I suppose there are very few members in this Chamber who have ever been to Lake Varley, but I can assure them that it has proved to be a successful wheat-growing area, particularly with the farm machinery that is now available.

While these people are able to develop their land they find difficulty in getting the grain to the various CBH receival points. In most cases railways serve the major districts, but there is no service to the areas that were opened up later. I hope the Main Roads Department gives earnest consideration to this submission with a view to alleviating the plight of the people who are developing these remote areas.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.25 p.m.]: The amendments contained in this Bill are consequential upon the previous Bill the debate of which has been adjourned a moment ago—the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill. We have no objection to the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.28 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 28th October, 1975

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

BILLS (10): ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Inventions Bill.
2. Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.
3. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.
4. Recording of Evidence Bill.
5. Auction Sales Act Amendment Bill.
6. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.
7. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.
8. Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill.
9. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
10. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Report: Tabling

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I table the annual report of the Parliamentary Library of Western Australia for the year ended the 29th July, 1975.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 503).

QUESTIONS (25): ON NOTICE

1. METROPOLITAN HIGH SCHOOLS

Prevocational Centres

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

(1) Have any of the metropolitan five year high schools not been provided with prevocational centres and, if so, which schools?

(2) Are these high schools to receive priority rating when any future prevocational centres are provided?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) Yes.

(b) John Curtin Senior High School.
City Beach Senior High School.
Tuart Hill Senior High School.
Kewdale Senior High School.

(2) The above schools will receive due consideration in relation to the needs of other schools should additional funds become available for the provision of prevocational centres.

2. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

Meetings and Remuneration of Members

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Traffic:

In reference to my question 47 of Wednesday, 22nd October, and his reply to part (3) (b) concerning the payments to local government representatives on the Road Traffic Authority, would he provide a breakdown of how the amount of $2 468.08 is arrived at?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

	$
Meeting Fees—24 attendances at $45.00	1 080.00
Travelling Expenses—	
Fares, mileage allowance, hotel expenses ..	1 388.08
	2 468.08

3. TOWN PLANNING

Linear Park: Swan River-Mandurah

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

What consideration has the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority given to the concept of an unbroken linear park system between the Swan River and Mandurah as recommended in the T. S. Martin report on the south-west corridor and which would seem to complement the Lake Joondalup-Neerabup National Park-Yanchep National Park system in the north-west corridor?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The current "Cockburn Amendment" is intended to complement the existing metropolitan region scheme in achieving both coastal reserves and an extension of the "parks and recreation" system from North Lake southwards as a continuous reserve. The MRPA is considering the total implications of the T. S. Martin report.

4. HEALTH

PVC Food Wrappers

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

(1) Adverting to questions on notice 7 of 18th March, 1975 and 48 of 20th March, 1975, has he had reason to change those answers in the light of more recent research into PVC?

(2) If so, what was the date of such research and by whom was it undertaken?

(3) Was this problem considered recently by the Food Standards Committee?

(4) If so, what was the date of the meeting and the findings of the committee?

(5) Who are the members of the committee and what bodies do they represent?

(6) If the answer to (3) is in the negative is the matter to be considered shortly?

(7) If so, what are the details?

(8) To what extent is PVC used for food packaging in Australia?

(9) Has the National Health and Medical Research Council recommended vinyl chloride limits for material in contact with foods?

(10) If so, what are the limits, are they enforceable and what scrutiny is in operation in Western Australia to see that they are enforced?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A comprehensive report was published by the Plastics Institute of Australia in 1975.

(3) Yes.

(4) August 1975. A recommendation was made to the National Health and Medical Research Council.

(5) Food Standards (Standing) Committee:

Dr F. H. Reuter, Food Technologist, Rose Bay, New South Wales (Chairman).

Mrs J. Coy, Nutritionist, Department of Health Services, Tasmania.

Mr A. H. Downer, Chief Food Inspector, Health Commission of New South Wales.

Mr J. Edinger, Food Technologist, Department of Public Health, Perth.

Professor R. A. Edwards, University of New South Wales, Kensington, N.S.W.

Dr R. H. C. Fleming, Medical Officer, Department of Health, Canberra (Deputy Chairman and Convenor).

Mr W. C. K. Hammer, Assistant Secretary, Department of Primary Industry, Canberra.

Mr J. M. Kingsey, Research and Development, Kraft Foods Ltd., Melbourne.

Mr H. D. Kruger, Chief Health Inspector, A.C.T. Health Services.

Mr C. Murray, Chief Food Inspector, Department of Health, Queensland.

Mr I. S. Ogle, Technical Secretary, Council of Australian Food Technology Association Inc.

Dr F. E. Peters, Australian Government Analyst, Department of Science, Canberra.

Mr G. L. Robinson, Assistant Chief Inspector, Department of Public Health, South Australia.

Dr B. K. Sellinger, 8 Robson Street, Garran, A.C.T.

Mr R. C. Stanhope, Food Technologist and Senior Chemist, Department of Health, Victoria.

Miss C. N. Turner, Chief Research Dietitian, Cancer Institute, Melbourne.

Mr S. W. C. Smith, Principal Chemist, Australian Department of Health (Secretary).

(6) and (7) Not applicable.

(8) No exact statistical data is available.

(9) Yes. Vinyl chloride monomer concentration in the following applications shall not exceed the limitations set out hereunder—

(i) in rigid PVC containers and utensils intended for use in contact with food or which may normally come into contact with food—5 mg/kg.

(ii) in flexible PVC films intended for use in contact with food or which may normally come into contact with food—1 mg/kg.

(iii) in foods and beverages—0.05 mg/kg.

(10) These are interim standards and the recommendation of the Food Standards Committee, which has not yet been released by Council, relates to levels of monomer in foods. This will be considered by the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee with a view to inclusion in regulations under the Health Act. When these recommendations have been approved by Parliament, routine periodical examination of food samples will be made.

5. PARTICLE BOARD PROJECT, DARDANUP

Environmental Protection Review

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

(1) Further to question on notice 53 asked on 12th August, 1975, has the Minister yet received the composite report from the Environmental Protection Authority on the Wesply (Dardanup) Agreement Act?

(2) If so, will he please table a copy of that report?

(3) If not, when does he expect to receive the report?

(4) Further to part (4) of that question, would he please table recommendations which he has stated were made by the Department of Environmental Protection?

(5) Were these recommendations accepted and the agreement modified accordingly?

(6) If not, what are the reasons for the Government rejecting the recommendations?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) At the earliest possible opportunity.

(4) As indicated in the answer given to question 53 on 12th August, the Department of Conservation and Environment made recommendations to the Department of Industrial Development which administers the agreement.

(5) The terms of the agreement and licenses required thereunder are considered adequate to achieve the purposes of the department's recommendations.

(6) Answered by (5).

6. WATER SUPPLIES

Dams: South of Mandurah

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) At page 189 of the T. S. Martin report on the south-west corridor, does the statement that "dams south of the Mandurah area are being considered for incorporation into the (metropolitan) system in the long term" include existing dams which supply water to the Harvey and other coastal plain irrigation schemes?

(2) Does the infrastructure of $83 million for water supply, provided at page 61 of the report include service reservoirs and reticulation mains which are connected to the consumer?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) and (2) T. S. Martin & Associates were commissioned by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority to prepare its report. The report refers to a number of strategy options relating to the south-west corridor up to the year 2000, including water supply.

The Water Board is not in the position to particularise on the general comments of the firm referred to.

7. PELICANS
Peel Inlet

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) What officers are available to police the Peel Inlet including Boodalan Island?

(2) Is it a fact that great damage has been done to a pelican rookery on the island?

(3) Is there any evidence as to what has happened to the adult birds that previously nested on the island?

(4) What is the Government intending to do to prevent a recurrence of the outrage?

(5) How many honorary wardens are there in the State?

(6) Do they have sufficient powers to apprehend vandals?

(7) How many such honorary wardens are resident in the general area referred to?

(8) Approximately what percentage of applicants are appointed as honorary wardens?

(9) How often would an island such as this be visited by officers of the department?

(10) Have the numbers of pelicans in waters within approximately 200 kilometres of Perth decreased noticeably in the past 10 or 15 years, and if so, to what extent?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Two fisheries officers stationed at Mandurah and one district warden stationed at Waroona.

(2) Reports have been received but so long after the event was said to have happened that positive confirmation has not been obtained.

(3) There is no evidence but many pelicans are still on the estuary.

(4) Patrols will be maintained.

(5) About 800.

(6) Yes.

(7) Mandurah Shire, 11;
Murray Shire, 6.

(8) About 88%.

(9) Fisheries officers patrol about 15 times a month in the waters nearby but actual landings on the island would be less as the birds are easily disturbed. Additional visits are made infrequently by the district warden and by a research officer.

(10) No. Our officers believe the numbers may have increased rather than decreased.

8. WATER SUPPLIES
Metropolitan Aquifer System: Recharging

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) (a) What is the nature of studies being undertaken by the Metropolitan Water Board for recharging the metropolitan aquifer system;

(b) when are such studies anticipated to be completed?

(2) What environmental studies have been undertaken in regard to drainage proposals by various authorities, as reported on by the T. S. Martin report?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) (a) Studies have been limited to surface spreading of wastewater effluent on the board's sand disposal sites in conjunction with chemical and bacteriological sampling of the ground water from monitoring bores around the sites.

(b) A proposal for expandable sites is under consideration by the Commonwealth Government under the national sewerage programme. These sites, if started, would extend over a number of years.

(2) Firm proposals for drainage have not yet been developed.

9. TOWN PLANNING
South-west Corridor: Services

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) Do the infrastructure costs, provided at page 61 of the T. S. Martin report on the south-west corridor, for electricity, sewerage and water supply, include the whole service system from major facilities like power generating stations, sewerage treatment plants and storage reservoirs to reticulation to blocks to be served?

(2) Does the item for electricity also include gas services?

(3) At page 194 of the report it is stated that costing is based on supply to 50% of houses for electricity and gas while it is indicated that telephone costs are based on 65% of houses being connected. Since power is considered by most to be an essential service, could the significance of this apparent low servicing be explained?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) The costings quoted on page 194 of the report relate to gas and telephone only. Costs for power are based on a 100% connection.

10. NOISE ABATEMENT
Regulations

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

(1) What progress has been made in compiling regulations to deal with industrial noise?

(2) When can these be expected?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) The Noise and Vibration Control Council and its Advisory Committee is currently engaged in amending and adapting the National Health and Medical Research Council's model regulations for hearing conservation.

(2) A final draft will be available early next year and it is hoped to gazette regulations by the middle of the year.

11. WALPOLE-NORNALUP NATIONAL PARK
Development

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

(1) Does the National Parks Board intend opening up and developing the western part of the Walpole-Nornalup national park?

(2) (a) Have there been many requests to have the national park made more accessible, particularly to vehicles;

(b) if so, what has been the general nature of and response to such requests?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) No decision has been made on this matter pending a management plan for the national park which is at present being prepared.

(2) (a) A number of requests have been received.

(b) Some access has been permitted.

12. EDUCATION
Guidance Branch: Referrals

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

How many—

(a) primary school;

(b) secondary school,

students were referred in each of the years 1972, 1973 and 1974 to the schools' guidance branch for diagnostic and/or behavioural reasons?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

In 1972, 4 646 primary and secondary students were referred to the guidance and special education branch. In 1973 and 1974 decentralised procedures were adopted and records are now maintained by district guidance officers.

13. HIGH SCHOOLS
Reading Retardation

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

(1) What percentage of children entering high school first year classes in 1975 were retarded in their reading ages—

(a) two years or less;

(b) three or four years;

(c) more than four years?

(2) How many reading remedial teachers are employed in Government high schools and how many of them have been trained in diagnostic and remedial methods of teaching reading in contrast to being chosen merely on the basis of experience?

(3) What kinds of training and extent in time of training are referred to in (2)?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Statistics of this type are not maintained because the work involved in supplying fully standardised tests to all students is beyond the present resources of the department.

(2) and (3) A total of 102 remedial teachers are employed in secondary schools. No specific training requirements are set down for their recruitment. The Education Department now trains special education teachers with a one year full-time course at the Mt. Lawley Teachers' College. In each of 1974 and 1975, 35 teachers were given full-time release on full pay to attend this course.

14. HEALTH
Milk: Iodine Levels

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

(1) What are the limits of iodine in milk recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council?

(2) Have these recommendations recently been altered, and if so, what are the details?

(3) Are levels being monitored in Western Australia and if so what are the details?

(4) What is the World Health Organisation suggested standard?

(5) Has there been a meeting of officers from the Australian and various State Governments to discuss this problem within the past two months?

(6) If so, what are the results?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) No limit has been recommended.

(2) There is no record of any previous recommendation.

(3) Yes. Since March 1974, 51 samples of milk have been tested and the results have ranged between 70 and 870 micrograms of iodine per litre, with a mean approximately 450 micrograms iodine per litre.

(4) There is no World Health Organisation standard. The FAO/WHO daily dietary intake recommendation is 400 micrograms per day per person.

(5) Yes.

(6) A recommendation for an interim limit is being considered by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

15. CHOC-MILK

Production

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Does the milk that is used in the manufacture of choc-milk in Western Australia come from quota milk?

(2) What firms manufacture choc-milk in Western Australia?

(3) How much choc-milk is produced in Western Australia at the present time, on a weekly or monthly basis?

(4) (a) Where does the milk come from that is used in the manufacture of choc-milk;

(b) how much is paid per gallon for quota milk;

(c) how much is paid per gallon for milk used in (4) (a)?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) No.

(2) Brownes Dairy Pty. Ltd. and Masters Dairy Limited produce "dairy choc" as part of their flavoured milk drinks.

(3) During September, 1975, 63 465 gallons of flavoured milk, including "dairy choc", was produced.

(4) (a) Manufacturing milk production.

(b) Average price 68.01c per gallon is paid to dairymen for milk delivered at dairy produce factories.

(c) Currently 55.10c per lb butterfat for milk is paid at the factory.

16. TABLE CREAM

Production

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is the cream that is sold as table cream in Western Australia manufactured from quota milk?

(2) What firms manufacture table cream in Western Australia?

(3) How much table cream is produced in Western Australia at the present time, on a weekly or monthly basis?

(4) How many gallons of milk are used in the manufacture of (3) above?

(5) How much is paid per gallon for the milk used to manufacture table cream?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Cream produced by licensed dairy produce factories is part of the market milk quota.

(2) Brownes Dairy Pty. Ltd., Masters Dairy Limited and Peters Creameries (W.A.) Pty. Ltd.

(3) During September, 1975, 31 886 gallons were sold.

(4) During September, 1975, 317 102 gallons were used.

(5) 27.54c per gallon is paid to dairy farmers for milk delivered to the dairy produce factory.

17. YOGURT

Production

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Does the milk that is used in the manufacture of yogurt in Western Australia come from quota milk?

(2) What firms in Western Australia manufacture yogurt?

(3) How much yogurt is produced in Western Australia at the present time on a weekly or monthly basis?

(4) How much milk is used in the manufacture of one gallon of yogurt?

(5) (a) Where does the milk come from that is used in the manufacture of yogurt;

(b) how much is paid per gallon for milk used in (a)?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) No.

(2) Brownes Dairy Pty. Ltd., Masters Dairy Limited.

(3) During September, 1975, 20 286 gallons of milk and 755 gallons of cream were used in the production of yogurt milk.

(4) Not known. Some formulas are subject to copyright and the quantity of milk varies according to recipes used.

(5) (a) Manufacturing milk production.

(b) Currently 55.10c per lb butterfat for milk is paid at the factory.

18. TRAIL BIKES AND RECREATION VEHICLES

Legislation

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

(1) Will legislation to control trail bikes, four wheeled drive and similar vehicles be introduced in the current session of Parliament?

(2) If so, what measures of control will be included in the proposed legislation?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) It is hoped to introduce a Bill this session to control certain aspects of the use of off-road vehicles.

(2) At this stage I am not at liberty to disclose the content of the proposed legislation.

19. HOUSING

Manjimup and Bridgetown: Rent Increases

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

(1) Have rents for—

(a) State Housing Commission homes;

(b) Government Employees' Housing Authority homes,

been increased in the towns of Manjimup and Bridgetown this year?

(2) If "Yes" what is the level of increase for each category of housing unit?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Yes.

(2) In regard to State Housing properties the ranges of increase are as follows—

	Manjimup	Bridgetown
1 Bedroom	$2.00	....
2 Bedrooms	$4.40–$6.15	$3.75–$4.15
2 Bedrooms plus sleepout	$7.15–$9.75	$9.30–$9.45
3 Bedrooms	$7.65–$8.35–$12.35	$5.10–$8.70
3 Bedrooms plus sleepout	$7.30–$9.25	....

These increases are to be phased in in two moieties in October, 1975, and April, 1976.

In regard to Government Employees' Housing Authority homes the increase for each category is shown on the following schedule—

(a) Minimum rental to be $8.00 per week. (All rents below $8.00 to be raised to the minimum rental of $8.00 per week).

(b) The maximum rental to be $16.50 per week. This rent to apply to all the design 3/208 and to all new houses built subsequently.

(c) All existing rents at $12.00 per week (excluding the design 208) to be increased to $15.00 per week.

(d) All existing rents between $8.00 and $9.50 to be increased to $10.00 per week.

(e) All existing rents between $9.50 and $12.00 to be increased to $12.00 per week.

(f) Single tenants from $4.80 per week for each tenant to $6.00 per week for house rent.

Furniture rent from $1.35 per week to $2.00 per week each person.

The rental on 29 houses was increased in these two towns and the increases in each category were—

(a)	1
(b)	6
(c)	5
(d)	4
(e)	11
(f)	2
	29

20. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Off-peak Usage: Meters

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Is he able to advise the estimated cost to the consumer of installing the separate meter and time switch for "off peak" electricity supplies as announced in the Press recently?

(2) If so, what is the figure?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) and (2) These costs are an integral part of the off-peak tariff considerations which have yet to be finalised and approved.

21. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRE

Warnbro

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

(1) Are the following statements relative to a pre-primary centre at Warnbro, in the *Sound Advertiser* of 22nd October, correct—

(a) "The $72 000 centre will go ahead providing the three kindergartens in the area, Rockingham Beach, Rockingham Park and Safety Bay, agree to incorporate with the Education Department;

(b) The kindergartens have been asked to help provide equipment for the centre"?

(2) If (1) (a) and (1) (b) are correct, who made the statements?

(3) Does this constitute the method which the Government proposes to adopt to achieve the implementation of its election promise: "We believe every child has the right to attend a pre-school centre or kindergarten"; "We will co-operate with local authorities to provide kindergarten and pre-school sites"?

(4) Is the Minister aware of the divisive effect this demand could have on the community?

(5) In the light of the statement that the $72 000 centre will not proceed unless the three existing kindergartens agree to be taken over by the Education Department, how does the Minister explain this in view of the Government's policy speech?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) to (5) Negotiations are proceeding with the Rockingham Shire and it is thus not possible to discuss details until agreement has been reached.

Members may be assured however that no kindergarten will be transferred to the Education Department except with agreement from parents.

22. HOUSING

Solar Heaters

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the policy of the State Housing Commission in relation to solar heating?

(2) Has any survey been done into the costing of provision of solar heaters?

(3) What is the cost per unit of solar heaters purchased on a bulk buy basis for SHC units?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) It is not the policy of the State Housing Commission to install solar heating in its own houses for families of low and moderate income.

(2) Yes. Detailed investigation has been made into overall costs and this indicates the total cost per annum is substantially more for a solar heater (inclusive of the cost of electricity necessary to supplement the sun) than for instantaneous gas heaters or storage solid fuel heaters.

Savings in fuel costs which can be expected by the average family are outweighed by the capital cost of a solar heater.

(3) The commission does not purchase bulk supplies, therefore the cost advantage is not readily available. However, allowance was made for this aspect in the comparison referred to above.

23. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Guarantees and Loans

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

Since 1st July, 1974, to whom and for what purposes has the department either guaranteed or advanced loans?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I seek leave to table a list detailing assistance extended during this period.

The list was tabled (see paper No. 504).

24. TRAFFIC

Fines and Infringement Notices

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Traffic:

In each of the 12 months to and including September 1975, what amounts have been paid in traffic fines and infringement notices in the metropolitan and country areas respectively?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The information sought for traffic fines is not readily available. To obtain the answer would require a manual search of some 35 000 briefs. However, for the year ended 30th June, 1975 there was a total of 34 198 charges heard by courts, resulting in fines amounting to $1 454 665.

In connection with traffic infringements the information requested is as follows—

Month	Country Amount $	Metropolitan Amount $
October, 1974	23 753	125 431
November, 1974	23 671	127 517
December, 1974	20 403	111 753
January, 1975	32 730	148 327
February, 1975	26 121	137 512
March, 1975	30 194	129 677
April, 1975	35 404	143 693
May, 1975	32 400	118 841
June, 1975	27 815	105 006
July, 1975	32 919	134 616
August, 1975	28 908	134 262
September, 1975	29 591	131 969
Totals	$343 975	$1 548 604

25. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Kwinana Industrial Area: Waste Emission

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

(1) Is it a fact that a person can be fined up to $200 for dropping a piece of paper?

(2) Is he able to quote the waste emissions from the industries in the Kwinana industrial area, with particular regard to CSBP, BP, Western Mining, Kwinana Chemical Industries, CIG, AIS and Alcoa?

(3) If "Yes" what are they?

(4) Will he instruct the Environmental Protection Authority to make public at monthly intervals the precise nature, in terms of both composition and quantity of emissions of waste products into the air and the sea from the above industries?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) These broad questions are currently under review.

(3) Answered by (2).

(4) No.

QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT HOSPITAL

Refusal of Treatment

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Has he seen the report in the latest issue of *The Sunday Times* wherein it was stated that Mr Bruce Blyth, Principal, Kingsley Primary School was shocked over what he described as a dangerous situation at the Armadale-Kelmscott Hospital where a student with a badly gashed cheek was refused treatment because he was not covered by a hospital benefit fund?

(2) Does he agree with the reported statement of Mr Hayward of the AMA that doctors do not have to treat anyone not covered by a hospital benefit fund?

(3) As it appears that the Armadale-Kelmscott Hospital exists only for the purpose of providing accommodation and facilities for doctors to treat private patients, for how long is he content to allow this situation to continue before taking action?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Minister for Health thanks the Leader of the Opposition for notice of the question, and has supplied the following answer—

(1) My attention has been drawn to the report, but I regard the statement attributed to the headmaster as inflammatory. The situation is not dangerous as has been claimed.

(2) Mr Hayward's reported statement was unfortunate in that reference was made to membership of a hospital benefit fund, a matter which is irrelevant to the present discussion. The AMA has given an undertaking that doctors will treat any patient who is stated to be an emergency irrespective of whether he is a hospital or private patient. In this particular instance the person who took the call considered that the quickest method of obtaining treatment was for the child to be taken to the doctor's surgery. This represented merely a change in the geographical location at which the service was provided.

(3) The Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial Hospital does not exist for the purpose of providing accommodation and facilities for doctors to treat private patients only.

2. POLICE

Assault Charge: Conviction and Pardon

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister for Police:

(1) When the police were interesting themselves in connection with a complaint against Leslie Blackman, David Morse, and Michael Antonovich, who were subsequently charged and convicted of assault, did they handcuff and take away the driver or owner of the motor vehicle involved in the affair?

(2) If "Yes", why was this done?

(3) Why was not the driver or owner of the vehicle called to give evidence at the trial of the three men?

(4) Subsequent to the decision of the court, what were the circumstances which enabled the police to obtain further evidence which obviated the holding of the intended appeal hearing?

(5) Why was it not possible to have obtained this further evidence before the case first went to the court?

(6) Upon whose recommendation in the Police Department was it decided to initiate action directed towards the ultimate granting of pardons to the three men who apparently should not have been charged?

(7) Is it intended to compensate the three men?

(8) Does he agree with the reported statement of the Minister for Justice that he "considered the matter closed"?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for notice of the question. The reply is as follows—

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Driver not located; owner considered unreliable witness.

(4) Information not previously available.

(5) Only known witness to assault refused to supply any information whatsoever.

(6) Superintendent Brennan, Officer in Charge, Criminal Investigation Branch.

(7) Compensation being examined.

(8) I was away when the Minister for Justice made the statement, but I have been advised that the statement was only part of an explanation given to the reporter by telephone. The Minister explained that he had prepared the papers recommending a pardon. He explained the difference between a pardon and a remission, and beyond that he stated that he could make no further comment. His remarks were not in regard to compensation.

3. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Off-peak Usage: Meters

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

I would like some clarification from the Minister for Fuel and Energy regarding the reply he gave to question 20 on notice today. I asked the Minister whether he could advise the cost of installing a separate meter and time switch for off-peak electricity supplies. The Minister said that the costs are an integral part of the off-peak tariff considerations which have yet to be finalised and approved.

I imagine the cost would be an integral part of the overall cost, as anyone with any sense would know.

Could the Minister tell me what the cost of the meter and the time switch is likely to be?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No, for the reasons explained in the answer. No decision has been made. Therefore, the reply is, "No".

4. CAVE RESERVES

Control and Vandalism

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

(1) Would he advise which Government department has responsibility for control and management of cave systems and cave reserves?

(2) Are penalties provided for damage in categories as above and, if so, would he indicate the scale applicable?

(3) Is he aware of the concern among speleologists regarding management, care, and control of caves against vandalism and pilfering of unique crystalline formations?

(4) If within his responsibility, will he give consideration to tightening controls in the interests of preserving these unique and valuable tourist assets?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

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

(1) This matter, as with several similar matters, is being investigated at the present time.

(2) Where caves are under the control of the National Parks Board penalties are provided under the Parks and Reserves Act and the by-laws of the board, maximum penalty $40.

(3) No representations have been made to the National Parks Board in recent years.

(4) Yes.

5. CLOSE OF SESSION

Target Date

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Has the Premier yet set a target date for the completion of this session of Parliament?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer, firstly, I do not have a firm date in mind but I would be only too pleased to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition later in the week by which time I think I will be able to supply a fairly accurate list of Bills yet to be introduced.

The Bills to be introduced are not many in number, but they are important. Some of them, of course—such as the Bill dealing with off-road vehicles—will be introduced and allowed to lie on the Table of the House in order to obtain public reaction to rather contentious issues. As I said, by tomorrow or Thursday I hope to be able to indicate a complete list of legislation yet to be introduced. I also want to confer with the Leader of the Opposition on the date we are to introduce the suspension of Standing Orders to permit Bills to go through this House at the one sitting, in appropriate cases, and sent to another place.

I hope that by the end of the week I will be able to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition a target date for the current sitting. As to whether we will achieve that target date will depend on the usual unpredictables. However, I hope we will finish before the end of November.

6. UREA

Price

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) On what basis is the Australian price of urea determined?

(2) Does world parity price influence the Australian price?

(3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes", could the Minister detail—

(a) World price movements over the past 12 months,

(b) Australian price movements over the same period?

(4) If the answer to (2) is "Yes", why has not the Australian price followed world prices?

(5) Is there to be any refund of money on urea purchased in the past season?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) and (2) The price of locally produced urea is set by Australian manufacturers but is influenced by world prices because of potential imports.

Importers can obtain quotes for supplies of urea from overseas. If this price is below the domestic price in the supplying country, the importer is liable for dumping duty on the entry of the urea into Australia. This urea would not qualify for the nitrogen subsidy. However, if the price quoted by an exporting country is not below its domestic price, the urea can be imported and still attract the subsidy provided Australian manufacturers state that they could not supply the same amount of urea, at the same price, under the same conditions.

The Minister for Customs and Excise has the right to refuse to grant the subsidy to either the local manufacturer or the importer if he believes that the price does not reflect the benefit of the subsidy to the final purchaser.

(3) Indonesia was buying urea at $420 (US) per tonne—approximately $330 (Aust.)—at the peak price during the last 12 months. Since then there has been a gradual decrease in world price and now with a world surplus of urea this price is believed to be slightly in excess of $100 (Aust.) per tonne.

At present the price of urea ex-works in Queensland is about $116 per tonne, while in New South Wales the distributor price is $130 per tonne.

The price in Western Australia on the 1st January, 1975, was $181.70 per tonne ex-Kwinana. Prior to this the price was $87.10 per tonne. The current price—from the 17th October, 1975—is $144.60 per tonne.

(4) Australian prices have been affected indirectly by world prices but did not reach the peak of world prices. At present the price in Australia is above the world price. However, the current costs of importing urea from overseas would bring the price up to a figure close to that now obtaining in Western Australia.

(5) There is no reason to believe that there would be any such refund.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been prepared principally to overcome difficulties which have arisen in regard to amendments to industrial agreements made under the provisions of the Public Service Arbitration Act.

The majority of the agreements concerned are between the Public Service Board and the Civil Service Association. They are usually entered into for a term of three years with the provision that after 12 months, negotiations can be reopened for amendments to the agreement. If agreement cannot be reached it has been understood by all parties that the matter could be referred to the Public Service Arbitrator for hearing and determination. Although the Act has been in operation since 1966, until recently this situation has never arisen.

Earlier this year, however, the Civil Service Association lodged a claim with the Public Service Board to amend a salaries agreement covering a Public Service occupational group. Agreement could not be reached and the Civil Service Association lodged the claim with the Public Service Arbitrator to have the matter determined. The arbitrator then raised the question of his jurisdiction to deal with the matter. Although the Act gives him the power to make and amend awards, there was doubt in regard to similar power in relation to agreements.

Legal opinion has been sought on the matter and it confirmed that this power did not exist.

The difficulty in the present case has been overcome by both parties agreeing to the Public Service Arbitrator sitting as a private arbitrator. However, the lack of statutory power in these circumstances is a matter of concern to the board and the association.

The other amendment contained in the Bill clarifies the intention of subsection (2) of section 27 of the Act. The Public Service Arbitrator requested this amendment to make it clear that the 12 months' interval which must elapse before an award or agreement can be reopened, dates from the date of operation of the award or agreement and not the date it was signed.

I shall now explain the main clauses of the Bill.

Clause 2: This clause amends section 23A of the Act. Paragraph (a) is the necessary renumbering of the existing section 23A as subsection (1). Paragraph (b) deals with the jurisdiction to amend agreements and specifies the procedures to be followed.

Proposed new subsection (2) gives the Public Service Arbitrator the power to amend any agreement, on application by a party to the agreement.

Proposed new subsection (3) provides that in dealing with an application to amend an agreement, the Public Service Arbitrator will apply the same provisions as those covering the amendment of awards. In particular, the provisions of subsections (2) and (3) of section 27 of the Act relating to the times at which awards may be altered will apply.

The whole intention of this clause is to give statutory authority for the jurisdiction and procedure which the parties had assumed to exist already in the Act.

Clause 3: This clause makes it clear the date referred to in paragraph (c) of subsection (2) of section 27 of the Act is the date of commencement of an award or variation of an award.

This has been the understanding of the intention of the present provision and the amendment clarifies the Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Skidmore.

BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Church of England (Diocesan Trustees) Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), read a first time.

2. Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).

3. Murdoch University Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills received from the Council; and, on motions by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), read a first time.

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.

2. Motor Vehicle Dealers Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.11 p.m.]: This is a taxing measure aimed originally at bringing in $3.2 million for the remainder of this financial year, and $5.5 million in a full year. I am not clear now, following upon representations made by those who are to pay the licenses, and the deferment of the payment of the licenses, whether the sum estimated originally will be actually received. It seems to me that there will be some small reduction of the estimated amount.

The fact that this type of legislation has been introduced already in South Australia and Victoria, and it is contemplated in New South Wales, suggests that all States eventually will adopt this method of raising additional finance. It is proposed to use this money to dispense certain advantages in other directions; that is, increased living-away-from-home allowances for students, increased payments to foster mothers, and certain reductions in pay-roll tax applicable to some people.

I am sure the smokers who are to provide all this money will not be very happy about that, because this is a sectional tax of the worst kind. It is true, as the Treasurer said earlier by interjections when I was dealing with the Revenue Estimates, that if people do not want to pay the tax they do not have to—they can stop smoking. However, if all the smokers did that, doubtless the Treasurer would find some other means of raising the money upon which he is estimating his receipts.

I want to make it clear to the smokers that they and not the Government are the benefactors. The foster mothers, the parents of children who live away from home, and those business people who will benefit from a reduction in pay-roll tax, do not have to be grateful to the Government for the improvements which are being effected; their gratitude should go to the smokers who will provide all the money. We should let the smokers know that they are the real benefactors, and perhaps they will pay the tax a little more cheerfully than they would do otherwise.

In view of the fact that this is intended as a fairly general method of raising additional funds, and as we on this side have urged that there was no need for the Government to aim for a balanced Budget as we would have preferred it to run into deficit in order to keep people employed, we cannot very well oppose a measure which will raise additional funds for the Government to carry out the functions which it proposes.

So, without taking up any more time of the House in connection with the measure, I say that in view of the fact that we believe additional revenue is necessary, and we agree with the benefits which will accrue to the people I have already mentioned, we support the Bill.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.16 p.m.]: Like my leader, I have no great objection to the Bill. However, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the Bill seems to be *ultra vires* an existing Act of Parliament and, as such, it may require immediate attention before it is proceeded with.

The Treasurer will recall that when he was representing the Minister for Justice in this Chamber some years ago in a previous Government he dealt with the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act Amendment Bill. That Bill removed reference in that Act to the sale of liquor, and left the Act dealing only with the sale of tobacco. I warned him at the time that skimpy little Acts such as this could cause problems in the future.

Indeed, upon studying the Bill now before us, it would seem very clear to me that it is *ultra vires* the law. I would like to hear legal argument in this respect. It seems to me that every packet of cigarettes sold by means of a vending machine could be illegally sold at the moment, because the Sale of Tobacco Act forbids the selling or supplying of tobacco to any person under the age of 18 years. When this Act was amended in 1964 not many vending machines were in existence, so I do not suppose the situation mattered at that time.

It is interesting to note that the Sale of Tobacco Act now has only three sections. The first operative section states that no person shall sell, give, or supply tobacco in any form or cigarette paper to or for the use of any person under the age of 18 years. The other operative section states that all proceedings for offences against the Act shall be heard and determined before and by a police or resident magistrate. The penalty is forty shillings, and I suppose that is a significant penalty bearing in mind that it was set in 1917.

Clause 2(3) of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Bill, with which we are now dealing, states—

> (3) The presence on any premises of a vending machine from which tobacco may be obtained by an operation that involves the insertion in the machine of a coin, token, or similar object shall be deemed to constitute the carrying on on those premises by the occupier thereof of tobacco retailing unless the machine is owned and operated by a licensee in accordance with his licence.

From that we can clearly see the Government is now placing itself in a position of receiving a tax from a machine that can and does contravene the law by virtue

of the fact that any person under the age of 18 years can insert money in the machine and obtain cigarettes; and that is an offence under the Statute to which I have referred. I do not condone the Statute that says it is an offence, but nevertheless it is in existence. The Bill presently before the House is to place a tax on the sales of tobacco in the form of a percentage, and it places a tax on each packet of cigarettes. Therefore, any person under the age of 18 years who uses a cigarette vending machine is causing the Government to receive unlawful revenue.

For that reason, before the Government proceeds with this proposal I suggest the matter be thoroughly researched. Surely the Government has research officers, and when Bills such as this are being drafted it would not be very hard for those officers to find that we have a Sale of Tobacco Act and to have due regard to it. It seems as though no attention has been paid to this aspect. Certainly it is not in accordance with good government to introduce a Statute which could allow the taking of tax from people quite unlawfully.

Mr Young: The Commonwealth Government is doing that on the same basis; it is charging an excise on tobacco, which is encouraging youngsters to break the law.

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know whether the Australian Government has an Act which prohibits the sale of tobacco.

Mr Young: It takes an excise well knowing the State Act exists. So what is the difference?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know whether the Australian Government has anything to prohibit it from taking excise from persons under the age of 18 years; but in this case the State does have a Statute.

Mr Young: To use your argument, the Commonwealth is encouraging the breaking of the State Act. It is a silly argument, anyway.

Mr JAMIESON: I point out to the member for Scarborough that where there is a Commonwealth and a State Act and the two conflict, the Commonwealth Act prevails over the State Act. However, I am not arguing that point at the moment; I am saying that if any existing Statute obstructs the operation of this Bill, the existing Statute or provision should be eliminated by this Bill to make the position clear.

I do not condone the Sale of Tobacco Act, because if any member walks down Hay Street now he will see any number of children from newsboys upwards smoking cigarettes. If that Act cannot be enforced, it is a bad Act and should not be on the Statute book. However, the Act is in existence, and if we provide a method of taxing which will condone its contravention, it is bad legislation.

Therefore, I suggest the Government should further research the matter to see how the Sale of Tobacco Act will affect this legislation. I suggest the Treasurer should have a good look at that aspect before this Bill becomes law. If necessary, he could put through a small Bill to get rid of the Sale of Tobacco Act if it stands in the way.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.24 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy for their contributions to the debate on this Bill. The Leader of the Opposition queried the amount of revenue that will be raised this year. I think I made it clear when introducing the Bill that the Treasury has had to make a guesstimate regarding what the amount will be, because it was not quite certain—no more certain than other States have been when they introduced such a tax—as to what will be the incidence at the take-off point.

The new date that has been inserted does not mean to say that we will be out of tax for the whole of that time because, as the Leader of the Opposition will know from reading the Bill, the tax is payable on sales before that date; but to meet the convenience of sellers the date was extended. I understand there may be a slight drop in the revenue compared with the amount for which we have budgeted, but that is very much in the lap of the gods, just as the figure for the full year is a guesstimate. My guess is that there will be a slight drop in the amount of revenue; but I believe the officers concerned were wise to act in this way in view of some pratical difficulties encountered in another State. As a result of that experience they recommended that we use the dates now included in the Bill.

So far as the actual allocation of the amount of tax to specific purposes is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition knows that Budgets are not made on that basis. The Government receives money from all sorts of sources. It receives revenue from stamp duties, territorial sources—as referred to in the Budget—pay-roll tax, and a host of other things. It is the conglomeration of all those amounts that gives the Government the Revenue Budget from which it can work. Having arrived at a figure of revenue which the Government expects to receive, the Government can then budget its spending. If we followed the argument of the Leader of the Opposition to its logical conclusion we would have to say, for example, that some particular aspect of education or hospital expenditure was paid for by the beer drinkers as a result of the amount of tax we receive from liquor.

We could follow this right through to the point of some fellow lining up and saying, "I am keeping someone in hospital or at school because I pay my vehicle license fees", and so on. However, it does

not work like that. For instance, the Commonwealth Government raises money from a tax on petroleum products. There was a time when that revenue was intended to be applied to roads, but the amount has long since gone into general revenue and it is not now identifiable; it is part and parcel of the general revenue of the Commonwealth and is treated on a conglomerate basis.

Therefore, I cannot accept the argument that smokers will be making a contribution to the living-away-from-home allowances for children in remote areas, the employment of itinerant teachers or similar specific purposes. However, if they get any joy out of claiming that, good luck to them. I only hope they do not say the tobacco tax they pay will go towards those things forever and a day, because it will be lost in the conglomeration of taxes and income that the Government receives and will not be identifiable.

The Leader of the Opposition again touched on the question of deficit financing. The Government on this occasion has set its heart against a deficit Budget. I do not believe some people want to accept the point that for every dollar for which we budget by way of deficit we have to take an equivalent dollar out of loan funds. We could have avoided the imposition of this tax on tobacco and budgeted for a deficit of $3.2 million or some figure in that vicinity; but to do that we would have had to take money out of loan funds for a similar amount and put it on ice, just like the Leader of the Opposition did when he was Treasurer. He would regard himself as a prudent Treasurer; and he immediately earmarked money out of loan funds to ensure that at the end of the year he had money in hand to meet the expected deficit.

Our Government is no different; therefore, if we can budget to break even we can commit the whole of our loan funds as we have done in this instance.

I would hazard a guess that had we budgeted for a deficit the very first area to get the axe would be some of the moneys given to the water board; but because we are able to use the whole of our loan funds we are able to give the board more than might otherwise be the case. I regard this tax as just part of the total financial strategy of the Government to finish up with a balanced Budget; and the people working for the water board are just as entitled to say, "Thank God for the smokers", as are, say, trainee teachers and the like.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised a very pertinent point, and I can assure him I will have it researched. I was assured that a lot of research had been done on this legislation to ensure that we were not *ultra vires* the Commonwealth Constitution or, on the other hand, conflicting with any legislation of our own. However, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised the point; it is the sort of point which is of value in a place like this when someone does research and brings a matter before the attention of Parliament. After all, that is what we are here for. I can assure him that before the third reading is dealt with I will obtain an explanation for him. I cannot be certain of the answer, and rather than give an off-the-cuff, half-baked explanation I would much rather obtain a legal interpretation and inform the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the House of it.

The last thing I want to do is to get on the Statute book an Act which is immediately subject to challenge, because once these things are challenged we never know what will be triggered off; and we need the revenue and we need to get this tax working smoothly and quickly.

There is, of course, another aspect to these vending machines so far as they relate to retailers; and, as members will know, retailers are not in the same position as wholesalers.

There is a distinction, also, between the origins of the tobacco that will be sold. However, that is a moot constitutional interpretation I do not wish to pursue at the moment, but on the more relevant point raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition regarding the use of vending machines for tobacco I can assure him that he will be given an explanation in this House when, hopefully, we deal with the third reading of the Bill tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

GRAIN MARKETING BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 16th October.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.33 p.m.]: I am a little at a loss as to how to approach this part of the debate on the measure which deals with the concept of general grain marketing and the bringing together of the three grain marketing bodies in Western Australia. The origin of this concept can be traced back to 1970. It is a move which was certainly fostered, as far as it was possible to be done, by the Tonkin Government.

Without doubt, we find ourselves in accord with the principle of the Bill, but several aspects have to be studied before we proceed any further and therefore the Minister may consider it desirable to withdraw the Bill for a time, at least until two further aspects are clarified. I will deal with these at the outset.

Firstly, a referendum is currently being held among lupin growers. Lupins are to be a prescribed grain which is to be encompassed by this legislation, but if the producers currently involved in the referendum opt for the second alternative that is offered to them, under the terms of the Bill now before us it could not be implemented.

That appears to be something of a Hobson's choice, or it does indicate a certain air of insincerity and places the bona fides of the Government in question in regard to the holding of the referendum. The terms of the referendum that was presented to the lupin growers of this State are as follows—

> Indicate which you favour:
>
> Marketing of sweet white lupins by a single grain marketing authority on the basis of—
>
> (1) Full acquisition for both export and local sales with provision for approval by the Board of Farmer to Farmer sales and Farmer to Processor sales.
>
> or
>
> (2) Marketing of sweet white lupins by a single grain marketing authority on the basis of all seed voluntarily delivered to Co-operative Bulk Handling with no control by the authority over farmer to farmer sales or farmer to processor sales.

To me it would appear that the provisions of the Bill would not permit the implementation of the second alternative. As yet we do not know the result of the referendum that has been conducted in accordance with the terms I have just read to the House. I understand the result of the referendum will be known later this week—on Thursday, I believe—and therefore it seems rather premature to introduce a measure in which lupins are a prescribed grain. Indeed, that is a stipulation in the definition of "prescribed grain" and a further amendment to this definition is foreshadowed on the notice paper.

That is the first point I raise in regard to the measure, and I consider that in regard to this grain at least the wishes of the lupin growers of Western Australia should be examined before the legislation proceeds any further.

On the second score I have held some growing concern which in the last week has become manifest as a result of telegrams, several letters, and a telephone call from the chairman of the grain section of the Farmers' Union who, I understand, is Mr Colin Adams of Mt. Barker. He took the trouble to telephone me and to explain his stand on the matter and he has expressed some concern on the question of the marketing of oats. I have also received a telegram from the Albany zone of the Farmers' Union which reads—

> Essential oats be declared prescribed grain immediately to safeguard grain-pool and industry
>
> Albany Zone Farmers Union

The grains to be prescribed under this measure exclude oats and it is evident that the oat growers of this State have certainly not reached unanimity. I do not know to what extent harmony has been achieved, but when we have concern expressed at this level there must be some disquiet among the grain growers, particularly in the southern areas of the State.

At a meeting of the Boyup Brook lupin growers I understand, also, that similar concern was expressed, but on a different premise from that on which the oat growers are basing their concern. I consider it is necessary to examine the attitude and the reason for the concern that has been expressed by oat growers in Western Australia, because the Grain Pool took the trouble to advertise fairly extensively in the *Farmers' Weekly* of the 16th October, 1975. This advertisement occupies a full page and is captioned with very bold letters as follows—

> CHAOS FOR
> OATS GROWERS
> with the destruction
> of orderly marketing

This is the attitude that is presented by the authority—and it should be the authority as far as grain marketing in this State is concerned—the Grain Pool of Western Australia. This article points out that Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has announced it will receive oats in the 1975-76 season under the warehousing system. Under the legislation governing CBH there is provision for warehousing to be conducted. I do not think it has ever been invoked before; this is the first time it will be done. However, it does mean that oats will be received by CBH in its handling facilities. Any individual farmer or firm—not necessarily a grower—could use the CBH facilities for warehousing purposes if this invocation is brought about.

The implications of such a move are fairly far reaching. One problem which the Pastoralists and Graziers Association has raised and canvassed extensively is that it will provide the opportunity for overseas processors and firms to enter the Western Australian grain trade on a basis which, ultimately, could be undesirable and even unsavoury.

In effect, it would mean that they could use the existing CBH facilities, the capital investment involved in which is so great as to preclude any private firm from setting up duplicate grain marketing facilities in Western Australia. However, under this system of warehousing, such firms would be able to move into Western Australia, enter into negotiation and make

purchases while using the grain handling facilities available locally. It is even conceivable that a firm could use our mineral handling facilities in much the same way, although this is questionable.

Mr McPharlin: It would be only for grain.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes; however, it is conceivable that it could apply to minerals as well, particularly in the case of the facilities at Bunbury for the processing of mineral sands.

Such firms would not have a commitment in Western Australia. Thus, in boom times they would be able to enter the trade on a profitable basis and, when there is a downturn in world grain trade, they would be able to withdraw from the Western Australian market due to the fact that they did not have any financial equity in the industry or the responsibility or obligation to remain.

Even after a period of several years, if needs be they could withdraw their operation at no great cost or detriment to themselves, leaving the Grain Pool to carry the can because, obviously, it would be the Grain Pool to which the growers would be compelled to turn. In my opinion, the grain industry should not be placed in such a position.

The newspaper advertisement continues—

> Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has announced it will receive oats in the 1975-76 season under the warehousing system.
>
> C.B.H. says this will be done as a result of requests. We believe it is the result of outside pressure on C.B.H. —and we say this pressure comes from speculators in the grain trade.

This fear has been expressed by the Grain Pool and echoed by processors over a wide part of the State. The advertisement continues—

> These un-named speculators—and they're not necessarily West Australian—will throw the local oats industry into complete chaos, destroy the system of orderly marketing grain growers have for so long enjoyed, kill overseas buyer confidence in W.A. oats supplies and, most importantly, will deny hundreds of growers any chance of selling their oat crops to the best advantage.

I do not intend to go into the history of the Grain Pool of W.A. or of grain marketing itself, which extends back over a long period; suffice to say that the grain handling segment of the industry has developed over the years at the expense of growers. Many millions of dollars have been provided by grower levy to establish grain handling facilities not only at the wharfside but also at the many sidings throughout the grain growing areas.

The Grain Pool, through the WA Voluntary Oats Pool, has been active on a co-operative, nonprofit basis in the successful marketing of Western Australian oats for something like 30 years. It was through the voluntary pooling arrangement that grower returns were equalised, enabling growers to enjoy the same equity in each season's pool. This system has operated with a degree of success and to the satisfaction of the oat growers of Western Australia.

The advertisement continues—

> Now, the activities of outside speculators—people who may buy grain this year but may ruthlessly abandon producers thereafter will bring about the collapse of this orderly marketing system and the end of these financially successful voluntary oats pools.

If this occurred, no longer would growers' returns be equalised; in addition, growers would be confronted with uncertainty, over and above the normal problems of the grain industry. I believe such a move would be a deleterious and backward one.

If the system breaks down, forward selling will be undermined. Forward selling is an important facet of grain marketing and represents security and comfort to the grower at the beginning of a season —sometimes, even before he puts his harvester into his crop. Although the first advance payment varies, this payment probably is more important to the individual grower than the ultimate return because it provides him with the necessary liquidity to remain in operation. If this arrangement is undermined, as it could well be, the grain growers of Western Australia will be faced with a serious problem.

The Pastoralists and Graziers Association of Western Australia has never been in complete harmony with other farmer organisations; it has never fully gone along with the various orderly marketing schemes because it claims it seeks the greatest degree of flexibility possible within any statutory or orderly marketing system.

The Pastoralists and Graziers Association Press release of the 23rd October, 1975, deals in a fairly broad way with oat marketing. It mentions firstly the system to which I have referred; namely, the invocation of the powers of CBH to permit warehousing. It goes on to deal with the warrants which would be issued once this is done, and the trafficking in these warrants which could take place. In other words, once the delivery of oats is made to the CBH facility, a warrant indicating the amount involved would be issued to the particular farmer. If the farmer so desires he could then traffic that warrant to another producer, to a processor, or to an overseas exporter. He would have complete freedom to do that.

Of course, this is seen as having some inherent dangers, and such a system would

place any voluntary pool—for instance the one that exists at the present time—at a disadvantage. It means that large international grain traders could undermine the present system. Their activities are not constrained to Western Australia alone. They do have the opportunity to operate on an international scale, and we have seen that in respect of other commodities. Within the margarine industry we have seen a large processor and competitor coming here to trade, lowering the price, sustaining a loss for some years, and offseting such losses against his profits —and not necessarily profits made in another State but in another country. Ultimately these traders could corner the market; in other words, they could develop a monopoly in such an artificial situation by paying to the producers a price above which the local markets could not offer. Once this is done it comes back to a monopoly situation within the particular State; and it is Western Australia with which we are vitally concerned.

Once a large exporter takes sufficient grain he could embarrass the voluntary pool which exists by placing it in a position where it could not supply its commitments made on a forward selling basis. This must necessarily be quite a danger.

Similar to the second alternative offered to the lupin growers, there is a suggestion that oats could become a prescribed grain once it has been delivered to the CBH facilities; in other words, placed under the jurisdiction of the Grain Pool. This means that any grain not so delivered is not prescribed, and would be available for free interchange and free sale within the State, from farmer to farmer, or from producer to processor.

While this is a source of some concern, the justification for it does become evident when we look at the question of costs. If all oats are required to be forwarded through CBH to the Grain Pool, then the farmer-to-farmer sales that are currently taking place in respect of feed and seed requirements would be involved in an additional cost. It is possible that such cost could be as high as 30c per bushel. I have no way of checking the figure for accuracy or authenticity, but it could well be a substantial amount when the grain is sent through CBH to one siding, unloaded there, moved by rail to another point, and perhaps moved again to a third point. If oats do become a prescribed grain, the incurring of added costs under this cumbersome system could well result in an inherent burden on the producers.

Although it might be illegal, the trafficking of this commodity between farms is carried on at the present time. It does not worry the conscience of the farmers who engage in farmer-to-farmer sales, and the morality of the situation is not in question. They feel it is the commonsense thing to do, but whether or not we agree is another point. However, if the law does place the farmers in a position where the majority of them do break the law, then perhaps it is time we looked at this piece of legislation, and ascertained whether it did, in fact, involve farmers in breaking the law. On those grounds we should determine whether or not the law should be amended.

Coming back to the justification of the argument raised by the pastoralists and graziers that something in the order of 2 to 3 per cent of coarse grains is being used in Western Australia in the feed industry, I should point out that the processors legally handle only that percentage of the total quantity. The rest is available for export. If the figure is of that low order then perhaps there could be justification for allowing free trafficking between the farmer and the processor.

The attitude of the Farmers' Union is that a very delicate line of demarcation exists in relation to farmer-to-farmer sales. While the official policy of the Farmers' Union is to condone farmer-to-farmer sales, that body has raised the question as to whether a farmer who produces oats should be able to sell that grain to a dairyman on a farmer-to-farmer basis, or whether such sales should be regarded as coming within the realms of commercial enterprise. The sales direct to feed manufacturers cannot be viewed in the same way; but then again, as the total quantity involved is comparatively small, perhaps such sales are not as serious as they might seem to be on the first count.

I feel I have a responsibility to voice these areas of objection that have been raised by the people who have referred them to me. I suggest on those two counts it may well be worth while deferring this piece of legislation until such time as these two issues have been resolved.

I believe the result of the referendum of lupin producers should be available towards the end of the week. Today is the last day for the posting of votes by producers, and so the Minister will be in possession of the full information at the end of the week. That rectifies the position very simply, but it does not resolve the question of what is to be done with oats.

This is an issue that requires clarification before this Bill is passed. If we are to put this piece of legislation through Parliament now—and it is possible the second alternative would be acceptable to the growers—it means in very short order the legislation may have to be further amended. It seems to me that now is the time for us to resolve the whole matter.

As far as oats are concerned, it is too late to do anything in the Bill before us. It cannot be proclaimed in time to enable this season's crop to be handled, even if oats become prescribed by way of amendment. Therefore this matter lacks urgency. I feel that the other matters I

have raised should be attended to at this juncture, rather than to allow the Bill to go through.

There are some amendments on the notice paper. While they are of a machinery nature, touching only on procedure and aspects of that kind, several principles do become involved, and it may be as well that we have regard for them and incorporate them in one embracing Bill that will satisfy us on all counts. I am afraid that while the intention to establish the new Grain Pool of Western Australia is laudable, the approach leaves a little to be desired.

I do not know how the Minister feels about that. If the Minister would agree, I would be happy to seek leave to resume my remarks at a later date, not necessarily during this session. But these two issues must be resolved at this juncture. I have not had any indication from the Minister. I gather he would prefer to continue now.

Mr Old: Yes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: How does the Minister propose to get around the question of lupins if the growers—

Mr Old: I will tell you when I reply.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What about the conflict within the oat industry? Is not the Minister worried about that?

Mr Old: Of course I am. I will deal with that when I reply.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Apparently the Minister has it worked out, but he made no reference to it in his introductory speech. He mentioned that there had been a certain amount of conflict and that there had been a compromise to enable the Bill to reach the stage it has reached. However, he made no reference to the attitude of the oat growers and the fact that the Grain Pool had gone to rather extraordinary lengths to make certain statements. I believe that this is only the tip of the iceberg and the disquiet felt in the growing areas should be resolved. Could the Minister tell me, perhaps again by interjection, whether there has been a referendum of oat growers?

Mr Old: Not to my knowledge.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have rather vivid recollections of the then Opposition challenging the Tonkin Government on occasions when legislation dealing with rural matters was submitted. Each time the then Opposition asked whether a referendum had been held. We can all recall the fiasco which the apple and pear Bill turned into and it was on these very grounds. The Opposition used its weight of numbers in another place to make it necessary for a referendum of growers to be held before it would pass the Bill in that place, notwithstanding the fact that the legislation had been accepted at two annual conferences of the official organisation of the fruit growers. That goes back into history, of course.

The same can be said at this time, in view of the anxiety expressed in growing areas. It has been stated that oat growers should have the opportunity to express their views by way of a referendum. It is for this reason that I suggest to the Minister it would be better to have the legislation deferred and tidied up, and then its passage through both Houses no doubt would be expedited with a minimum amount of time wasted.

However, I take it that the Minister is adamant that the show must go on. If that is correct, then of course the responsibility will be his and he will have to answer to the growers. Those on this side of the House are rather anxious to ensure that grain marketing in this State is rationalised in the most satisfactory manner. However, these matters are his responsibility and the result of his actions must be on his head. All we can do is offer our co-operation and as speedy a passage of the Bill as is possible.

I now return to the Bill generally and make some reference perhaps to the rather inadequate second reading notes with which the Minister introduced the measure. I would point out that the background of grain marketing goes back to June, 1970, when the Grain Pool of Western Australia wrote to the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr C. D. Nalder) requesting that the franchise for persons eligible to vote for elections for members of the growers' council be extended to include wheat, linseed, and barley. There was no indication of an extension of powers at that time.

In September of the same year—1970—the Minister advised the pool, after considering all aspects, including the freedom of barley and linseed buyers to elect to use alternative agents and independent activities of the Australian Wheat Board, that he did not favour the extension of the franchise.

In April, 1972, the pool again wrote to Mr Nalder's successor repeating the request, and it was from that point onwards that some progess was made.

The matter was submitted to Cabinet in September, 1972, and in January, 1973, the coarse grain executive of the farmers' Union of WA made a submission to the Minister, in the form of a deputation, during which the representatives requested major changes in the structure of the Grain Pool. The pastoralists and graziers also registered their attitude towards the subject of grain marketing and, all in all, in the past three years there has been a reasonable degree of cohesion within the industry, and a working party was set up.

The working party met on three separate occasions and, as a result, there was an attempt to determine the attitude of the growers towards the proposal for a consolidated grain marketing authority.

The rationale and logic behind the proposal are fairly obvious and were covered by the Minister when he introduced the present measure to the House. The aim of the legislation is simple; it is to incorporate the three bodies to which the Minister referred—the Barley Marketing Board, the Seed Marketing Board, and the Grain Pool of WA—within the single compass of the Grain Pool of WA.

Obviously, there should be opportunities for economies and savings. There should also be greater cohesion and co-ordination which should logically assist the growers with this all-important facility. The retention of the name, and bringing the new authority under the title of the "Grain Pool of WA" is a wise move, and I do not think any other course could have been followed.

The reconstitution into the one authority is something which needs to be questioned, I think. In the light of experience, which the member for Narrogin—the Minister for Conservation and the Environment—no doubt recalls fairly clearly, the question of the structure of any marketing authority has to be examined with a number of factors in view.

The composition of the proposed authority will be the present four trustees of the Grain Pool, the present two grower-elected members of the Barley Marketing Board, the present two grower-elected members of the Seed Marketing Board, and two persons who have special expertise in finance, or marketing, or both, to be appointed by the Minister from a panel of names to be submitted to him by the grower organisations. That makes a total of 10 members on the initial board, to which will be added two further grower representatives—one each from the temporarily vacant zones Nos. 1 and 5, indicated in the schedule. Of the 10 members of the initial board, two will have marketing and finance expertise. While they will have this particular background they, too, have to be nominated by the grower organisations.

While I agree most strongly that there has to be adequate representation of growers on any marketing authority, this can be overdone, and was overdone, as the member for Narrogin is aware. There was an occasion when a particular commodity board—its members had some of the soundest market expertise in the State, and they had performed particularly well and given stability to the board—was brought into serious question by the Grain Pool in what I considered to be a most unfortunate letter. The matter was never made public for reasons of harmony and subsequent probable recriminations. But the point has to be made that when a board gets to the stage where it is completely grower dominated there is always a danger that the administrative staff will exercise a disproportionate influence beyond that which they should naturally and normally exercise in their own right.

Too frequently—and it happens with many organisations such as local government, for example—an individual goes into a board room without a thorough understanding of what is happening or sufficient preparation which is necessary to arrive at a proper judgment. In other words, the individual has not done his homework to the extent that is necessary. It is a simple fact of human nature that all too often people make decisions when they are not in a position to do so.

I can recall the experience to which I referred, and in which the member for Narrogin was involved, when a grower-dominated body made comments and condemned another body where a degree of expertise was in evidence and where the State was being served remarkably well. It will be most unfortunate if any marketing body becomes over-represented by producers to the detriment of the marketing expertise that is needed to direct the operation. In the formation of the proposed authority there are to be 12 members, two of whom will have a background in expertise and finance, but even they will be appointed on the recommendation of the grower organisations.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Earlier in the debate I suggested the Minister might care to withdraw or postpone the passage of this Bill until he has had a look at the situation pertaining to lupin growers after the referendum, and also to oat growers, especially those who have expressed dissatisfaction. I do not know whether he has considered the matter during the tea suspension and would like to change his mind.

Mr Old: No.

Mr H. D. EVANS: As I said, the Opposition is noted for its co-operation, and all we can do is extend it in this instance.

I mentioned the composition of the proposed new Grain Pool and suggested it may be that growers are predominant. I think there needs to be some objective expertise from the marketing or financial sections, and this may well be worthy of consideration. I referred to the unfortunate experience of the Barley Marketing Board and the Grain Board, as it was previously.

There is provision for the producers' council to continue in an advisory role for a five-year period. At the end of that time, after consultation with the Minister, the future of the council will be determined. That is a fair provision and it is probably a compromise which will lead to the best solution of this aspect of the operation.

Provision is made in part III of the Bill for the Grain Pool to conduct statutory or voluntary pools in relation to any grain or seed which is the subject of authority vested in it. I take it the grain would need

to be prescribed before the Grain Pool could bring it within the ambit of its control. That is where the contention with regard to oats lies, because at the present time barley, rape seed, and linseed are delivered under their respective Acts, and under the Bill now before us they will be prescribed grains. Amendments which appear on today's notice paper indicate that lupins will also be included in this category.

Reference was made to lupins in the Minister's second reading speech but apparently the speech was compiled some time ago because the referendum which he said was to be conducted in October has well and truly taken place. We are awaiting the results of that referendum to enable us to make a comprehensive decision.

There are three schedules to the Bill, the first of which lists the various Acts which are to be repealed and replaced by the legislation now before us. I wish to draw attention to several aspects of a minor nature but I think they would more appropriately be dealt with in the Committee stage. They concern some of the amendments which appear on the notice paper.

It is not the intention of the Opposition to move to amend the composition of the new Grain Pool. However, we sound a word of caution in the light of our own experience and the general experience of all members in the House. We reiterate that several points have not yet been resolved, and we ask the Minister to be specific when replying on the aspect of the lupin marketing referendum. The second alternative open to growers is the marketing of sweet white lupins by a single grain marketing authority on the basis of all seed being delivered to Co-operative Bulk Handling with no control by the authority over farmer-to-farmer or farmer-to-processor sales. A grain is either a prescribed grain under the terms of the legislation, or it is not. As I see it, there is no provision to allow flexibility by having a bit of both worlds as an alternative; that is, by having a voluntary pool of the grains delivered to CBH, and at the same time allowing freedom of negotiation between farmers on a feed and seed basis or between farmers and processors.

In addition to those two reservations, I comment on the slovenly manner in which the Bill has been presented to the House. Half a page of amendments appears on the notice paper, which suggests there may have been lack of preparation. This is borne out by the fact that the results of the referendum are still not known, yet we are proceeding with this measure. The suggestion I made to the Minister still stands, but it appears he is prepared to go on with the Bill.

With those reservations, we are delighted to see another piece of our legislation introduced into this place. If the present Government continues to resurrect legislation which we commenced, it could finish up with a fair batting record at the end of its term. To that extent, I support the Bill.

MR CRANE (Moore) [7.37 p.m.]: It is not my intention to delay the House for very long, but I feel it is incumbent upon me to make some comment on this Bill because I would say it affects every rural producer in my electorate. If a farmer does not grow one grain, he grows another.

The reason I speak tonight is that in the Moora area which I represent, the two grower organisations—namely, the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association—have reached a great degree of unanimity. When legislation such as this is about to come before the House or is being considered, the two organisations in that area get together to discuss the problems which are facing their industry, and as a result, when I speak in this House on their behalf I do not speak on behalf of one organisation to the exclusion of the other but I speak about a situation where both organisations have at last reached a degree of unanimity.

I commend the Minister for Agriculture for introducing this legislation into the House. We know it has been under discussion with the farmer organisations for a couple of years. It has taken a long time to get here but at last we are faced with the legislation which will mean a great deal to the grain producers of Western Australia. For that reason I believe we must be very sure that all aspects of the Bill are in accordance with the desires of the producers.

I am very pleased that the need has been recognised to retain the name of the Grain Pool, which is well known throughout the world as the selling agent for grain from Western Australia.

The Grain Pool is a producer-owned co-operative which has operated successfully for over 50 years. It has a good record, and it is well recognised in grain circles throughout the world. Furthermore, it is trusted by the countries with whom we deal; so any change in name could have been a disaster for grain marketing. This is a very good point, and while it may not matter here, I think it is well to recognise that farmers themselves are pleased that in our wisdom we saw this important point and made provision for it.

There are a few aspects of the Bill which do cause some concern to the producers in my area. Kipling said, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," but the same thing could be said about north and south. I represent growers in the north, and as they are concerned about one or two aspects of the Bill, I will mention these briefly.

I have every confidence in our Minister, and I know that should an anomaly arise at a future date—even after this Bill becomes law—he will be prepared to make improvements in the legislation if it can be shown the improvements are necessary. Probably one of the weaknesses in legislation is that we do not follow up fully its implementation. We should always be mindful of the need to improve legislation.

Earlier tonight it was mentioned that laws must be good and sensible laws, and I agree entirely with that sentiment.

The first point I wish to raise is about the research fund contribution when grain is sold from grower to grower. We recognise that the research fund is a very important aspect of any orderly marketing scheme; it is fitting and proper that the growers themselves should finance any research undertaken in the interests of the industry. We should not expect other people to pay for that, and I am sure the producers do not expect it. At one time there was a provision in a warrant which a grower could fill in if he wished to make a contribution to the research fund. A grower who did not wish to contribute simply crossed out the reference to a contribution on the warrant. I believe it is better for this contribution to be made automatically.

However, in the instance of small amounts of grain which may be traded between producer and producer—perhaps only a few bags—the amount of research levy on the transaction would be infinitesimal. It is for this reason that I made my comment about the necessity for laws to be good laws. I am afraid that when it becomes too much of a bother to comply with a provision such as this, it will be bypassed and the producers will not apply to the authority for a permit. In transactions between farm and farm—members will note I did not say between farmer and farmer—it is possible that permits are not warranted. However, in these instances I believe the contribution to the research fund could be waived.

Another point which has caused considerable concern is the matter of production control by the Minister. We have just been through a traumatic experience in our wheat-producing lives where production controls have harmed the industry a great deal. I know it is all very well to have hindsight and while at times it is necessary to have marketing controls, I think that in a world such as the one in which we live—where a shortage of food is ever present—production control, particularly when administered by a Minister, is undesirable to producers, and we should be aware of this fact. So I repeat that while it is a good thing to have marketing controls for some orderly system of marketing when there is a surplus, we should steer clear of control of actual production, whereby a producer may be precluded even from growing grain to feed to his own pigs.

Further on in this measure we see that appeals may be made to the Minister. However, in this instance I do not believe the necessary responsibility should be in the hands of the Minister. Control should be on the marketing of the production.

Mr Skidmore: Is it not a good thing to enable orderly marketing in the industry?

Mr CRANE: Another matter which has been exercising the minds of many producers in my area is the fact that provision must be made in a Bill of this nature for more than one seller of the commodity. I would like to explain this point very carefully. I believe, and the producers in my area believe also, that the Grain Pool should be in complete control of the commodity. We are not questioning this point at all; we believe that just as a ship must have only one captain, so must the Grain Pool be in charge of the commodities concerned. However, the point I raise here—and this has happened with many of us at different times—is the possibility that people selling other commodities in other countries may sometimes find markets of varying size for grain. There should be provision in the Bill for people such as these to be able to act as agents for the Grain Pool, and to receive remuneration as agents. These people must be encouraged to act—competition is the spice of life. If markets are found for our produce, it should be obligatory for the Grain Pool to make available to the people who found them, sufficient quantities to sell to these markets at a price acceptable to the pool.

One other matter of concern is stock feed supplies held for drought and other purposes. In the past, the practice has been that certain tonnages of grain are held back for stock feed purposes, but many growers feel that this is an impost on them. Most reliable farmers make provision to feed their stock through the summer months, and they do not expect others to carry a stockpile of grain for this purpose. Once the summer season has broken and it is evident that the natural growth will be available, the surplus grain is sold and for this reason provision is made, I think with Co-operative Bulk Handling, to take wheat until about October.

I understand that a few years ago a quantity of barley was held back at the instigation of our Government. Even though it had been forward sold, the pool was not allowed to sell the grain as it was felt necessary to keep back sufficient supplies in case of drought. It is felt generally in my area that if the Government is going to step in like Big Brother to stipulate that certain tonnages must not be sold, thus resulting in a fall in price to the producer, the Government should then buy that grain or guarantee it at the price at which it was forward sold.

In this particular instance, after the grain was held for some time and the market was lost, the people for whom it was held decided the price was too high and said they did not want it after all. The result was that the grain then had to be sold at a reduced price, and it was the producer who had put the grain into the bins who suffered the loss.

Some small concern is being experienced in respect of the producers' council. The Bill makes provision for the board to retain the producers' council after a period of five years if it is felt to be necessary and worth while. It is considered that perhaps this decision should be made by the growers themselves. The growers, by their usual means of referendum, can decide in their own way whether they consider the producers' council is a worthwhile organisation to retain under the Act. I bring the point forward for this reason.

On the matter of directors, I understand seven directors will be appointed from the 21 zones. I have not had time to discuss this fully with the Minister, and I am not too sure of the position; but I wonder whether that means there will be only 14 of the original 21 left on the producers' council, or whether after those seven directors are appointed a further seven producers will be appointed, keeping the total of 21 on the producers' council.

Mr Jamieson: They can't be directors and on the council at the same time, so they would have to be replaced.

Mr CRANE: Yes, it would seem that we need to have replacements.

A further point I bring forward tonight has been mentioned by the member for Warren; that is, the warehousing loopholes in the Bulk Handling Act. Much has been said in the Press lately about this little problem which is causing concern in some areas; possibly it is causing more concern than it need do. I know many growers—and I am referring to oats now—are not aware that such a provision is included in the Bulk Handling Act, and normally they deliver their oats to Co-operative Bulk Handling. Once the grain is delivered they feel it is there to stay until such time as it is sold by the pool. I believe the second question asked in the lupin referendum currently being conducted is a very wise one and could be used to our advantage in this case.

I feel a provision should be written into the Grain Marketing Bill to the effect that grain—or oats in particular—may be prescribed once it is delivered to Co-operative Bulk Handling, and that it then may be handled only by the Grain Pool. I think this would overcome the anomaly which is raising its head at the moment and I am afraid it is one that may become worse and worse as time goes by.

I bring these points forward because they are of general interest to the area I represent. Perhaps they are of a little more than general interest because they are causing considerable concern in some instances. However, as I said earlier, I am sure the Minister will be prepared to alter this legislation if it is shown that it is necessary so to do. Eventually by trial and error and as the result of experience we will have a commendable Act for the marketing of all grains in Western Australia under the one umbrella.

I refer back to the matter which is of most concern to the growers in my area; that is, the vexed question of supplies being held by CBH for producers who themselves are not prepared to make their own provision.

I believe one of the fundamentals of sound farming is to provide feed for one's own stock during the period when natural feed is not available. People who do not do this leave themselves wide open to very serious problems and sleepless nights during adverse seasonal conditions. Just as we learnt the story of the seven lean cows and the seven fat cows, droughts will return again and lean years will be experienced. I believe firmly that if a Government is going to suggest that supplies must be kept to tide over these people in such an eventuality, that Government should be prepared to put its money where its mouth is and support the price at which the grain that is retained could have been sold.

Some of the farmers will not retain grain for this purpose. Farmers are human beings, and there are the odd human beings who would take the proverbial worm from the blind hen. If they can sell something and leave it to someone else to make provision for a rainy day, that is what they will do. In my opinion they should not be encouraged.

I support in principle this Grain Marketing Bill before the House. As I said earlier, it brings under one umbrella all the organisations which have been marketing grain up to date. It tidies up the whole matter. I commend once more our Minister for bringing forward this legislation, even at this late hour in the session. I am sure that as time goes by we will improve the legislation even more as a result of our experience.

MR GREWAR (Roe) [7.57 p.m.]: The Bill before the House is the result of considerable discussion, compromise, and negotiation. In its present form it will not satisfy completely all sections of the grain growing industry. However, with the passage of time and possibly minor amendments in the future, this legislation should give the industry the marketing authority it is seeking.

Co-operative grain marketing reform began in Western Australia about 1922 and replaced the private buyer system used up to that time. The private buying system had many opponents, but whether it was as terrible as we are led to believe it was, only research in history will reveal It possibly stems from a grower's desire

not to compete with his fellow grower that orderly marketing had so much appeal. The grower wishes to grow grain and not to be a wheeler and dealer in the market place—something for which he has neither the time nor the expertise.

Whilst being an advocate of orderly marketing, I also hold the view that private trading as an alternative means of selling can operate side by side with the present system. The competition engendered by a combination of the two systems operated together could be very healthy and in the best interests of the industry and could give the highest price. Orderly marketing by itself and by virtue of its monopolistic role can become bureaucratic and inefficient and may not necessarily give the best price. However, it does offer all growers an equal price over the whole season.

In the Press at the moment we see an appeal from the Grain Pool urging growers to support the voluntary oat pool rather than trade privately with overseas buyers. Regrettably, the warehousing provision under the Bulk Handling Act allows the use of grower facilities by overseas traders. The Grain Pool endeavours to obtain the highest price over a season for its participants. This price may not be as good as that offered by private buyers, who unfortunately enter the market only when there is a sudden increase in the world price.

If the overseas traders were genuinely interested in the long-term world oat market, they have had plenty of opportunity to participate in the past. Their entry now is unfortunate as it could endanger the operation of this season's voluntary oat pool. The security of receiving an average of season price has considerable appeal to growers, and it is to be hoped they will continue their support. I sincerely hope the growers get behind this scheme and back their pool.

This legislation comes before the House as a result of the desire to streamline the marketing of barley, oil seeds, and small seeds. The intention of the legislation is to combine under the one authority the structure and functions of the Grain Pool of WA and the two commodity boards, the Barley Marketing Board, and the Seeds Marketing Board.

These three bodies act in different ways, and I propose briefly to discuss the functions of each. The Grain Pool is the selling authority and is composed of 21 elected members, one from each of the grower districts. This body is called the growers' council and it is from this body that four trustees are elected. A general manager is employed whose responsibility it is to arrange sales of grain the Grain Pool has been commissioned to sell.

The operations of the Grain Pool are financed by fractions levied on grain sold. Profits accruing from trading in grain and from the handling of money are invested in real estate—mainly—on behalf of the growers. In other words, the main function of the Grain Pool is to sell grain, notably barley small seeds, and oil seeds.

However, the Grain Pool also has the responsibility for two voluntary pools—the oats and the lupin pools. In addition, it can act as selling agent for the Australian Wheat Board as required and by agreement.

The two commodity boards—the Barley Marketing Board and the Seeds Marketing Board—have a slightly different composition. The Barley Marketing Board consists of two grower-elected members, one Minister-nominated grower, two commercial representatives, and one neutral chairman.

The Seeds Marketing Board is composed of two grower-elected members, one Minister-nominated grower, one manufacturers' representative, and one neutral chairman.

The functions of the commodity boards are to look after producers' interests—including the prices paid for their grain—to follow up methods of upgrading and operating their industry through research and breeding of new varieties, to engage in publicity and promotion of their products and to set standards for the industry. The boards are virtually watchdogs over the operations of the Grain Pool.

In the existing situation, all these bodies serve their purposes reasonably satisfactorily. However, it is felt that in the interests of efficiency an amalgamation of these functions under the one body is desirable. Whether this will prove to be so, only time will tell; personally, I am hopeful that it will be a success.

I am very pleased that the Bill recommends the retention of the growers' council, for I think this body has a very important and increasing part to play, especially in the future if this Bill becomes an Act.

The growers' council is to be called the producers' council, and will be a "grass roots" organisation which will be close to the growers and aware of their problems and needs; it will feed back to the Grain Pool information on seasonal conditions, harvest prospects, varietal charges, research, etc.

It could also partly take over the watchdog functions previously carried out by the barley and seed boards and serve as a training ground for future directors of the Grain Pool.

In my opinion, the role of the producers' council will be vital to the operations and success of the new Grain Pool. To disband the concept completely would have meant that malfunction of the Grain Pool could pass unnoticed. The five-year term of operation proposed in the Bill should be ample time to assess the usefulness of this body; if it cannot perform satisfactorily in that time, it can be disbanded.

It is the intention of the new authority to utilise the facilities and staff of the Grain Pool, thereby causing minimum disruption in the implementation of the legislation. The retention of the name is very important, as it is one which is internationally known and accepted.

I wish now to deal briefly with the composition of the new board. As a result of negotiations with the industry, it has been decided that the four trustees of the Grain Pool will be retained. In addition, the two grower-elected members of the Barley Marketing Board and the two grower-elected members of the Seed Board, plus two commercial members nominated by the growers' organisations and approved by the Minister, and two grower-elected members from zones currently not represented are to be added to the new marketing authority. Thus, initially, the board will consist of 12 members, 10 of whom will be growers and two of whom will be commercial men; in the course of a few years, the board will be phased down to nine members, seven of whom will be growers and two of whom will be commercial men.

It is the intention of the Bill to amalgamate three grower council districts to form one zone from which one member will be elected to the position of director. Thus, all areas of the State will be adequately represented on the new Grain Pool.

Various bodies interested in this legislation met on many occasions to assist with the drafting of preliminary legislation. Some of these organisations violently opposed the inclusion of commercial interests on the authority; however, the Government has decided that such interests should be represented by two members on the board.

When one reviews agricultural boards and co-operatives, it becomes obvious that the most successful have operated without commercial interests being represented. I mention as two examples Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and the present Grain Pool. There are many capable men representing growers, who have had considerable commercial, financial and marketing experience prior to or during their terms as farmers; the experience they have gained, plus their greater affinity with the industry makes them much more able to represent their industry.

I do not dispute the need for commercial men on the board; I believe commercial expertise to be a most important requisite. However, I fail to see why these nominees should have voting rights, as they really have no vested interest in the product being handled. I would prefer to see commercial men seconded to the board without voting rights—men who could be appointed as the need dictates, and once they have served their role, replaced by some other commercial men with different expertise.

I should like the comments of the Minister in regard to several parts of the Bill. The first concerns the power of the Minister to appoint two commercial men. The legislation provides that the growers shall nominate men with commercial expertise for appointment to the board, and the Minister shall then appoint two members from this group. However, if the growers do not produce such a list of nominees, the Minister has the power to appoint the members himself.

While I respect the responsibility of the Minister, I feel the powers granted to him under this clause may not always be in the interests of the growers. I would wish to see this clause changed in such a way that in the event of unsatisfactory candidates being nominated, a request will be made to the industry to submit a further panel of names.

At a meeting of the nine-member board —as it will become—five directors will constitute a quorum. However, the Bill makes provision for deputy directors to be appointed to replace directors who may be absent. I fail to see a need for this provision because it would be on only the rarest occasion that more than four members are absent at one time. The newly-appointed deputy would be unaware of previous activities of the board and his contribution could be minimal and could even be damaging, due to a lack of background knowledge.

Under the Bill the Minister can appoint deputies to overcome the absence of commercial members. This provision is similarly dangerous because we would have an appointee who is unfamiliar with the operations and the previous decisions of the board. Therefore the provisions relating to the appointment of the deputies should, in my opinion, be removed from the Bill.

Part V of the Bill provides that the chairman of the board of directors shall be an *ex officio* councillor on the producers' council, and the third schedule to the Bill spells out in greater detail that this *ex officio* councillor shall be chairman of each meeting of the producers' council. I accept that the chairman of the board of directors should be an *ex officio* councillor on the producers' council, but I do not agree that he should fill the role of chairman of that body. This position is rather powerful and he could exert influence from the board of directors to the producers' council. In my opinion it would be better for him to return to the producers' council as an ordinary member because, after all is said and done, the producers' council is the advisory body that will be having its decisions passed upwards and should not be having them passed downwards.

In conclusion, it is my belief that the newly-constituted Grain Pool will result in greater efficiency in grain marketing and will provide growers with an authority which replaces what is at present a fragmented group of organisations. No doubt problems will arise in the implementation period, but with the passage of time and tolerance shown during negotiations with the industry, board members, and the producers' council, eventually we should see a Grain Pool which will add considerably to the fine record of Western Australia in the grain marketing sphere.

This speech would not be complete without some reference to the negotiating ability and logical direction shown by Mr Robin Clayton, the Co-ordinator of Agricultural Industries, without which this Bill would not now be before the House. I commend the Bill to members.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [8.12 p.m.]: I will endeavour to avoid tedious repetition because speakers who have preceded me have spoken in a general way on the Bill and one has to guard against repetition. As mentioned by those speakers before me there has been a great deal of discussion in producers' organisations with a view to bringing this legislation before the House. Much time was spent in an attempt to bring matters to a head and to encourage the organisations concerned to agree to work together so that this grain marketing authority could be established to handle those grains in a way which would be more acceptable to all.

It is commendable indeed that the position has now been reached where the Bill has at least been presented to the House and that by far the majority of growers have agreed to it. Some sections of the industry do not agree with all parts of the measure but I am sure that as time goes by they will be satisfied with it.

It is interesting to read some of the history of the Grain Pool which has been in operation in this State for something like 52 years. As an experienced marketing authority it has performed a very commendable job for the grain growers in Western Australia. It has negotiated the sales of oats and other grains in the past. In the last few years barley has become one of the major commodities it has handled, but speaking of oats the Manager of the Grain Pool has said that this grain is one of the most difficult to sell. The Grain Pool did have a good market in Germany, as that country was purchasing 200 000 tonnes of oats a year, but the market in Germany has now dropped to 50 000 tonnes a year. Fortunately, however, over the last three years the pool has developed a good market in Japan and this year it is negotiating the sale of something like 100 000 tonnes of oats to that country for the 1975-76 season.

The comments of the trustees of the Grain Pool are rather interesting. They have reported that the quality of oats obtained through the Grain Pool cannot be equalled anywhere in the world. That is a most commendable effort in regard to the sale of oats on the world market, because this has not been achieved easily.

Barley has played a big part in the operations of the Grain Pool, and it is interesting to note, from the figures presented to me, that, according to its percentage of world production, Australia ranks 13th among world producers. This country produces 1.9 per cent of the world's total production—that is, as from 1969-70 to 1971-72—and the average production of Western Australia represents 28 per cent of the Australian total. That is a very good percentage for Western Australian growers to be producing. This represents only 0.532 per cent of the world's total, but Australia is one of the four major exporters of the world. Its three-year average from 1969-70 to 1971-72 was 1.2 million tonnes. So in the last few years the export of barley has increased and undoubtedly the Grain Pool has performed a commendable job working in conjunction with the Barley Marketing Board in negotiating the sales that have been made, especially in the last three years.

When this question of bringing the various boards under one authority came before me as Minister I appointed Mr Robin Clayton, Co-ordinator of Agricultural Industries, as the chairman of the working party which was endeavouring to bring the various bodies together. Mr Clayton worked exceptionally hard, attended a large number of meetings, and was successful in having the growers reach some degree of unanimity. I met the growers' representatives on a number of occasions and gradually the differences between the organisations were ironed out and, as time progressed, most of the differences were resolved. As a result we have now reached the point where this Bill is being debated and hopefully it will pass through the Parliament in the not-too-distant future.

When the legislation is passed it will give the Grain Pool an opportunity to work under its new method of operation by having a newly-constituted board which I think should work efficiently and well for the benefit of grain growers by the system of holding elections over a period of years. The board will commence with 12 members but that number will eventually be reduced to nine in accordance with the method proposed to reduce the number of directors.

We must bear in mind, of course, the tremendous value of assets the Grain Pool has acquired over the years and we must also keep in mind the efficiency of operation shown by the directors of Co-Operative Bulk Handling Limited and the value of the assets that that body has built up over past years.

After studying the Bill it became evident to me that there was a need to offer some protection to Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to ensure that its operations were not downgraded in any way; that there was no possibility of any other organisation taking over its rightful operations. I have now noted a number of amendments on the notice paper which will ensure that such an opportunity does not present itself as the Bill will give protection to CBH—protection which I consider is completely fair and justified. Of course the Bill will still leave the board with discretionary powers in certain respects, and in accordance with the amendments proposed in carrying out its operations it will work well with Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

The main provisions of the Bill are concerned with Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. A new definition of "lupins" has been prescribed in the measure. I have also noted in one of the schedules to the Bill that the question of the chairman's deliberative vote in the producers' council has been dealt with.

Referring to the point of control of production raised by the member for Moore, if one looks at section 19 (5) of the Seed Marketing Act one finds that the wording appearing in clause 22 (4) of the Bill before us has been taken from that subsection, because subclause (4) states—

> (4) If, at any time it appears to the Board that there is likely to be a surplus of a prescribed grain that would adversely affect its marketing, the Grain Pool may, with the consent of the Minister, control production of that grain on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed.

To my knowledge this wording in section 19 (5) of the Seed Marketing Act has not caused any confusion; one can therefore assume that the wording in the Bill will similarly not cause any concern. It has been used with success in the Seed Marketing Act, and so it should succeed in the legislation before us. If in the future this wording does cause concern to growers then no doubt the matter could be rectified.

Turning to the problems which have arisen in the last few weeks—the warehousing of oats and associated problems—apparently the Grain Pool is very concerned that these problems could undermine the contracts it has entered into. Some criticism has been levelled at Co-operative Bulk Handling. It has been alleged that CBH should not be warehousing oats, other than for the Grain Pool.

If one turns to the Bulk Handling Act, particularly to section 18, one finds that Co-operative Bulk Handling has no alternative but to do what is asked of it by people who seek to market oats, because subsections (2) and (3) state—

> (2) As regards grain, the position of the Company at law is that of a custodian for reward.
>
> (3) The proprietary interest in grain is vested in the person who, for the time being, is entitled to obtain it from bulk stocks held by the Company or under its control.

Section 19 states that subject to that Act and its regulations, CBH shall allow a person, on payment of the prescribed charges, the use of any bulk handling facilities and equipment controlled by it at ports in the State.

So, Co-operative Bulk Handling has no alternative but to do what is requested of it by the people who at the present time are seeking to market oats, other than through the Grain Pool.

The Pastoralists and Graziers Association has become very concerned, and in its Press release of the 23rd October which was placed before me this morning, that association stated it would like to see oats brought in as a prescribed grain on delivery to the handling authority.

At this late stage, without consultations with the oat growers or the representative organisation, the step proposed by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association might be a hasty one. If implemented it could cause a great deal of dissatisfaction and confusion, although in my view its proposal is not so undesirable.

Mr H. D. Evans: What degree of consultation was there with oat producers previously?

Mr McPHARLIN: The consultations were with the representative body of the producers—the grain growers. They would be the barley growers, the wheat growers, but not specifically the oat growers. I do not think that a farmer specifically grows oats only.

Mr H. D. Evans: There is a referendum of the lupin growers.

Mr McPHARLIN: Oats was mentioned in general discussion, but at no time was it considered seriously to bring oats under the statutory marketing authority.

Mr H. D. Evans: Were the oat growers dominated by the barley growers?

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not think that was the case. Oats did not receive a great deal of mention. Over the years it has been traditional for farmers to leave oats out of statutory marketing, so they could negotiate private sales, undertake backloading, and do similar things. However, the Pastoralists and Graziers Association did make some very pertinent comments in its Press release. One of the comments was—

> If overseas traders were genuinely interested in marketing Western Australian oats overseas, they had ample

opportunity in the past to establish a system in competition to the voluntary pool.

The fact that this did not eventuate clearly demonstrates that the current interest has only been generated by the current buoyant grain marketing situation.

Further down in that Press release the following appeared—

When markets were buoyant, these traders would operate and thus restrict deliveries to the pool. As the market deteriorated, these same traders would withdraw without any cost, and leave the pool responsible to find export markets.

I find that comment, which reflects the concern of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, to be most enlightening. Usually that organisation is very concerned with complete free enterprise trading, and does not talk about bringing grains under control in any way.

There will be a further opportunity for me to contribute to the debate on this measure at the Committee stage, and I shall reserve further comments till then.

MR COWAN (Merredin-Yilgarn) [8.27 p.m.]: Like all members on this side of the House, I support the measure before us. It is very pleasing to me after two years of fairly solid argument amongst producers to see this legislation introduced in the House.

When the Bill was in the process of being drafted the most contentious points were the composition of the board itself, and the retention of the producer representation in the form of the growers advisory council.

Several speakers on this side of the House have been rather critical of the proposition to provide two seats on the board for persons having a commercial background, but I am not one of those who are against the proposition. I support the measure fully. People who are critical of it usually put forward the case of Co-operative Bulk Handling as a great argument for not having commercial representation on the board. I would like to point out that the problems encountered by CBH are nowhere near as complex as would be the problems in relation to the marketing of grain.

The problems faced by CBH are storage, and catering for that storage at a future date. In the case of the Grain Pool it faces a marketing problem which changes from day to day; and therefore it is justifiable to have commercial expertise on the board.

Because of the extension of the statutory marketing authority into the handling of most grains, with the exception of wheat, I think it is very desirable to have the growers advisory council so that it could give advice when necessary.

I support the amendments that appear on the notice paper in the name of the Minister. The majority of these seek to protect Co-operative Bulk Handling, and I think it is only right that they be agreed to because this company is very valuable to the State and its record speaks for itself.

Over the years it has invested $100 million in the provision of storage for our grain and it has earned for itself a great reputation in connection with insect control to such an extent that our product is marketable anywhere in the world.

I also support the amendment to clause 33 which allows appeals to the Minister by growers for any dockages which occur.

The member for Warren referred to the CBH warehousing as it affects the oats handled by the pool. This, in itself, is definitely a threat to a co-operative system of marketing, but as far as warehousing is concerned I feel it may not be a bad idea to have this provision incorporated to get the grain off the farms into CBH where there is a rigid insect controlled storage area.

Mr H. D. Evans: There would be no problem with the prescribed grain. You could still do that.

Mr COWAN: No, because once it was a prescribed grain the present situation would not exist where, under the warehouse agreement, a farmer can deliver his grain to the pool and then use his dockets to sell to a feed merchant. This could not happen if the grain were prescribed.

Mr H. D. Evans: I take the point, but by prescribing it on a voluntary basis if delivered—

Mr COWAN: This would have occurred anyhow, under the existing legislation. As far as I am concerned I believe this loophole can probably be repaired at a later stage.

I certainly support the Bill and everything it intends to do.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.32 p.m.]: I would hate to let a Bill like this one be passed without my making some comment on it. Having read it through rather well I wonder how the Minister managed to get hold of it. I could have understood it if he had had an electorate on the coast, because the Bill could have been left by the red hordes after being driven back by you, Sir, and your supporters after they breached the beaches along the coast. However, as the Minister has an inland electorate, I wonder how he got hold of this legislation because if it had been drafted by the best draftsman in Peking or Moscow he could not have come up with anything different. The Government is to be complimented on the drafting.

I imagine that if we had come up with anything like this we would have been

accused of having fallen for the action of all the hordes and—

Mr H. D. Evans: Wait a minute. This is our legislation.

Mr JAMIESON: I know, but we did not introduce it. The Government pinched it. If we had introduced it the criticism would have been cutting. The only criticism I have of my colleague is that he wants to delay the Bill. I want it to go ahead rather rapidly.

I am reminded of how far this delves into the socialistic field by reading the definitions. "Grain" is defined as meaning the seed of any crop or pasture species. There is also a definition of "prescribed grain". The Grain Pool is the sole marketing authority of prescribed grain which is any grain which can be prescribed by the Minister.

Mr Bertram: You are working on the basis that they are serious about this socialism business.

Mr JAMIESON: I think the Government must be. The beauty of the situation is that if the Government keeps going there will be nothing left for us to do on the rural side. This legislation goes much further than did the meat Bill. It did not interfere with private abattoirs or anything, but stopped short of being really refined socialist legislation.

I compliment the Government on this Bill. It is really good and one of those which we like to see coming forward.

I can envisage that before long we could have endorsed Country Party and Labor Party candidates being up for election as directors, but it appears to me that this sort of legislation would be more suitable to our philosophy than to that of some of the members of the Country Party. We would be very wrong if we did not endeavour to get our people on the board of control. Indeed, they could possibly get into other sections as well.

Mr H. D. Evans: That might be too left wing for us. Watch it!

Mr JAMIESON: That is the only thing I am worried about. How far do we fly the red flag? The Government has endeavoured to do it on this occasion, and congratulations to it.

As someone has pointed out, this Bill will obviate the necessity for 16 Acts of Parliament dealing with various marketing organisations because it will consolidate them all into the one Act over which the Minister will have firm control. This is the kind of legislation we should have.

I agree with the honourable member who just resumed his seat. Organised marketing legislation under which people are not expected to work for nought for their produce is sensible; and this is sensible legislation to that extent.

Getting away from my frivolous attitude of a few moments ago, I wish to say that I can see a lot in the Bill which will do good for the grain producers of this State, and I believe we should support it and any other legislation of this nature which is submitted to us.

I have one complaint; that is, the definition of a "producer". It allows a person who is a Khemlani in his own right to be included, as long as he is a relative. The definition does not describe a relative or how distant he may be. He is included as long as he has a financial interest. He can then take the rights of a producer for the purpose of qualifying for election as a councillor. This is a situation which I do not countenance because on occasions the financial interest could be very heavy over one's head. The producer should be the one who works at the ocupation. An investor should not be entitled to be a councillor.

The Minister might hasten to point out that an investor can be a councillor only with the approval of the actual producer but, of course, if the investor is backing a producer, the producer would be subjected to rather heavy influence as a result of that financial support. He may be threatened with a withdrawal of the support.

I think this is a little objectionable. The producers should be the ones to have all the votes in connection with the marketing of their produce, not those who have invested in the farm.

I have had a look at the amendments, but they do nothing to desocialise the legislation. As a matter of fact they are an improvement. It appears to me that the Bill has been reviewed by some other socialist draftsman who has found a few improvements are necessary to ensure that the legislation covers such items as lupins which evidently did not come into the category of seeds, although I believed the definition covered just about everything produced. I feel that if those in authority wished to include Iceland poppies or sweetpeas, they could do so. Now lupins are intended to be included under the amendments proposed by the Minister. He has even referred to them by their Latin names to make doubly sure there is no loophole. This is desirable. Some of those people who produce lupins might want to find a way out, at some time, and it is essential that there should be no way out except through the passage of legislation similar to that now before us.

A previous speaker suggested that production could be limited under certain circumstances, and that is a sensible provision, also. It could be claimed that not enough food is produced in the world at the present time. We are aware of that, and we know we could probably produce a lot more in Australia. However, we could not sell that food effectively and we are not in a position where we would be able to give it away. If we could afford to give food away we probably should make it available, but we cannot do so at this

stage. The nations which most need food are the ones which find it most difficult to pay for that food. I do not know how we will ever overcome that problem, but when we do overcome it the opportunity will be available for the proposed new authority to authorise greater production. The measure now before us also provides for a reduction in production when a market disappears because some other country has started to produce in opposition to us.

We have to remember that the Japanese are very cunning, and have many irons in the fire, in all sorts of systems throughout the world. A large Japanese venture is the development of land within the territory of the Soviet Union. I understand the area is nearly as large as the State of Western Australia. When a country is involved in that sort of co-operative development, and on such a large scale, certain markets may dwindle in time. When it is found that markets are drying up the board will have the power to reduce production until new markets are found for the produce from the farms of this State.

Many farmers who have overcome past problems—including those created by themselves—are fearful of any legislation which introduces controls over their produce. Any scheme which will ensure the sale of their produce, in the long term, is for their own benefit. At present we see the position facing the beef industry, where the farmers cannot get rid of their stock. There is quite a problem in that particular field. Although the beef industry has nothing to do with the measure now before us, it is another industry which will go from bad to worse unless it is controlled by some sort of legislation.

If we are successful in obtaining long-term markets for the sale of grain, for food and for other purposes, we will be in a position to produce that grain. With the use of computers, in this modern day and age, we should be in a position to reasonably forecast how much grain can be sold. Whether or not we can produce the exact quantity of grain which is required rests on the vagaries of nature. Some years are more bountiful than others and always there will be the risk that production will not meet expectations.

I am sure that what I am saying is most enlightening to those members who are involved in the production side of grain, but that they appreciate my interest. However, my interest is essentially a socialist one and nothing but good can result from this proposal. Those who work hard to produce the grain are entitled to a fair return, and I am sure that the passing of this measure will be of assistance in that regard.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [8.45 p.m.]: After listening to previous speakers there is very little that can be said which is new. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition I will confine my remarks to a few points which are of interest to my own electorate.

It is true that this legislation, after a lengthy gestation period, has finally seen the light of day due to a degree of compromise between all the parties which have been involved. The measure has finally met with the support of those organisations.

In general, I support the measure although I must say there are several points with which I am not particularly happy. When I say that I am not particularly happy, I am also reflecting the point of view of those people I have the privilege to represent.

The first point I wish to raise is the question of the two persons with commercial expertise who will be appointed to the board, and who will be nominated by the Minister. The proposed authority is to be a marketing organisation and although I agree that commercial expertise is necessary I also believe that a board duly constituted by the growers would be able to purchase that necessary expertise. It is not necessary for the expertise to be possessed by two nominated members with voting rights. For that reason, I do not think those two apointments are entirely necessary or desirable.

I am quite happy, of course, to observe that the authority will be a majority grower elected body. In this respect the legislation will be vitally different from the type which the Labor Party may have or would have, introduced. The member for Mundaring, and also the Federal Minister for Agriculture on one occasion to my knowledge, stated that the producers have no God-given right to have majority representation on boards. That sets out an essential difference between members opposite and my party on the question of orderly marketing.

It is essential that boards which handle the produce of growers should be controlled by a majority of those growers. Such boards should not be controlled by people from outside the industry. Those people could be nominated by Government officials who have no idea of handling the produce which is brought onto the market.

Another area of minor concern is the growers' council which, under this legislation, will become the producers' council. I agree with the proposal that a representative of the new board should be *ex officio* on the producers' council; that is desirable when it is realised that the producers' council will be an advisory body. However, I cannot see the necessity for the *ex officio* councillor to be the chairman of the producers' council. I trust the Minister will give an indication for the necessity for the *ex officio* councillor to be the chairman of the proposed board.

The member for Warren mentioned that he had been contacted by several people from my electorate. He mentioned Mr Colin Adams, and also the zone council of the Albany branch of the Farmers' Union. I assure the member for Warren that those people did not contact him because of any lack of confidence in their local member; I know them personally and I know they have confidence in me. Of course, in contacting the member for Warren they may have been hoping that if I found it necessary to move amendments to the Bill those amendments would receive the support of the member for Warren. Perhaps that was their idea in contacting him!

A major question of concern to my electors is the threat to the Grain Pool because of the warehouse provisions of the Bulk Handling Act.

This point has been touched on by most speakers. I will not go into it in any detail but as I understand it the warehousing provisions in the Bulk Handling Act were included in the first instance because when that legislation was enacted there were private speculators in the grain trade and steps had to be taken to cover the situation. However, with the establishment of the Wheat Marketing Board the activities of those grain speculators have ceased long since and I cannot understand why these provisions have not been deleted. Nevertheless, they were not deleted, and now that a party has found it can act under the provisions, I think the Bill before the House is particularly timely because it enables us to consider amendments which will overcome a situation which is potentially dangerous to the Grain Pool and to orderly marketing, generally.

I do not agree with the comments of the member for Warren that the Bill should be temporarily withdrawn and that it is too late to have the legislation operating for the current crop. It will be noted that subclause (2) of clause 1 states—

> This Act shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

My interpretation of those words is that the legislation could be proclaimed a day or two after it is passed; and bearing in mind the answer the Premier gave this afternoon it is quite likely that the Bill will be passed before the close of this session, so it could be operative before the end of November.

If the House saw fit to amend the Bill to retain the status quo in regard to the voluntary oats pool, it would be of benefit to growers this year. The growers in my area want to retain the status quo; they were quite happy with the situation which existed—although it may not have been the legal situation—whereby growers could engage in farmer-to-farmer sales or they could sell to producers, feed merchants, or exporters. But once they delivered their grain to Co-operative Bulk Handling, it was considered it then became the property of the Grain Pool. That is the situation growers in my area wish to retain, and it could be retained with the legislation now before the House if the Minister would accept a very simple amendment to insert as clause 20 (1a) the following—

> Oats in bulk received by a licensed receiver is a prescribed grain.

A simple amendment such as that would retain the status quo and would still allow to growers their farmer-to-farmer sales and their sales to produce merchants, feed merchants, and exporters, if they felt so inclined. However, under this system exporters would not be able to use the facilities of CBH, which is the situation that existed until the warehousing provisions were taken advantage of.

Failure to accept an amendment along those lines could well result in the growers in Western Australia finishing up without a pool at all. I can envisage a situation, although it may be extreme, where because of forward sales by the Grain Pool and the necessity to go out and purchase grain to ensure they are met, and the fact that the private operator also will be out purchasing grain, in the end there may not be sufficient oats to justify a pool. So the growers could be left in a difficult situation, which could be overcome by a simple amendment. It may not be the perfect answer to the warehousing problem but it would hold the situation for the time being and allow an opportunity for further consideration by all parties, perhaps with a view to some additional amendments next year if considered necessary.

I support the measure before the House with those provisos, and I hope it has a speedy passage.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.56 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments on the Bill and I will endeavour to answer some of the queries which have been raised.

The member for Warren mentioned the fact that the referendum of lupin growers is shortly to be determined, and he felt the passage of the Bill should be delayed until the results of the referendum are known. I assure him and other members that in no way have we preempted the decision of the lupin growers in their referendum by including lupins as a prescribed grain in the Bill. On the contrary, it is purely a measure to bring in sweet white lupins, as they were, under the old Seeds Act, and in the event of the growers desiring lupins to be an acquired crop the machinery already exists for that to be done. If, on the other hand, they opt for the second alternative, as the member for Warren suggested they might, there is provision in the Bill for the Minister to "unprescribe" the grain.

The reason for prescribing sweet white lupins, other lupins, and rape seed at this stage is that, after a grain has been prescribed, there is provision in the Bill that a minimum of one month must elapse before that prescription becomes legal. There would therefore be a period of one month during which the grain could be traded freely, and the Seed Board expressed concern that this could be chaotic. That is the reason for prescribing those three grains along with barley.

The member for Warren can rest assured that in the event of the lupin growers opting for the second alternative we are currently seeking legal advise on any necessary amendments to the legislation to comply with their wishes. I can assure the House that the wishes of the lupin growers will be met, as that was the idea of holding the referendum.

Almost without exception, those who spoke to the Bill mentioned the current situation in regard to oats. I assure members that we are very conscious of that situation, and also of the fact there has always been provision in the Bulk Handling Act to allow warehousing, but up to date it has not been utilised to the extent that will now be possible.

I also point out to members that it is not easy to prescribe oats in any way because growers have jealously preserved that crop as a free crop. I am not at all convinced that the majority of growers want any change in that situation, and it is my intention to canvass the industry as far as possible prior to making any amendments to the legislation.

I acknowledge the fact that I have received telegrams as well as phone calls, in the same vein and from the same people. I have also had phone calls from people who say, "Do not touch the holy cow".

Mr H. D. Evans: Logically, would it not be the proper thing to canvass those growers now before the legislation is passed?

Mr OLD: We can always correct this later. The important thing is to get the legislation going, and if necessary, it can be amended in another place.

Mr H. D. Evans: Your lot used to become hysterical if we ever suggested something like that.

Mr OLD: That was a quite different set of circumstances.

The honourable member mentioned a few facts about the Grain Pool which I appreciate, and which I am sure the members of the current Grain Pool appreciate. As has been mentioned, the pool has made very substantial forward sales, and naturally, the chairman and the members of the board are very concerned about the possibility of not being able to meet their commitment. From the information I have, I feel quite confident that the board will be able to meet that commitment, and appeals have been made to the growers to preserve their own facilities in Co-operative Bulk Handling by delivering grain to the pool rather than delivering it for warehousing. I believe common sense will prevail amongst the growers because all they are doing by providing their own facilities is upsetting their own marketing organisation, and, quite frankly, I do not see this happening. However, members can rest assured that we are taking legal advice on the matter in an endeavour to overcome the problem as quickly as possible.

The Bill in its present form has received some criticism here and elsewhere, but generally it has been received with accord throughout the industry. In fact, I have had phone calls from producers to the effect that they are very happy with the Bill, although possibly with some minor alterations.

The member for Warren said that the measure was a little sloppy because there were amendments on the notice paper. I will concede the point that there are amendments on the notice paper, but in no way will I agree that the measure is sloppy. The reason for the proposed amendments is the current unsettling experience with CBH. In consultation with that organisation, it was felt desirable to tighten up the Act in respect of its operation within the ambit of the Act. That is the reason for the majority of the amendments that appear on the notice paper in my name. We want to ensure that the rights of CBH are preserved, and that in the future any provisions in other current Acts relating to CBH will be watertight.

Pleasure has been expressed at the fact that the name of the Grain Pool of Western Australia will be preserved. The first reason for this was an historical one—the Grain Pool was an organisation formed by the farmers. Secondly, on a more mercenary note, the Grain Pool is so well known and respected overseas through past transactions that it would have been rather stupid to change its name whilst the organisation continues to operate in virtually the same way. Indeed, the Grain Pool of Western Australia is highly respected.

The member for Warren referred to the composition of the new board and stated that there would be 10 elected members; four trustees, two present members of the Barley Marketing Board, two members from the Seed Marketing Board, two commercial men, plus another two members to be elected, giving a total of 12. However, I point out—and this has been pointed out by subsequent speakers —that elections will be held, and the actual membership of the board will be nine.

The inclusion of two commercial men on the board has caused comment—some favourable and some not so favourable.

This has been the pattern right throughout the preparation of this measure, and the member for Mt. Marshall will bear out these comments because during his term as Minister for Agriculture he put a great deal of work into the preparation of this legislation. He found that the consensus of opinion was evenly divided about the inclusion of commercial representation, in the same way that it was evenly divided as to whether a producers' council was warranted. We are hoping that by including both, we will give each faction some satisfaction.

I know that some organisations which were opposed to the inclusion of commercial representatives have now accepted the situation. Although I do not say they are particularly happy about it, I do not anticipate any problems. Provided that the right people are recommended by the producer organisations, and then appointed to the board, I believe they will do much to assist its operations. In fact, the result should be a balanced body. It has been suggested that the commercial representatives should not have voting powers, but I could not agree to that proposition because it would emasculate their effectiveness. They would not be full members, and unless a person is a full member of a board, his interest will wane.

Mr H. D. Evans: Will you accept the foreshadowed amendment of the member for Stirling?

Mr OLD: Not until I take further legal advice, which I am in the process of doing.

The member for Moore brought up some points which need answering. He referred to the grain research fund and the fact that permits may be necessary for the sale of prescribed grain from farmer to farmer or from farmer to processor, and he wondered how this levy would be collected. He suggested that some farmers would not make these sales through the pool. Whilst such action may not be quite legal, it is accepted generally that this has happened in the past and I cannot see that the Grain Pool will make great endeavours to discover farmers doing this sort of thing. However, when a sale of a reasonable size is made between farmer and farmer, or between farmer and processor, an undertaking must be given to pay the levy, and the levy will be collected by the Grain Pool. So I do not see any great problems in this regard.

The method of production control has also caused some controversy and concern. The member for Mt Marshall pointed out that this provision already appears in the Seed Marketing Act. I would like to say that it appears also in section 20 (3) of the Marketing of Barley Act. Although the phraseology is different, the implication is the same and the same power is given. This power has never been utilised, although I do not say it never will be. Some time ago it was found necessary to limit the production of wheat in order to maintain a stable market, and it is possible that the same thing could happen with other grains.

One never knows what may happen in the future, and this provision will provide the mechanics to limit production if it is necessary. I assure members that production will not be limited unless it does become necessary and the Bill provides for appeal to the Minister if anyone feels he has been treated unfairly.

Paragraph (b) of clause 31 (2) provides for the provision of grain within the State or those parts of the State where there is a shortage of grain. The member for Moore made the point that the provision of this grain should not be the responsibility of the producers.

However, I would point out that the wording of the particular clause is that the board may supply this grain; there is no compulsion upon it to do so. This is one of the functions the board may undertake; and it would be done in consultation if the situation ever arose.

The producers' council is to have a life of five years, after which it will be reviewed by the Grain Pool. I think that should be the decision of the Grain Pool and not the decision of growers as was suggested by the member for Moore. In my opinion the Grain Pool will be in a position far better than the producers to assess the worth of the producers' council because it will be in close consultation with it at all times. When all is said and done, the Grain Pool is elected by the producers.

With regard to the members of the producers' council, this is covered in the third schedule. The schedule says there will be 21 electoral districts, and clause 3 states that one councillor shall be elected from each district. Therefore, there will be 21 members on the producers' council plus one *ex officio* member from the Grain Pool, who will be the chairman. I think this matter was the subject of comment by the member for Stirling. The producers' council will be a different ball game from the growers' council which exists today, because the new council will not be an elective council. The growers' council has in the past elected the trustees of the Grain Pool. That will no longer be done, and the trustees will be elected direct by growers. The area of responsibility is diminished to some degree, and it will be purely an advisory council to the Grain Pool.

It was thought that as the chairman of the Grain Pool is to be an *ex officio* member of the producers' council, it would be fitting that he should be the chairman of that council also. I have no very strong views on this matter. However, as he is the chairman of the Grain Pool I think he should be accorded the same honour on the producers' council.

It was suggested that this member may unduly influence the producers' council. All

I can say is that if one man could influence 21 elected men on a council he would be a very strong man and obviously could run the whole show as a dictatorship; and then there would be no need for a producers' council.

The member for Roe referred to deputy directors. I point out that deputy directors will not of necessity be appointed; they will be appointed only under certain circumstances. The circumstances envisaged are prolonged illness or a prolonged overseas visit, in which case the Minister may grant leave of absence. When that is done, the directors may appoint a deputy director from the zone of the absent director. The deputy director would represent the same interests as the absent director. This is an amalgamation of three different boards and the Acts in respect of each of those boards made provision for deputy directors in the past. I think the fact that we have amalgamated these boards without very much change is beneficial.

The member for Roe urged growers to patronise the Grain Pool, and I commend him for that. I would like to add my 5c worth: I think growers should patronise the Grain Pool as much as possible. The fact that the Grain Pool has proved it can sell to the advantage of the grower is something producers should keep in mind when delivering their grain. I urge them to support the Grain Pool to the fullest, especially in the matter of oats.

The honourable member also mentioned the power of the Minister to appoint commercial men from a panel of names submitted by growers, and he referred to a situation in which no names were submitted. I can assure him the growers' organisations will be only too keen to submit a panel of names, and they will submit the names of those gentlemen whom they think will be of the most use to them and whose opinions are akin to their own. Therefore, I do not see any problems in that respect.

The member for Mt. Marshall made several comments, for which I thank him. I would like to thank him also for the work he put in on this Bill. Together with Mr Clayton he did a tremendous amount of work on this legislation, and as a result of that we now have before us what I hope is the finished product.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made his usual speech about socialistic legislation, for which I thank him. I would like to say that if complete producer control of a board means socialistic legislation then that is a fair enough definition of socialism so far as I am concerned.

Mr Barnett: When are you going to join the party?

Mr OLD: I would say it is completely free enterprise when we have men marketing their own products, and there is nothing socialistic about that.

Mr Taylor: Would you repeat that?

Mr OLD: I said it is completely free enterprise when we have free enterprise men marketing their own products.

Mr Taylor: That was worth repeating.

Mr Bertram: It is something to do with co-operation, perhaps.

Mr OLD: It could be. However, it is quite different from communism. Despite what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, there is also a minimum of ministerial control.

Mr Jamieson: There is not, of course.

Mr OLD: Ministerial control is at an absolute minimum. If the honourable member cares to read the Bill he will find that is so.

Mr Jamieson: There is maximum control. This is where you should read the Bill.

Mr OLD: Actually, I have read it a few times.

Mr Jamieson: Read it again, it might do you good.

Mr OLD: I think if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition read the Bill once he would find there is a minimum of control.

Mr Jamieson: I have read it over and over.

Mr OLD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was quite off the beam when he spoke about the definition of lupins. He made great play of the fact that we have had to define "lupin". For his education I would point out that there are various types of lupins, and those in which we are interested are sweet white lupins, even though some of them may be yellow, as opposed to the old Geraldton blue lupins. If we simply have a definition saying that "grain" means the seed of any crop or pasture, then the old Geraldton blue lupins could also become an acquired seed and we do not want them as they are not marketable like the other lupins.

Mr Jamieson: I was associated in the earlier stages with sweet lupins.

Mr OLD: Very good! I am pleased about that. Along with the good doctor I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did a lot of work.

Mr Jamieson: No, but I was very interested in his work.

Mr OLD: I think I have covered most of the points brought forward during the debate. The member for Stirling referred to commercial men and their voting rights, plus the *ex officio* chairman of the producers' council, but I have covered that matter in comments I made in respect of the contributions of other members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Interpretation—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 16—Insert after the clause designation "5." the subclause designation "(1)".

This will provide for a later amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 3, lines 17 to 20 inclusive —Delete the interpretation "licensed receiver" and substitute the following—

"licensed receiver" means a person who has under section 34 a licence to receive and handle grain on behalf of the Grain Pool;

The effect of this amendment will be to remove the ability of the licensed receiver to deal in grain. He will be receiving and handling grain only on behalf of the Grain Pool.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr STEPHENS: During the second reading debate I indicated an amendment which could resolve the matter relating to warehousing, and still retain the status quo. I understood from the Minister's reply that he intended to give further consideration to this matter. As I did not go into detail earlier, I point out now that the word "oats" should also be defined by this clause. If the Minister intends obtaining legal advice relating to my suggestion, I request that he reports progress at this point.

Mr OLD: I am not prepared to report progress; as I mentioned before, we are taking legal advice, and will continue to do so in an endeavour to overcome the situation. I move an amendment—

Page 3, after line 20—Insert before the interpretation "Order" a further interpretation as follows—

"lupin" means—

(a) the Uniwhite, Uniharvest, and Unicrop cultivars of *Lupinus angustifolius* L. (narrow-leaved lupin); and

(b) the Weiko III cultivar of *Lupinus luteus* L. (yellow lupin);

Amendment put and passed.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I believe the member for Stirling referred to a very contentious issue. Contrary to what the Minister said, it is not just a legal issue, but a matter of principle and of meeting the requirements of the oat producers. The word "oats" should be defined in clause 5. The interests of the oat growers have been seriously neglected in this matter. As the previous Minister for Agriculture mentioned, general discussions have been held, but the Government has not reached the stage of understanding and meeting the requirements of the oat growers.

The oat growers are in a unique situation and, as the Minister himself indicated, it is very difficult to institute changes in this area which will be completely satisfactory to the industry. If this is the case, why do we not leave the position as it is? This will meet the requests of those who have been sufficiently troubled to contact various members of this Chamber and, at the same time, enable the free trade of seed and feed on a farm-to-farm basis to continue.

I believe the Minister should report progress so that he may clarify the matter to the satisfaction of all members. Once this opportunity is lost, it will be a difficult job to bring this Bill back for further amendment. That would be an untidy exercise; rather, the tidying up process should start at this stage.

Mr OLD: If there is any necessity for further amendment, I will ensure it is carried out in another place. I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 25—Insert after the word "barley" the passage ", linseed, rapeseed, and lupin".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 4, after line 19—Insert a subclause as follows—

(2) This Act shall be construed subject to the Bulk Handling Act, 1967 and the duties, powers, and functions imposed or conferred on Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited by or under that Act.

This amendment will ensure that CBH is fully protected within the meaning of this legislation.

Mr H. D. EVANS: We certainly have no objection to the insertion of this subclause. Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is not only equal to, but is probably ahead, of most other grain marketing authorities in Australia. Therefore it should be retained because in the long term it will be of importance to grain handling generally in Western Australia, and we are quite happy to agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 18 put and passed.

Clause 19: General powers of the Grain Pool—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 10, line 36—Insert after the numbers "1967" the words "and after consultation with the Company within the meaning of that Act".

This refers again to Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 20: Prescribed grains—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 12, line 16—Delete the words "is a prescribed grain" and substitute the passage ", linseed, rapeseed, and lupin are prescribed grains".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 21: Appointed date for commencement of the marketing of grain that becomes a prescribed grain—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 12, lines 36 and 37—Delete the passage ", other than barley, which is a prescribed grain" and substitute the passage "specified in an Order pursuant to subsection (2) of section 20".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 32 put and passed.

Clause 33: Classifications and dockages—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 20, lines 19 and 20—Delete the words "in which case the decision of the Board is final" and substitute the passage "subject to like procedures for persons who are dissatisfied with the determination to those provided by and under subsections (5) and (6) of section 43 of that Act in respect of grain to which that section applies".

In explanation, this gives the right of appeal to a producer which applies under the Bulk Handling Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 34: Licensed receivers on behalf of the Grain Pool—

The clause was amended, on motions by Mr Old, as follows—

Page 20, lines 25 and 26—Delete the passage "or deal, or to receive and deal, in" and substitute the words "and handle".

Page 20, line 28—Insert after subclause (1) the following new subclause to stand as subclause (2)—

(2) The Company within the meaning of the Bulk Handling Act, 1967 has by virtue of this subsection a licence to receive and handle a grain on behalf of the Grain Pool. .

Page 20, lines 28 to 30 inclusive—Delete the words "hold on behalf of the Grain Pool all grain received and shall not deal in or dispose of it" and substitute the words "not dispose of grain received on behalf of the Grain Pool".

Page 20, line 32—Delete the passage "or dealing, or receiving and dealing, in" and substitute the words "and handling".

Page 21, line 3—Delete the word "determines" and substitute the word "recommends".

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 35 to 45 put and passed.

First and second schedules put and passed.

Third schedule—

Mr OLD: I move an amendment—

Page 31, lines 6 and 7—Delete all words after the word "and" down to and including the word "vote" and substitute the following passage—

the chairman has a deliberative vote only and, if the councillors present at a meeting and voting on a question are equally divided, the question shall be decided in the negative.

Amendment put and passed.

Schedule, as amended, put and passed.

Fourth schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Amendments

Amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows—

No. 1.

Clause 2, page 2, line 9 of paragraph (a) of the proposed new clause 2 of the First Schedule—Delete the word "injury" and insert in lieu thereof the word "incapacity".

No. 2.

Clause 2, page 2, line 11 of paragraph (b) of the proposed new clause 2 of the First Schedule—Delete the word "injury" and insert in lieu thereof the word "incapacity".

Mr GRAYDEN: I move—

That the amendments made by the Council be agreed to.

These amendments do not alter the legal interpretation of the provision in clause 2. They will make the position clear, so that if a person is injured and then at a later stage is incapacitated he will receive the wages that are applicable at the time of incapacity. The Council's amendments make it abundantly clear that that will be the position.

Mr HARTREY: The Roman poet Vergil in describing how the foolish Trojans admitted into their beleaguered town the

famous Trojan horse, had his hero, Aeneas, exclaim in Latin, *"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentis"*. This translated into plain English is, "I fear the Greeks, even when bringing gifts."

So it is common sense that I should tremble somewhat when I see amendments to such a reactionary proposition as this Bill is, proposed by that stronghold of reaction which is politely described in this Chamber as "another place". However, I have given due consideration to the Council's amendments, and I find the Trojan horse is devoid of anything concealed. There is really nothing wrong with the amendments.

What the Minister has said is perfectly correct. It can quite easily happen that a person sustains an injury when working in industry, but he is not entitled to compensation till he suffers incapacity as a result of that injury. It could easily happen that the worker is injured in the course of his employment and the incapacity does not become evident until months later. In the case of the injury known as silicosis, the incapacity often does not reveal itself until years later.

So, I agree with what the Minister has said. The date of the injury is not to be the date for measuring the wages of the injured worker, because he does not lose any wages just because he has sustained an injury but only when he is incapacitated for work. Where the injury and incapacity are not simultaneous the gentlemen in the upper House have made the correct choice and in fact have at long last justified their existence as a House of Review in effecting these amendments.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [9.50 p.m.]: I intend to speak about a few problems, and, if you will bear with me, Mr Speaker, I wish to make a few statements. The first is that good government is good management of all departments and utilities which, to me, means good housekeeping. Management of government in my opinion can be divided into two areas, but cannot be separated as one is dependent upon the other. The two areas are the day-to-day running of the State, and planning for the future. If any part of the day-to-day running is bad, one cannot properly plan for the future for the baseline is on false premises. I find myself totally at variance with my own Government's performance on certain aspects of health and welfare.

Mr Carr: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: These are two areas of the State's responsibility about which I wish to speak. I am alarmed that already we have completed two years of our three-year term, and we have done very little or next to nothing constructive to overcome the problems which I will enumerate.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: Before I go any further I wish to state that I appreciate the fact that the Opposition is agreeing with me on these points, but I want members opposite to know that I am talking about a problem which commenced long before I came to this Parliament four years ago, and it is a continuing problem. When I was in Opposition it was very good because I was able to have a go at the then Government; now we are the Government, and I feel I am not getting anywhere with what I am trying to achieve and hence I have to come to Parliament. I do not seem to be able to get the message across in any other way.

Last Thursday the Premier said he was a prudent housekeeper, and he will also say that I do not understand finance. No-one has ever tried me out to see whether or not I do; and I will be told I do not understand Cabinet government. I assure members that I understand Cabinet government, but I do not understand the Premier's present concept of it. I believe in open government, not secret government.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: When members opposite were in Government they were equally or more secret so, please, I do not want any encouragement.

I find it is a terrible state of affairs being a back-bencher on the Government side, and I am considered as a security risk. It is my firm belief that if legislation is good and wholesome there should be no secret about it.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: If I remember correctly there were many secrets when members opposite were in Government.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr H. D. Evans: Name one.

Dr DADOUR: I do not want members opposite to put me off any more.

Mr Bertram: You have a bad memory.

Mr Harman: We are trying to encourage you.

Dr DADOUR: Good housekeeping is not a matter of throwing this or that dog a bone. It is a matter of getting the priorities in their correct order—

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: —and using the money we have in the areas of the greatest need in the first instance and then afterwards in other areas.

Mr Skidmore: I agree wholeheartedly with that concept.

Dr DADOUR: Priorities and our performance in health and welfare are the two areas about which I wish to speak. The situation is very unwholesome—nearly as unwholesome as it was when the Opposition was the Government.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: Health has become the biggest costing factor in the Budget, and believe me it will go on with the catalyst Medibank defying everything before it. This will be the real tragedy because we, as a State, will get very little relief from Medibank if we permit to continue what is occurring at the moment.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: I will come back to this shortly. Our election promise of putting efficiency into the Public Service and some public servants rings fairly hollow now. It is my opinion that this promise is akin to the proverbial barber's cat—it is a lot of hot wind. Also we are not going to conduct a witch hunt.

It is true that in the main we have limited the Public Service increase to no more than 2 per cent per annum, but this is a very negative measure, when we consider the teaching hospitals and, in particular, Royal Perth Hospital. Members will have to excuse my talking about RPH but it is the only hospital which has produced an annual report, and that is bad luck for it. I do not know the situation in the other teaching hospitals, but I have heard on the grapevine that they are not as bad as RPH.

When one looks at the situation at RPH one is appalled to find that it was happy it had only a 41.2 per cent increase in expenditure in 1974-75 on day-to-day running; not capital cost. A 41.2 per cent increase equals $11 million. That hospital was able to achieve this fantastic result without any increase in the number of beds or any appreciable increase in staff! I am led to believe that the increase in staff is no more than 2 per cent.

Of this increase in running costs of 41.2 per cent, or $11 million, 21 per cent can be attributed to inflation and increases in wages and salaries. What happened to the other 20 per cent which represents $5 million-plus? This concerns me. That hospital seems to have an open cheque—a bottomless pit—from which it can draw money. What criteria does it use in respect of the money? Why are not the normal limitations put on RPH?

I still do not know how RPH could have spent this extra $5 million. One can speculate. Is more stealing occurring? Is RPH paying for capital costs? Does the administrator get his linen every week? Does he bring back the soiled linen? I know a lot of linen is missing from the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service.

What is the situation with regard to cheap petrol? I do know that the past Administrator of RPH, years after he ceased to be attached to the hospital—in other words, after he retired—was still getting cheap petrol. With your permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to place on the Table of the House a copy of the petrol book which indicates that he has been receiving cheap petrol.

Mr Harman: Shame!

Dr DADOUR: Mr Speaker, may I place this on the Table of the House?

Mr T. D. Evans: Put 30 pieces of silver on it.

The SPEAKER: There is a refinement. The paper will be placed on the Table of the House for the information of members. It will not be tabled.

Dr DADOUR: I could have submitted the original book, but I thought I should return that and submit only a copy.

At times I am ashamed that I am a member of a Government which would accept this disgraceful abuse of public moneys. I sometimes wonder why Cabinet and the Premier tolerate this disgraceful state of affairs. I must say honestly that if my housekeeper were to keep house in the manner in which Cabinet is governing, I would give her the boot because I could not afford to keep her.

I believe there should be an inquiry into the running of the Royal Perth Hospital. I know that I could tell Parliament exactly what type of inquiry it should be and how it should be carried out. I would doubt the integrity of other members of my party if they did not insist upon an investigation.

Mr Moiler: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: I do not know who should be blamed for the expenditure of additional money. In the case of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, I believe those responsible have acted in good faith because they finished up with 23 fewer staff, and saved $250 000 by spending less than was made available to the hospital.

I feel I must place the blame for the expenditure of additional money on the administrator and the medical superintendent. I would go further than that and say I believe they may have deceived the hospital board, the Medical Department, the Minister, and Cabinet. This is a case of blatant empire building; I have no other words to describe the situation. If the hospital board, the Medical Department, the Minister, and Cabinet have not been deceived, then I believe the guilt should be placed on everyone I have mentioned.

Mr Harman: Have you any documents for 1970?

Dr DADOUR: Yes. The people to whom I have referred are responsible for overspending $5 million. One can contemplate and realise that if that $5 million were available to this State Government we would have been able to retain the 300 sewerage workers on essential works and still have had some money over. We could have instilled some money into community welfare and still have had some left over for other projects.

During the last two weeks I have asked questions in this House regarding bed costs in hospitals. On Tuesday, the 7th October, I asked—

> What was the cost per bed per day on the 1st September, 1975, at each of the teaching hospitals?

The reply included the following information—

> The latest available figures are for the 12 months ended 30th June, 1975, and for the five teaching hospitals these were—
>
> | | $ |
> |---|---|
> | Royal Perth Hospital | 121.88 |
> | Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital | 118.74 |
> | Fremantle Hospital | 121.78 |
> | Princess Margaret Hospital | 120.62 |
> | King Edward Memorial Hospital | 94.76 |

On Wednesday, the 15th October, I asked the following question—

> (1) What was the cost for bed per day at 30th June, 1975 at—
>
> (a) the Royal Perth Hospital (Wellington Street);
>
> (b) the Royal Perth Hospital annexe (Shenton Park); and
>
> (c) the Royal Perth Hospital annexe (Mt. Lawley).

The reply was as follows—

> (1) Separate costs are not kept for the Mt. Lawley annexe. It is regarded simply as additional wards for the main hospital.
>
> The cost per patient day for the year ended the 30th June, 1975, for the Royal Perth Hospital and the Mt. Lawley annexe was $133.82.
>
> The cost for the Royal Perth (Rehabilitation) Hospital, Shenton Park, for the same period was $85.80 per patient day.

The bed cost per day for the Royal Perth Hospital and the Mt. Lawley annexe had skyrocketed from $121.88 to $133.82. If we were able to separate the Mt. Lawley annexe from the Royal Perth Hospital—bearing in mind that most of the patients at the Mt. Lawley annexe are nursing patients—I venture to say the cost would be something like $150 per bed per day.

It can be seen that the costs associated with the annexes dilute the actual costs per bed per day of the Royal Perth Hospital. The true costs have been diluted to make them appear comparable with those of other hospitals. I ask: should we accept the figures which have been supplied? I do not accept them, because they do not seem to be straightout, and the questions do not seem to have been answered as clearly as they could have been.

Let us now look at outpatient costs. Outpatients are referred to hospitals for diagnosis, and the initiation of treatment. The patients should then be sent back to their general practitioner, or to their specialist, and it is obvious that is the way it should be done. The cost per outpatient as at the 30th June was $20 plus per attendance. That does not seem to be very much, but when one examines the total number of outpatients one is astounded to find the figure is 321 041. At $20 per attendance, that amounts to $6.5 million.

We have to remember that Medibank will pay half the cost, and the State will pay the other half, and we must also remember that the job of the hospital, with regard to an outpatient, is to diagnose and instigate treatment. However, the patients are not being returned to their medical practitioners or specialists and, as a result, Medibank would meet the whole of the cost. So, by allowing the present trend to continue we are adding a further burden to our costs. Of course, I am aware that some patients have to be retained at the hospitals for teaching purposes, but the majority of them should be returned to their general practitioners or specialists so that Medibank will pay the whole of the expenses incurred and the State will not have to pay half. However, that remains to be seen.

It may be asked why I have brought this problem to Parliament—this blatant abuse of public funds. The reason I have brought the problem to Parliament is that since we have been in Government I have been complaining as hard as I know how through all the accepted channels—through the party and through the party room—but I have come up against a brick wall at every turn.

Mr B. T. Burke: Do you agree with the Caucus system rather than the party meeting system?

Dr DADOUR: I will leave that for the time being because I am already on dangerous ground.

Mr Bertram: I thought you started very well.

Dr DADOUR: I have not been able to make any progress so I have brought the problem to Parliament. This is the highest forum in the land and I sincerely hope I will be able to wake up Cabinet so that something will be done.

Mr McIver: No-one else can.

Dr DADOUR: It would be easy for me to remain tacit on this subject, and probably I would be more prudent if I did. However, if I remain quiescent I will become acquiescent. I refuse to do that; it is not in my nature or my personality.

It is my intention to prove to Parliament, as I have tried very hard to do previously, that I am right. With your tolerance, Mr Speaker, I wish to read some letters which I have written to the Premier since we have been in Government. The first one was written on the 4th July, 1974. I have not received a reply to any of the letters.

The SPEAKER: Must you read all of the letters?

Dr DADOUR: I would like to read some extracts from the first one, and then read two others.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to impair your speech, but try to avoid lengthy reading.

Dr DADOUR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The first letter is dated the 4th July, 1974, and reads as follows—

> At our last Parliamentary meeting, I attempted to instigate a Parliamentary enquiry into our Public Hospitals. However, you were not willing to discuss it. I agree that there is need to overhaul the Public Service and the Semi Public Service in toto. I do not know what I have to do to impress upon you the need to clean up our own back yard. You have continually said that you were going to run a tight ship and I wonder when we are going to start. I do not wish to elaborate on the need for investigation of our Public Hospitals, but I do say if we do not start soon, we shall not have good Government.

I went on to say I had the necessary expertise to lead a small parliamentary committee to look into these matters. I was given a committee but unfortunately I did not seem to be able to get anywhere with it.

I will now read the letter I wrote on the 21st January, 1975—

> I wrote to you on the 4th July, 1974, regarding the investigation of our Public Hospitals in which I stated it was time we cleaned up our own back yard and remind you of your promise that you were going to run a tight ship. I wonder when we are going to start.
>
> I am prompted to write because of the S.E.C. fiasco. There has been two rises to the consumer in the last six months. I say fiasco because it is only after the second rise, you started to instigate an enquiry into the S.E.C. operations.
>
> Now, let us look at the Hospitals, another semi-governmental area. We have already had one rise and another is imminent. Yet we have done nothing to curb costs and improve efficiency. I have begged, badgered and argued with you continually over the past nine months that an investigation was imperative. Yes, you gave me a Committee, but this committee has no teeth and for ten days from the 21st October 1974 to the 31st October 1974, I tried to obtain a copy of the State Government's Submission to the Sax Committee for extra loans for Hospital buildings. I was completely frustrated by the Department, the Minister and yourself. As yet in my short Parliamentary experience, I have not accepted the word 'expediency' nor do I have any intention of doing the same. Hence when you decide on the next Hospital charge increase I shall bitterly oppose it, because, in my opinion it is due to bad government in the main.
>
> I am very concerned that the people are not getting what we promised. My own observations are that we as the party, are doing no better or worse than the Tonkin Government. In fact worse, because we know better. I ask you to examine your conscience on this point. I was horrified at our last Parliamentary meeting, that not one member appeared to have the courage to question the S.E.C. increments. I feel that we will be much better off if we criticised Canberra less, and got on with our own job.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: The third letter—

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please resume his seat. I have been very tolerant of members reading letters in the House and I propose to allow the honourable member to read this one but the subject matter of the letter is obviously critical of the Government and could be used in the course of his speech rather than be quoted. However, I will permit the honourable member to read this letter provided it is not a very long one.

Dr DADOUR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will give the gist of the letter. I was extremely upset on having read in the newspapers that permission had been given for the Royal Perth Hospital extensions to continue. I wrote a letter of objection to the Premier concerning that matter. I will read one paragraph of the letter relating to the decision to permit the extensions to continue—

> This decision is a blot, and will remain so, on you and your Cabinet. This $25.5 million will give no beds—only better facilities to those working there.

I think I have proved I have done as much as I can through the normal channels. I bring the problem to Parliament

because I am very concerned that State funds are not being used as I would like them to be used and as I believe they should be used. However, I do not seem to be able to get the story across. I have no intention of letting up, because I believe my course is the correct one.

I wonder what has happened to report No. 11 of the Public Accounts Committee. It was a very good and reasonable report but, like most other reports, it seems to have been shelved, along with all the work, the thinking, the conclusions, and the interviews which went with it.

Why do we permit all the unnecessary duplication in the medical field? I can mention neurology, neurosurgery, cardiac and thoracic surgery, and the medical physics manufacture of short-lived isotopes. And what about operating theatres? These are extremely expensive to run. There should be one operating theatre per 100 beds in any hospital. Not so long ago the Minister said he was thinking of increasing the number of operating theatres to one for every 80 beds. There is no need for that because the world figure is 100 patients per operating theatre in any hospital, and that also includes the specialities.

I believe we should appoint a committee of three to five people who have no connection with any hospital and who are above reproach and accountable for their deeds, to undertake planning for future hospitals and their location. We should not be propping up the past but investing in the future. We should be looking for peripheral and district hospitals which are close to the people, so that the loved ones have only a short distance to go to visit a patient in hospital. It is interesting to read on page 75 of the Auditor-General's report that the hospital fund is not subject to audit.

As a result of the blatant spending on the hospitals, we have neglected some other areas of welfare. Over the last three years I have taken most of the Liberal members of this House and another place to an institution in which I am very interested, and they have all come away in tears. The work of the people at this institution is involved with young children who have been abandoned by their parents. The children have been exposed to considerable mental trauma and insecurity; they have been placed in foster homes, where they have failed, and they have been brought back to the institution. I am speaking about the Catherine McAuley Centre in my electorate.

The Salvation Army has not enough money to keep one of its boys' homes in Nedlands open, so it remains closed.

I have been on a subcommittee looking into this aspect of welfare, and I believe our Government's priorities are all mixed up—and not only the priorities of the present Government but also the priorities of the previous Government and, I think, many Governments before that. My priorities are not mixed up but certain other people's priorities seem to be mixed up.

Mr B. T. Burke: Whose?

Dr DADOUR: If the honourable member cannot work that out now, he never will.

The Premier has received two requests from a Catholic Bishop in Perth to receive a delegation of four of the members of residential child care institutions which come under his jurisdiction. They have not been able to see the Premier as yet. The Premier wanted to gather more information. The requests were made in April and July of this year.

I wrote to the Premier on the 6th June, 1975, in the following terms—

> re Residential Child Care,
> in particular, Catherine McAuley Centre.
>
> I wish to impress upon you the need for your full involvement in this area. There has been a great amount of correspondence between Commonwealth and State departments, Ministers and the Institutions concerned. In my opinion we are going to get nowhere in a lot of time and I impress the need for round-table discussions, plus your expertise in getting a solution to a very very urgent and worthwhile need.

I will not read all the letter. The reply from Sir Charles Court is dated the 8th July, 1975, and the last paragraph reads—

> I regret I am not able to become personally fully involved as you suggest in your letter. You know the pressures and priorities on my time.

During the grievance debate a few weeks ago I spoke about the chronic shortage of money for child care institutions. The Premier undertook to reply to my grievance. With his reply he enclosed very kindly a minute over the responsible Minister's signature. I find this minute a little wanting, because although statements in it are essentially correct, unfortunately they give the reader an incorrect impression that things are not too bad. Let us consider this sentence—

> The Government pays the salaries of teachers at Home of Good Shepherd, Castledare and Clontarf.

One would assume from that sentence that the Government pays the salaries of all the teachers. The Home of Good Shepherd is in my electorate, and although five schools teachers are employed there, the Government pays the salary of only 1½, while the statement I have quoted makes one think that the Government pays the salaries of all the teachers. Then we see that special rates are quoted for different institutions. However, these rates are the maximums, and they are payable only for wards.

We see in the figures that the payment for 10 wards—so-called difficult cases—is $25 per head per week, but an institution may not necessarily have 10 wards who are difficult cases—it must accept whatever wards the department sends it. So although the figures look very good on paper, they are really the maximums that may be claimed. Another paragraph in this minute reads—

> It should be noted however that in Victoria non government institutions have traditionally carried out most of the functions of residential child care and the residential treatment of delinquency. Accordingly funds that would normally be used by government institutions in Western Australia and other States to finance the most costly areas of residential care and treatment are spread across the board in Victoria. Such an arrangement gives little regard to the quality of service appropriate to the variable needs of children.

I have spoken to some people who are aware of the circumstances in Victoria, and they dispute this paragraph in toto. They told me that the quality of service in Victoria is far superior to the quality of service here, and yet we are told this sort of thing by the department.

Everyone is aware of the ever-worsening financial situation of residential child care institutions. The chronic shortage of funds in these institutions was bad enough in the days of Charles Dickens, but I believe it is appalling in the days of Charles Court. From the very beginning it has been obvious that the Premier used delaying tactics. Representations have been made to him over the last two years, and these have intensified this year, in an endeavour to receive some assistance from the Budget. The $3.50 per head which has been handed out will be of very little assistance to these child care institutions. As a matter of fact, there are 221 children in the Catholic institutions and the total paid for these children is $216 per week—less than $1 per head. So this provision in the Budget is like throwing the doggie a bone—it is of very little help in his total keep.

In this field we have dodged our responsibilities and failed to fulfil our obligations. I cannot be convinced that there is insufficient money to inject into this very urgent welfare need. If we were to be a little careful in what we permit some of our public hospitals to spend, there would be ample money—and I really mean ample money—to inject into this area. We must remember that this is a State responsibility.

In conclusion I would like to say I am sorry that I have had to go this far to bring the matter to the notice of the people. The whole financial situation of child care institutions is shocking. The problem affects all denominations and not just Catholic institutions—Methodist, Presbyterian, Salvation Army, and Anglican organisations all need help. The only thing keeping them going is the fact that they are subsidised by other areas of their Orders. However, this can continue only for a certain time. They are in jeopardy, and if we do not accept full responsibility to see that they can carry on, we will finish up with more trouble than enough. We allocate $16 per week per child at primary school, plus $1 from the Lotteries Commission. That is a total of $17 per week. If these children were housed in State institutions, the cost would be in excess of $200 per week. If we help these non-Government institutions, we are really helping ourselves. Remember, the staff at these institutions are devoted to their cause; otherwise they would not be able to carry on. I am on my feet tonight because of this very urgent need.

I was able to have a resolution passed in my own party concerning help for these institutions, and I hope sincerely that the parliamentary wing of the Liberal Party will adhere to that resolution.

MR McIVER (Avon) [10.28 p.m.]: The subject before the House is the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund), and in this session of Parliament we find that speakers have utilised portion of their time to refer to the situation in Canberra. In line with previous speakers, I wish to comment also on that situation.

First of all, I would like to express my point of view and also to answer some of the utterances of Government members, as I believe they should not pass without challenge. Without a doubt, democracy in Australia is at the crossroads. If the Federal Opposition were allowed to have its way to refuse supply, most certainly democracy in Australia would suffer a downward thrust.

Now, Sir, the situation is this: the *"SS Election Victory"* for the Liberal Party is sailing over the horizon, and on the jetty with their bags are Mr Fraser and Mr Anthony, and they have missed the boat. It is as simple as that. It would be ridiculous to state that had this situation arisen 12 months ago the people of Australia would not have been in favour of it, but that is not so today.

Unfortunately, during the reign of the Whitlam Government it has received such adverse comment from the Press and the media generally that even some of our loyal supporters were beginning to believe it; also it would be most unfair if we did not concede that during the reign of the Whitlam Government mistakes have been made, just as other Governments at a national level have made mistakes. However, too much play has been made of the mistakes that have been made by the Whitlam Government and very little has been made of its achievements. Nevertheless, I reiterate what I said previously:

Unless the Federal Opposition views the situation in its true perspective and passes the money Bills which are before it, democracy will most certainly suffer a downward thrust.

Inevitably Governments change and the Liberal-Country Party members will not always control the Senate. If the members of those parties create a precedent and use their numbers to block money Bills and force an election every time a controversial issue arises the Westminster system will most certainly go out the window; and that situation must be averted at all costs.

It is a little amusing to see how the Liberal and Country Party members of the Senate have been able to utilise their numbers to bring about this situation. We have heard from previous speakers how they stood on the grave of a dead Labor senator so that they could achieve this position, and I do not wish to elaborate on that point. However, I do wish to make a point which I think is pertinent and valid. Let us consider the situation of the late Senator Hannaford.

He was formerly a Liberal senator, but at the time of his death he was an independent. He was unable to get along with Liberal Party policy; that is not hard these days because it changes from one week to the next depending upon which way the wind is blowing and who is the Prime Minister. Of course, when the Liberal Party was in Government we did not know who would be the Prime Minister from one week to the next. However, when Senator Hannaford died he was an independent. He was a senator for South Australia, and under the Constitution the Labor Premier of that State (Mr Dunstan) could have nominated an independent senator.

However, this is where we find the vast difference between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, because the Labor Party rigidly adheres to its policy and its principles on all occasions; and that is not so in respect of the Liberal Party. Premier Dunstan, in accordance with the Constitution, nominated a Liberal who is a member of the Senate today.

But that was not the position when that reptile in Queensland, that great bigot and friend of our Premier, the Queensland Premier (Mr Bjelke-Petersen), was faced with the same situation. No other man has done this country such a great injustice as that man has. He is the man who deprived State ships of the opportunity to enter Queensland ports when the oil situation in Queensland was in a very sorry state; and he is a man who is claimed by our Premier to be a great statesman. He threw principles and the Constitution out of the window and nominated a supposed Labor man to the Senate. That man already had one foot in the grave and was determined to bring down the Whitlam Government. There lies the vast difference between the parties.

Let us consider also the man who is supposedly leading the Liberal Party. Let us consider his credibility. He has been very vocal in the last few weeks regarding the credibility of Mr Whitlam. I can recall a Liberal Party rally in my town at which this man got up and said he would strongly support Mr Snedden and would not oppose him in any way; he said he was right behind Mr Snedden. Then only a matter of days later he stood for the leadership of the Liberal Party and used every device to attain it. Let us have a look at what this man said after achieving leadership through mean devices. This is what he said—

> The basic principle which I adhere to strongly is that a government that continues to have a majority in the House of Representatives has a right to expect that it will be able to govern.

Fine words; fine principles. That man of principle is the present Leader of the Opposition in Canberra (Mr Fraser). This man is now saying to the people of Australia that the Whitlam Government should not have that right. He has tried to give a lead to the people of Australia in the basic principles of democracy. I might add that he made those comments a few days after he replaced Mr Snedden as the Leader of the Opposition. In speaking in the House of Representatives, our present Prime Minister said—

> Yet today he has made statements which can only mean that he is willing to overturn his principles and overturn the basis of our system.
>
> He has said that he intends to use the accidental numbers he thinks he controls in the Senate to delay passing the Budget until the money runs out. In other words he intends to produce chaos in order to prevent the Government being able to govern.

I think those words are very pertinent indeed, and I am sure the people of Australia most certainly agree with them. If ever a political boo-boo was made by a political party, it was the recent decision of the Liberal Party to block supply, because that party has been able to achieve in three days what has been most difficult, for reasons I have already outlined, for Labor organisations to achieve during the whole term of office of the present Australian Government; that is, the unification of the Labor movement throughout Australia.

I would say without hesitation that if the Australian Government were allowed to continue its term of office, I am sure when the time came for an election, because of the pressure that has been brought to bear by the allies of the Liberal Party—namely, the Press and the other media—a change of Government would occur. Anyone who disputes that would be looking at the political situation in Australia through rose-coloured glasses,

because the Liberal Party had everything going for it. But that is in the past and we are now looking to the future. The Liberal Party has let the Labor Party off the hook.

I fully agree with the President of the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr Hawke) that before this week is ended the situation will be resolved.

It is humorous to see the various devices used and the statements which have appeared to support the Liberals' case. They even got old Bob the bandit out of his sick bed to bring him forward into the public arena. Ming the merciless! The newspapers have described him as one of the greatest statesmen we have ever seen.

Sir Charles Court: That is true.

Mr McIVER: Last week, my leader stated that he admired Menzies as a statesman and a politician. For the first time, I must disagree with the Leader of the Opposition, because I believe we have seen only two bushrangers in the history of our nation; one was Ned Kelly and the other was Bob Menzies, and the only difference between the two was that Ned Kelly had a horse. If ever there was a man who stood in the way of the progress of Western Australia, it was Sir Robert Menzies.

The present Liberal Government always talks about the 1950s and the 1960s and the great work it did in developing the iron ore industry in the north. However, if my predecessor, the former member for Northam and Premier of Western Australia (the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke) had been able to obtain the export licenses the Brand Government was fortunate to obtain, these export contracts would have been written years ago.

Sir Charles Court: Do not talk nonsense!

Mr McIVER: The Premier knows what I say is true. The same man who was described by the Press as a great statesman was prepared to sell this State to the Japanese. We all know of the infamous Brisbane line created by Menzies.

Mr O'Connor: The Commonwealth Government wanted to sell Australia to the Arabs.

Mr McIVER: This is the man the Liberals are looking to for leadership; they are trying to use a sick man to prop up their case. But Menzies dwells only in the past and can contribute nothing to the future; he has had his day. I am sure that even in the Liberal Party there must be young men with some inspiration who could provide the party with leadership.

But no; they have to rely on Bob the bandit and hang on all his words when he agrees that the Senate has a right to block the Budget. The Federal Opposition has used the word "block", but it is not blocking the Budget at all; the Budget has been deferred with a proviso amounting to a gun at the head of the Prime Minister, saying, "You have an election or else!" What a great precedent that is in this democratic nation of ours!

Then we have the other little schoolboy, Mr Anthony, who is hanging on the coat tails of Malcolm Fraser and who also cannot get off the hook.

The people of Australia are a wake-up to these tactics because people who only a matter of days ago were saying, "The sooner we get rid of this Whitlam Government, the better it will be" are now saying, "Let us retain the Labor Government for as long as we can, and defeat the Liberal Party." One has only to see the thousands of workers who are rallying throughout Australia to understand the truth of what I am saying. However, I believe they are rallying not to say who should govern but to defend democracy in this country.

I notice that recently the Labor Party has been receiving a lot of publicity in the media as a result of these rallies. However, our very good friends and allies, *The West Australian*, saw fit to publish a photograph of the crowd Malcolm Fraser drew at the Randwick racecourse. What a little tinpot show! There would be a better crowd down at the Tivoli to see Big Pretzel than they had at that little affair. The Liberal Party knows it has made a boo-boo and it is of no use its trying to gain political kudos now because the entire situation has altered. It is like an egg timer: The sands have run out, and the Liberals know it.

Although I note that the Minister for Labour and Industry is not in his place, I should like to say how disgusted I was to hear him urging the Premier of this State not to issue a writ if the Federal Government called for a half-Senate election. This Minister is always saying that we must have law and order on all occasions, but here he was requesting the Premier not to issue a writ in Western Australia.

I was also disgusted to see on television the Premier opening the Esperance Show. People did not invite him down to Esperance because they wanted to hear a great political spiel; they wanted him to open their agricultural show.

Sir Charles Court: And I did, and it was very nice too.

Mr McIVER: However, that is what the Premier gave them. In fact, I suppose the television coverage was paid for by the Liberal Party or by some insurance or oil company.

Mr Sibson: No, it was the Arabs.

Mr McIVER: There was the Premier saying to the people of Esperance, "Do not be alarmed; we have thousands of

dollars. There is no shortage of money in this State and we can carry on. We are not going to issue a writ." I was delighted to hear of the State's financial position and I can assure the Premier that my submissions in respect of my electorate will increase.

What hypocrisy! As I have said so often before, the principle in which the Liberal Party believes is one of hypocrisy, and nothing else. I wish now to leave the Federal scene and return to the State scene.

Mr Sibson: And go sailing down the Avon.

Mr McIVER: I appreciate the contribution made to the debates in this place by the member for Bunbury, but I missed his interjection. As I should like to hang on his every word, I ask him to repeat what he said.

Mr Sibson: I said that you are leaving the Federal scene to go sailing down the Avon.

Mr McIVER: I have done so on many occasions, and have spent many an enjoyable day; however, I do not want to do so this evening.

The first matter to which I wish to refer concerns both the Minister for Education and the Minister for Transport. It is wonderful to see the Minister for Transport back in his place in this House because this matter vitally concerns my electorate, particularly the high schools in the wheatbelt area. I refer specifically, of course, to the Northam Senior High School; however, all other high schools in my area are similarly affected in this respect.

The Government's increased transport costs have imposed a severe burden on the parents of high school students who must travel by hired bus to the metropolitan area in order to advance their education, whether it be in the field of technical education, drama or whatever it may be. In addition, these increased costs have severley curtailed the ability of the country high school students to participate in competetive sport with metropolitan high school students. The Government has deprived the country students of these activities.

As the Minister knows, my submissions to him meant nothing at all; he merely referred me to the Minister for Education, from whom I received the same reply. These are the things for which the Liberal Party must answer.

Mr O'Connor: You increased costs when you were in Government.

Mr McIVER: Not to the degree where we deprived country children attending high schools of the opportunity to travel to the metropolitan area to further their education. Under this Government, such travel no longer is possible.

Mr O'Connor: What was the additional amount per child?

Mr McIVER: In the short time available to me I do not propose to deal with the finer points of the matter; however, the Minister has my letter on the file and it is all there.

Mr O'Connor: How much would you say it would take to provide a child with such advantages?

Mr McIVER: It does not matter how much it costs, because a Government should be prepared to bear such cost. The Government can waste money in that field. We have just heard the member for Subiaco—a member of the Government, as loyal as he is—speaking in regard to this situation. The State Government's priorities are all wrong. If the Government wishes to prevent country children from visiting the metropolitan area to advance their education, such a move is on the Government's own head. The other evening we heard the Premier telling the Leader of the Opposition that he would be pleasantly surprised about what the Government had in store for the advancement of education in Western Australia. We will be all ears waiting to hear this information.

Mr O'Connor: You do not know what you are talking about. You are saying that a great amount of money is involved, but you do not know the actual amount.

Mr McIVER: I am not talking of the amount involved at the moment.

Mr O'Connor: How much is it?

Mr McIVER: If the Minister is so interested let him look up the letter, because it is on the file.

In speaking of education, the Leader of the Opposition has already referred to the deceitful statements that have been made by this Government on the thousands of dollars it has allocated for education throughout the State. The reason for this, of course, is that this is money which the Government has received from the Australian Government. Therefore it is easy for the Government to make a statement in the Press, in an endeavour to deceive the people of Western Australia that it has allocated a large sum of money for education throughout the State when, in essence, this is money the Government has received from the Australian Government; the Government which, on every occasion possible the State Government tries to ridicule, but on the other hand, it accepts with both hands all the Australian Government offers to it. Despite this the State Government does not have the decency to give the Australian Government credit for these allocations.

Mr O'Connor: Does not the money come from here? It is Western Australian taxpayers' money, is it not?

Mr McIVER: All I know is that prior to the present Australian Government coming to office, not even Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* could be found on the shelves of school libraries. Most of the shelves in

the libraries were empty. However, it is now found that the shelves of the libraries in secondary schools throughout the State are full. Today these schools have all the library facilities possible, and this applies from Kununurra in the north to Esperance in the south. These library facilities have been provided from money obtained from the Australian Government and the State Government has been hypocritical in ridiculing that Government with critical statements that have not been backed by facts.

I also wish to take to task the State Minister for Agriculture, because day in and day out all that the Ministers of this Government can do is to criticise the policies of the Australian Government, and half the time they do not know what they are talking about. Because of his inexperience, apparently the recently-appointed Minister for Agriculture has taken a leaf out of the Premier's book by making such statements and, as I have said, I take him to task for doing so.

Mr Old: When was that?

Mr McIVER: I have here a cutting from the *Northam Advertiser* dated the 23rd October, 1975, and in the report that is published in regard to extensions to the comprehensive water scheme in the Greenhills area, the Minister for Agriculture is reported as having said—

> The State Minister for Agriculture, Mr Old, has advised council that the extensions to the Comprehensive Water Scheme in the Greenhills area is unlikely because of Commonwealth Labor Party policy . . .

That shows the Minister for Agriculture did not know what he was talking about; he had not done his homework. This was shown by the fact that the Minister's colleague, the Legislative Council member representing the Central Province, took Mr Bungey, the Federal member for Canning, to task in the *Beverley Times* of the 23rd October, 1975, for making statements in an attempt to gain cheap political mileage. I give full marks to the member representing the Central Province for making that statement, because he did a great deal of work in an attempt to have this extension made to the comprehensive water scheme when he was the member for Avon.

The member representing the Central Province contradicted Mr Bungey's statement in the same way as I am contradicting the statement made by the Minister for Agriculture in an endeavour to put him on the right track. I quote the following from the article that was published in the *Beverley Times* on the 23rd October—

> Mr Gayfer said the Federal Member was passing the buck. If Mr Bungey had bothered to check the background on Comprehensive Water Scheme extensions, he would have found that although the State had given a No. 1 priority to Greenhills and Corrigin, in 1968 it was the Federal Government and a Minister of his own political colour which had rejected the scheme submitted.

So, like the member representing the Central Province, I take strong exception to the Minister for Agriculture giving wrong advice to the shires in my electorate in an endeavour to gain some political point. All he has done is supply them with political claptrap.

Mr Old: That is not correct, because we could not obtain the money from the Commonwealth Government for the extension.

Mr McIVER: In his statement the Minister blamed the Australian Government.

Mr Old: That is where we get the money from.

Mr McIVER: How long has the Australian Government been in office? It has been in office since 1972 and, prior to that year, when the Federal Government member Mr Hallett was asked what the reply was to his submission for this extension to the comprehensive water scheme he said that the answer was in the negative. About a week later the Government woke up to the blunder it had made and said it would be rectified. If the Minister for Agriculture wishes to make such statements he should tell the truth and make sure they are factual, especially when dealing with shires in my electorate.

Mr Old: That was the truth. We cannot obtain the money from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr McIVER: That is not the fault of the present Australian Government. This matter has been going on for a long while. If the former Minister for Agriculture—the member for Mt. Marshall—had still been in the position the Minister for Agriculture now occupies, he would not have made such a statement, because he is aware of the true facts. Therefore if the Minister intends to make any statements to the shires in my electorate in the future I hope he makes sure that what he tells them is correct.

Mr Old: Can we expect some money for that extension from the Commonwealth Government now?

Mr McIVER: I am not in the position to give the Minister that answer. Let the Minister for Agriculture start with his own department, because it is in a shambles. I find that the agricultural societies in my electorate are deprived of finance because of bungling in the Minister's own department. So let the Minister put his own house in order first before he attempts to criticise the Australian Government.

I wish now to move on to the subject of education and to refer to the high schools in the country areas. Before doing so, I make a plea not only on behalf of the Northam Tennis Club but also

on behalf of all tennis clubs in the wheat belt area that have grass courts. As a result of increased water charges it would appear that these clubs will have to cease functioning. Last year the Northam Tennis Club paid in excess of $900 per annum for water charges. This year the amount will exceed $1 000. This is only a small club but it obtains its water from the comprehensive water scheme and naturally the club will have to meet the increased charges.

If we are to encourage young people to play sport we should grant some concession to these tennis clubs in some way or another. I am fully aware that such a decision is difficult, because once a concession is granted to one club other clubs will seek the same. Nevertheless I ask the Government to make an endeavour to arrive at some arrangement so that concessions on water charges may be granted to lawn tennis clubs in country areas. For the information of members I advise the House that Bromwich, Dinny Pails, and many other international players have competed in the eastern districts tournaments on these grass courts. This tournament attracts many players from various parts of the State and therefore it would be a sad day indeed if, merely because of dollars and cents, this tournament were discontinued.

I am afraid this will occur unless some arrangement can be entered into. I will be writing to the Minister on a personal basis in regard to this matter, but I hope that, in the meantime, some arrangement can be made with a view to granting concessions on water charges for lawn tennis clubs.

I now want to deal with a very controversial issue. It is something we have to tackle quickly, and I refer to the Aboriginal problem. At the outset I say that I am no expert on this very complex problem. The Australian Government made provision under the RED Scheme to enable the shires, particularly the Shire of Northam and the Northam Town Council, to employ these people. It allocated large sums of money to enable Aborigines to be employed on the making of cement slabs and kerbs. Many of the road verges in that area have been completed by gangs of Aborigines laying the slabs and the kerbing. There are not too many of them unemployed.

It is useless for us to sit in this House and say that Aborigines will not work, and will not do this and that. If we do not provide them with any incentive or fix a starting point to assist them, it will not be long before we find in Western Australia a situation which has arisen in the United States of America.

I know this is a very complex problem, and I am aware of the situation which confronts the Minister for Lands in that respect. I do not know how we will be able to get the Aborigines to work, but we should make an attempt. I would like to see an allocation of funds by both the Australian Government and the State Government to my area to enable these people to be employed. There is a small industry there which is about to be closed, and this can be purchased for a few thousand dollars by the Government. This industry could be used to provide work for the Aborigines. The Aborigines now have their own foreman, their own leading hand, and their own truck. In their work they are left to their own devices, and this method has operated successfully.

If the Aborigines can be employed gainfully in my electorate the same can be done in other places. These people to whom I am referring are tenants of the State Housing Commission and are respected members of the community. Most of them have full-time employment. I am no authority on the Aboriginal problem and I do not pretend to be, but I put this proposal forward as a commencement point. No useful purpose will be served in continually turning our backs on these people.

There is a wine saloon in Fitzgerald Street, which is the focal point of the Town of Northam, and right opposite it is the post office. This wine saloon is frequented by natives who have nothing better to do. Naturally trouble has been experienced by the tenants of shops in close proximity to the wine saloon. Sometimes in their drunken rampages the Aborigines go through the shops and cause the police and citizens no end of trouble.

It is of no use gaoling these people, because when they are released they will commit the same offences again. In putting my proposal forward I am trying to be practical, and I am not doing it for political gain. I am putting forward something which is constructive. I do not know whether the proposal will work, but it should be given a trial. I say that for the sake of a few thousand dollars it is worth a trial.

Unfortunately the Minister for Health is not a member of this House. I do want to make a special plea for the establishment of a permanent care centre as an annexe to the Northam Regional Hospital.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): The honourable member has seven minutes more.

Mr McIVER: That will be quite sufficient. There is a permanent care centre attached to the Northam Regional Hospital and it accommodates 15 patients. However, there are nine others on the waiting list, and another 15 who can be classed as geriatric and who wish to be accommodated in the permanent care centre if it has the required facilities.

In reply to a question I asked of the Minister representing the Minister for

Health I was informed that one permanent care centre would be built in Osborne Park in the metropolitan area. I should point out that in the last three months the Northam Regional Hospital has sent 21 patients to institutions in the metropolitan area. Where is the logic in that?

I notice from a news release there is only a 42 per cent utilisation of several of these institutions; so, why not expand the facilities already established at Northam and provide a permanent care centre, instead of spending thousands of dollars on institutions in the metropolitan area to which the Northam Regional Hospital is sending 50 per cent of its patients? That is a ridiculous state of affairs.

I do not have to emphasise the fact that elderly people prefer to live in environments to which they have been accustomed and among their friends. They like to remain in the places where their interests lie, and where they have surroundings to which they have been accustomed. They prefer that to going to a strange situation and into a strange environment. Furthermore, I say these elderly people deserve better treatment.

I make a special plea to the Government to give this suggestion of mine further consideration. I am disgusted that the Minister for Health, who is supposed to represent that area, has come up with an answer like that to the question I asked. He should be prepared to visit the area and examine the situation for himself; if he did that he would get the full facts. I am sure by doing so he would adopt a different attitude.

I do not agree with the Premier when he said in this Chamber the other night that in view of the economic position of the country we were on the breadline and nobody had any money.

Sir Charles Court: I did not say that.

Mr McIVER: The working people of Western Australia have never been better off in their lives. I would say that this state of affairs has been brought about to some extent by the double income which some households are earning through both the husband and wife working. The State Government should stop playing its record of blaming the Australian Government; instead, it should endeavour to co-operate in some way.

Sir Charles Court: How can you co-operate with people who will not co-operate?

Mr McIVER: If I were in Mr Whitlam's place, and the Premier at every available opportunity hounded me, he would not get any funds from me either.

Sir Charles Court: You do not know the other side of the story. He will not co-operate.

Mr McIVER: Has the Premier tried to co-operate?

Sir Charles Court: He is committed to getting rid of us, including you.

Mr McIVER: It is claimed by members opposite that as a result of the economic situation farmers will be walking off their farms by Christmas. I say that by December next they will have so much money they will not know what to do with it; the same applies to the workers of this country.

I realise the position of farmers in the south-west of the State is not good, but to the member for Wellington I repeat what I have said: the farmers in the wheatbelt areas will have so much money they will not know what to do with it. Many of them are still going on world trips and buying modern machinery. They have not been retarded in any way.

In the last three months many farmers have told me that they have never been better off than they are under the Whitlam Government, but they are not game to say that publicly. However, that was what they told me, and they were telling the truth.

Do not let members opposite think that everything is rosy for the Liberal and Country Parties. With the line they are adopting they will suffer a very heavy defeat in the election in 1977.

MR COYNE (Murchison-Eyre) [11.09 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to make some observations on matters affecting my own bailiwick. We are all aware that in recent weeks there has been a very serious downturn in the goldmining industry. This is affecting, in particular, the town of Mt. Magnet which is situated about 352 miles along the Great Northern Highway. It is at the junction of Geraldton Highway and Great Northern Highway; and it is a town which has experienced a degree of prosperity since about 1934.

Most of that prosperity originated from the Hill 50 Gold Mine which has been a tremendous producer and a rewarding investment to the hundreds of people who have shared in its wealth over the last couple of decades. Today this particular goldmine is facing a very serious downturn in its prosperity. In 1963 it employed something like 300 miners, but it now employs only 70 and the prospects of its continued operation are not good in the present economic climate.

Generally there is an optimistic tone on the overseas gold market and many people are pinning their faith on this. It is to be hoped their optimism will be justified because I cannot visualise on what they could pin their hopes otherwise.

One of the problems facing a goldmine such as the Hill 50 and the goldmines in Norseman, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder is the run down condition of their plants which

would cost many millions of dollars to replace. It is doubtful whether this kind of capital could be invested at this stage in addition to a tremendous amount of cost involved in the development work necessary to recover the ore from the deep sections of the mine.

The declining gold market is a problem, and there is a pessimistic outlook right throughout the goldfields at the present time. It would be a sad blow to this little town if the mine had to be abandoned and it became another ghost town.

Recently the member for Clontarf dealt with goldmining in a grievance debate and one of the matters he blamed for the situation today was the shortsightedness of the goldmining companies. I do not believe this is correct at all. The reason is the inflationary situation enveloping the whole country.

The deferment of the Perseverence project at Agnew was purely and simply a result of the inflationary situation. The feasibility of the project was in jeopardy because of the tremendously increased costs. One of the reasons for the deferment must have been the long delay in getting a suitable partner to develop the project; and it was only when the Mt. Isa mining group came into the picture that there was some prospect of the joint project getting off the ground quickly. However, as time went by and inflation caused prices to rise, the project had to be deferred.

Before I proceed, I would like to correct a misunderstanding because it was unintentional and was an unwarranted reflection on the project. During the debate on the Agnew nickel agreement Bill last year I made some comments about the discovery of the actual indicator and I said that the discovery was a fluke. The word "fluke" is used to describe a lucky happening. I was actually referring to the indicator which is like a gossan which indicates the existence of an ore body.

It was not until some time afterwards that the management of the Perseverence project drew my attention to the situation and I was horrified to discover that my comment had reflected on the expertise of the exploration team involved. I want to take this opportunity to correct that impression because it was an unguarded comment.

The people who did all the exploration work were there from 1964 to 1970 and I believe that it was some time in 1970 that the discovery was made, but there was no doubt that the people who did the exploratory work were well aware that there was an ore body of some consequence in the area and it was certain they would find it at some time, which, of course, they did. The finding of the gossan made the discovery a little more premature. However, it was as certain as the sun rises in the morning that the discovery would be made, and I compliment those responsible.

The delay in the fulfilment of this project is a great disappointment to me because it was one I wished to see proceed. It is also a disaster for the whole of the State. It was envisaged that the project would employ something like 2 500 people and a township of something like 4 500 people would result. To have a community of that size established in such a remote location would have been a tremendous fillip for the eastern goldfields in particular, and in the present economic climate it would have given the Kalgoorlie area a wonderful alternative to the present downturn in the gold situation.

There is no doubt that the project will get off the ground. The deferment is temporary. The project is only waiting a more favourable climate when inflation has been contained to proceed. The people concerned have access to an ore body of tremendous proportion and have the expertise and resources available to develop it in the same competitive way as other discoveries which might be made in the present economic climate. No doubt more discoveries will be made. The future of Western Australia depends on base metals. If we could only peer into the future in 10 or 15 years' time I am sure we would find that the price we will be paying for base metals then will be unbelievable. This is why this State has such a wonderful future.

If we look further afield to the Poseidon development at Windarra we can see how fortunate those responsible for that project were in being able to get it off the ground before the inflationary crisis occurred. They have had some serious setbacks, but in recent months they have reached a profit situation. The fact that they have reached such a situation in the present economic climate is a compliment to the monumental effort of private enterprise.

Members will recall that earlier this year some serious flooding occurred and the company involved was disadvantaged as a result and suffered a serious financial set-back. I believe that those floods were the reason for the recent bad reports on the company. I think in the 12 months up to June last it lost about $3 million and it is hard to assess just how much of that was as a result of the floods. However, it is a great tribute to the company that it has been able to overcome the disadvantages and reach a profit situation.

It is also great to know that the Western Mining Corporation joined Poseidon and helped to make the project a success. The project and its associated instrumentalities are to be officially opened, I think, some time before December when a ceremony will be held for this purpose. I take

the opportunity to wish all those concerned well.

I desire now to leave the mining situation and refer to the Murchison area—in particular the Mt. Magnet district—and try to indicate some way to overcome the present difficulties and disadvantages facing the district.

It is hard to know what the immediate future will bring. It is doubtful whether it will be possible to obtain the massive injection of capital required to keep the mine operating.

One way to help the area would be to develop the Geraldton Highway. As I have already said on a number of occasions in this House the Geraldton Highway, to my mind, is of great importance to the whole of the Murchison region. Until that highway is completed tourism will stagnate. When I was in Mt. Magnet during the weekend, a tourist development meeting was held in an effort to devise a way to overcome the disadvantages which affect the area at present. It is generally acknowledged that the area between Cue and Yalgoo is of great interest to rock hunters. Caravans go to the area in large numbers and people fossick around in that very interesting area.

The completion of the Geraldton Highway would also bring tremendous benefits to the Port of Geraldton because trade opportunities would flow to the coastal resorts. A distance of 200 miles is nothing these days, particularly if it is over a bitumen road. The present gravel road deters travellers. I know many people who would sooner travel to Geraldton via Wubin, and have to travel an extra 100 miles. I constantly receive complaints.

I was travelling through the area quite frequently during 1967-68 at the time the North West Highway was completed. A ceremony was held some 12 miles south of Cue to commemorate the completion of the road from Perth to Meekatharra. At that time, the Brand Government was warmly applauded for its tremendous and unremitting efforts to have the road completed. No doubt, the iron ore development north of Meekatharra caused those efforts to be sustained, and the objective of the Government was commended.

The Geraldton Highway, linking Geraldton and Mt. Magnet, covers a distance of 214 miles, 110 miles of which is already sealed. Another 20 or 30 miles has been formed so it would not be such a large project as to prevent the problems associated with it being overcome. I believe that when assessments are made of traffic density, the assessors forget that the traffic flow changes dramatically once a road is sealed. It is similar to the old story of which comes first: the chicken or the egg.

I envisage that the traffic will double or treble very quickly once the Geraldton Highway is completed. It could be said that an alternative railway service exists between Geraldton and Mt. Magnet, and that the service caters for the small towns along the way. However, that is not so. The railway system is completely out of date. It could have been argued some 20 or 30 years ago that the railway service provided an alternative. However, the only service which would be suitable would be one comparable to *The Prospector* service to Kalgoorlie, which is wonderful. However, I could not imagine a service such as that extending to the Murchison. The area has to rely on motor vehicle traffic, and commuters to the coastal recreation areas have to use motor vehicles.

One of the great prospects in the lower Murchison is the Golden Grove project in which Electrolytic Zinc is trying to purchase a 45 per cent interest. I believe that in 1976 the company will start a shaft, which indicates it is fairly confident that development will proceed. That development will generate a fairly substantial work force, and that work force will be looking for a quick means of commuting to the coast. The proposed development will bring prosperity to the area, and the Geraldton region. If the Geraldton Highway is completed tourists will be able to travel to Geraldton, through to Meekatharra, and return along the inland road. I believe the tourist traffic will increase right throughout the Murchison. I have already written to the Minister regarding this matter and I will be pressing him further than I have done previously in an effort to have this work completed. I believe it is virtually a commitment of this Government and, as I have said, I will not give the Minister any rest until the matter is finalised.

I would like to turn to one or two other matters. During the last few weeks there was a debate on the disparity of living conditions between country and city dwellers. Although I did not enter the debate, I listened to it with a considerable amount of interest. There are some thoughts I would like to voice in a general way. Although beer and food prices were mentioned during the debate I want to relate my comments to the general communications situation which affects country areas.

I will start with telephone and postal services, for which we are paying more and receiving less. Referring to radio communications, it was envisaged that when Radio Australia was established at Carnarvon it would be possible to broadcast the programme as an alternative to the programme which is now broadcast. The people living in the area are very conscious of the fact that they are not able to receive television programmes. It is difficult to explain to them that it is impossible to provide television programmes to small isolated communities. Coaxial cable has to be used in conjunction with high frequency broadcast.

I do agree that the quality of the radio programmes in the area is very poor. The people receive a composition of ABC programmes 1 and 2. On a Saturday afternoon they can listen only to the football, cricket, or racing and on week days the main programmes are for women, kindergartens, and so on. An alternative programme is not available. Surely it would be possible to provide an alternative through Radio Australia. I have been told that this is not possible because the Radio Australia programme is beamed to the islands on short wave, apart from which it is multi-lingual.

I believe the Broadcasting Control Board is looking at the possibility of introducing additional equipment for one of the regional stations of the Australian Broadcasting Commission which will allow it to provide a separate alternative programme. This would be a great thing for the area because those people are disadvantaged in terms of ordinary communication. I intend writing to the Minister for the Media to put a case to him and obtain some information about this matter.

While on the subject of communications, the School of the Air, which comes from Kalgoorlie, Port Hedland, Meekatharra, and other regional stations, is about to change over to a single side-band system. In 1967 the international conventions agreed that because of crowding of the spectrum it was necessary to introduce a new system. The double side-band system now in use does not allow enough stations to be serviced. The changeover to the single side-band system is to be completed in 1976, by which time every user is supposed to have changed over.

The double side-band set which has been in use for the last 20 years or more has been a very reliable, fault-free, and effective means of communication. Many of the people who have these sets have to change over to the single side-band transceiver which is not quite so efficient, despite all the claims made for it. The cost of setting it up in a station homestead is $900 or $1 000, and could be up to $1 150 with the proper antenna system.

The School of the Air is subsidised, and people can use part of their education allowance for the purchase of the set. A sum of $150 a year is allowed for general purposes. If two children in a family are on the School of the Air, $300 can be deducted for payment of the set. If a set is used for School of the Air purposes and also for general communications, nothing can be claimed by way of deduction because the set is used for outside communications. If the set is also being used for business purposes no claim can be made.

I think that is unfair because if people are on the telephone system they do not need to use their sets for anything other than School of the Air purposes. There are other people in the outback who do not use their sets for School of the Air purposes at all but only for general communications. It was said initially that the life of the double side-band set would phase out over seven years and allow the introduction of the single side-band set. However, it is not true to say the sets would phase out, because they are just as efficient today as they were 20 years ago and they are still being used effectively. So that is not an argument.

Where a homestead is connected to the telephone system, it is necessary to pay only the rental on the installation and for calls made. Why could not a person in the outback who depends entirely on a single side-band transceiver be given the same concession or consideration? Instead of having to fork out $1 000 to pay for his set, he could pay for it in instalments over a certain number of years. He is using it only for communication purposes and he does not have the benefit of a telephone. I believe he should be able to pay for it in that way, and that the ordinary person who uses his transceiver for business and School of the Air purposes should also get the same concession. However, it is difficult to go back, and many people have already paid cash for their single side-band sets; but consideration should be given to assisting people who have not the wherewithal to purchase these sets.

It is a great tribute to our State Budget that it provides such increased concessions for School of the Air situations. The people are very happy with what has been provided and they are pleased that the Premier has given them consideration in this matter.

I will now touch on the general feeling of discouragement which is abroad in country areas and which is not so evident in the metropolitan area. This was not always so. Until recently there were great advantages in living in the country. One has only to attend some of the functions where the people create their own entertainment and amusement to appreciate the value they get out of life. Country living, generally, is a matter of involvement, and people are dragged in in spite of themselves to make their own amusement. One has only to attend a country race meeting, gymkhana, or golf match to realise how much enthusiasm abounds in these small communities.

The Minister for Transport, the Hon. Mr Withers, and I recently attended an open golf tournament at Meekatharra in which something like 80 men and 40 women were competing. It was a tremendous day, and we appreciated the hospitality and generosity of the people.

When I mention the difference in the style of living, I do not refer so much to the transient people as to those who are committed to living in the country because they own their own home, run a business, or are developing a property. The transient people do not have any roots in the

area, and it is for the people who are committed to the country that I am trying to get some consideration. They are the people from whom the little complaints are coming in. They were previously quite happy to live in the country style, and there must be ways in which we can improve their general well-being.

One of the greatest problems in country areas is the cost of transport which makes everything so much more expensive than it is in the city, particularly when we realise that profit is made on the transport, as well as on the goods, and that sales tax is also added. The Prices Justification Tribunal has attempted to identify how it can make the price structure more relative to the city. I admit it is very difficult to do but I think it bears some investigation.

The other factor I would like to mention is the cost of air fares. It is now almost as expensive to fly from Perth to Laverton as it is to fly from Perth to Adelaide. A person living in the Laverton area who is recommended by his doctor to a specialist in Perth does not receive a concession on his fare. This is an additional cost that should not have to be borne by people in remote areas. Surely they should not have to pay the full fare. Nearly everyone finds it necessary to make at least one trip a year to Perth. I believe this matter of air fares should receive consideration.

My time has just about expired—

Sir Charles Court: Just before you finish, could you go back to the question of School of the Air radios and the $150?

Mr COYNE: This $150 can be used for any purpose. Sometimes the parents use it to send the children to the trans.-line sports or for some other particular purpose. It is a Federal allowance. Many parents use it to purchase the transceiver sets for the School of the Air. If they have two children using the service, it means that the transceiver set can be paid off over three years. This is a good idea, but the allowance is not available to parents who use the set in any way at all for communication purposes. It is then considered that the set is used for the parents' business and no allowance is paid.

As my time has nearly expired, I will close on that note.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin.

House adjourned at 11.42 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 29th October, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

WEST COAST HIGHWAY

Extension through Cottesloe: Petition

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.32 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from residents of Western Australia expressing opposition to proposals to route any West Coast Highway extension through Marmion Street, Cottesloe, or any other existing residential or recreational road in Cottesloe. I move—

That the petition be received.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.33 p.m.]: The petition contains 4 361 signatures, and bears the Clerk's certificate that it is in conformity with the Standing Orders. I move—

That the petition be read and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.34 p.m.]: The petition reads as follows—

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia.

We, the under-signed, hereby express our opposition to proposals being considered by the Consultants appointed by the Environmental Protection Authority, Scott Furphy and John Patterson Urban Systems, to route any West Coast Highway Extension through Marmion Street, Cottesloe.

We support the principle, that unless already provided for in Regional or Town Planning Schemes, a residential street should not be used for major road or highway development, because of the well known disruptive and harmful effects on the residential environment.

We therefore request that the Consultants be instructed to refrain from proposing any such extension through Marmion Street, Cottesloe, or any other existing residential or recreational road in Cottesloe.

Your petitioners will ever pray that their humble petition will be acceded to.

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 412).

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

TROTTING MEETING

Northam

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Recreation:

(1) Is the Minister aware that a trotting race meeting is to be held at Northam on Wednesday, the 29th October, 1975?