was not proceeded with immediately because at that time there was tremendous economic growth in this State—quite unlike the situation that now exists—and the architect did not have time to proceed with it.

The architect gave the job to one of his junior officers who misinterpreted the instructions of the principal of the firm and went off and made a full-scale feasibility study. In the course of the preparation of his document he had contact with the S.E.C. and, unbeknown to the Council of Guildford Grammar School, he made available to the S.E.C. a drawing that indicated there would be some subdivision of the land held by the school. At no stage was consideration given by the council to subdivision of the land; so for the Minister to say—as he did earlier this year—that the council of the school intended to subdivide that land is entirely inaccurate. The Minister made no reference to that matter when he spoke in this House tonight, so I assume that—

Mr. Jamieson: They showed to me a plan for the development of subdivided land.

Mr. THOMPSON: That was never agreed to by the Council of Guildford Grammar School.

Mr. Jamieson: I know, but they brought me that plan. Why did they bring it to me?

Mr. THOMPSON: The plan came into the possession of the commission indirectly, through the junior in the architect's office, without the knowledge, consent, or instruction of the council of the school.

Mr. Graham: Who commissioned the architect to prepare a plan?

Mr. THOMPSON: There was no formal commissioning. The architect-town planner offered his services, as some people do to voluntary organisations by saying, "I'll look after it for you." He was not commissioned or instructed to do any particular thing, and certainly the council made no decision to accept anything that was done, even if he were formally commissioned. If one engages a professional

architect or any other professional person to plan something and he comes back with something one does not want, one is not committed to it.

Mr. Jamieson: You give him an idea of what you want—either a house or a church.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister was not listening.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, I was.

Mr. THOMPSON: Whatever the Minister cares to say about this, the facts of the matter are that the Council of Guildford Grammar School did not specifically ask the architect to prepare a plan of subdivision; it was not, as a council, aware that that was what he intended to do; it was not aware that the S.E.C. had access to the documents; and it did not intend at any stage to subdivide that land.

Mr. Jamieson: They did not deny it when they came before me in a deputation and I asked them about it. This seems to be another tack.

Mr. THOMPSON: The denial came from the Chairman of the Guildford Grammar School Council. If the Minister wants to call him a liar, he can go ahead.

Mr. Jamieson: Why did they not say so at the time?

Mr. THOMPSON: Another aspect of this land that Guildford Grammar School has now acquired is that very little of it is in fact usable. It is part of the flood plain of the Swan River. The site of the recently constructed library at the school was gouged out of the bank of that flood plain. Although the school obtained the land at a very reasonable rate, a lot of money must be spent to enable the land to be used. The S.E.C. proposes to run a high percentage of lines across that land, so the school will be forevermore precluded from using some of the more attractive land on that side.

Mr. Jamieson: That is another thing they never mentioned at any stage.

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, just because somebody has a piece of land for which he has no immediate plans, the Minister believes he should have the right to jump into it.

Mr. Jamieson: It is not that at all. They came up with a specific written objection, and there was nothing of this in it.

Mr. THOMPSON: Once the line goes in the school will be precluded forevermore from building under the line. It may not have plans to build at the moment, but certainly once the line is there it will not be able to do anything. For the Minister to say that Guildford Grammar School will not be injured as a result of the power lines—

Mr. Jamieson: You cannot say that, because the Town Planning Department may not have allowed buildings in any case

owing to the proximity of private houses. The area has not been zoned for that purpose.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is something the Minister could not prejudice.

Mr. Jamieson: Nor could you.

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, it is as easy for me to say that the school could use the land as it is for the Minister to say that it could not.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: As easy, but no easier.

Mr. THOMPSON: All right. I hoped the Premier would not interject. A little earlier tonight the Minister made reference to the fact that there is no hazard as far as the climbing of towers by boys is concerned, I must admit that the chance of boys climbing the towers is fairly remote. However, as he spoke I was reminded of a picture which appeared in *The West Australian* fairly recently showing a boy dangling by one foot from a power transmission tower.

Mr. Jamieson: That was not a very high tower; it was an ordinary street tower.

Mr. THOMPSON: Then that makes it a little safer; these towers will be taller. I come now to what I believe to be the main issue in this debate; that is, the question of the environment. The 1971 election campaign was fought, not entirely, but to some extent, on the question of environmental protection. We had the present Premier parading around the State saying that what the Liberals had done was wishy-washy, and that his party would introduce legislation with "big teeth."

Mr. Brown: That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON: Against this background we had a situation in which the Premier of the day (Sir David Brand) gave an undertaking that no decision would be made regarding the route of the line until the matter had been reviewed by the Environmental Protection Authority.

The Minister for Works said a little earlier that insufficient time had elapsed for the Environmental Protection Authority to do something about the matter. The Premier, soon after the election, said that he would call Parliament together very quickly because many things had to be done. In fact, we did not enter this House much earlier than would otherwise have been the case. Therefore, all those important things were suddenly forgotten. I believe the hiatus—caused by the inaction of the Government—is the responsibility of the Government.

This Government left the State without environmental protection legislation for more than 12 months. I suggest that it still has a responsibility to submit this matter to the Environmental Protection

Authority. I have made reference in this House previously to the report tabled by the Minister for Environmental Protection at the request of the member for Dale.

Mr. Davies: I don't think you have read it.

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes I have.

Mr. Davies: Didn't you see the map, and read where the director said people such as engineers from the Snowy Mountains Scheme would be needed?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am talking about the report of last year wherein Dr. O'Brien, before he had any power, said that in his opinion the first line should run behind the hills, and that it should be constructed straightaway. He also said that later a second route should be surveyed roughly along the same path as the first. I believe Dr. O'Brien suggested to the Minister that he should place the line behind the hills. Does the Minister agree that that is a reasonable summing up?

Mr. Jamieson: It was his personal opinion, without technical knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON: It was the same personal opinion to which the Government resorted in regard to the location of the Pacminex project, and many other things.

Mr. Jamieson: It is not the same situation.

Mr. THOMPSON: Only because the Minister does not want it to be.

Mr. Jamieson: You have a look at what he has done since he has had more opportunity.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister's Government took notice of him when it suited it.

Mr. Graham: Who said it suited us?

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, I do not think it suited the Minister for Development and Decentralisation because a project of his did not go ahead as a result of a decision of the Environmental Protection Authority.

Mr. Graham: You cannot win them all.

Mr. O'Connor: We would like you to win one.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would now like to refer to something which I regard as a very grave offence on the part of the Minister for Works—I am sorry, I mean the Minister for Electricity.

Mr. Jamieson: You had me worried for a minute.

Mr. THOMPSON: I refer to the recent radio interview between Garry Meadows and the Minister for Electricity. The interview covered much of this particular controversy, and several sections

of it are of importance. One section which I believe is of prime importance is as follows:—

G.M. So the complete route has been submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority for their opinion?

May Oh yes—my very word.

G.M. And what was their opinion?

May Their opinion was that—in the interest of the State, both from a technological point of view, and also from an aesthetically and environmental point of view—that the present route for both lines was acceptable.

Mr. O'Connor: Are you sure that is what he said?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes. I have a transcript, and also a tape to indicate that that is what he said. However, what he said is not the case, as I will indicate in a moment. I think it is a grave matter when a Minister of the Crown makes a public statement—in this case on a radio programme which was broadcast to thousands of people—which leads the people of this State to believe that the E.P.A. has made an environmental study when in fact it has not, and the Minister would have known it at the time. Based on that interview I asked a question in this House on Tuesday, the 1st August—the day the Parliament reassembled. I would like to read part of the question and answer. The first part of the question is as follows:—

In an interview between the Minister for Electricity and Mr. Garry Meadows, broadcast by 6PR on the morning of the 24th July, 1972, he (Mr. May) stated that the complete route of the 330 kV power line had been submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority. According to the transcript of the interview the Minister said—

... their opinion was that in the interest of the State, both from a technological point of view and also from an aesthetic and environmental point of view, that the present route for both lines was acceptable.

- (1) Will the Minister table the report of the Environmental Protection Authority which gave rise to the statement he made during the broadcast?

In answer to that part of the question the Minister said, "Yes." He tabled the report which, he says, makes reference to the overall power line proposal, from which I would like to quote. I apologise to the House for reading this, but I must do so

for the sake of accuracy and to highlight what the Minister has done in this regard. Paragraph 2 states—

2. As to the first item, namely the need for and comparative impact of the foothills and escarpment routes, the EPA has reviewed the history of the proposals and negotiations and has given consideration to the suggestions presented by me as Director of Environmental Protection, namely "The second (revised) route beyond the ranges is acceptable and . . . this line should be built initially. At the same time, effort should be made to survey a route for the second route in roughly the same path". (Extract from Minute, Hon. Mr. Davies, November 22, 1971.)

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

Now, I suggest to the Minister that he seek an early opportunity to apologise to the House for having lied to it. Incidentally, as a result of that report being tabled and as a result of the reply to my question, the Press, acting most responsibly, took the Minister's word as fact and published an article in *The West Australian* on the following morning telling the people of this State that the Environmental Protection Authority had reviewed the power line proposal and had said to go ahead with it. However, that was a lie; but it is not the responsibility of the Press; it is the responsibility of the Minister.

I proceed a little further with this saga. When I raised this matter in the debate on the Supply Bill the Minister for Development and Decentralisation supported the contention of the Minister for Electricity that paragraph 6 of the report covered the overall environmental aspect. I would invite members to read the report, because that is not so. Here we have the Deputy Premier of this State getting behind the Minister for Electricity and leading members of this House to believe that a report had been made by the Environmental Protection Authority. On that score the Deputy Premier should apologise to the House.

I do not wish to say much more because, as the member for Narrogin said earlier, this matter has had a fair airing. May I simply say that I seek the support of the House in my efforts to have this matter reviewed by the Environmental Protection Authority—that "big teeth" organisation set up by the Government to do the things the people of this State want it to do. I do not suggest the Environmental Protection Authority will find another route; but

at least the people of the State should have the benefit of the direction of that authority.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—18

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Mensaros
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Williams
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Davies	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. R. L. Young	Mr. Jones
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. May
Mr. Nalder	Mr. T. D. Evans
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Brady
Mr. Ridge	Mr. Moller

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

SUPPLY BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

ABATTOIRS

Comprehensive Statement by Government: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 12th April, on the following motion by Mr. I. W. Manning:—

That in the opinion of this House because of the importance of adequate abattoir and meat processing facilities both in the immediate and longer term future, a comprehensive statement should be prepared by the Government and tabled in Parliament setting out details of:—

- (1) (a) installed capacity in W.A.;
- (b) the current rate of usage in each case;
- (c) the livestock areas served by each facility;
- (d) the main markets served by each facility;
- (e) the status of each abattoir so far as exports or any other special markets are concerned (e.g. Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry licences for export);

(f) the feasibility and intentions for expanding and/or upgrading in each case;

- (2) the Government expenditure on the establishment or expansion of abattoir and meat processing facilities with a summary of each case 1960/1972 including dates when decisions to undertake expansion were made;
- (3) the private abattoir and meat processing plants that have been established or expanded in the same period including date when a decision was made to establish or expand in each case;
- (4) current Government and private enterprise projects for new and upgraded abattoir and meat processing capacity, including details of Government guarantees or other Government assistance involved in each case;
- (5) the capital needs and the economic and other particulars of the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. project which awaits a decision on Government guarantees prior to consideration by Parliament; and
- (6) the capacity—including location by areas—the Government considers desirable and necessary to be established and the desirable dates for installation of such capacity to fit in with future planned rates of livestock increases.

MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [8.36 p.m.]: I thought the Minister for Development and Decentralisation might have taken this opportunity to give us some words of wisdom, but apparently he is not prepared to do so.

Mr. Davies: Do not upset the Minister.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I sat quietly while the debate on this motion was taking place, and the motion was moved some months ago. When the member for Wellington moved the motion he asked for a great deal of information to be supplied. However, when the Minister for Agriculture made his contribution to the debate he gave some information, but I believe he could have given a much fuller explanation. I will deal with that aspect later, so the Minister of Agriculture had better not interject now.

It is advisable to remind ourselves when the alliance between the United Farmers and Graziers Association and the Trades and Labor Council commenced. Although

I do not know for sure I believe the alliance started in about 1969-70, when a strike occurred at the works of Australian Iron and Steel at Kwinana. I understand the U.F.G.A. was asked to supply meat to the striking workers. As it was prepared to do so the Trades and Labor Council helped it to canvass for members and to organise. That is my opinion, whether it be right or wrong; but I believe it to be close to the mark.

Mr. Graham: I think the odds are that you are wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister is interjecting so I cannot be far off the mark. As soon as he interjects I feel sure one is getting pretty close to the bone—and that is not meant to be a pun in speaking to the motion.

Sir Charles Court: Do not forget the election pact.

Mr. WILLIAMS: There was that, but if I carried on in that vein you, Mr. Speaker, would no doubt ask me to confine myself to the motion. All the information that was sought by the member for Wellington has not been given, and I consider that it should have been given.

A report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 12th February, 1970, indicating that the leader of the farmers had put a plan to the Trades and Labor Council, which is the plan I have just mentioned. On the 9th August, 1971, a report in *The West Australian* indicated that the T.L.C. might become a partner in an abattoir. There we saw the alliance between these two organisations coming forward. Under our democratic system they were permitted to form an alliance and to join in a business partnership if they wished to do so.

However, what we in this House are particularly interested in are the pros and cons as to why Government guarantees were being sought, and the basis for those guarantees. Of course, a feasibility study had been made and the proposal had been investigated by various Government departments. From questions asked in this House we were told by various Ministers that this feasibility study was the property of the U.F.G.A. or the T.L.C.

I have asked a number of questions on this subject, and maybe the Minister for Agriculture could have accused me of stealing some of his thunder, because those questions were asked prior to the Minister making his contribution to the debate on this motion.

I raised the matter of this feasibility study. On the 19th April I asked the Premier the following question:—

- (1) Has the Government received a copy of the feasibility study undertaken by Civil & Civic Pty. Ltd. for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. abattoir?

- (2) If "Yes" as the Government is considering guaranteeing the whole of the money for the establishment of these projects would he table a copy of this study?

The Premier replied—

- (1) A copy of the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. feasibility study for the construction and operation of three abattoirs was made available for examination by officers of the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Treasury.
- (2) The study is the property of U.F.G.A./T.L.C. and has now been returned to this body.

Information relating to the payment of the cost of this feasibility study was and still is very hard to obtain.

The member for Wellington moved the motion on the 29th March, and his contribution to the debate is recorded on page 407 of the current *Hansard*. I quote what was said—

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Perhaps he will tell us something of the feasibility study which is taking place and who is footing the bill?

Mr. Graham: If the honourable member wants that question answered it is the U.F.G.A.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I have been led to believe that the feasibility study will cost somebody \$40,000. Who is going to pay this? There are three parties who could pay it and one of them is the U.F.G.A.

Mr. Graham: Yes, and it is financially responsible. The U.F.G.A. will pay the bill if it has not already done so.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: The U.F.G.A. will pay for the feasibility study. And that is the clear statement of the Acting Premier?

Mr. Graham: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Why did you not ask a question about it? That would have been easier.

I would remind the member for Merredin-Yilgarn that I did ask questions about this feasibility study. On the 19th April I asked the Premier the following question:—

Has the Government been requested to assist in any way for the payment of a feasibility study for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. abattoir proposal?

The Premier replied—

The fee for the feasibility study for U.F.G.A./T.L.C. has been included in the estimated capital cost of the venture for which the Government has been asked for a guarantee.

That was an airy-fairy sort of answer, because he did not tell us whether the Government had assisted in paying for the feasibility study.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You seem to be rather dull of comprehension.

Mr. WILLIAMS: When I asked a further question on this subject on the same day the answer of the Premier was even more confusing. I asked the following question of the Premier:—

- (1) Does this mean that the Government, through its guarantee, is going to pay for the feasibility study?
- (2) If not, will either one or both of the organisations be paying for the feasibility study, which is quite apart from the guarantee?

The Premier replied:—

No decision has been made in connection with this matter and, therefore, it is impossible to give an answer to the question.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That was a little different from what the Minister for Development and Decentralisation said when he interjected while the member for Wellington was moving the motion.

Mr. Graham: It is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister stated quite categorically in his interjection that the U.F.G.A. would pay the bill for the feasibility study.

Mr. Graham: We were emphatic that the cost would not be borne by the State, and that has been acknowledged by your present leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS: If the State is to guarantee the large amount to be borrowed surely it is guaranteeing the payment of the feasibility study.

Mr. Graham: But the U.F.G.A. will be responsible for the payment.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It would be responsible but it did not foot the bill.

Mr. Graham: The responsibility was still theirs to meet the payment.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes, theoretically; but who was footing the bill?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: This is not theoretically. That organisation would meet the bill out of the money it would borrow.

Mr. Graham: And not from the State.

Mr. WILLIAMS: If they have to pay \$30,000 to \$40,000 for the feasibility study they are hoping to get the money out of the guarantee.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: One does not get the money out of a guarantee, but from the source from which it comes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Government is to give a guarantee to this organisation for a loan of \$23,000,000; so if there is any loss I presume the Government will meet the loss.

Mr. Bickerton: Similar to what was done in the Coral Bay venture.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That was a little different from the sort of project we are discussing. The Coral Bay project concerned tourism.

Mr. Graham: Your Government in its term in office guaranteed \$99,000,000 for various purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Once again the Minister for Development and Decentralisation is having a say.

Sir Charles Court: The amount mentioned by the Minister included guarantees given to statutory authorities.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation obtained the adjournment of the debate on the motion, but today he did not elect to make any contribution. He had his chance, but he has foregone his opportunity.

Mr. Graham: He has not foregone it.

Mr. WILLIAMS: He obtained the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Graham: It is time the honourable member studied the Standing Orders.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I did hope he would make a contribution, and I would have liked to hear it.

Mr. Graham: I did not say whether I would or would not be making a contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS: There is one aspect that tickles my fancy in respect of this subject. On the 11th April I asked a series of questions of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation. I asked—

- (1) How many proposals for—
 - (a) new abattoirs;
 - (b) extensions to existing abattoirs,
 has the Government before it for consideration at the present time?
- (2) What is the locality of each?
- (3) What amount of finance is the Government being asked to guarantee in each case?
- (4) What is the equity or finance being provided by the proposer in each case?

The Minister replied—

- (1) (a) 6.
(b) 2.
- (2) Boyup Brook.
Geraldton.
Northam.
Baldy.
Wanneroo.
Esperance.
Derby.
Carnarvon.

(3) Boyup Brook, Geraldton, Northam—joint proposal—\$23,000,000.		
		\$
Baldivis	3,000,000.
Wanneroo	1,500,000.
Esperance	1,300,000.
Derby	240,000.
Carnarvon	1,000,000.

(4) Respectively—Nil.		
		\$2,000,000.
		\$2,000,000.
		\$2,100,000.
		Nil.
		Nil.

Those were the amounts the Government was asked to guarantee. I would stress that regarding the equity or finance to be provided by the proposer in the case of the Boyup Brook, Geraldton, and Northam joint proposal there was to be no equity at all. In the case of Baldivis there was to be equity totalling \$2,000,000; in the case of Wanneroo \$2,000,000; in the case of Esperance \$2,100,000; and in the case of Derby and Carnarvon nil. I presume that the equity in the case of Derby and Carnarvon would be the present abattoir buildings. I think in respect of the abattoir at Carnarvon the Minister for Development and Decentralisation has directed that it be closed down.

Mr. Graham: That is the same abattoir, but I did not direct that at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS: According to the Press the Minister did.

Mr. Graham: That may be so.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It is rather strange that one organisation which is asking the Government to give a guarantee for finance required for abattoirs has no equity at all; whereas other abattoirs have equity of some type either in the present abattoir buildings or in cash. Whether it is for its friends that the Government is doing this I do not know, but in a normal transaction with a bank the bank likes to know what sort of equity the proposer has in putting forward a proposal.

My banker always insists I have a fair percentage. However the Government must trust these organisations concerned and hope they will do well; but later on I will point out that there is not much likelihood of this.

Earlier this evening I asked the Premier several questions concerning whether this request had been agreed to, and we will know this in the next couple of days.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You asked whether it was still under consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That is right.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: To which the answer truthfully was, "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am not having a shot at the Premier for the answer he gave. I am saying that in the next few days we will all know the Government's decision

on this particular approach for a guarantee of \$23,000,000. I am not querying the answer at all and I hope the Premier did not take it that way.

Mr. Graham: I think you should make it clear that apart from the north-west, which may be in a different category, the only abattoir which has been the subject of a guarantee by this Government is the one at Katanning. That is the only one agreed to and announced at this stage.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That may be so, but the others are under consideration.

Mr. Graham: That is so.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Normally when a person requests finance he has some equity in the whole venture.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Should you not examine every proposition submitted?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Of course we would have liked to know more about the feasibility study. However, I have other questions to ask the Minister for Agriculture in a minute concerning the stock numbers and the capacity at existing abattoirs and those which are on the way. However, I will leave that for a moment.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It depends on what you mean by "on the way."

Mr. WILLIAMS: Those under construction.

Mr. H. D. Evans: If you came up with a proposition tomorrow, it would only be right and proper for the department to look at it.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sure. I do not blame the Minister for this. I do not know, and I will not know until the announcement is made, whether or not the right thing has been done by the Government.

Mr. Graham: No, but neither do you know about Esperance or Wanneroo for instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS: But at least they have some equity which gives them an extra leg in because they are at least prepared to put money up—

Mr. Graham: That could be one factor, but there are others as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS: —whereas the others have not a cracker, apparently.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you want stock figures in addition to those supplied in my reply?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I obtained some from the industry itself and I will quote these in a moment. A short while ago I referred to the abattoir at Carnarvon and asked whether the one mentioned in my question was the same as the one directed to cease operations.

Mr. Graham: I did not direct the abattoir at Carnarvon to cease operations.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister had better check.

Mr. Graham: I have, and it is still going.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Then the Minister had better pull someone into gear.

Mr. Graham: What is more, I have no doubt that it will still be going in years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS: In *The West Australian* of the 26th June—probably a country edition—was the following:—

Abattoir Told to Close Down
Carnarvon, Sunday.—The Minister for Development and Decentralisation, Mr. Graham, has directed the Carnarvon abattoir to cease operations and dispose of its assets within one month.

I have not seen anything in the Press since then. If the Minister intends to speak on this debate perhaps he will let us know something about that too.

Mr. Hutchinson: We would like to hear from the Minister.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Definitely.

Mr. Graham: I am not very often invited by the Opposition to speak.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The article continues—

He said that his department had paid nearly \$135,000 to subsidise the abattoir since it started nearly seven years ago.

All I can say is that in the interest of decentralisation the State has had to pay far less for that than for Wundowie in the years it has been in operation.

Mr. Graham: Perhaps you are hoping.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Having dealt with quite a number of the questions I asked I would now like to deal with portions of the reply of the Minister for Agriculture to the motion of the member for Wellington. Speaking of training programmes, the Minister said—

Private abattoirs are saved this expense because they do not engage in such training programmes.

This I believe is not quite correct. Some private abattoirs do engage in training programmes.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I qualified the interjection of the member for Wellington by saying that they have training programmes, but not to anything like the same extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Not to the extent the Government ones do because they are much bigger concerns and they can do this, and are expected to. However, I will not argue the toss about that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is the point?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Just that the inference was that private abattoirs do not train anyone at all.

Mr. H. D. Evans: No, but the fact is that private abattoirs get the benefit of Government abattoir training.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Government might get the benefit of anyone I train in my workshop. We always take the chance that the fellow will leave. We cannot bind him for life.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The essential point is that it costs the Government money.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It costs other people money. They do not keep the people they train because once those people have finished their programme they are entitled to buzz off. Money is spent to train them whether they are in private enterprise or Government employ.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This is a significant loss to Government abattoirs.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It works both ways in much the same proportion.

Sir Charles Court: Some of the smaller abattoirs do a higher percentage of training.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This is true.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This I would doubt.

Mr. WILLIAMS: This is proportionate to the kill.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have to slow down the chain to enable training.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It is proportionate to the whole exercise of an abattoir.

Mr. Hutchinson: Please, one at a time!

Mr. WILLIAMS: We must disagree on this.

Mr. H. D. Evans: All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Minister also said—

Speaking in a general way, the capacity of any slaughterhouse or abattoir depends on a combination of factors which vary considerably. The member for Wellington will be aware of such factors as the availability of stock; the actual slaughtering facilities; the amount of chiller-freezer space, and the ability to dispose of by-products and effluent.

Again I agree with him, but I will take issue with him in a moment on the availability of stock which he indicated in answers to questions and in some papers he tabled when making his speech. I will not bother to read the Minister's answers because we all know them, and if we do not, we can look them up in *Hansard*. The only figures he gave for the potential kill of any abattoir were those of Government-owned establishments. He did not know the precise figures for the private abattoirs.

He did say—I am generalising now—that the abattoirs were operating to near capacity for sheep. This is not the case according to the trade. I think we all agree there is excess space which would allow more cattle to be killed in all abattoirs, both private and Government. The Government establishments last year were operating at 25 to 30 per cent. capacity so there is plenty of capacity in the State for the slaughtering of cattle.

The Minister said that he thought the sheep numbers indicated that the abattoirs were operating at near capacity. However, this is not the case according to figures supplied to me by the industry. I will not read all the figures, but merely the totals. The potential for private and Government export works in the total export agricultural areas was 7,257,000; whereas the kill in 1971 was 4,245,985. That is about 60 per cent. of the capacity for sheep at the export works.

In the nonexport works the total potential was 1,765,000 whereas the actual kill was 1,196,594. If we add the export and nonexport together the total potential was 9,022,000 and the kill for that year was only 5,442,579 which is about half the capacity. This indicates the capacity is nowhere near utilised.

I agree that at certain times during gluts this may not be the case, but no-one will build an abattoir just to satisfy a glut period of approximately three months because it is not an economic proposition. I realise this is also the case sometimes with the Government when it must undertake certain projects in order to overcome a problem and assist the industry itself—those tied up in it, but particularly the farmers. However, we do not expect anyone to build an abattoir specifically to overcome a glut period, because such an abattoir would finish up by making a loss and it would very smartly close down. No-one would provide finance for it. No abattoir is established to provide a free service. It must make a profit, and the profits are not high in the abattoir field as I will point out in a moment with a couple of quotes from the financial returns printed in various Press reports.

In addition to the potential kill of 9,000,000 sheep we also have the export of live sheep and this will total approximately 1,000,000 in one year, so this takes care of about 10,000,000 sheep.

The situation is that the farmers must retain a certain number of breeding stock and, again, from answers to questions I asked the Minister, I ascertained that about 48 to 49 per cent. of the total sheep number represents the breeding ewes. The farmer cannot utilise those very much for killing or he will have to import sheep from other States or go out of business.

Mr. H. D. Evans: In other States this goes up to 60 per cent. or so.

Mr. WILLIAMS: In that case the farmers could afford to take some out of the field.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This appeared to be a very definite trend here some 12 months ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I interjected on the Minister at the time and suggested that the price of wool might have an effect on the number of sheep available for slaughtering, and I think from memory he said that to ascertain this he would need to have the ability to gaze into a crystal ball. Since his speech the price has risen and abattoirs are running short of stock for slaughter at this particular time. I cannot visualise that another three abattoirs will assist this situation any; in actual fact, it would aggravate it.

The farmers might be happy because everyone will be vying with each other to buy the stock but then, of course, the consumer finishes up paying for it in the long run anyway.

I mentioned a moment ago that I would quote very briefly some financial returns of companies tied up in the abattoir business. According to *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 25th January, the profit of Thomas Borthwick's Australian meat operations dropped from \$1,900,000 to \$224,500 in 1971. That \$224,500 profit was made on a total turnover of \$103,600,000. I do not expect members to work out what percentage that profit represents, but I have and it is .218 per cent. of 1 per cent. Not many businesses could run on that profit.

Mr. O'Connor: What was the capital investment?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not know, but based on the turnover the company had a very small margin of profit. It would probably have been even smaller on its capital investment. When an abattoir makes this sort of profit it is a fairly dicey sort of business to enter, and I think the Government is being a little dicey too if it happens to go ahead and guarantee the \$23,000,000.

Mr. O'Connor: Very dicey.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes. It is a fairly high risk for the State to front up to, especially if it is as short of funds as we are led to believe.

I refer to another article in the *Company News and Comment* concerning the Project Development Corporation Limited. Figures are given for the December half-year, which would be December, 1971. It says—

Trading profit increased by 29.1 per cent. but net profit fell by 14.8 per cent.

Net profit is what people look for at the end of the year, not the trading profit. Net profit is what puts dollars and cents into the pocket.

I believe we could have been given far more information on this subject. I could speak on other matters, but I think I have taken up sufficient time of the House. I have no doubt other members from this side will take up certain aspects, such as the one the present Leader of the Opposition took up with the Attorney-General on the prospectus issued by the organisations.

With those remarks, I support the motion moved by the member for Wellington.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [9.01 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words in support of the motion. Quite a few of the points I had intended to make have been covered by the member for Bunbury and, in consequence, my remarks will be briefer than I had intended.

The meat industry is a very important one to the Western Australian economy. Although I could not obtain the figures, I understand exports of meat have now exceeded the value of exports of wool.

I thought the Minister, when he was speaking, would have been fair and acknowledged the difficult situation in which the previous Government found itself with relation to the drought, lack of available slaughtermen, and a slow-down in killing brought about by the restrictions imposed by the United States hygiene regulations. These had the effect of slowing down the output per man and, consequently, reduced the rate of kill at the works. I had the feeling when the Minister was speaking that, by attacking the lack of action of the previous Government, he was perhaps trying to cover up for some of the weaknesses and lack of action on the part of his own Government in the period it has occupied the Treasury bench.

I would like to make reference to a few comments the Minister made in his speech. The first one appears on page 605 of *Hansard* of Wednesday, the 12th April, 1972, and reads—

After some procrastination, and against the advice of the Towns and Austen report, the decision was made to extend the facilities at Midland.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I pointed out also that approaches began to be made to the previous Government in 1965. These were published in the Press and were never denied. The situation had built up and up.

Mr. Nalder: The Minister never quoted the report of the Manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir.

Mr. Graham: The fact remains the previous Government did nothing.

Mr. Nalder: Rubbish.

Mr. Graham: Until it was too late, and then it was in the wrong place and against advice.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Brown): Order! The member for Stirling will carry on.

Mr. STEPHENS: I was making a point about the so-called procrastination. Let us look at this term. The Towns and Austen report states, on page 11—

In our view, there is a real need for a Meat Industry Authority representative of the interests involved whose duty and responsibility it would be to continuously review the need for slaughtering capacity and determine when, and where, and the capacity of, new plants required.

This report was brought down in May, 1970. On the 18th April, 1972, I asked a question of the Minister, as follows:—

With reference to the Towns and Austen report of May, 1970, which included in its recommendations the establishment of a meat industry authority, has the present Government considered this recommendation, and, if so, what was the decision?

The answer was—

The Meat Industry Advisory Committee is currently making a detailed assessment of this matter.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Who set up the Meat Industry Advisory Committee?

Mr. STEPHENS: I do not know, but from the way the Minister has asked that question I suppose it is the present Government.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I will tell you; we set it up as a prior step to this.

Mr. STEPHENS: I am referring to the Towns and Austen report. The Minister criticised the previous Government for not taking notice of what the Towns and Austen report said.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have accused us of procrastination. We have taken a step forward. We set up the advisory committee and one of its functions is to implement this.

Mr. Graham: Your Government had the report for 10 months and did nothing.

Mr. STEPHENS: Today I asked the following question of the Minister for Agriculture:—

- (1) Has the meat industry authority, as recommended by the Towns and Austen report, been appointed?
- (2) If not, when is it intended to set up this authority?

The answer was—

The Meat Industry Advisory Committee is currently examining this matter but has not yet made a recommendation.

Three or four months later the committee is still examining the matter! I think I am quite fair in saying this is a degree

of procrastination in view of the fact that the Towns and Austen report was specific and the Minister criticised the previous Government for not accepting the recommendation in that report. As a result of a situation that was developing, it was inevitable that urgent action was required to provide additional slaughtering facilities in the minimum time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Hold it right there. We have actually done something about this. The previous Government did nothing at all.

Mr. STEPHENS: The present Government has talked about it for three months.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We set up an advisory committee which is examining the way in which this should be implemented. Surely this is a logical step.

Mr. Hutchinson: The Minister should not be making a speech sitting down.

Mr. Graham: The previous Government sat down for 10 months and did nothing at all.

Mr. STEPHENS: The present Government has appointed a committee to investigate a recommendation. I assume the Government will accept that recommendation. The Minister criticised the previous Government for ignoring a recommendation, but apparently he is not prepared to accept it himself.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We have started.

Sir Charles Court: What?

Mr. H. D. Evans: An examination of a recommendation and the manner in which this should be implemented.

Mr. STEPHENS: I think the Minister is trying to sidetrack me.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Never.

Mr. STEPHENS: I refer to another comment which the Minister made in his reply which is also to be found on page 605 of *Hansard*. It reads as follows:—

We must bear in mind that there is invariably a pressure on the available loan funds and if the spending is not sufficiently judicious and orderly to maintain a certain level over a particular period, periods will occur when we will have to make up the leeway.

I agree with that, but surely this is not new for a Government; the previous Government would have been faced with a similar situation. The previous Government was in office during a period of great progress, at a time when there were unlimited demands on the funds available. Certainly the previous Government had to spend judiciously.

I suggest that had the Brand-Nalder Government spent loan funds, or even revenue funds, in setting up new or additional facilities in advance of requirements—in other words if there had been an

over-capacity of abattoirs—the present Government, which was then the Opposition, would have been highly critical, and rightly so.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We would have applauded it had you maintained the existing ones at a standard where the export license to America was not jeopardised.

Mr. STEPHENS: I do not think that is a fair comment.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Not much!

Mr. STEPHENS: Not only were works right throughout Australia subject to the United States hygiene regulations but, in the United States itself, many works were closed down permanently or temporarily because of the increased standards required by those regulations. It was not peculiar to Western Australia, and consequently, I do not think the comment is fair or applicable.

Mr. H. D. Evans: If you look at the lack of spending over the last 10 years you will realise why the export license was jeopardised, particularly at W.A.M.E. where it was ground down and down. Something had to be done in a big way.

Sir Charles Court: You are on weak ground in referring to those works.

Mr. STEPHENS: Had most of the money been spent earlier I think it would have added to the over-capacity that existed in most of the years to which the Minister referred when he commented about the 12 years of neglect.

Mr. O'Connor: The Eastern States abattoirs were closed down.

Mr. STEPHENS: I have made that point already. Abattoirs in the Eastern States and in the United States were closed down permanently or, temporarily, until they had raised their standards.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I do not know the reasons there, but I know them here.

Mr. STEPHENS: I think the Minister may be a little biased in his assessment of the reasons here.

Mr. W. G. Young: He is having a calculated guess.

Mr. Nalder: The Government is thanking its lucky stars that we have had a bad season.

Mr. STEPHENS: I will admit that three or four years ago there was suddenly a crisis with regard to the slaughtering capacity at the Midland Junction Abattoir. If the Government is fair, it will realise this situation was brought about largely by drought. Excessive numbers of turn-offs were being brought to the abattoir for slaughter. Further, there were strikes for two successive years. I think it is more than a coincidence that the strikes occurred in the November period—the flush season period—of slaughtering. The workers at the abattoirs did not wait for

the off-season, because the strike may not have been effective at that time. Instead, they waited until the works were operating at utmost capacity. As I have said, there were strikes for two successive years. These had a detrimental effect on the ability of the abattoir to handle the stock coming through. Of course, the losses sustained by farmers through these strikes are well known. This may have added to the number of votes I received during my election campaign.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The previous Government was warned in 1965 of the impending crisis but did nothing about it.

Mr. Nalder: Sing out in another chord.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It would be just as true.

Mr. STEPHENS: I think the action taken by the previous Government in spite of the Towns and Austen report—a decision which seems to have upset the present Minister for Agriculture—has proved to be the correct one, because it alleviated the situation in which farmers found themselves because of their inability to have their stock slaughtered.

I have the killing figures for the Midland Junction Abattoir which were supplied to me by the management. I will not read them all. The figures for 1969-70, which was the year in which the first of the two strikes occurred, indicated that a total of 1,322,703 sheep and lambs were slaughtered at the abattoir. In 1970-71 the second strike occurred. I cannot recall the number lost to slaughter because of that strike.

Mr. Nalder: It was 250,000.

Mr. STEPHENS: I accept the figure given by the Leader of the Country Party and this means that 250,000 could have been added to the figures of 1,191,852 which is given as the number of sheep and lambs slaughtered in that year. I also have the figures for 1971-72, the year just ended. I am indebted to the member for Bunbury for these figures because he asked a question which enabled me to bring my figures up to date. The total killed at the Midland Junction Abattoir in the year 1971-72 was 2,090,309 sheep and lambs and represents an increase of 800,000 sheep.

I consider these figures vindicate the previous Government for taking prompt action, notwithstanding the recommendations of the Towns and Austen report.

Mr. Nalder: Sheep and lambs.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Dear oh dear! What about the year in which the prices went down to such a low ebb? You must admit the previous Government had been well and truly approached in 1968. The following year the cost to the farmers of this State was millions of dollars.

Mr. Nalder: Why are the prices so low in New South Wales at the moment?

Mr. H. D. Evans: That has nothing to do with Western Australia.

Mr. Nalder: It has a lot to do with it. It is a drought situation.

Mr. STEPHENS: The question has been answered, and I can only endorse the answer—the drought. I previously mentioned the drought and the strike which reduced the throughput. These things had a tremendous bearing on the situation which followed.

I did intend to go into great statistical detail, particularly with reference to the projection made by the Department of Agriculture. However, the member for Bunbury has adequately covered that. I would like to make one further comment: I just cannot pick up the reference in *Hansard*, but I do not think the Minister will dispute that he said stock numbers in Western Australia looked like levelling at between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000.

I have some figures taken from statistical records which indicate the stock population of Australia and the percentage slaughtered. I will not read all the figures, but I wish to give the numbers of sheep and lambs slaughtered expressed as a percentage of the total sheep and lamb population. Over the years from 1952-53 to 1970-71 the percentage slaughtered in Australia has varied between 17.68 per cent. and 24.75 per cent. In the same period in Western Australia, the percentage ranged from 10.57 per cent. to 12.72 per cent. in 1970-71. The highest percentage occurred in 1959-60 when 16.25 per cent. were slaughtered.

If we assume that the Western Australian slaughtering will get near to the Australian figure for 1970-71 of 25 per cent., this represents a quarter of the stock population, or 10,000,000 sheep, taking the highest figure mentioned by the Minister. From the figures previously mentioned by the member for Bunbury, we see that the potential at the moment is 9,000,000. If we add to this 90 per cent. of the maximum output of the proposed abattoirs at Esperance and West Meats, we have another 382,000 sheep.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have 1,000,000 live sheep on top of that.

Mr. STEPHENS: That is 9,382,000 sheep as well as approximately 1,000,000 live sheep. Therefore, even allowing for a large increase in the population, it would appear we have very close to sufficient capacity or even over-capacity at the moment.

We all know that a scheme has been proposed and discussed for some time by the U.F.G.A. and the T.L.C. I will have to quote figures from memory at the moment as I cannot find my notes, but if the three works come into operation there will be capacity for another 4,000,000 sheep a year. When we consider the other

figures I have mentioned, this is a ridiculous situation. For the Government to allow even one abattoir in the existing circumstances would be an irresponsible decision.

Mr. Williams: The figure is 4,500,000 sheep.

Mr. STEPHENS: Thank you, I erred a little on the light side when I said 4,000,000. I am trying to be fair.

A decision to permit new abattoirs would be completely irresponsible in the circumstances. I know the claim has been made that the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposition has been researched and the feasibility study shows that it is a viable venture. I assume that this conclusion is on the basis that there is a full flow-through of stock. In view of the figures I have just quoted, it would be impossible for these abattoirs to attain full capacity. It can be safely assumed therefore that the proposition will run into trouble.

If the Government guarantees the loan to these organisations, it appears that it will have to pick up the tab and pay out the money. If the Government has this sort of money to spend recklessly, may I, as the member for Stirling, stake a claim for schools, police stations, water supplies, and public works generally. The Government is illadvised to proceed further with its negotiations on this proposition. With those few comments I support the motion.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [9.20 p.m.]: I hoped that we would hear from the Minister for Development and Decentralisation on this issue because his colleague, when speaking to the motion, said that certain information would be conveyed to us by the Minister. However, at this stage one cannot gauge whether he intends to participate in the debate or not. He would have been more anxious to participate if the debate had proceeded last April. We should all remind ourselves that when the motion was introduced earlier in the year the situation was very different from what it is today. Of course, it will be different again in another six months. This is one of the peculiarities of the industry. It is not like a manufacturing industry where precise timetables of production and demand are possible.

The Minister for Agriculture spoke to this motion in April, and at that time his colleague was very confident that he would demonstrate how he could produce abattoirs almost "two a penny". We lost count of the number of abattoirs we were to have. We are now waiting to see which one we will get because the whole of the case put forward by the Minister for Agriculture on behalf of the Government will collapse to the ground if some of the projected abattoirs do not in fact materialise.

I would like to refer to the meeting called by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association. I was not at the meeting but some of my colleagues were and reports were published in the association's journal. I sensed that there was some conflict in the views expressed by the two Ministers. On the one hand the Minister for Development and Decentralisation said in effect, "I have so many propositions for abattoirs that it is almost embarrassing. I do not know what the previous Government was doing." On the other hand, from the figures published and the comments made by the Minister for Agriculture, I feel he took a more realistic and sober line and indicated, to my understanding anyhow—

Mr. Jamieson: There never has been any conflict.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Wait a minute. The Minister indicated that we could have too much capacity and thereby the whole industry would become uneconomic and collapse.

Mr. Graham: We acknowledge that the Minister for Development and Decentralisation had had many approaches made to him and his department. The Minister for Agriculture explained the availability of stock. There is no conflict whatever.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is all very well for the Minister for Development and Decentralisation to dismiss this with a flick of the fingers and say there was no conflict whatever. However, particularly when he spoke at this meeting, he gave the impression that he could whistle up abattoirs from the sky.

Mr. Graham: I said that increasing numbers of people were coming in with propositions to establish abattoirs, and this is perfectly true.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I just wish to tell the Minister something: While the previous Government was in office there were plenty of people who wanted to establish abattoirs.

Mr. Graham: What did you do about it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We did plenty. However, these people wanted to establish them on their own terms—terms which were completely unacceptable to the Government and to the people who would have been the patrons of the particular abattoirs.

Mr. Graham: We will tell you a few of the places in which they wanted to establish them.

Mr. O'Connor: Pinjarra.

Sir CHARLES COURT: There were several who wanted to establish abattoirs in the metropolitan area for a start.

Mr. Nalder: Midland.

Mr. Graham: Any in the country?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes.

Mr. O'Connor: People would promise us money and then go back on the promise.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We experienced exactly what the Minister is experiencing at the present time. People wanted to establish abattoirs, but always on certain conditions, and usually on the basis that we gave some form of guarantee or otherwise made it financially possible.

Mr. Graham: There is nothing wrong with that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not saying there was anything wrong with it, but at that time the demand for killing capacity was quite different, say, in 1964-65, from what it was during the later critical period. Intensive industrial strikes occurred during this period. I want to make the point that this industry will never be completely predictable. It is so different from a manufacturing industry which is churning out cars or radios.

Mr. Graham: We are aiming to have abattoir capacity—something which was not present when you were in office. You did nothing about it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation keeps saying we did nothing about it. That is completely untrue.

Mr. Graham: What did you do?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister overlooks the fact that during the life of the previous Government very efficient rural abattoirs were established which made a great contribution to the needs of the industry. The Minister is giving the impression that nothing happened. The member for Wellington has a very fine abattoir in his electorate.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Katanning did not get under way in your day.

Mr. Nalder: That was not the fault of the Government.

Mr. Hutchinson: It was certainly in the pipeline.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is under way now.

Mr. Graham: It is to the credit of this Government that it is under way now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Nalder: We did everything that was asked of us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation speaks about Katanning. I say quite categorically that it was through no fault of the then Minister for Agriculture, the Minister for Industrial Development, or any other Minister of the previous Government that Katanning never got under way. We leaned over backwards to try to find a way to make this proposition viable. On

at least three occasions in this building we spent hours in consultation with these people.

Mr. Graham: It did not take us long.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If these people tell you the facts, they will say that the previous Government leaned over backwards to try to get the project off the ground.

Mr. Graham: And did not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It had to be established on a firm basis. Because of the work accomplished by the previous Government, many of the unrealistic factors of the project were removed. When this Government took office a new proposition, which was a projection of the previous one, was put forward.

Mr. Williams: There was a lot in the pipeline when you took over.

Mr. Graham: We had nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I was hoping the Minister would take advantage of the motion moved by my colleague to give us a clear statement, not only of the situation covered by the request for information, but also of the Government's intentions to deal with the situation. He gave us a lot of words and figures but did not give a clear picture of how the Government intended to cope with the situation, not only now but also in the future.

The motion is very clearly set out under several headings and seeks to obtain a clear picture of the situation pertaining to abattoirs so that we, as a Parliament, can understand what we have, what we need, and where we are going. Having heard and read the Minister's submissions, including the papers he tabled, I must admit that one still has to get down and do one's own arithmetic and make one's own assumptions to get an idea of what the industry needs in the future and what will happen to it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What further information do you need which you cannot obtain?

Sir CHARLES COURT: At no stage has the Minister for Agriculture committed himself exactly as to what is needed to ensure that the required amount of capacity is provided, including the reserve capacity to take care of fluctuations which are inevitable. At no stage has the Minister committed himself on this point. Apparently the Minister for Development and Decentralisation has all these things in the "pipeline," as he says, and none of them are coming out.

We will be very interested to read of the decision which the Government makes in respect of the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposition. If the letter is written today it should be received on Friday or Saturday

and we will have an answer by Monday—certainly before we meet on Thursday. We are at some disadvantage discussing this matter tonight, because perhaps the Government has approved of one, none, or all three of the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposals.

I have read the Premier's answers and it would take somebody much cleverer than I am to work out what the Government has decided, because it has given one set of answers in this House and another set of answers in another place. It may not be a bad thing to have a look at what was said in the reply to the question that was asked here, and the reply that was given to the question in another place. In another place The Hon. T. O. Perry, M.L.C. asked the following question:—

Is it a fact that an agreement has been signed or is about to be signed whereby the Government guarantees or provides large sums of money for the establishment of abattoirs?

The answer he received was—

On the assumption that the question refers to a proposal submitted by the United Farmers and Graziers' Association in conjunction with the Trades and Labor Council, no agreement has been signed or is about to be signed whereby the Government guarantees large sums of money for the establishment of abattoirs.

In view of the fact that the answer to his second question was "See answer to (1)" there is no reason for me to read his second question. I then had to apply a little logic to the answer that was given to a question concerning the matter before this House. The member for Murray asked the following question:—

- (1) What is the present situation as regards the possible development of an abattoir at Boyup Brook?
- (2) Does the Government agree that the proposition is a feasible and economically viable one?
- (3) When can it be expected that a decision will be made by the Government as regards financial assistance?

The answer given to him was—

A decision has been made, but the parties concerned have not yet been advised.

A similar answer was given to the member for Bunbury who asked a question about the financial guarantees the Government was considering giving to all or any of the proposed abattoirs to be established by U.F.G.A. and T.L.C.

If I follow the normal line of logic I would say that the Government had decided not to give any guarantees to this project.

Mr. Graham: Why do you say that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is if we follow the normal principles of applying logic. However, we will be kept in breathless suspense until the Government's decision is announced on Monday morning in the Press. If I submitted this matter to the member for Boulder-Dundas as a legal man I am sure he would come out with the same answer that I have reached; that is, that the Government is, in fact, thinking of doing nothing. However, I have learnt from my experience in this place, that one does not apply the normal rules of logic in seeking to find an answer to the problems that arise here.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You do not jump to conclusions.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is the practical way of applying ourselves to these matters, but if one uses the normal pattern of logic to make a judgment on the type of answer that has been given to questions that have been asked, one would say that the Government has decided that it will not back the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposition.

Mr. Graham: You have been waiting for this for months so why not wait a few days longer?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is rather peculiar that the Government, in putting forward a Supply Bill for an amount of over \$200,000,000, has not considered it desirable to advise Parliament about this matter.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you not think that the persons who have put up the proposition are entitled to know the result before they are called upon to read an announcement of it in the Press?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not disagree with that, but in the circumstances what I would have done, with a view to being courteous to both parties, would be to advise the people concerned by telephone of the decision that had been made and then make a statement to the Parliament. Both parties would then have been satisfied, but now the Parliament, which has to consider a Supply Bill of such magnitude without all the information, is left in the situation of having to read the newspaper on Monday morning to ascertain what the Government has decided. I do not think this is fair and proper, particularly in the circumstances when this has been such a contentious matter.

We will see how my deductions work out when the answers are given, but I would be surprised if my deductions are found to be incorrect.

Mr. Graham: When a private concern does business with the Government, surely it does not forfeit all the rights of ordinary business treatment?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not saying it does, but I have put forward my method of dealing with this particular situation.

It is not the usual problem that concerns a Government, but, on the other hand, Governments must have some regard for unusual problems.

Mr. Graham: If the Leader of the Opposition himself made an application to the Government for assistance, surely he would be entitled to receive advice from it personally rather than read about the Government's decision in the morning paper?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have given an answer to that question. In the circumstances, to be fair to both parties, if I were in the Premier's position I would have telephoned the parties concerned and then made a statement to the Parliament. I think this would have been a better way to handle the situation.

Mr. Graham: There may be all sorts of involved terms and conditions. You never know. You are only guessing, are you not?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Had we done it this way we would have been here until 3.00 a.m. or 4.00 a.m. tomorrow listening to protests and motions of all kinds, with the Opposition playing tricks with the Standing Orders. I can visualise the Premier, if he had been the Leader of the Opposition; he would have had the time of his life. He used to love it. He would have had us here until the early hours of tomorrow morning and we would have had tears all over the carpet because of the Opposition's claims that it was being treated with contempt. I could almost make the speech for the Premier now, but I do not intend to.

I return to the motion before us. Prior to dealing with another aspect of the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. proposition, I want to reiterate to the Minister that he has not given us the information requested in the motion. He has not gone beyond stating a mass of words and figures. He has not done what the Parliament is asking him to do; to give us a picture of where he is going, or where his Government is going with the provision of abattoirs not only by the private sector, but also by the Government sector.

In the course of his remarks the Minister referred to the market for meat with rather a defeatist attitude. I wonder whether he would say the same today, because he was adopting a pessimistic outlook towards the marketing of meat when he replied to this motion in April last—

Mr. H. D. Evans: The F.A.O. reports are that there will be a shortage of sheep meat in 1980.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When the Minister was replying to this motion he indicated that as far as the export markets were concerned, the position was critical and difficult.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I think you should have read that in proper context. If we are to chase markets for our prime cuts of meat or for our pork we have to cater for the specific requirement of the market we are chasing. This can be done only by proper trading practices, proper production of animals, and proper presentation of the meat products.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No-one is questioning that contention at all, and it is rather pathetic that we have to extract information by way of interjection from the Minister. I do not disagree with the fact that we have to enter a more specialised form of market, but the Minister is portraying a picture of some great difficulty and almost pessimism in regard to any attempts to sell the meat. If we go about it the right way there is no need for any pessimism in this market, whether it be for sheep or for beef.

In the old days an abattoir was merely a slaughterhouse. Carcasses were produced and were placed on the market, and that was that. But in the future we will have to follow the line followed by some other countries when they get into difficulties. They had to completely rethink their meat marketing and as a result of going through trials and tribulations because of various diseases and other problems they have taken special precautions and now find themselves with a much more buoyant meat economy than ever before. It was the objective of the previous Minister for Agriculture and the previous Government to plan for future operations on a basis that would go far beyond providing merely an abattoir. The idea was to provide meat processing works of high quality, and the final objective was to package special cuts of meat in packs prepared in this State that would find their way, already packaged and labelled, on to some of the supermarkets of Germany, Japan, U.K. and other countries.

I think that is a fair summation of what was intended by my colleague, the previous Minister for Agriculture, and myself when we sought out and negotiated the Baldvis site. We managed to select the Baldvis site after tremendous difficulty. For example, we had to get a local authority that would agree to the establishment of an abattoir within its boundaries. The Baldvis site was selected because of its location in proximity to the railway, roads and the necessary type of work force required for the operation of the works. The present Minister for Development and Decentralisation has announced three times the proposed works on the Baldvis site as though it were something new. In fact, I have a confession to make. I backed a horse of that name to win the trotting derby only because the Minister had announced the site so often. I was of the opinion that

with such a persistent "tip", it was not possible for it to be beaten in the derby and that is why I backed it!

However, departing from the facetious line, an important reason that the Baldvis works were sited on the present location was that the site was so close to a potential large female work force. In this new look at the industry we have to develop in Western Australia we will require a tremendous proportion of female employees.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Why did you not do something about this?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We did do something about it, and there is nothing the present Government can say to deceive the public by denying the fact that my colleagues and I managed to get the then Government of the day to make an announcement about those works before the election. The Minister for Agriculture is getting very excited, but if he will listen for a while he will find we are trying to be helpful, because we are not so clueless as he may think.

The Baldvis site was selected for a good reason. It is an ideal site because of its topography; it is served by an ideal transport system, and is an ideal spot for the recruitment of female labour. What is more, it is a good location because it is a fair distance away from established meat works. This was one of the few times I was in complete agreement with the union secretary. He criticised the expansion of the Midland abattoirs. Because of the critical industrial situation there, he thought that we should establish an abattoir elsewhere rather than expand Midland. However there were special circumstances.

I will now return to the Towns and Austen report that has been quoted so often. I am not here to defend my colleague, the previous Minister for Agriculture, because he does not need any defending. If the present Government talks to its advisers it will find that the previous Government had difficulty in making a decision to establish an abattoir at Baldvis rather than expand Midland immediately. I think we would have lost two years had we said we would establish the new works at Baldvis instead of expanding Midland.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Well, why did you not do something about it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: There is a good reason. If the Minister will go back and consult with the advisers who advised us he will soon ascertain that there was good reason for action not being taken in earlier years. First of all, we could not get anyone to undertake this type of project on terms that were acceptable to both the Government and those who would use the abattoir. Secondly, the need was not critical back

in 1965 and immediately thereafter. The need became critical due to a set of seasonal and other circumstances which are quite beyond the control of any Government, or Minister—including the present Minister, as good as he might think he is.

Mr. H. D. Evans: So far as the Chairman of the Australian Meat Board is concerned, the information is that the sole reason was that the lack of abattoir facilities in this State was responsible for most farmers in Western Australia losing millions of dollars. I would mention that the former Premier was present when that statement was made.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: A person can always be very wise after the event. One must consider all these decisions in the light of all the circumstances. I will say that if there had not been the sustained industrial strife at that time the farmers of the State would have saved millions of dollars, regardless of any additional abattoir facilities. Also, as the member for Stirling said, the workers picked the most critical, the most sensitive and cruel time to do what they did.

Tremendous capacity was going to waste week after week, not for just a couple of days. We must have some regard for this because had the capacity even been doubled this would not have helped us out of that situation if people were not prepared to work and use the capacity.

The Minister referred to the United States and D.P.I. requirements. I know these were severe, but he implied that the previous Government brought about a critical situation so far as the hygiene and acceptability of the local works were concerned. This is not true, because the Government of the day kept up with the requirements. If it were not keeping up with them it was the fault of management; but to my knowledge the management was always on the back of the Government anticipating the increasing needs.

The Minister might not know this, but the higher standards of the U.S. and D.P.I. were not something which came out overnight. They came out in instalments. We would meet the first instalment and would be just about on top of it when up would come something else. It was not something announced overnight and was not done in one hit.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You spent \$1,500,000 in 10 years and we, in the last two years, are up for double that; but you allowed the structure and basics to deteriorate so we have to make major alterations.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister is using up my time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The place would fall down if—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir David Brand: Ten years ago it was never given a—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister had unlimited time and he did not make a good fist of answering the debate. It is about time he kept quiet and gave me a chance in my limited time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I did not want to upset you.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The previous Government met the needs of both works as required. It was not something served up by notice in 1960-1962. It was progressive. It is true that in the last few years a tremendous amount had to be spent, but that was not peculiar to us. Look what was done to the Wyndham works and the works on the Queensland coast. At one stage a dozen works in Australia were shut down.

Mr. Graham: Because of direct neglect and total lack of appreciation of the situation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister is now reflecting on the manager of Robb Jetty who is one of the most competent in Australia.

Mr. Graham: I am reflecting on the Government of the day.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He is also reflecting on the manager of the Midland abattoir, because neither manager could tell you truthfully that his wishes in respect of these matters were ever ignored, and huge sums were used in the finish—

Mr. Graham: Yes, in the finish.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Because that was the time when the great demand took place.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Did the management wish the place doubled?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It became intensive towards the finish, not only in Western Australia. It became a crisis in Australia as a whole. Some places were shut down for months and whole seasons were lost. Yet we lost only a small amount of time. I hazard a guess that if an inventory were taken of all major export works in Australia it would be found that the Midland and Robb Jetty works lost less time as a result of being shut down because of the condemnation under the D.P.I. requirements than any other similar works in Australia. This gives the answer more effectively than I can.

Mr. Graham: They were burying the sheep on the farms.

Sir CHARLES COURT: During a period of drought and intense industrial strife.

Mr. H. D. Evans: And a shortage of abattoir facilities.

Mr. Graham: As a consequence of your neglect to provide adequate facilities.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: You fouled it up.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister has not at this stage given us any indication of the Government's policy and attitude in regard to the protection given to the Government works in the metropolitan area. I want to make my position clear. I think they have been protected for too long and it is time—

Mr. Graham: What did you do about it in 12 years?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We had resolved the protection was to be taken off.

Mr. Graham: What did you do about it in 12 years? Just talked about it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is the only way to get a major works established in Baldivis or places like that; that is, to take off this unfair restriction placed on private works.

Mr. Graham: Which you kept there for 12 years.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Under it they are not allowed to participate in local trade except for the permitted percentage—

Mr. H. D. Evans: Ten per cent.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —and then only from export rejects. I think it was the present Minister for Development and Decentralisation who on one occasion when in Opposition asked why we should have the reject meat on the local market if it were not good enough for the export market.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You would support such a move?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I believe it must come if we want a major private works in the metropolitan area. The Minister will find that that is my view recorded on the files.

Mr. Graham: Not in the record of what you did about it in 12 long years.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It did not have to be done in 12 years; it was in the critical last year when decisions had to be made.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Everything is so urgent now we are in Government. Look at the amount we have spent on abattoirs compared with what you spent. We are both unafraid and unashamed.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Thank goodness we made some decisions for the present Government before we went out—

Mr. Graham: The wrong decisions—

Sir CHARLES COURT: —or the farmers would have to cut the throats of their sheep on their farms today, had the demand continued.

Mr. Graham: —against the advice of the officers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Not against the advice, but based on the advice of the officers.

Mr. Graham: What about that report you have?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Towns and Austen were not officers of the department.

Mr. Graham: Of course they were. What did you get the report for?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We got the report.

Mr. Graham: And chose to ignore it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If we had had the time we would have implemented it, but we had to deal with a bad situation, and not in two years' time, but by the following September.

Mr. H. D. Evans: A situation you let arise, though.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No. The Minister is quite wrong.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Oh no I am not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not have to defend my colleague. He knows the answers because he was so heavily involved. I was involved because it was another industry and we were trying to work together towards the day when we would have a much more sophisticated industry processing meat into a packaged form for sale on the export market—and quality meat the Minister is acknowledging as being the marketing of the future.

I want to get back to the question of the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C.

Sir David Brand: A great partnership.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is the great partnership which took place following the pact.

Mr. Graham: It used to be Hancock and Wright; now it is U.F.G.A.-T.L.C.!

Sir David Brand: We do not have to worry about Hancock and Wright; they have millions.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If it had been anyone else but U.F.G.A. in partnership with the T.L.C. they would not have got inside the Minister's door. It is probably the greatest scandal of all time. It is the greatest scandal we have ever seen and if it had involved anyone else he would have

been hauled up before the beak for breaching the Companies Act, the co-operatives law, or the associations incorporation law. We had a document which we produced to the present Attorney-General.

Mr. Graham: You sound like Senator Greenwood.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We produced a prospectus, acknowledged by the Attorney-General as having been marked "Prospectus," and it did not comply in any part at all with the requirements of the Act. However, the Attorney-General white-washed it.

I will not go through the whole of the sad story. If people are allowed to use an unauthorised prospectus and use it to raise money, without a single prosecution taking place—if this can be done within the law—we have left the situation wide open for the very people we tried to keep out of this type of promotional work. Many years ago this Parliament faced up to this matter, ahead of any other State in Australia I believe. I refer to the question of share hawking and similar activities.

We found that no matter what questions we asked the Attorney-General, or what prompting we gave him, he was always looking into the matter or telling us what was being done. From what I have read, and from what I know, nothing will convince me that this was within the law. If it was within the law I think we will have to introduce a few more Statutes to avoid this sort of thing happening. The situation will be left wide open for people to raise money without conforming to the strict requirements concerning prospectuses which we have carefully written into our Companies Act.

Sir David Brand: What happens to those people who put their dollars into the scheme?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I think I can best answer that question by referring to page 1193 of *Hansard*, 1972. I asked a question of the Attorney-General as follows:—

- (1) Has he or departments under his portfolios made any studies or inquiries about U.F.G.A. incorporation and the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. methods of seeking to raise funds and conduct operations for a major abattoirs project since he last answered questions from me on this subject?

This was after months and months of questioning during the previous session, and further questioning in the first part of the present session which terminated on the 2nd June. My question went on—

- (2) If not, why have not studies been made in view of the nature of previous questions?

The Attorney-General replied to the second part of my question as follows:—

- (2) It has not been considered necessary to conduct any inquiries. Information has been received that all persons who have subscribed in the terms of the "prospectus" have been admitted—

And this is an interesting thing. I do not know whether the people concerned realise this, but they had the privilege of being admitted—

—as members of U.F.G.A. and the moneys have been paid to that body.

That answers partly the question raised by my colleague as to what happened to those people. They now have the privilege of being classed as members of U.F.G.A.

Sir David Brand: A very poor return, I should say.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was admitted by the Attorney-General that those people were not in the venture, the subject of the prospectus, but were now made members of the body known as U.F.G.A.

Sir David Brand: They have been harnessed with a liability.

Sir CHARLES COURT: My third question was as follows:—

- (3) Is he satisfied U.F.G.A. is properly incorporated and carrying on within the terms of the appropriate Statutes?

The answer is very significant. The Attorney-General said—

- (3) U.F.G.A. is not incorporated but the necessary certificate to enable incorporation has been granted by me.

After all these months. They were still not even incorporated at that stage, when they were taking the money and people were being admitted as members. Part

(4) of my question was as follows:—

- (4) Is he satisfied U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. are seeking to raise funds for the abattoirs project within the terms of the appropriate Statutes?

I think the answer to that part of the question is the "daddy" of them all; it is a real "daddy". It was as follows:—

- (4) I am unaware of any statutory breach committed by U.F.G.A. in the raising of funds.

In other words that is the "classic" legal man's way of saying he was doing the Nelson trick as far as that particular aspect is concerned. I think I can leave that now.

Mr. Graham: I should think so.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It would be quite wrong for the Government to back this venture. Of course, the Premier has undertaken that if the Government agrees

to guarantee the sum requested by the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C., he will submit the project to Parliament for ratification. In that case we will have ample chance to discuss it here.

Mr. Jamieson: He has been very fair.

Sir CHARLES COURT: From the smile on the Premier's face I have an idea that my guess is right.

Sir David Brand: It is a smile of relief.

Mr. Nalder: We will possibly read the answer in the *Sunday Independent*.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes. I believe the member for Wellington has done a service to the Parliament by bringing forward this motion. I am sorry the Minister did not see fit to take us into his confidence and let us have a look into the future, and at the planning he has undertaken.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Runciman.

House adjourned at 10.00 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 10th August, 1972

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [11.03 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.04 a.m.]: I cannot let the third reading of this Bill pass without making further comment. There have been occasions, even as late as last evening, when an accusation was made by the Government that the Opposition was not sincere in its opposition to a Bill; and that was accepted because no comment was made on that Bill in the Committee stage. The Opposition, did, in fact make a protest in respect of a particular clause of the Bill in the Committee stage. I do not want to have the accusation, that the Opposition is not sincere when it does not take the opportunity to protest, levelled at us again.

There are a number of matters which I did not cover in the second reading debate. They came about as a result of answers given to questions asked by me some time ago relative to the operations of the State Government Insurance Office.