

Clause, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. V. J. Ferry

(Teller)

## Noes—7

Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Lyla Elliott
Hon. S. J. Dellar	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. Grace Vaughan

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Title put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. V. J. Ferry

(Teller)

## Noes—7

Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Lyla Elliott
Hon. S. J. Dellar	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. Grace Vaughan

Title thus passed.

Bill reported, with amendments.

### BILLS (6): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

#### 1. Inventions Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), read a first time.

#### 2. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2).

#### 3. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.

#### 4. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.

#### 5. Juries Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

#### 6. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.44 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 1st October, 1975

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

### QUESTIONS (32): ON NOTICE

#### 1. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

##### Kalgoorlie and Boulder: Property Valuations

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) When was the last valuation survey of properties made by the State Taxation Department in the Town of Kalgoorlie and the Shire of Boulder districts?
- (2) When had the previous valuation survey in the above districts taken place?
- (3) Is he aware of the discontent expressed by The Kalgoorlie-Boulder Ratepayers' Association (Inc.) because of steep increases said to be in the range of 200% struck in some instances while some reductions were made in others?
- (4) Would he please explain the method used by his officers in striking a norm and apparent variations from the norm?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Revaluations were made for the local authorities in 1974-75 for 1975-76.
- (2) Revaluations were made in 1968-69 for 1969-70.
- (3) No. The revaluations were made for the local authorities and any appeals would be made to them.
- (4) The rating base is the annual value for municipal purposes and valuations were made as prescribed by section 533 (4) of the Local Government Act, 1960-1975.

#### 2. BEACH EROSION COMMITTEES

##### Coastal Development

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

Further to question on notice 28, asked on 22/4/75, does the interdepartmental committee consider and make recommendations on matters relating to coastal development?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The advisory committee has been required to give advice on certain coastal development and coastal protection proposals from time to time. Coastal proposals are not all referred to the committee as a matter of course.

### 3. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

#### *Departmental Funds*

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

- (1) Do the expenditure amounts relating to the Department of Environmental Protection for 1972-73 and 1973-74 include funds from the Australian Government?
- (2) If so, could details be supplied?
- (3) Were funds received for the Hardy Inlet Ecological Study and cosmetic operations for Peel Inlet during these years, and if so how are these administered?

Mr F. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) During 1973-74, \$25 000 was received through the National Estate for Hardy Inlet ecological study and \$15 000 for Peel Inlet cosmetic operation. The funds were administered by Department of Environmental Protection through a separate Treasury account.

### 4. FAUNA RESERVE

#### *Heirisson Island*

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

- (1) What specific species will be included in the fauna reserve on Heirisson Island?
- (2) By which authority will the fauna reserve be managed?
- (3) What is the source of the various sums which will finance the entire Heirisson Island project?
- (4) What forms will public access to the island take?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Specific species have not been selected as yet.
- (2) Perth City Council.
- (3) Out of a total Public Works Department estimate of \$419 000, some \$206 000 has been allocated from the State unemployment fund. A decision on the balance of funds required is still pending.
- (4) Pedestrian and public transport.

### 5. TOWN PLANNING

#### *Cycleways: Public Attitude*

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

- (1) Has the MRPA yet investigated public attitudes to the provision of cycleways?
- (2) If so, what are the results?
- (3) If not, when is the investigation expected to be completed?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) A preliminary investigation has been made and the appropriate report is now in the course of submission to local authorities and other interested parties for comment.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

### 6. TRAIL BIKES AND RECREATION VEHICLES

#### *Damage to Environment*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a great deal of damage is being done to flora by the uncontrolled use of trail bikes, mini-bikes and four-wheel drive vehicles?
- (2) If so, what is he doing about it?
- (3) When will the long promised legislation be brought to Parliament?
- (4) Is he aware that excessive and unreasonable noise from these vehicles is a major cause for complaint from a growing number of residents of the metropolitan area and near metropolitan area?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes, in some areas.
- (2) Legislation is being prepared and a satisfactory draft Bill is expected shortly.
- (3) It is hoped that a Bill will be introduced before the end of the current session.
- (4) Yes. Mention should be made, however, of the possible action available to residents and local authorities under the provision of the Noise Abatement Act. The Government is aware of the difficulty of enforcing the existing controls and is anxious to see a more satisfactory remedy available as soon as possible.

## 7. TRAIL BIKES AND RECREATION VEHICLES

### *Damage to Environment*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Committee on Freedom and Responsibility made recommendations to the Government on the need for a greater measure of responsibility by trail bike and four-wheel drive vehicle users towards the environment which is being seriously damaged by the irresponsible use of such machines?
- (2) If so, what are the recommendations and what does the Government intend to do about the problem and when?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is in the negative, will he seek the "cool advice of very thoughtful people" as promised in his election policy speech?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) The question posed by the Member hardly falls within the work of the type of advisers fore-shadowed in the document referred to.

As has already been stated publicly, the Government has been studying the activities of trail bikes, four-wheel drive and other vehicles, which are likely to seriously damage the environment, and legislation is proposed. Such legislation is not easy to draft if one seeks to preserve a sensible balance between all factors involved.

## 8. TRAIL BIKES AND RECREATION VEHICLES

### *Damage to Environment*

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

- (1) Is he concerned at the continued and rapidly accelerating damage being done to the environment, especially the flora, by four-wheel drive vehicles and trail bikes?
- (2) If so, what is he doing about the problem?
- (3) If not, will he attempt to make himself familiar with these serious developments?
- (4) Has the Environmental Protection Authority or Council given him advice on these problems?
- (5) If so, what was the advice?
- (6) If not, will he ask these two bodies to discuss the matter as a matter of great urgency?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) to (6) In November, 1972, the then Environmental Protection Council expressed great concern at the activities of such vehicles and as a consequence of the chairman's inquiries and report to the Environmental Protection Council the Council advised the Minister that legislation was desirable.

Since that time further inquiries and discussions have been held and it was decided by Cabinet in December, 1974, to appoint a sub-committee under the Minister for Recreation to draft legislation for the control of recreation vehicles such as trail bikes, beach buggies and other vehicles operating off roads. Such legislation is currently being drafted under instructions from my colleague the Minister for Recreation.

## 9. TRAIL BIKES AND RECREATION VEHICLES

### *Damage to Environment*

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

- (1) Has there been study by any committee charged with the responsibility for advising the Government on coastal erosion on the daily increasing danger to the stability of dunal systems by the rapidly increasing use of four-wheel drive vehicles and trail bikes?
- (2) If so, what are the results of this study?
- (3) If not, will he take steps so that such a study is undertaken?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (3) I refer the Member to the reply to question 8 of today's date which was directed to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment.

## 10. YOUTH ORGANISATIONS

### *Report*

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

- (1) Has a report been prepared by Mr Ross Smith into youth organisations in Western Australia or a similar topic?
- (2) If so, what was the date of the report and will the Minister table it?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The report was prepared for the Community Recreation Council and received in August, 1974.  
Some of the data collected was considered to be unreliable and the council was not prepared to accept in full, the recommendations made in the report, nor formally to accept the document.  
Some of the organisations involved contributed data which they considered confidential and therefore it is not considered desirable to make the report public.

- (2) Most of the powdered laundry and industrial detergents on the market contain what could be termed high levels of phosphate.
- (3) None at present; there is no evidence that detergents are a major source of phosphate contamination of waters in W.A.
- (4) The present Canadian situation is not clearly known. However, restrictions on phosphate content detergents were introduced from 1st August, 1970, with the aim of complete elimination by 1st January, 1972. I am also aware that several States of the USA have had total bans in force since 1973.

11.

## HEALTH

### Detergents

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

- (1) Did the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia give an undertaking to the State and Australian Ministers of Health that "hard" detergents would be replaced by biodegradable types by 1971?
- (2) If so, what are the details of the undertaking, and what progress has been made in this direction?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, the undertaking was in respect of domestic and industrial cleaning and washing products. It is understood to be 95 per cent effective.

12.

## HEALTH

### Detergents

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

- (1) Is he concerned at the high level of phosphate to be found in detergents which can have the effect of eutrophication of water bodies?
- (2) If so, will he list the detergents on the market in Western Australia which have a high phosphate content?
- (3) What action is the Government taking to reduce the degree of contamination from this source?
- (4) Has the Canadian Government taken the step of eliminating phosphate from detergents and if so, what was the date of the decision?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes, with the reservations explained in part (3) of this answer.

13.

## WATER SUPPLIES

### Aquifers: Salt Intrusion

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

- (1) As Perth will rely for 33% of its water from underground water by 1991 (question on notice 39 of 10th September, 1974), is he concerned that as a consequence there may be intrusion of ocean water into the aquifers as has happened elsewhere in coastal Australia?
- (2) If not, what is the rationale of this confidence?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) The risk is well recognised by the Metropolitan Water Board, and is taken into account in the planning of ground water schemes. In the Yanchep-Two Rocks area the quantity of water extracted is controlled and water levels are monitored.

14.

## CONSERVATION OF TERRESTRIAL COMMUNITIES PROJECT

### Land Reserves: Study

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

- (1) Is there a study in progress by the Conservation of Terrestrial Communities Project of the International Biological Programme whose aim, *inter alia*, is to examine the adequacy of Australian reserved land?
- (2) If so, what stage has the study reached so far as this country is concerned?
- (3) What assistance and co-operation have been sought by the project from the Government?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) No. The study has been completed. It has been published in the Australian Journal of Botany Supplementary Series No. 7, July 1974.

- (3) Information and advice were supplied by officers of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, the Department of Agriculture, and other Government instrumentalities.

15. **MID-EAST MINERALS NL**  
*Operations: Capel-Busselton Area*

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

- (1) Has Mid-East Minerals N.L. commenced mining in the Capel-Busselton area?
- (2) In general terms, where are this company's deposits?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Westralian Sands Limited, the operator for the joint venturers, Mid-East Minerals N.L. and Westralian Sands Limited, carried out some mining near Busselton during July to provide heavy mineral bearing sand for trial runs of the wet concentrating plant.
- (2) The area of main interest is approximately five kilometres south-east of Busselton.

16. **WALPOLE-NORNALUP NATIONAL PARK**  
*Dieback Disease*

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

Further to question on notice 9 asked on 1st May, 1975, what species of eucalyptus were affected by *phytophthora cinnamomi* in the Walpole-Nornalup National Park?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

I have been advised by the National Parks Board that *E. marginata* (Jarrah) and *E. jacksonii* (Red Tingle) have been so infected.

17. **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.**

*State Forests: Darling Range*

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

- (1) Further to question on notice 19 asked on 22nd April, 1975, what are the Environmental Protection Authority's long-range plans for the environmental management of the forest zone of the Darling Range area?
- (2) What action has been taken to co-ordinate the activities of respective interests in this regard?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) The Environmental Protection Authority is of the opinion that the proper multiple-use planning of this region is of major importance to the people of Western Australia. The authority, through the Department of Conservation and Environment, has had preliminary discussions with various other Government departments and instrumentalities with responsibility for planning works in this zone with a view to meeting the authority's desires. As a result of these and further discussions I expect to be in a position to make a significant announcement on the matter in the near future.

18. **PHARMACEUTICAL COUNCIL**  
*Membership*

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

- (1) Who are currently members of the Pharmaceutical Council of W.A.?
- (2) What positions, if any, do such members hold within the Pharmaceutical Society of W.A.?
- (3) For what period and in what manner are members of the council elected?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2)—  
Mr E. G. Kirk, President;  
Mr N. J. Geneve, Deputy President;  
Mr E. P. Walsh, Registrar;  
Mrs M. J. Humphreys, Treasurer;  
Mr J. M. O'Hara, Board Member;  
Mr W. D. Jewkes, Board Member;  
Miss G. Heedes, Board Member;  
Mr R. M. Thomas, Board Member.
- (3) Elected by ballot by members of the Pharmaceutical Society for a period of three years.

19. **RAILWAYS**  
*Parking Areas*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What areas of Westral land are made available to private entrepreneurs for parking areas?
- (2) Where are the areas located?
- (3) How is available land put on offer to interested parties?
- (4) Is any such land likely to be made available in the foreseeable future?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

- (1) Land which is suitable for parking and which is not anticipated to be required for railway purposes in the immediate future.

- (2) Milligan Street, Perth.  
Nash Street, Perth.  
Moore Street, Perth.  
Stirling Street, Perth.  
Bridge Street, Perth.  
Cnr. Wellington and Pier Streets,  
Perth.  
Cnr. Moore and Pier Streets,  
Perth.
- (3) Generally by calling of public tenders.
- (4) Not at present, but from time to time land does become available and if the Member is aware of demand at a particular location, Westrail would be happy to examine the position in that area.

## 20. HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE

### *Retention*

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

Further to my question 41 of 20th August last, can he now advise regarding the future of Her Majesty's Theatre?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Not as yet.

21. *This question was postponed.*

## 22. HOSPITAL

### *Bridgetown*

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

- (1) Is it proposed that a start will be made on the construction of a new hospital at Bridgetown in the current financial year?
- (2) If so, will he indicate when a commencement will be made, and when completion is expected?
- (3) Has there been any announcement during the past month of proposed extensions to any country hospitals, and if so, which hospitals are involved and what is the value of construction anticipated in each case?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) to (3) This information is not available until such time as the Loan Estimates are presented to Parliament. No announcement has been made during the past month of proposed extensions to any country hospitals.

## 23. LAPORTE TITANIUM

### *Effluent*

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

- (1) Is it proposed to resume efforts to convey waste from the Laporte industries' workings at Bunbury into the sea by pipeline?

- (2) If "Yes" to (1)—

- (a) when is it proposed to commence this practice;
- (b) what quantity of effluent would it be proposed to dispose of in this manner;
- (c) has the approval of the Environmental Protection Authority been obtained to allow this practice to proceed?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) It is intended to resume discharging a small quantity as part of an overall monitoring programme.
- (2) (a) During November, depending on weather conditions.
- (b) 90 cubic metres (20 000 gallons) per day.
- (c) Yes.

## 24.

### MILK

#### *Additional Quotas*

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

- (1) Is it intended that the Dairy Industry Authority will issue a further 70 market milk quotas each of 54 gallons per day?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) will applications for such quotas be called, and if so, when?
- (3) On what basis will such quotas be awarded to successful applicants and what priority of consideration will be accorded to the basis of consideration?
- (4) Is it intended that some individuals in all districts which are currently producing milk will receive quotas for market milk in the next distribution of quotas?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (4) A proposal has been agreed to in principle only. This involves the issue of 54-gallon quotas to approximately 70 non-quota holders in 1976. The details have yet to be determined and will be the subject of further meetings.

## 25. DARWIN RECONSTRUCTION COMMISSION

### *Contracts*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Besides Kerby (W.A.) Pty. Ltd. of Maddington, what other W.A. companies have been successful in obtaining contracts in connection with the Darwin Reconstruction Commission?
- (2) Will he list the respective companies, together with particulars of the individual contracts?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Besides Kerby (W.A.) Pty. Ltd. the Darwin Reconstruction Commission has let a contract to Fabeo Pty. Ltd. for the supply and delivery of 39 bunk houses valued at \$500 000.

A \$1.2 million contract for pre-fabricated building panels has been placed on a Perth supplier, System-Built Pty. Ltd. An official announcement to this effect was made by the Darwin Reconstruction Commission today.

Apart from those already mentioned a number of Western Australian companies have supplied approximately \$1.6 million of steel, asbestos sheeting and fencing, metal fascias and screen walls under direct purchase arrangements with the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. I am informed that this represents approximately 80 per cent of all direct purchases made by the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. My department kept constantly in contact with relevant bodies and advanced the interest of Western Australian manufacturers and suppliers.

Individual details of direct purchase items are not available.

- (2) Answered in (1) above.

## 26. ALWEST ALUMINA PROJECT

### *Commencement*

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) As it would appear that there is no longer opposition to the Alwest alumina project on environmental grounds, would he indicate when it is anticipated an announcement regarding the commencement of the project will be made?
- (2) When did the last meeting between Government and Alwest officials take place?
- (3) Will the Australian Government's recently announced foreign investment policy assist the development of the Alwest project?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The general uncertainty and lack of confidence surrounding the mining industry engendered directly by the failure of the Commonwealth to clearly spell out its policies in this area, has been a major impediment to projects like Alwest. Delays resulting from this situation have

brought about escalations in the capital cost of the project which have placed its economic viability in jeopardy. Whilst every endeavour is being made by the company and the State to launch the Alwest project, for the above-mentioned reasons it is not possible at this time to indicate a commencement date.

- (2) A close liaison is maintained continuously between representatives of the company and the State—as part of which, discussions have taken place at a senior level in recent days.
- (3) The Commonwealth Government's recent announcement is not expected to assist, or even affect, the Alwest project, and it will do little to increase business confidence in those contemplating investment in Australia—indeed, in some respects, it could do the opposite.

## 27. NATURAL GAS

### *Dongara Field*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Having regard for existing contracts and consumption what is the anticipated life of the Dongara gas field?
- (2) What is the percentage of gas currently being consumed for—  
(a) domestic purposes;  
(b) industrial purposes?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The Dongara gas field is expected to be depleted by the mid-eighties.
- (2) Assuming that the Member's question is directed to the total and not only SEC gas sales—  
(a) 6.4%  
(b) 93.6%

## 28. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Busselton*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is there any known concern that the water supply at Busselton is not potable?
- (2) Is any change in treatment to improve quality contemplated?
- (3) If so, what are the changes?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) The Busselton water supply is controlled by the Busselton Water Board.

## 29. STATE FORESTS

*Jarraah and Karri: Royalties*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

Would he advise the rates of royalty charged by his department for—

- (a) jarraah;
  - (b) karri saw logs,
- to respective south-west millers, and would he further indicate the type of permit held in each instance?

Mr RIDGE replied:

As the answer to this question is statistical, I seek leave to table it.

*The answer was tabled (see paper No. 426).*

## 30. MILK

*Additional Quotas*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the Dairy Industry Authority made a determination regarding the number of additional quotas to be allocated to dairy farmers, and if so, would he give details including number involved, date of commencement, etc?
- (2) When will the Dairy Industry Authority allocate intended quotas?
- (3) What were the criteria used in assessing suitable applicants for the May allotment of quotas, and is it intended to modify or change DIA policy in this regard? If so would he give detail?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) A proposal has been agreed to in principle only. This involves the issue of 54 gallon quotas to approximately 70 non-quota holders in 1976. The details have yet to be determined and will be the subject of further meetings.
- (3) The Dairy Industry Authority was directed that new market milk quotas be allocated on the following bases and principles—
  - (a) Location of property.
  - (b) Area of land.
  - (c) Number of cows in milking herds.
  - (d) Standard of dairy building and equipment.
  - (e) Provision of refrigerated bulk tank complying with ASN 46.
  - (f) Availability of bulk collection services to the property.

(g) Applicant's standard of dairy hygiene.

(h) Applicant's milk quality record.

It is not intended to modify or change the policy at this stage.

## 31. TRAFFIC OFFENCES

*Busselton, Albany, and Geraldton*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Will he advise the number of
  - (a) infringement notices;
  - (b) prosecutions;
  - (c) cautions,
 to motorists for offences and breaches of road traffic regulations at Busselton, Albany and Geraldton in each month since 1st May, 1975?
- (2) How many officers and vehicles of the Road Traffic Authority are in each centre as above?
- (3) Further to question (1) can he advise the number of offences detected by officers of his department other than the Road Traffic Authority in each centre?
- (4) Since May 1st, 1975, can he advise the accident rate comparison with previous years and also the number of offences related to alcohol for each centre during this period?

Mr O'Neill (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

- (1) to (4) The information sought by the Member is not readily available and will take some little time to collate.
- It will be forwarded to him immediately it is available.

## 32. POTATOES

*Rejections*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Would he give details of the total tonnage of potatoes received at—
  - (a) Kewdale;
  - (b) Fremantle,
 by the Potato Marketing Board since 1st May, 1975, and the weekly tonnage and percentage of rejection rate of potatoes in each centre during this period?
- (2) Would he further advise—
  - (a) reasons for rejections in each instance;
  - (b) inspectors involved;
  - (c) specific names of merchants; and



(d) number of times that merchants have requested re-grading of potatoes, at either Kewdale or Fremantle since 1st August, 1975?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) As the answer is extremely detailed I request permission to table it.

*The answer was tabled (see paper No. 427).*

## QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. JUMBO STEELWORKS

*Site: Report*

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) Was the Premier correctly reported in this afternoon's issue of the *Daily News* as saying that the jumbo steel mill consortium had considered Geraldton, Albany, and Bunbury as possible locations, but had reported that none of these centres was practicable?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), will the Premier please undertake to make this report available to the House by way of tabling it, or otherwise disclose the information as to why those locations are unsuitable?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes, I was correctly reported as saying that the consortium had considered Geraldton, Albany, and Bunbury.
- (2) I would not undertake to table at this stage any reports dealing with these negotiations in respect of any of the locations. The honourable member should appreciate that enough damage has already been done by some of the statements being made at both State and Federal level at a very critical time when we are trying to get one of the most important industries ever sought by this State.

### 2. BAYMIS UGLE

*Prosecution: Premier's Press Comments*

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

I would hope that the answer to this question would be to the specific matters raised and not a generalised answer to the material as a whole. The question is—

- (1) Was the Premier correctly reported in the daily Press on the 11th and 12th September as saying the material raised in the House about the arrest and trial of Baymis Ugle was—
- (a) part of a familiar pattern of attack on the WA

police in which they are accused of brutality or corruption;

- (b) part of a relentless campaign against the police that he referred to in those Press statements; and

- (c) part of an attack made on police here and throughout the nation?

- (2) Is it true that the Premier was absent from the House during most of the time when the material regarding Ugle's arrest and trial was presented?

- (3) If "Yes", on what basis did he make his comments?

- (4) If the situation is as outlined by the Premier in his public statement, why has the Government bothered to appoint a Royal Commission into the arrest and trial of Baymis Ugle?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I received notice of this question only as I was about to come to the House, for reasons the honourable member will appreciate. There seems to be some minor variations in the question he read out and the question I received; however, they are not of any great significance. With all respect, I would say to the member for Balga that it is not appreciated by Ministers when we have a direction given to our staffs as to how we will answer questions. Ministers of this Government do their best to answer questions as frankly as is practicable under the circumstances, and it is not good taste to give messages to staff regarding how the question shall be answered.

Mr B. T. Burke: I gave the prefix to the question in this House. I also gave the prefix to the question to your staff.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am telling the honourable member that Ministers will answer questions in the manner they feel appropriate; in fact, they are not obliged to answer them at all.

Mr B. T. Burke: I will make my point about the way in which they are answered.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have not been able to study the question in detail, but I answer it as follows—

- (1) A copy of my Press release of the 11th September, 1975,

is presented, and I request permission to table it.

The honourable member will see it refers to the general question of attacks on the Police Force, and no specific mention of the Ugle case is made.

- (2) I was absent from the Chamber on official duties for part of the time. The honourable member will, realise however, that *Hansard* records the proceedings of this place, and the matter in question has been the subject of a full discussion in Cabinet.

Mr B. T. Burke: Your comments were made the next day.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is right.

Mr B. T. Burke: I am making the point that your comments were made the next day.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have news for the honourable member: the Minister discussed the matter with me before I went home that night.

Mr B. T. Burke: He didn't have a corrected copy of the speech.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: To continue with the answer—

(3) See answer to (2).

(4) See answer to (1).

I suggest that the honourable member awaits the full text of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission before speculating on the nature and scope of the inquiry.

*The Press release was tabled (see paper No. 428).*

3.

## HEALTH

### Detergents

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

My question arises out of question 12 on today's notice paper. I ask the Minister: What is meant by "entrophication of water bodies"?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Would the honourable member by way of interjection repeat the phrase he used?

Mr HARTREY: Entrophication of water bodies.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that question could well be asked of the member who asked the question—

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: —in a private capacity. Will the member for Morley resume his seat, unless he wants to ask a question?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I do, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

4.

## WATER SUPPLIES

### Consumption: Check of Meters

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

- (1) Is it policy to insist upon the payment of exorbitant excess water rates even though the amounts alleged to be used are obviously absurd?
- (2) What check is made upon the checker of water meters when there is an obvious malfunction?
- (3) Can he explain how the owner of a duplex with a minimal garden and no swimming pool could use 518 000 gallons of water in the period specified?
- (4) How many hours would a normal garden tap have to run to allow 518 000 gallons of water to be used?
- (5) Will he use his judgment and modify the excess water bill of Mrs White-Dunn of 450B Light Street, Dianella, knowing that the amount of water alleged to be used—over half a million gallons—was in fact not used?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

I thank the member for Morley for giving me adequate notice of the question, and I answer it as follows—

- (1) to (5) It is obvious that the honourable member has been misinformed. The figure of 518 000 gallons was the registration on the water meter when it was read on the 24th February, 1975, and is the consumption since the meter was installed at the property on the 10th May, 1969.

Where an inspection reveals there is an obvious malfunction in a meter or the meter fails a positive test, the water consumption is adjusted. In the case of 450B Light Street, Dianella, there was no obvious malfunction and the meter at this property was subjected to a positive test on the 27th May, 1975, and found to be registering correctly, with the meter dial in good order.

## 5. HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE *Retention*

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

My question arises out of question 20 on the notice paper, which relates to the future of Her Majesty's Theatre.

As the time for arriving at a decision, which the Premier gave me some time ago, has long passed, and as he said today, "Not as yet", and did not indicate when a reply could be expected, could he tell me when I might expect a reply?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the question asked by the member for Victoria Park, which is a very reasonable one, I could say, "Not as yet"; but I do not intend to do that. I wish I could give him a date, but at the moment I could not with any certainty predict when there will be an answer in respect of this rather difficult question.

As the member knows it is a complex situation. We must see whether this building could be adapted for use in a manner in which certain people favour it to be used, and the other alternatives have to be examined simultaneously. However, I do hazard a guess that it will not be in the immediate future.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

### *Introduction and First Reading*

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

## INVENTIONS BILL

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Industrial Development), and transmitted to the Council.

## CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

### *Third Reading*

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Question put.

The SPEAKER: This Bill is one that requires an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House. As there are some dissentient voices, in order to satisfy myself that there is an absolute majority present and voting for the Bill, I order the ringing of the bells.

Division taken with the following result—

Ayes—26.

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Noes—18

Mr Barnett	Mr T. D. Evans
Mr Bateman	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bertram	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bryce	Mr Jamieson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Moiler

(Teller)

The SPEAKER: The result of the division is Ayes 26 and Noes 18. I therefore declare that the third reading of this Bill is passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Third Reading*

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.06 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask members when they have seen the notice paper and the type of orders of the day set down on it to realise that when the Speaker is on his feet they should contain themselves until he resumes his seat.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## BILLS (3): THIRD READING

1. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.

2. Juries Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr O'Neill (Minister for Works), and transmitted to the Council.

3. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), and transmitted to the Council.

## SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

## LIBERAL AND COUNTRY PARTY GOVERNMENTS

### *Breaches of Conventions and Traditions: Motion*

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.11 p.m.]: I move—

That this House expresses its abhorrence at the recent successive breaches of conventions and traditions by Liberal and Country Party Governments throughout Australia.

Further, this House calls on the Premier to immediately convey to the Premier of Queensland this State's opposition to the appointment of a non-Labor nominee to the Senate vacancy caused by the untimely death of Labor Senator Milliner.

You will recall, Mr Speaker, that some time ago I sought your approval to move a motion similar to this under Standing Orders 46 and 48 which deal with adjournments of the House. At that time the motion was more topical than this one is at present. Nevertheless I feel we should know where we stand in regard to future appointments to the Senate by a State Parliament and therefore the motion should proceed.

It would appear to me that there are far too many people in this community of ours, not only in this State but also in other States, who have the idea that they were born to rule. We have at least five members of the Government in this State who come within that category. Also within that category we have the Federal Leader of the Country Party and the comparatively new Federal Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr Fraser), all of whom have the idea that they were born to rule. Where they get that divine right, I do not know.

Mr Coyne: Positive thinking, that is.

**MR JAMIESON**: No, it is not. It is one of those syndromes that exist, particularly within the conservative forces in this country. It is manifest on the front bench of the Government of this State and it certainly comes forward very quickly as soon as one makes mention of it. There are a couple of other members who are not in the Ministry who also have the idea that they were born to rule.

However, electors in the States still have to a limited degree the right to determine who shall rule. The exception, of course, can be found in the case where the Queensland Premier selected a man to be appointed to the Senate who did not belong to the same political party as the man who preceded him and who left the seat vacant by his demise.

It is interesting to note that the man appointed by the Queensland Premier filled the 27th casual vacancy in the Senate—and he is the subject of my motion—since the introduction of proportional representation in 1949. The idea of introducing proportional representation was to

ensure that the Senate at any one time was not loaded one way or the other. By doing that we adopted a democratic system of selection. There are other occasions when Independent senators—

The **SPEAKER**: Would members keep their level of conversation down, please?

**MR JAMIESON**: If they do I will endeavour to talk softly, too, and that might help. The position is that on 10 occasions out of 27 when vacancies have occurred in the Senate, the new senator was appointed by a State Government that held a political view opposite to that of the senator who was appointed. However, in all cases, until the beginning of this year when the replacement of Senator Murphy, and later the replacement of Senator Milliner, took place, the situation that was created by the then Premier of this State (Sir Ross McLarty) has been maintained.

After 1949 the first replacement arose when Senator Nash of Western Australia died. The then Premier of Western Australia (Sir Ross McLarty) immediately sought guidance from the Premiers of the other States. As a matter of fact he sent them a letter indicating his own thinking, and seeking their views. Typical of his thinking, and the contents of the letters he sent, is the letter dated the 10th January, 1952, which the then Premier of Western Australia sent to the then Premier of South Australia (Mr Playford, later Sir Thomas Playford). It is as follows—

Dear Mr Playford,

You are no doubt aware that a vacancy has arisen in the Senate owing to the death of Senator Nash of Western Australia.

The Constitution provides that if the State Parliament is sitting, the successor shall be appointed by both Houses of Parliament at a Joint Sitting. If Parliament is not in session the appointment is made by the Executive Council and referred to Parliament when it meets. The Western Australian Parliament will not meet for several months, so the vacancy will be filled by Executive Council.

This is the first vacancy that has arisen since proportional representation was adopted for the Senate, so whatever action is taken on this action could be taken as a precedent in filling future vacancies. I am therefore anxious to obtain the views of all State Premiers as to how they consider the future vacancies should be filled.

My opinion is that, in view of the fact that proportional representation is now the method of election to the Senate, a member of the same Party, nominated by the Executive of the Party, should be appointed when future vacancies arise through death or other causes.

In this particular case, the nomination would come from the Executive of the Western Australian Branch of the A.L.P.

As it is desirable that an appointment should be made as soon as possible, I would appreciate an early expression of your views.

Yours sincerely,  
(sgd.) Ross McLarty  
PREMIER.

As a result of the letter he sent the then Premier of Western Australia received sufficient inducements from the Premiers of the other States to indicate that his thinking was correct in respect of the filling of Senate vacancies. Indeed, Senator Cook representing Western Australia was appointed as a result of the determination made by the Executive, and the appointment was confirmed by Parliament when it sat later that year.

Sir Charles Court: In the meantime they had some moments before they finally reached agreement.

Mr JAMIESON: They might have had some moments, but the point is the Premier would be privy to this matter because he has access to the file and all the replies from the other States which, so far as I know, have not been made available to us despite a request to do so.

Sir Charles Court: The Prime Minister has seen all the papers.

Mr JAMIESON: They might have been available to the Prime Minister, but I have not had access to them. Since the coming into operation of the system up till this year, each time a casual vacancy occurred a replacement was made by appointing a person from the same political party as that of the deceased or outgoing member.

It is important that this principle be maintained. The position is slightly different from appointing a member to represent an electorate. I would possibly agree that if there is some method of filling a vacancy by appointing someone of the same political faith as the outgoing or deceased member, it should be adopted.

When the people of this country elect a member of Parliament they elect him as part of a team to form a Government. Under our system there is no other way in which we can operate successfully without causing chaos in administration. Once a Government is elected, then whenever it is able to sustain its majority in Parliament it should be entitled to run its life.

Indeed, a member is not elected as an individual but as part of a team for a certain period of time. In the Senate that period is for three or six years. I feel it is desirable that there be no interference with the thinking of the people who elected that member of Parliament

at the time. The replacement should not be based on some occurrence since that time, such as unemployment or inflation. The other senators who were elected at the same time were elected on the thinking of the electorate at the time. It was that thinking of the electorate which returned the Government of the day.

Because of that I feel it is very important that we adhere to the principle of filling a temporary vacancy by appointing a person of a similar political faith. Of course, this has invariably been the case. Before some member gets up and tells me that since Federation there have been 16 cases in which the person appointed to fill a vacancy did not represent the same political outlook as that held by the deceased or retiring member, I should point out I am quite aware of this fact.

I appreciate that, and I also appreciate the fact that since 1949 until this year the system has been maintained whereby conservative Governments of various States decided that other courses of action should be taken. The history behind the filling of various vacancies does not reflect favourably on the conservative forces of this country.

Not only have occasions arisen in the States where the conservative forces were in Government and an ALP member died, and the vacancy was filled by a conservative member in the form of a Nationalist or a Country Party member, but there have also been occasions—for instance, in 1925 and again in 1946—where a State Labor Government in a joint session between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly was not able to replace one of its own senators who had died. Through the weight of numbers in the Legislative Council the conservative forces were able to replace the outgoing or deceased member with a member of the Nationalist Party or Country Party, against the wishes of the State Labor Government. An examination of the history behind these replacements does not reflect favourably on conservative State Governments.

Conservative State Governments have always been inclined to depart from tradition and adopt the role that they are born to rule. In my view nobody is born to rule, but it is very difficult to indicate this to some people who think they have the right to rule.

In the current case we have seen the matter being referred to some type of court. The original case which caused the problem to arise occurred in Queensland in 1962 when Alfred Edward Arnell was nominated to replace Senator Maxwell William Poulter, who had died. Senator Poulter was elected to the Senate in 1961, but he did not survive long enough to take his seat in Parliament. As a consequence a replacement was required.

The then Premier of Queensland (Mr Nicklin) was not satisfied with the nomination of Arnell. As I understand the position, Arnell had been president of the waterside workers' union for 12 years. Despite the fact that he defeated a communist to gain his position, at some stage he was supposed to have been on a unity ticket, and so he was not acceptable to the then Premier of Queensland who wanted someone else to be nominated.

On the first occasion when an attempt was made to fill the vacancy Arnell was the only nominee, but the decision of the Queensland Parliament under Premier Nicklin was to reject the nomination. Subsequently three people nominated for the vacancy; and again Arnell was nominated together with George Irvine Whiteside who was then the President of the ALP in Queensland, and Thomas Thomson McCracken who had some association with the DLP. As a result of the vote, Whiteside was returned to fill the vacancy.

Coming to the current case we see that it has a somewhat similar twist. Where in Queensland Dr Poulter, who was a lecturer in the University of Queensland, had died, in this case Dr Mal Colston, a civil servant in Queensland and also the third member of the ALP Senate team at the double dissolution, was affected. He faced the electors, but failed by a very few votes to be elected. Logically he should be the candidate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Milliner.

However, this was not to be the case, because on this occasion that State has probably one of the worst Premiers in its history, and he is a self-appointed Premier. We recall the circumstances in which he came to power. At the time he was Chairman of the Parliamentary Country Party. The vote was tied, and he used his casting vote to elect himself as Premier. Having been self-appointed, he might be inclined to think he has some divine right to rule, but I do not think he has. The position has prevailed, and he has continued from strength to strength in Queensland due to all sorts of circumstances.

On this occasion the Premier of Queensland has used his power in a cussed way to reject the nomination of a person. The only fault that Government could find with this nominee was that some 13 years ago when he was rather young—and he must have been because he is still a young man today—somebody suggested he might have been associated with two or three other persons who started a fire. He was subjected to some inquiry arising from an act of arson; however, no case was presented and he was not charged. Despite the fact that today he is a well-respected civil servant in Queensland, the events of the past were considered sufficient for the

Queensland Parliament to reject his nomination, and to look elsewhere for another nominee.

To its credit the Australian Labor Party in the Queensland Parliament refused to nominate another person. Some person who has very little political nous—this is evident from the television and Press interviews, and he is certainly not up with the "field" as his name would indicate—was then selected to be the nominee of the Premier to fill the vacancy. It is not good enough for that sort of action to be taken. We should not let the position rest without protesting that this move departs from tradition. If the same action is repeated we will end up with some form of bloody revolution in this country. We do not want that; we want sensible action on the part of parliamentarians; but if the conservative Governments play it tough, and the Premier of Western Australia aligns himself body and soul with the Premier of Queensland, he has to take what is coming to him.

We do not want this to happen but if politicians are stupid—and there is no other word to describe their stand on such issues—then, of course, stupid actions will be taken against them. Stupid actions will cause people to react violently, and the reaction could be equal to the action taken by those who are in authority.

You, Mr Speaker, have had experience in sporting teams and you are aware that nobody is a born winner. People do not win all the time, and it is a pity that some of those people about whom I am complaining had not been associated more with defeat so that they could appreciate their position a little better than they do at the moment. They want to preach and carry on, but they are not prepared to practise the principles which they preach. As a consequence, they set a very bad example to the people of this country.

The only comforting aspect about the two particular persons I have mentioned is that they are not really products of the Australian environment. We hope that any person who is a product of the Australian environment will not copy their efforts in the future. I trust this Parliament will support my motion.

MR T. D. EVANS: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

## CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

### Second Reading

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.33 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members who are interested in this matter can quickly orient themselves with the

principal Act by looking at page 52 of the blue booklet which is available to them.

This is at least the third time that a Bill of this kind—or for this particular purpose—has been brought to this Parliament. In the late 1940s or the early 1950s Mrs Cardell Oliver introduced a Bill designed to achieve the same purpose as the measure now before us; the purpose of which I will describe shortly, but which can be gathered, quite readily, from looking at what happens to be a short and—I trust—sweet Bill. The legislation introduced by Mrs Cardell Oliver was carried in the Legislative Assembly but, because of its nature, the adequate majority necessary was not obtained and the Bill lapsed.

The member for Kalgoorlie, when he was Attorney-General during the time of the Tonkin Government—only a short time ago—introduced a similar measure as part of a Bill to amend the Constitution Acts Amendment Act. That Bill passed through this Assembly with the requisite constitutional majority, received a second reading in the other place, but had the portion relating to this particular bar—which is the bar contained in section 31 (4) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act against clergymen and ministers of religion—excised during the Committee stage. The remainder of the Bill became law but not the portion to which I have referred.

The purpose of the measure now before us is that when it becomes law no clergyman or minister of religion, henceforth, will be barred from becoming a member of this Parliament. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there appears to be no sufficient or good reason why this particular bar should continue to be part of the law. I have written to, I think, as many as 12 of the churches in this State and I have received replies from most of them. So far as I am able to observe and recall, not one of those churches opposed the measure which is currently before members. On the contrary, there was what I think could be described as solid support for it.

Of course, by reason of their nature some churches are not, in a sense, very involved in the measure at all because they have the power to allow for the resignation or demission, or relinquishment of the ordination of clergy from the faith they follow. A particular person can simply cease to be a clergyman or minister of religion, in which case the bar is easily overcome. Such a person ceases to come within the provisions of the particular bar to which this Bill relates.

The assessment of the virtue of this Bill is not the sole prerogative of the churches. Nonetheless, it would hardly be proper or fair to introduce a Bill of this nature without the knowledge of the churches, and without having their views in respect of it.

So far as I am aware, this State is the only one the laws of which place a bar on clergymen and ministers of religion becoming members of this Parliament. What harm has been caused in the other States and the Australian Parliament as a result of the nonexistence of this bar? In those situations, so far as I have been able to gather, no harm has resulted.

I think it is fair comment to say that both Parliament and politics are the concern of the people and, to that extent, I suggest that clergymen and ministers of religion have a common rather than a competing objective or interest in the affairs of the State. From the standpoint of fairness, it is interesting to observe that clergymen and ministers of religion must vote at elections. While some people do not seem to realise it, they also have an obligation to pay taxes and obey the laws of the country. When one looks at the situation in that light one begins to wonder, as I have intimated, just what grounds could possibly exist for the continuation of this discrimination by means of the bar which exists against clergymen and ministers of religion, and precludes them from becoming members of Parliament in the State of Western Australia, if that happened to be their desire and they could attract sufficient votes to achieve that objective.

It is reasonable to say that a clergyman or a minister of religion could have qualifications, skills, capacity, and a greater sensitivity of conscience than most members of Parliament. On some occasions he could have more. However, under the present law those people find themselves ineligible to become members of Parliament.

Whilst it is possible for clergymen and ministers in some faiths or churches to relinquish or demit their ordination, it is important to remember that such action is not possible in other faiths. At least, that is the way the position has been communicated to me. The belief of some faiths is that ordination is something ordained by God, and no temporal power can demit that ordination. In other words, once some clergymen become ordained they cannot cease to be clergymen so as to avoid the present bar.

Mr Jamieson: What specific religions are they?

Mr BERTRAM: I will refer to them in a moment. To mention a few, I think the Roman Catholic faith would be one, and the Methodist faith would be another.

Mr Jamieson: Also, the Church of England and the Church of Scotland.

Mr BERTRAM: That may be so. Those people know that their only possible hope of becoming eligible to be members of Parliament is by means of a Bill along the lines of the one presently before the House. Furthermore, I believe this Bill tackles the problem in a way which is desirable and

acceptable to most—or perhaps all—of the churches. It also seems to me that this procedure would be acceptable to the public and that the measure is overdue. Whilst there may be various avenues available through which to tackle the problem this seems to be as acceptable as any.

In England, in 1870, a Bill with the same objective as the one now before us was enacted in an effort to attack this very problem in a different way. I am sure those members who are interested in this question will come to the conclusion that the simple way to overcome the problem is by means of the Bill now before them.

It so happens that some people in our community have been ordained as clergymen or ministers of religion but they have not functioned in that capacity for many years and, in some cases, for virtually their lifetime. They have become farmers, or have followed some other vocation, but they remain ordained for the reason I have mentioned. In their particular faith they cannot be demitted, or relinquish their ordination. Whilst for all practical purposes it could be said that they are not clergymen or ministers of religion they are still regarded, within the wording of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, as being clergymen and ministers of religion.

We are supposed to espouse certain inalienable rights, and religion is one of them. Therefore, it is proper to ask whether the existing bar which we are seeking to remove is consistent with that inalienable right.

Of course, no matter how good any legislation may be, I believe it is accurate to say that none of it is without fault. It is clear that a minister of religion or a clergyman could use his pulpit to advance his political thoughts and standing, but I do not think that is very likely these days. There is at least a better than even probability that if a minister of religion or a clergyman were to carry on in this way, he would be running a very real risk of losing ground in the political field.

Mr Hartrey: In any case it is not a function of the Constitution to stop him doing so.

Mr BERTRAM: That is so. If we are to apply standards or conditions of this type because we are frightened of the possibility of the pulpit being used in a manner for which it was not designed, we should also extend the same conditions to school teachers, lawyers, doctors, employers generally, lecturers, salesmen, journalists, and the like. Why should we simply apply this test or be concerned about such activities in relation to clergymen and ministers of religion alone?

I doubt whether the history relating to this bar against clergymen and ministers of religion as evidenced in the United Kingdom is of much assistance to us, although it may be of interest. Members who

wish to know more about the history of the Statutes in the United Kingdom may borrow a report I have. It is the report of a committee on clergy disqualification set up by the Imperial Parliament, and amongst other things it sets out the various applicable Statutes in that country from 1662, to 1800, 1801, and so on, up to 1914. As I said, whilst this report may be of interest, I do not feel it will really be of much help to members. However, I have photostat copies of the report and other material and members are welcome to look at them if they wish.

I wrote to the various churches to determine their views on this matter, and the copy of my letter will be made available to any member who may wish to see it. I propose now to read excerpts from some of the replies I received and in this way members will have some indication of the thinking of the various churches. Part of the first letter reads as follows—

The Committee recently expressed its opinion again that it believes there is no adequate justification to preserve the present discrimination against Ministers as contained in our Constitution. No other profession is so discriminated against. We would support every effort being made to delete the discrimination from the Constitution, and hope that you might direct your efforts along this more just course.

I quote an excerpt from the second letter as follows—

The sacrament of Priesthood is a Bishopric Act in which, in a visible way, an ordained priest receives the invisible grace of God *forever*. In the country of my birth the Constitution allowed the priest to be a member of Parliament and even a Minister of the Crown retaining his priesthood at all times.

Part of the next letter reads—

I think only clergy of the "established Churches" of England and Scotland are ineligible to the House of Commons. I believe "Roman Catholic" and "Non conformist" clergymen are not so disbarred. However the latter are ineligible in W.A. together with all other clergy.

And further on in the same letter appears the following comment—

Therefore, as a matter of principle, we would like to see the repeal of Sub-section (4) of Section 31 of the Constitution Amendment Act since together with clergymen, I understand, convicted felons and certified lunatics are among the few who are disbarred from becoming Members of Parliament. We would not be interested, however, in an amendment which recognized the relinquishment or withdrawal of an ordination since this



is not canonically possible. As I remarked above, only the exercise of Orders received may occasionally be dispensed.

I quote from the next letter as follows—

It is important to understand that according to the rites of the Church the ordering of a candidate to the priesthood is an indelible act. He acknowledges to having been called by God to the ordained ministry and gives himself wholly to this office and to apply himself wholly for this one purpose throughout his life. That decision is irrevocable.

It is worth while commenting that this last statement makes it abundantly clear that a priest has absolutely no way to get around the bar. He cannot relinquish his ordainment; it is conferred upon him, and it is indelible. The only way such a priest could stand for Parliament is to remove the bar contained in the legislation. No self-help would assist such a priest, or indeed ministers in some other churches, to sidestep this provision in the Constitution. I will read another portion of this same letter. It says—

At the 1974 session of the Synod of this Diocese, the following motion was adopted:—

This Synod urges the State Government of Western Australia to take the necessary steps to remove all statutory restrictions and limitations at present imposed on clergy which prevent them as citizens of this State for standing for election for either House of Parliament, and any other such disabling legislation.

The Government is aware of this motion and will be giving consideration to it when next any amendment to the Constitution is being contemplated. However, you will appreciate that the Synod motion does not suggest that priests should be deemed not to be ordained but rather that their ordination should not preclude them as citizens for standing for election for either House of Parliament.

Part of the next letter reads as follows—

It is however, a matter of concern to us from time to time, that a young minister who feels strongly that he may serve best in politics as part of his calling, State-wise is denied from doing so until he renounces the ordination which he holds dear.

We are grateful for your sensitive approach to this matter, but we all long that a way could be found out of the dilemma, but a way acceptable to us all.

That is a fair sample of the replies I received to my letter. I repeat that any member is welcome to look through this correspondence. I will be very happy to make it available to anyone. I do not think the decision of the churches only is

relevant here, but nonetheless it is important and we should take notice of their views.

This measure has very real merit and its provisions are long overdue. As I have already said, I believe clergymen can take a seat in most, if not all, of the other State Parliaments. There is no evidence that I can find to substantiate the argument that the presence in a Parliament of a minister of religion has brought about a result unacceptable either to the minister or, more importantly, to the public as a whole.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works).

## MILK QUOTAS

### *Negotiability: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 20th August, on the following motion by Mr H. D. Evans—

That in the opinion of the House the Dairy Industry Authority should be instructed to change its present policy in regards to the negotiability of market milk quotas, to the extent that producers may only sell quotas to the Dairy Industry Authority which shall dispose of quotas purchased in accordance with the best long term interests of the dairy industry.

**MR OLD** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.55 p.m.]: The member for Warren brought up some very interesting points in his speech on the dairy industry. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that members of the Government share his concern at the situation experienced in the industry today. We well realise the parlous situation of sections of the dairy industry, but I urge members to look at the industry as a whole rather than talk about quotas and their negotiability, because the dairy industry covers a very wide area from production to retail.

The Dairy Industry Authority currently is taking an overall look at the whole situation in an effort to provide some solution to the problem of the people who are being disadvantaged. Of course, the dairymen presently being disadvantaged are those producing manufacturing milk.

I believe it is the duty of the Government to ensure that we preserve the milk industry. We should endeavour, and we are endeavouring, to keep as many manufacturing dairymen in the industry as we possibly can. It is not outside the realms of possibility that this State will in time, and probably in the not very distant future, find itself faced with a shortage of milk. Indeed, today we are importing a tremendous amount of manufactured dairy products. It is desirable for Western Australia to become self-sufficient in regard to dairy products, and provided the people involved in the industry have a viable proposition, and the ability to produce

milk at reasonable rates, we must help them. We must evolve some method whereby we can keep these properties viable until we can bring them into the market-milk situation where they can partake of the benefits of the price of this type of milk which is much higher than that for manufacturing milk.

I understand that about 200 or even fewer dairymen presently engaged in the manufacturing-milk industry are interested in applying for quotas. This figure was given to me by a member of the industry who I feel would have a fair knowledge of this aspect of it. Certainly I have no reason to doubt his figures. This still leaves a fair number of manufacturing dairymen who must be given the opportunity to remain in the industry.

As members are well aware, the Dairy Industry Authority has made available 31 62-gallon quotas which will become operative early next year. If we are able to promote the industry—as the Dairy Industry Authority is currently trying to do in an endeavour to increase consumption—with natural evolution, we will be able to issue more quotas. A fair amount of money has been allocated by the authority for the promotion of milk in an endeavour to encourage more people to utilise milk and actually to drink more of it. However, we cannot afford to wait for natural evolution; we must take other steps.

In this regard, the Dairy Industry Authority was asked to take an overall look at the industry and report back to the Government. As is well known to the honourable member, several meetings of the Dairy Industry Authority have been held; we have also discussed various problems with members of the industry.

The Dairy Industry Authority met again recently and recommended a plan by which we hope to issue more quotas. This plan has been discussed at meetings throughout the country areas and the DIA is to meet again this week with the Premier and me to make a recommendation as to the manner in which this can be effected, and from that meeting, recommendations will be put to the Government.

I believe we must view the overall situation on a long-term basis, bearing in mind that the problem for some of the people in the industry is very much in the short term. We recognise the urgency of their needs, and I assure all members that we will do all within our power to relieve their situation. However, I urge members to examine the industry as a whole so that we may relieve all sections and, if necessary, improve some sections of the industry.

It was pleasing to note that the opening prices for butterfat did not take the decline that was expected following the termination of the Government bounty payment. I feel this was due in part to the

producers within the industry, who have endeavoured to keep prices at a reasonable level.

Unfortunately, last month the Federal dairy industry scheme which provided funds for farm consolidation and loans to enable dairymen to purchase refrigerated equipment ceased to operate at a time when a large number of applications from dairymen were outstanding. A meeting has been held since with the Federal Minister, and the money remaining in the fund will be allocated to the States. Although the final figure to be allocated to Western Australia has not been released, I understand we will receive in the order of \$500 000. Although these funds will go a reasonable way towards enabling dairymen to install refrigerated vats, it will not satisfy the demand which exists today.

If manufacturing dairymen are to apply for quotas on the present basis, it will be necessary for them to install refrigerated vats on their properties.

The member for Warren claimed that the quota price of \$250 a gallon was too dear; I suppose from the purchaser's point of view, this would be so. But I believe we must take a reasonable look at this matter on the basis of the value put on a quota by the State Taxation Department for the purposes of probate. The member for Warren mentioned a figure of \$180, but on checking with the State Taxation Department recently I was informed that the figure today ranged from \$200 to \$220 a gallon.

Mr H. D. Evans: But what is actually being paid for quotas in transactions?

Mr OLD: I understand it is \$250 a gallon.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is a nominal figure.

Mr OLD: That is according to the Dairy Industry Authority.

Mr H. D. Evans: Why do you not ask the people in the industry? According to them, the figure is closer to \$350 a gallon.

Mr OLD: I do not know about that; the price I have been given is \$250 a gallon. The honourable member claimed that a price of \$250 a gallon was too dear, and that is the point at issue.

Mr H. D. Evans: It is much too dear!

Mr OLD: If the State Taxation Department sees fit to assess the probate value of a quota at about \$220 a gallon, surely it is reasonable for a man to expect the quota to have a value at least equal to the probate assessment if he wishes to realise on it.

Mr Hartrey: It seems like a *non sequitur* to me.

Mr H. D. Evans: You are encouraging people to purchase in an artificial situation at about 12c additional to what the price should be, and paying them to do so.

Mr OLD: That is the opinion of the member for Warren. But as I am trying to point out, the Government is endeavouring to relieve the industry on an overall basis. I noted with great interest the remark of the honourable member that the industry owed the dairymen nothing. I believe he is wrong because, in the main, dairymen work very hard, especially those who produce milk 365 days a year, and I think something is owed to them.

Mr H. D. Evans: They do not work such hours for any altruistic motive, but for hard cash.

Mr OLD: Of course hard cash comes into it; they must live, the same as anyone else. However, they are supplying a community requirement by working 365 days a year.

Mr H. D. Evans: But they do not do it out of the goodness of their hearts; they do it for hard cash.

Mr OLD: Does the member for Warren come here out of the goodness of his heart?

Mr H. D. Evans: What do you think?

Mr OLD: The dairy industry is finely balanced and must be preserved and on that basis I appeal once again to members opposite to take an overall view of the industry.

#### *Amendments to Motion*

I move an amendment—

Delete all words after "House" in line 1 of the motion moved by the member for Warren (Mr H. D. Evans), with a view to inserting the following words—

The Government should continue the discussions it has commenced with the Dairy Industry Authority concerning the plans the authority has and the actions it is taking in efforts to improve the economic conditions in the dairy industry generally and, in particular, amongst the producers who only produce and sell manufacturing milk, or have market milk quotas which are below an acknowledged economic level of operation.

In the process of these discussions with the Dairy Industry Authority, the operations to date of quota negotiability and allocation should also be reviewed to determine whether changes are necessary in the light of experience since the provision of the initial basis of negotiability.

The object of the amendment is to encourage the Dairy Industry Authority to take an overall look at all facets of the industry, including the negotiability and price of quotas. I confidently expect that within the next week we will be announcing a plan which I hope will be acceptable

to all members of the industry and to members of this House. I commend the amendment to the House.

Mr O'NEIL: Mr Speaker, I formally second the amendment.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [6.09 p.m.]: What this amendment will do is to retain the *status quo*. We are still awaiting the result of the deliberations of the Dairy Industry Authority. It would seem that the Government takes a degree of satisfaction in the efforts it has made to date, but it is rather difficult to understand why it is so satisfied. The second paragraph of the amendment states—

In the process of these discussions with the Dairy Industry Authority, the operations to date of quota negotiability and allocation should also be reviewed to determine whether changes are necessary in the light of experience since the provision of the initial basis of negotiability.

In other words, the amendment will vest in the Dairy Industry Authority certain powers in relation to quota negotiability. The right of the DIA to be the honest broker in any quota transaction is to be denied and the matter is to be the subject of further consideration by the DIA and, I presume, by the Government. That would seem to be the substance of the amendment and, as it relates to the original motion, it will achieve precisely nothing.

The question of quota negotiability was the last straw that broke the back of the coalition camel. The policy of the Farmers' Union and the Opposition relating to negotiability remains unaltered. The deleterious effects which will stem from the unfettered transaction of negotiability are already known to the House because they have been canvassed at some length; however, that position will remain unchanged and undiminished. The consequences of free negotiability can have only serious effects upon the economics of the industry at a time when it can least afford them. However, I will return to the political aspect of the amendment in a moment.

Allowing the *status quo* relating to quota negotiability to remain must have serious long-term consequences to the dairy industry. These consequences have been referred to, but apparently are not understood by the Government. Let us examine just what effect free negotiability will have on the industry. It will place the large farmers—those farmers who have had substantial income for some years from their whole-milk operations—in the position of being able to purchase further quotas up to the limit of the manufacturing dairymen; but the man on a small quota has no chance of following suit.

To explain the economics of buying additional quotas, the farmer on a quota

of 150 gallons or 200 gallons who is producing more than that figure can receive an additional 40c a gallon if he can convert that amount into quota. In other words, he will receive his original income, plus 40c a gallon, and in the course of two years this would more than pay the \$250 a gallon purchase price. So, in two years, he has a negotiable asset without extra cost.

I refer members to the production figures relating to the industry. In Bunbury, the cost of production is 59.2c a gallon; in Harvey, it is 40.84c and 42.04c a gallon; in Busselton, it is 37.12c a gallon; and, in Albany the cost of production is 51.01c a gallon. On top of that, in irrigation areas the State sustains a loss per production gallon of 1.69c. I should explain by way of qualification the reason for the high cost of production in the Albany area.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr H. D. EVANS: If I may resume at the point I was making before the suspension for the evening meal I will return to the subject of production costs in the various areas of the State and mention the problems and the effects the present policy of negotiability will have on the dairy industry. Not only will it have an effect on the dairy industry but also on the consumer.

Perhaps I had better examine the figures a little more closely. The answers to questions I asked during the month of August—and these are quite current—show that the production cost per gallon for Pinjarra was 59.20c, for Harvey it was 40.84c and 42.02c, depending on whether it was dry land or irrigated land; for Busselton the cost was given as 37.12c and for Albany as 51.01c.

So when we take the disparity between the cost of production at Busselton of 37.12c and the cost at Pinjarra of 60.89c members will appreciate that we are looking at a difference of something like 22c per gallon—near enough to 23c per gallon.

So milk produced in the Pinjarra area costs 23c a gallon more to produce than it does in the Busselton district. The differentiation in the costs at Harvey were, as I mentioned, 40.84c and 42.02c respectively, to which is added the loss sustained by the Public Works Department for loss on irrigation bringing the figure to 42.53c and 43.71c.

So in the Harvey area we are looking at something in excess of 6c per gallon in production costs. This is surely something the consumers in this State have a right to know; they have a right to appreciate that they are paying an unnecessarily larger cost for an article—a particular article—that is produced within the confines of a closed industry. In other words, the market is captive as far as the producers are concerned. Any industry that

is given orderly marketing and the surety of a captive market has an obligation in terms of responsibility in production and it must necessarily produce in the most efficient and economic manner possible; a manner that will give to the consumers a fair deal in return.

Orderly marketing can never be acceptable in terms less than that. This, however, is not being done at the moment. The relative economic advantage that geographical positions give in such cases is being denied.

It is possible to grow strawberries at the South Pole if one wants to and one is prepared to pay for it. This can be done technically but economically it is hopeless and ridiculous; and when we modify this concept in terms of the practicality of producing milk in an area where it costs 23c a gallon more, surely it is not giving the consumers of this State a fair go.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have been trying to work out from the list of producers a detailed comparison of this area and the costs to the public. I am not sure of the figure, but whatever it is it is in excess of what it should be.

The costs at Albany which are said to be 51.01c a gallon are suspect and open to query because the region in which the quotas were issued are to the north of Albany and not in the coastal areas where I am sure better production costs would be achieved.

Mr Blaikie: It should be obvious why.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have made the point.

Mr Blaikie: Would you close that down?

Sir Charles Court: I gather you are advocating closing that down.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have said nothing about closing it down.

Sir Charles Court: Not much, you haven't.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am pointing out facts that are not palatable to the Government; I am indicating that the policy of the Government is to expand production in those areas of higher cost.

Sir Charles Court: It is nothing of the sort.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is what free transition from one farmer to another means.

Sir Charles Court: You are misleading the House.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am not.

Sir Charles Court: You are.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The costs of production are higher in these areas and one of the reasons for this is the cost of the quotas. This must place a loading on the industry somewhere.

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have them all going over there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr H. D. EVANS: I appreciate the assistance members are trying to give me but I would like to get back and indicate that the essential point in the policy of the Government is to encourage additional production in the areas of higher cost which must necessarily cut across one of the basic concepts of agricultural production. This would be so no matter what line of production one is in. The industry must ultimately suffer and if production costs continue to escalate we will find our ingredients for ice cream having to be imported into this State, as will be the case with butter and other dairy produce including whole milk.

Transportation is being improved all the time and the technology for ultra-heat treatment of milk is being developed steadily, and as long as the cost of UHT milk and the production of market milk as we know it—and as it is provided in the metropolitan area at the present time—is reduced to a level where it is economic to import it in quantity, then it should be imported.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The amendment moved does nothing to rectify the negotiability situation as it exists. Negotiability should go back to the DIA as was mentioned in a news release dated the 17th September, 1975, which stated—

...the negotiability of quotas would be temporarily concentrated in the Authority for distribution in small lots to enable the recoup of these quotas to be facilitated.

In the same news release we have the statement that—

Cabinet has reviewed the problems of the dairy industry and outline proposals submitted by the Dairy Industry Authority following discussions between the Premier, Sir Charles Court, the Minister for Agriculture, Mr R. C. Old, and the Authority.

In the speech of the Minister for Agriculture tonight there was no indication of the decision regarding the negotiability of quotas, only that the matter was going to be further reviewed.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, I miscalculated. The honourable member has six minutes.

Mr H. D. EVANS: So we have the situation where even well into the second year of office of this Government the matter of the dairy industry has not been resolved. The policy on which I think the Government has embarked is against the long-term interests of the industry and the Government is content now to fiddle

further while Rome burns. That is about the strength of it.

This is the issue that broke the coalition. As I said, it was the last straw.

In this particular Press release which states that negotiability should go back to the DIA we have acceptance by the Government of the issue on which the coalition floundered.

Sir Charles Court: You are distorting the issue.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Premier has accepted that the DIA should handle quotas.

Sir Charles Court: That was for a specific case.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is the issue the Premier denied and that is what broke the coalition.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Did the Premier make this release or not?

Sir Charles Court: Of course I did.

Mr H. D. EVANS: If the principle on which the Ministers of the Country Party stood out against the Liberal Party and on which they broke with the coalition is now acceptable does it mean that they get their guernseys back? Are they to be re-accepted into the fold? These Ministers proved the point on which the Opposition agrees.

Sir Charles Court: Why don't you get your bigger hammer out.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The stand the ALP has taken is the one that was adopted by several Ministers of the Country Party; it is the matter on which they stood up to the Liberal Party and broke the coalition.

After the Ministers left the coalition their point was proven; they are correct and now they are out in the cold and others have replaced them. Fair is fair and I think the players who have earned their guernseys should be offered them back.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [7.42 p.m.]: I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister both before and during the moving of his amendment. The Minister made reference to some of the problems associated with manufacturing-milk producers and asked that the industry be examined overall and not merely in isolation in specific areas.

The Minister also made the point that something like 200 or fewer of the manufacturing-milk producers would be interested in obtaining a whole-milk quota under the new plans that have been published in the Press recently. Apparently this information has been conveyed by members of the authority and it appears there are not quite so many of the whole-milk producers ready and willing to go into the question of obtaining a quota, for various reasons.

Mr H. D. Evans: A survey is being conducted in the south-west at present and from indications the figure will be in excess of 200.

Mr McPHARLIN: For various reasons I understand some of the more elderly people are not prepared to face the cost of installing vats and of bringing their dairies up to the required standard; they wish to go along as they are doing until they retire; they are not willing to face the costs involved.

There is an area which does need assistance and the authority is conscious, and always has been conscious, of the problem that faces the manufacturing-milk areas.

An offer has been made and the Press report I have before me states that more than 70 milk producers will get 54-gallon quotas. This no doubt is the result of a further examination by the Dairy Industry Authority which has come forward with alternative proposals or proposals it considers can be of benefit to the industry. It has, of course, taken some time to do this. In the same article is the following—

... the negotiability of quotas would be temporarily concentrated in the Authority for distribution in small lots ...

Of course, this is something I have wanted ever since the recommendations were made by the Dairy Industry Authority.

Mr H. D. Evans: Would you not agree that the present negotiability has used up a tremendous gallonage which could have been better directed? That would be in line with your thinking?

Mr McPHARLIN: Yes. I believe the authority could have distributed the quotas in a more equitable way. This has been my belief all along. The authority should have been handling the quotas as was recommended to me as Minister; that was in 10-gallon lots offered to those with under 100-gallon quotas in areas where processing plants were being operated to maintain, as far as possible, the *status quo* relating to treatment. However, the negotiability has been handled differently, and we have heard rumours of all sorts of prices being paid for quotas. The official figure is only \$250 a gallon and that is the figure placed in the documents. What happens on the side no-one can prove, but from all reports it is obvious various amounts in excess of the \$250 are paid.

Mr Skidmore: There is graft in the industry.

Mr McPHARLIN: So it would appear from the reports we hear, although it would be very difficult to prove.

It is pleasing to read the Press report regarding the quotas to be made available. I understand that consideration is being given to extending the quotas a little further than the 70 to be allocated as soon as possible. These will not be allocated immediately as it will take some

time for the scheme to be put into operation.

The proposal is that 13 per cent of the whole-milk quota, which is the cream content, will be taken from the whole-milk producers and distributed. The price of milk will be increased, but the proposal is that the income of the whole-milk producers will not be affected. This will be a move in the right direction to assist those in the greatest need of help. It is a commendable recommendation by the industry.

I do not believe the whole-milk producers want their counterparts to go bankrupt and suffer. They genuinely want to comply with the scheme which will assist those in the manufacturing section of the industry; that is, the butterfat section. These are the people who need assistance.

If the scheme can be made to work it will be of benefit to the whole industry and, as I have said, it will be a move in the right direction. However, a lot more work must be done because it is a complex proposal.

According to the Press report, some review has been carried out because it is stated that the authority will be handling the distribution. I would like the Minister to give an assurance that this will be the case and that the authority will be in charge. This would certainly be in the best interests of all concerned. If it is fitting for the authority to be given the opportunity to distribute these 70 quotas—and it is proposed perhaps to go further than the 70 to possibly 200 or so—then it is equally fitting that the authority should distribute these also. I would like an assurance given to the House that this will be the case.

During the last week or so I have had many discussions with producers, and this is what they want. The authority should be the body responsible for administering the industry, as was envisaged when it was established, without a great deal of interference. The authority is composed of very experienced men.

Mr H. D. Evans: They have not had much chance to administer the industry in the last 18 months.

Mr McPHARLIN: I believe they are experienced and have the ability to administer the industry to the benefit of the producers, consumers, and general public.

Mr Old: They will have every chance to do it. They have been asked to do the whole deal, and to review the whole situation.

Mr McPHARLIN: This is recently?

Mr Old: Yes; according to the terms of the amendment.

**Mr McPHARLIN:** Can I have an assurance that the distribution of these new 54-gallon quotas will be the responsibility of the authority? I understand that there is also a proposal to look further than the 70. I want an assurance that the authority will be responsible for the complete administration and distribution in small lots. That is the assurance I want because I believe such a proposal would be in the best interests of the industry. It is the desire of the producers, and it should be the desire of the Government.

**Mr H. D. Evans:** Did you get your assurance?

**Mr McPHARLIN:** The Minister can give it when he replies.

**Mr Old:** I cannot reply.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister has no right of reply.

**Mr Old:** That is why I have been trying to tell you by interjection that the terms of the amendment will be carried out.

**Mr T. H. Jones:** You do not seem to be too happy.

**Mr Old:** I am not unhappy.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mt. Marshall.

**Sir Charles Court:** Hoping against hope over there.

**Mr B. T. Burke:** Let us get it straight. Give the Minister a chance to answer by interjection.

**Mr McPHARLIN:** The leading article of the *Farmers' Weekly* of the 18th September applauded the new proposals as being heartening news. We would all endorse any move to assist those people desperately in need of assistance.

**Mr Hartrey:** Hear, hear!

**Mr McPHARLIN:** The proposal is welcomed by all engaged in the primary producing industry.

**Mr H. D. Evans:** This amendment backtracks from the Press release unless the assurance sought is given.

**Sir Charles Court:** It does not. This amendment is strictly in line with the announcement made and under negotiations with the authority. If you want to upset the programme—

**Mr H. D. Evans:** What about the assurance?

**Sir Charles Court:** You have the assurance. You have had it from the Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There must not be cross-conversation in the Chamber. The member for Mt. Marshall.

**Mr McPHARLIN:** The Press report indicates that the authority will administer the distribution of the quotas and the Premier has indicated that this assurance has been given by the Minister. I hope

that it will be adhered to in the future because it will be in the best interests of the industry.

I could go back and traverse a great deal of ground. The motion prompts one to do that.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member has four minutes.

**Mr McPHARLIN:** However, I do not propose to go into detail although I could spend some time giving details of discussions I had with the authority and others associated with the industry when I was Minister. However, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to do so at this time. We are debating a motion moved by the member for Warren to which the Minister has moved an amendment. I believe members on both sides of the House are concerned at the plight of the industry, particularly the manufacturing section, and all of us would like the industry to be assisted in order that all those involved might make a viable living. We are all aware that the industry is in trouble at the moment because of prices and so on, and if the moves suggested now are carried out they will assist a great deal. All of us would appreciate any scheme to give such assistance to help those in need.

The proposal is a move in the right direction, but I still think the points made by the member for Warren in his motion are relevant.

I repeat that all of us desire the DIA to have the authority to continue to administer the industry in the way envisaged. It must also administer the new quotas.

I will conclude on that note and resume my seat to enable other members to speak. I will listen to them with great interest.

**MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [7.59 p.m.]:** I am not going to disagree with many of the comments made. As the member for Mt. Marshall and the member for Warren mentioned, we are all seriously concerned at the plight of the manufacturing section of the milk industry.

I will confine my brief remarks more directly to the motion before the Chair and the amendment which has been moved thereto. The motion moved by the member for Warren expresses very clearly the position which was arrived at by the National Country Party. This is the measure we tried to implement from a party point of view when the member for Mt. Marshall and I were in the Cabinet. But that attempt was unsuccessful through no fault of mine.

I believe the situation which exists today is exactly the same. The need for the Dairy Industry Authority to have absolute control of the quotas is the same today as it was back in May when the division took place. I have listened to the present Minister for Agriculture, and as far as I am concerned he did not give any reason to justify a change from the stand the

National Country Party took in May—a stand which he, as the member for Kataning, was quite keen to support, and as is commonly known he even went to the office of the then Leader of the Country Party to ensure the stand was conveyed to the Premier.

I believe the amendment which has now been brought forward by the Minister is a bit of a smokescreen to play down the issue. As far as I am concerned, it is a clumsy attempt to play politics instead of facing up to the issues which beset the industry—or perhaps I should say the industries. I think to a certain extent there have virtually been two industries. We have the relatively prosperous one—the whole-milk industry, which has a privileged position—and we have the manufacturing industry.

To prove my point I would like to quote some figures from *The Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics*. They are for a four-year period from 1967 to 1970. The net farm income in the manufacturing sector in Western Australia was \$3 948, giving a return on capital of 2.8 per cent. The whole-milk sector of the industry in Western Australia on a four-year average in the same period had a net farm income of \$14 139, giving a return on capital of 4.8 per cent.

I have some more up-to-date figures which were included in a submission by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to the Industries Assistance Commission's inquiry into the dairying industry in April, 1975. In the 1971-72 to 1973-74 period, the disposable farm cash income in the manufacturing sector in Western Australia was \$6 720, and in the whole-milk section the disposable farm cash income was \$12 944. Members can see there is a vast difference in the returns of the two sections of the industry.

To come back to the history of the Dairy Industry Authority, many years ago I was privileged to be the secretary of a zone council of the Farmers' Union. I am going back perhaps 10 years or even further. At that time representatives of the manufacturing section of the industry were striving to come to some single authority concept, no doubt in order to improve their position; but at that stage the leaders of the two sections of the industry would not sit down at the same table. This is easy to understand when cognizance is taken of the figures I have just quoted.

I do not suppose I have any argument with the whole-milk section of the industry. It was in a position where it was getting reasonable returns on effort; it had a secured market; and I believe it had a privileged position. I do not want to take anything away from that section of the industry but I think it is important that the disadvantaged section of the industry be lifted to a position where it has

reasonable remuneration for the effort that has been made; and just as much effort goes into producing manufacturing milk as goes into producing whole milk. The manufacturing-milk section is entitled to a better return. But no doubt a degree of suspicion existed.

At that time the whole-milk producers also had an advantage inasmuch as they were able to sell their surplus milk not only for manufacturing purposes but also for butterfat. Butterfat has not the same significance today but in the period to which I am referring there was a great advantage because of the butterfat subsidy. So the whole-milk producer who had the advantage of a protected market also had the advantage of the surplus milk and the butterfat bounty and he benefited from both aspects.

Over a period the industry leaders, to their credit, got together and eventually came around; and their discussions resulted in the formation of the Dairy Industry Authority. It has been suggested by one or two people, who I believe are rather misinformed, that the Dairy Industry Authority was going to wave a magic wand and cure all the problems of the industry overnight. This has never been my view or the view of the party I represent.

Mr H. D. Evans: Nor of the Government which introduced it.

Mr STEPHENS: It was purely a framework whereby the two sections of the industry could evolve to a point where there was a reasonable proposition for both of them. The emphasis was placed on evolution, and it was realised by those in the industry that it would take time.

One of the first objectives of the Dairy Industry Authority after its formation and settling-in period was control of the issuing of quotas in the whole-milk section and negotiability of quotas. The Farmers' Union was virtually unanimous in its support of the Dairy Industry Authority having full control of the issuing of quotas. This was supported by the industry generally and, as I said earlier, it was supported by the Country Party.

We now know that at that time this control did not come about, and one of the reasons advanced by the Premier (Sir Charles Court) was that to do so would virtually be *ultra vires* the Act. He is quoted in *The Countryman* of the 1st May, 1975, as saying such control would be ignoring section 30 (4) (a) of the Act, the section which provides for the transfer of a quota, with the approval of the Authority, to another person specified in the application—from farmer to farmer. But I believe the Premier completely ignored the provisions of subsection (3) of section 30, which states—

(3) Without limiting the generality of subsection (2) of this section, it is hereby declared that a direction may



be made by the Minister prohibiting the Authority from granting any particular class or classes of applications made to it under this section for such period or periods as the Minister directs.

I believe that provision would definitely have been sufficient for the Minister to act in the way the Country Party and the Farmers' Union wished and which this motion moved by the member for Warren suggests. We now know that for a temporary period this provision will be implemented. If it was illegal earlier to allow the authority to have full control of the quotas, surely it must still be illegal. So there must have been a change of thinking on the part of the Premier in relation to that particular provision.

One of the great fears of myself and those I represent was that allowing quotas to pass from farmer to farmer, with the nominal control of the Dairy Industry Authority, would open up a black market in milk quotas. By way of interjection the Minister said earlier tonight that as far as he and the Dairy Industry Authority were concerned the price of a quota was \$250, but I think he is burying his head in the sand. It is generally recognised in the industry that the price is about \$350, and that it is arrived at by various means such as the transfer of stock and plant.

These are instances I have heard of. They are hearsay but one hears them so frequently that there must be some truth in them. A farmer just out of Albany, in my area, has told me quite categorically he can buy a quota for \$350 a gallon, and he would pay it if only he could raise the finance. So apparently that can be taken as the going price at the moment, which means of course that the manufacturing-milk producer—the man who is already disadvantaged by getting for his product only approximately one-third of the price the quota-milk producer is getting—is not in the hunt to purchase a quota.

Therefore, under the system which prevails at the moment, those who have the advantage of a quota of any size are in a far better position to purchase the quotas which are coming onto the market. I think this fact will be borne out when it is realised that in June, when 2 200 gallons of quota milk had been sold, not one gallon of that milk had gone to a manufacturing-milk producer, which indicates the inability of manufacturing-milk producers to compete in the race for quota milk.

In my opinion, the amendment moved by the Minister states only what the Dairy Industry Authority was created to do. The Minister also indicated we should have a total approach to the industry.

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member has five minutes more.

Mr **STEPHENS**: The Dairy Industry Authority was formed to take a total approach to the industry, and it had done

so in the past, although its time was limited and it had been criticised for not waving the magic wand and solving the problems overnight. But it had been looking at the problems of the industry and in fact had approached the previous Minister for Agriculture with a suggestion which on further investigation was not acceptable. Nevertheless, it indicated it was striving to correct some of the problems within the industry.

To this extent the amendment moved by the Minister really only covers what the authority should do and, in my opinion, is already doing. The amendment therefore clouds the issue in relation to the problem of the negotiability of milk quotas being in the full control of the Dairy Industry Authority.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is what it was intended to do.

Mr **STEPHENS**: I could support the amendment as an addendum to the original motion, but I cannot support it as a substitute for the original motion. A couple of months ago I was not prepared to sell myself, my party, or the people I represent; and I am certainly not going to change my mind now. I will be opposing the amendment.

**MRS CRAIG** (Wellington) [8.15 p.m.]: I think it is important at this stage to put before the House some of the reasons that there should be a value attached to a quota, and I think it is also important for the House to consider the reasons that the market-milk area developed as it did. Members in this House tonight have been pretending that suddenly the people in that area were given a wonderful golden handshake; and it is absolute nonsense to consider the matter in that light.

The market-milk industry developed in the near city area in order that the consumer could be supplied with milk of a suitable standard on 365 days a year. There was a small transport cost that accrued from areas close to the city, and that is how market milk—or if one likes, quota milk—began.

The people who undertook to produce milk for 365 days a year in 1945, after milking cows for 30 years surely should have something accruing to them if they are too old to milk cows any longer. Surely members would concede that. That is one reason I believe there should be a value attached to quotas.

Secondly, it has long been the practice—and the member for Warren knows this well—that when farms in the market-milk area changed hands the quota belonged to the land and not as it does today to the dairy; and because the quota belonged to the land and was not itself a salable commodity most sales took place with a

hidden cost built in. This was because—and I will be honest now—the market-milk area did offer a regular income, and so people were able to budget and to borrow money and go into debt for long periods of time.

It has been mentioned before, and I think it is worthy of mention again, that probate has been paid on quotas. The Taxation Department attaches a value to a quota. In fact, in my area I have farmers who have paid probate twice, and they are not frightfully amused that the member for Warren should now stand up and say that he does not think any value should accrue to a quota.

Also, since negotiability has taken place, people have been buying quotas. So there are four perfectly good reasons for a cost to be attached to quotas, and good reasons that people should not be asked to give up quotas easily. I do not deny in this instance that the manufacturing-milk sector faces great problems, but I would like the House to be aware of the fact that the market-milk sector also faces grave problems. It seems to have been taken for granted that the people who are engaged in producing whole milk have no debts. Let me tell members about a couple I know who have been farming for 15 years. They bought into the market-milk area in order that they would have an assured income. They borrowed money, and they had to borrow a great deal of it over 30 years. They built a dairy up to standard and then waited five years for a quota. They now live on \$30 a week in order that they can meet their debt repayments. So not everybody in the market-milk area has a large income.

The member for Warren also failed to point out that in a report published by the Western Australian Department of Agriculture entitled, "A Report on the Market Milk Industry in Western Australia 1973/74" under the heading "Rates of return" the following is stated—

In the base year of 1973/74 there were many farmers seeking to enter the production sector of the market milk industry, where the rate of return being realised was 3.8 per cent.

A rate of return of 3.8 per cent. One could hardly suggest that is too high a rate of return on the capital involved.

Let us look at this fallacious figure the member for Warren keeps on waving in front of us. He says the difference between whole milk and manufacturing milk is this magical margin in the middle. No mention has been made tonight of the extra costs built into producing milk for 365 days a year.

Mr H. D. Evans: Could I interpolate here? You know as well as I do that much of this milk is being produced at this time.

Mrs CRAIG: Yes, much of it is, but it has not been produced for many years,

and as soon as the farmer begins to subject his cows to stress he encounters productivity problems. It is quite ridiculous to go on about this 40c—this golden shower which will rain on people who acquire a quota.

Mr H. D. Evans: Much of this milk—it is being produced now—commands three times the price the minute it gets a quota. The production is already there.

Mrs CRAIG: Exactly the same thing applies in the market-milk area. Many people are producing manufacturing milk, too. They have their manufacturing milk, and they may like to buy a quota as well. They borrow a great deal of money to do this, and they find it is a worthwhile investment if they are already producing the necessary amount of milk a day.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is right. They are making a living now, and by the simple expedient of buying something for which they pay \$138 a year—which is the ruling rate per gallon—they are paying for their quota, and then they have that to negotiate with.

Mrs CRAIG: Then there is absolutely no reason why people in the manufacturing-milk areas who are already producing milk for 365 days a year cannot borrow exactly the same kind of money to buy a quota in order to be able to share in the benefits.

Mr H. D. Evans: Ask the member for Vasse how many farmers in his area have done that.

Mr Blaikie: What is the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wellington.

Mrs CRAIG: I believe it is only right and proper that discussion does continue along the lines set out in this amendment, and that a thorough appraisal of all sections of the industry be made in order to arrive at a solution that is fair to all in the industry. It is quite silly to say, as has been suggested in this House, that we should sprinkle around 30-gallon quotas to any farmer who is able to meet the standards to produce that quota, because the survey to which I referred suggests that it is ridiculous to reduce the base quota below 60 gallons. In fact, it does not actually say that; it says that we should look to raising the base quota, not to reducing it.

This report is a thoroughly researched document, as the member for Warren knows; and there is nothing sensible at all in the suggestion that those people who would like a 30-gallon quota should have it.

So, Mr Speaker, with those few words I would like to indicate that I thoroughly support the amendment before the House.

Mr H. D. Evans: Before she sits down, could I ask whether the member for Wellington would agree that had the 2 500

gallons a day of quotas that have already been transacted within the industry been directed through the Dairy Industry Authority, it would have made a tremendous difference?

Mrs CRAIG: No, the member for Wellington would not agree, because the member for Warren has lost sight of the fact that there are people in the whole-milk industry who needed another 10 or 20 gallons of milk in order to be viable, and that is exactly the sort of amount in which they were dispensed—in lots of about 20 gallons. The member for Warren knows full well that people did not buy 250, 230, or even 200 gallons in any of these transactions that took place. Therefore I would not concede that point to the member.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.25 p.m.]: I rise to indicate my support of the amendment moved by the Minister for Agriculture. The amendment originates from the motion moved by the member for Warren that negotiability of quotas should be conducted through the Dairy Industry Authority.

Mr H. D. Evans: Do you think quotas should be negotiated through the authority?

Mr BLAIKIE: May I clearly indicate to the House that I believe milk quotas should be negotiated on a free basis, with the qualification that this negotiability be restricted to holders of quotas of 100 gallons.

Mr H. D. Evans: Do you think they should be able freely to negotiate quotas?

Mr BLAIKIE: Yes, I do believe this should be the case in respect of holders of quotas of that size. I would remind the House that a number of members present this evening are not in such close touch with the dairy industry as perhaps they should be, and I include the Opposition spokesman.

The real question of negotiability was in fact decided by the dairy industry in April-May of 1974. If members cast back their minds to the circumstances which prevailed at that time they will recall we were living in rather buoyant conditions. The beef industry was extremely buoyant and prices were very attractive. In fact, it was most unattractive to milk dairy cows whether one had a whole-milk license or whether one was a manufacturing-milk producer; every incentive was there not to milk cows, because the beef side of the industry was so attractive.

The policy was decided at that time in 1974, and I challenge the member for Warren to deny the authenticity of what I say.

Mr H. D. Evans: I have here the stated policy of the Farmers' Union.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am well aware of that policy.

Mr H. D. Evans: The union recommended that quotas be sold only to the DIA.

Mr BLAIKIE: I will bet I attended more meetings of the Farmers' Union than the member for Warren did, and I have milked cows for much longer than he has and I am more aware of the practicalities of the industry than he is.

However, I get back to the point that this policy was decided on in April-May, 1974, and it was subsequent to that the traumas occurred in respect of which plan would be used and how it would be implemented. That matter took quite some time to resolve. Legal complications arose, and some of the plans submitted could not be proceeded with as a result of that. Eventually the Government decided upon the negotiability of quotas. In the ensuing 12 months the entire situation of the dairy industry changed completely.

We are now faced with drastically reduced prices for beef; and we have come from a situation of an over-supply of milk producers in 1974 when people were willing to get out of the industry, to a situation today where people want to remain in the industry. As far as I am concerned this whole question was completely overlooked by the industry; and I believe it was totally overlooked by the Opposition tonight, because negotiability of quotas will never cure the ills of the dairy industry. This is only a minor and relatively insignificant feature of the industry.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is why there is another motion on the notice paper.

Mr BLAIKIE: The industry is certainly not going to survive or die on the issue of whether or not quotas are negotiable. Certainly this issue will not kill the industry overnight. As far as manufacturing-milk producers are concerned—and I point out I represent more of these producers than any other member represents; in fact I venture to suggest I probably represent more than double the number any other member represents—

Mr Skidmore: I will check that out; I am not too sure how many I represent!

Mr BLAIKIE: —negotiability will in fact do very little for them. I say that because the majority of manufacturing-milk producers are not, and never will be, in a position to pay the price determined by the Farmers' Union of \$250 a gallon, no matter whether the quotas are negotiated through the Dairy Industry Authority or negotiated freely in the industry.

I would go further and say that I doubt, of the total number of butterfat producers in the industry, whether there were more than 15 who could have paid \$250 a gallon in order to produce a market-milk quota. So that is the significance of the negotiability of milk quotas as far as I am concerned.

The whole industry depended on a total review being made and this, in fact, has happened. The Dairy Industry Authority has now laid down the principles under which it will work including the allocation of another 76 milk quotas of some 54 gallons. It has also indicated that it hopes to make a further allocation in addition to this number. In fact the whole proposal is based on building up the industry in total and not on tearing down one section to give something to the other side, only to finish up with half of nothing for everyone.

I believe that this is the result the Labor Party would have achieved; that is, to wreck the industry in total. The propositions were based on that objective. I believe, quite categorically, that we are now seeing the most significant changes ever made in the history of the dairy industry since its inception in Western Australia and they are of major magnitude. Already those changes are bringing about a tremendous degree of confidence among those people who will apply and who will have an opportunity to share in the liquid-milk industry, thus giving them future confidence on which to expand a viable industry.

The entire question of negotiability of quotas is a storm in a teacup.

Mr H. D. Evans: It was so insignificant that it split the coalition.

Mr BLAIKIE: That happens to be the view of the honourable member, but what I have expressed is my opinion. The changes that are taking place will lead to an improved and stable dairy industry; the negotiability of quotas has nothing to do with that and I am quite certain that in the future they will have little effect on the industry.

I now come to the other side of the question that is under discussion. I realise the sensitivity of the Labor Party in regard to rural areas. I also realise the sensitivity of the champion of rural areas. We have seen a degree of political connivance. Also, earlier on, the member for Warren, although he did not in fact say so, alluded to the fact that those producers who remained in the industry at high cost should not continue in operation. He alluded to the fact that the producers in the Pinjarra-north area, and in the Albany area—

Mr H. D. Evans: I was talking about encouraging them; let us get this straight.

Mr BLAIKIE: I certainly accept that the honourable member encouraged them, but from my understanding of his speech he went a little further. So the people in the industry can look to a black future if the member for Warren ever takes hold of the reins again. What a veiled threat that happened to be!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr BLAIKIE: That is how the Labor Party planned to build up the industry—by tearing one section down. What a veiled threat that was. I certainly hope the members for Albany and Murray, in commenting on the speech made by the member for Warren, make their electors well aware of what he would do to market-milk producers in high cost areas if he became Minister.

Sir Charles Court: Especially his second motion.

Mr BLAIKIE: Yes, what a beauty that is, but I must not move away from the point I am making. On looking at the record of the Labor Party one can appreciate its super-sensitivity about the rural areas.

Mr Skidmore: You seem to like that word.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am only talking about the dairy industry.

Mr Bryce: You could start talking about the motion.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am talking about the amendment and again I refer to the super-sensitivity of the Labor Party. In fact, one can see that super-sensitivity rising right now. First of all, because of the policies of the Labor Party, every manufacturing-milk producer in this State has had his income reduced by \$2 000. Every manufacturing-milk producer has lost that amount because the Labor Party has decided it will no longer pay the dairy subsidy. So all that money has gone. These are the producers whom the Labor Party states it is trying to help.

Mr Bryce: What has that to do with the motion?

Mr BLAIKIE: It has a great deal to do with it. I am talking of the underprivileged in the industry for whom the honourable member's colleagues have no consideration whatsoever. In addition to that move, one can also go on to speak of the effects of the waiving of the superphosphate bounty. Of course, when the Federal Government removed the dairy subsidy it granted the industry throughout Australia assistance for the purchase of bulk milk vats and other associated works. As far as I can recall, for the first time in the history of Western Australia this scheme has been quite successful, and strange as it may seem, most of the money has been used although the scheme was given a life of two years and should still have additional moneys granted to meet the time limit of June, 1976. Again, the people who were to be assisted by these grants—that is, the manufacturing-milk producers—in the main, because of their financial circumstances, have not applied for the receipt of this interest-free money for the construction of vats. We know now that the term of that scheme has expired and I

venture to say that half of the milk producers in Western Australia will not be able to apply for assistance in any case, and this is typical of the assistance schemes that have been promoted by the Labor Party.

I would have thought that at least this scheme would continue to give these producers an opportunity to recapture what they lost through the waiving of their subsidy. Therefore the chants of members opposite about granting assistance to disadvantaged people are rather hollow, because the track record of the Labor Party in looking after disadvantaged people in rural areas is rather miserable.

Mr Skidmore: Rubbish!

Mr BLAIKIE: That is absolutely right.

Mr Skidmore: It is absolute rubbish.

Mr BLAIKIE: If the honourable member wants to talk about dairy farmers in particular, they are, in fact, the people who have been disadvantaged more than those in any other sector of the rural industries because of the specific policy of the Labor Party. So the arguments put forward by members of the Opposition this evening are rather hollow. The Labor Party has a pathetic track record. I have said earlier that this motion by the Opposition has been brought forward only by way of a political connivance in trying to drive a wedge through the industry, but I can inform the Labor Party it will fail hopelessly. It had better make another attempt by trying to achieve something else. Surely this Parliament should not be used to introduce a motion that is only a show of mockery and political connivance.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [8.40 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, you will pardon the puzzlement on the faces of members of the Opposition, but perhaps it will be easier to understand if we recall that Saint Peter thrice denied the Lord. The Leader of the Country Party in this State has so often denied the policy of the party to which he pretends to belong that we are sick and tired of counting. Let us not be confused about what this motion seeks to do.

The member for Vasse is quite right when he says that this motion was introduced into this House to illustrate to the people of this State that, clearly, there is a serious division among members of the Government on what is a very important matter. We make no pretence about the purpose of the motion. We say only that it embodies a principle to which we adhere. We are quite pleased and quite proud to present this motion to the House.

We are quite happy to place the onus on the conscience of every individual member sitting opposite to stand up and be counted on this issue; to stand up and be counted when he or she will recall that only recently the matters contained in this motion were the cause of a split among the coalition parties.

Having stated that the Opposition is under no illusion as to the purpose of this motion; having said we will rely on each and every member of the Government to stand up and be counted on the basis of his or her conscience, let us now look at some of those matters that illustrate to the House the type of people who have remained in the Government as members of the Country Party. I refer, firstly to a statutory declaration which contains the following—

I, RICHARD CHARLES OLD of 16 Broome Street Katanning in the State of Western Australia Member of the Legislative Assembly being duly sworn make oath and say as follows:—

In this declaration he states that he was a person at a meeting of the Country Party executive and parliamentary members of the Country Party, and that that meeting was unconstitutional, and I quote these words to the House—

The said Meeting was attended by members of the State Council, the Federal Parliamentary Country Party and the State Parliamentary Country Party and was adjourned after debate to be reconvened upon the giving of twenty-four hours notice to each person entitled to attend the said Meeting.

6. The Resolution referred to in the said paragraph—

I will refer to that resolution shortly. Continuing—

—2 of the Plaintiff's Affidavit was passed on the 25th May, 1975 and I am informed and verily believe that not all persons entitled to attend the said Meeting were given twenty-four hours notice of the reconvening of the said Meeting.

That is an affidavit sworn by the present leader of the Country Party. We need only to refer to those two sets of minutes—which are the minutes of that meeting and the reconvened meeting—to see, quite clearly, that there is no reference to any 24 hours' notice. There is no reference to the fact that any delegate to this meeting should have been given that amount of notice to ensure the meeting was constitutional. The person who swore this affidavit is typical of the sorts of people who have no problems whatsoever in defeating this motion now before the House. The members of the Country Party wish to create a smokescreen to bring about misconception and confusion. No wonder they want to create a smoke-screen, because some of the motions moved and passed at the meeting of the Country Party in May last can be described as nothing else but hypocrisy. No wonder they want to say that the meeting was unconstitutional, and I will read to the House now some of the motions that were moved at the meeting of the

Country Party. One motion reads as follows—

“That in the opinion of this Joint Meeting of State Council and Parliamentary members that the recent change of Leadership of the Parliamentary Party is not in the best interests and continued strength of the Party”.

That is what was moved at the meeting of the Country Party. The motion certainly was put and not ruled out of order. Therefore, it was not, in fact, passed, but I wonder what the result would have been had it gone to the vote.

Let me explain to the House just how easily these people are able to deny what is the basic policy of the party to which they claim to belong. Another motion, shown quite clearly in the minutes of the meeting, reads as follows—

“That the National Country Party of Australia (W.A.) decision to withdraw from the coalition with the Liberal Party in W.A. be endorsed and that decision stand unless approached by the Parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party (W.A.) with concessions that the Parliamentary National Country Party consider satisfactory but not departing from or sacrificing National Country Party policies and platform”.

Again the Minister, in this case, does not agree with that motion and those policies—

Mr Old: That is only your opinion.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Is it not quaint the only way the Minister can escape from that decision of his party is to say that the following reconvening of the meeting was unconstitutional? Not only does he say it is unconstitutional, but he says that in the face of the minutes I have produced, which in no way referred to any meeting or motion requiring 24 hours' notice to reconvene a meeting.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to relate this to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I will relate it to the amendment before the Chair. I am saying in essence that if the Minister will flee to the length of making an affidavit that is not even true, in order to escape from upholding his party's policies, how easily will he support an amendment that does nothing but denigrate his party's stand over many years?

Let us not confuse the issue. Let us say quite clearly that this motion is intended, firstly, to express our attitude on a very important matter and, secondly, to make every member on the Government side of the House stand up and be counted on this important issue.

I have shown to the House that we cannot expect the Minister for Agriculture to stand up now and attempt to uphold

that which is his party's policy, because he has a vested interest in perpetuating the mistakes and the wrongs he did previously. He has a vested interest in saying that this amendment to our motion is not a smokescreen or a deception, but is part of his party's policy.

So, the responsibility devolves upon the other members of the Country Party. We make no pretence about the purpose of this motion. The member for Vasse waived on, as he usually does. He got into Parliament by joining Apex, and it seems the member for Karrinyup got in by joining the Jaycees.

Mr Clarke: I am J. C.!

Mr B. T. BURKE: Out of his mouth we hear that even the Jaycees would not have the member for Karrinyup.

Let us look at the situation clearly. We have said that this motion embodies our policy and we are placing it before the House. We state quite honestly the principles it contains are the principles to which we adhere. We say that coincidentally or otherwise the motion contains material and policies which previously had been acknowledged by the Country Party. We do not claim that it would not give us a degree of satisfaction to see the Country Party members supporting our motion; of course it would, but we cannot make them. We can only say that the choice is theirs, and they can deny once again their party's policy.

The SPEAKER: The member has five more minutes.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Or they can say, “Our party's policy is that which is embodied in the motion, and regardless of the origin of the motion we will maintain our allegiance to that policy.” If they support the amendment then they are saying that because the Labor Party has introduced a part of their policy, it is unacceptable. That places the decision in their court. It is their policy which depends on them for acceptance. We have only exposed it.

MR COWAN (Merredin-Yilgarn) [8.49 p.m.]: I am not associated with the dairying industry, and I do not represent a dairy farming electorate. I do not wish to talk about the technical points that have been raised in this debate, but rather about the points raised in relation to the policies of the National Country Party.

The policy of our party is to allow the dairying industry, through the Dairy Industry Authority, to control the industry. I would be happy if the DIA is allowed to control the industry without any political interference.

There can be no doubt that in May last the National Country Party suffered a loss in terms of its policy in that the DIA made a recommendation, but that recommendation was rejected. The consequences

of that are well known to members of this House and to the people of the State, so there is not much point in going over that again.

Since the National Country Party has returned to the coalition Government the DIA has made recommendations to the Minister for Agriculture, and those recommendations are now being implemented by the DIA—in my opinion, for the good of the industry. I do not think that point can be denied. In short, the DIA is now controlling the industry with a minimum amount of political interference.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Where did you get that impression?

Mr COWAN: If the honourable member reads the newspapers and talks to the dairymen he will get the same impression as I have.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The DIA was doing what it was directed to do by the Government.

Mr COWAN: The dairymen have the opinion that the DIA is controlling the industry.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The DIA is doing what the Government tells it to do.

Mr COWAN: The amendment put forward by the Minister for Agriculture is very much in line with the policy of the National Country Party; in other words, the dairying industry, through the DIA, is controlling the industry. That being the position I support the amendment.

MR SHALDERS (Murray) [8.52 p.m.]: Many aspects can be alluded to in speaking to the amendment. I want to indicate quite clearly at the start of my remarks that I support it wholeheartedly. I listened carefully to the remarks of the member for Warren who represents an electorate adjacent to the district of Nelson. If anyone has done a "Nelson" it is the member for Warren who has put a telescope to his blind eye. The member for Balga in a spate of verbal diarrhoea talked to the House but said very little about the subject of the motion, and then he disappeared from his seat.

Mr Clarko: That was why he disappeared!

Mr SHALDERS: Whether the member for Balga knows one end of a cow from the other is debatable.

In opposing the amendment the member for Warren indicated he did not want action to be taken that would improve the economic conditions in the dairying industry generally, and in particular among producers who produced and sold manufacturing milk only. Yet those are the very people in the dairying industry whom the member for Warren represents. I hope he will tell those electors that he does not believe action should be taken to assist

them even though they are in dire need of help.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: The member for Warren has been the most popular Minister for Agriculture in the last 20 years.

Mr SHALDERS: I too would be putting the telescope to a blind eye if I did not admit that on the question of the negotiability of milk quotas there was a difference of opinion between the Country Party members and the Liberal Party members. At the time I supported the decision which the Government made in respect of negotiability of quotas.

It is no good the member for Warren saying, "You were not looking after the policy of the Farmers' Union, and that was what the Farmers' Union wanted." When I asked him in the course of his speech what was the policy of the Farmers' Union during the time he was the Minister for Agriculture and introduced a Bill dealing with negotiability of quotas, he replied, "As far as I know that was never stated." In other words, at the time he was handling the Bill as Minister for Agriculture he was not aware that the Farmers' Union had a policy in respect of negotiability.

It was then that the Labor Party made some rules which provided for two types of negotiability. In relation to the passage of that legislation through Parliament the previous Minister for Agriculture is now hypocritical enough to say, "I made up some rules to govern the way the game was to be played, but now I do not believe you wanted to play it." That is hypocritical.

Mr H. D. Evans: Did you read the debates which took place at the time? Perhaps you should.

Mr SHALDERS: I am glad the honourable member has referred to the debates of the time. In referring to them I shall show how much more hypocritical the honourable member is. I regret I do not have the *Hansard* reference but it can be found. At the time mention was made by a member of the then Government that the matter of the transfer or negotiability of quotas should be applied in other industries. He said that this worked very well in another industry—the poultry farming industry.

If we examine the poultry farming industry we find that transfer of licenses can be made only from one producer to another, and there is no provision for the transfer of a license from a producer to the Egg Marketing Board, and for the board to reissue that license to another producer.

When recent amendments were made to that Act the Minister deleted a provision of this type from the Bill because it was clearly stated by the producers in the poultry farming industry that under no circumstances did they want the transfer of licenses other than from producer to

producer. Those points were brought up by some members of the then Government when it introduced the Bill. In other words, they said, "We believe in negotiability, and that is working very well in the poultry farming industry." However, they are now saying, "We said that, but we did not think it would turn out in the dairying industry the way it has turned out in the poultry farming industry even though we made provision for it to be so when we brought in the Act."

Mr H. D. Evans: You should follow this to its logical conclusion.

Mr SHALDERS: Why did the honourable member not follow his proposal to its logical conclusion? Why did he make reference to another industry, when he did not mean what he said?

The Bill allowed for negotiability in two forms; I agree that was sound. I believe that because of the way the debate was conducted at the time the Bill became an Act of Parliament, the Government quite rightly said that the tenor of the debates indicated to producers—this has nothing to do with the Farmers' Union—that they could expect farmer-to-farmer negotiability, and farmer-to-DIA negotiability, or negotiability in two forms. I believe the Government was quite right in deciding that it would start off with these forms of negotiability. However, at the time the decision on negotiability was made the Premier said, "We will guarantee to review this policy in the light of what happens in the next few months."

The amendment moved by the Minister for Agriculture fulfils exactly the undertaking given at that time. The amendment goes on to say—

... the operations to date of quota negotiability and allocation should also be reviewed to determine whether changes are necessary in the light of experience since the provision of the initial basis of negotiability.

I commend the Government for being prepared to review its policy.

Not only does the member for Warren want to deny assistance to producers in his electorate, but also he is certainly going out of his way, through another motion before the House which will be debated later on,—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot discuss that now.

Mr SHALDERS: —to drag down the producers in the existing quota areas. Indeed, the questions he has asked and to which the member for Vasse has alluded show that he has endeavoured to say, "These are not the areas where we should be producing milk. We should produce it in other areas." Yet the member for Wellington has demonstrated quite clearly that the lower costs of production in other areas have come about because the dairy

farmers in those areas do not produce for 365 days of the year. When they do have to produce in times of stress they will not be able to produce at that figure.

Mr H. D. Evans: This is market milk that we are talking about, and market milk is produced 365 days a year.

Mr SHALDERS: I am telling the member for Warren there is no way in the world that many producers in the areas further south, in times of stress, will be able to produce milk as cheaply.

I am extremely disappointed that the member for Warren did not attend a recent whole milk zone council meeting at Harvey so that he could explain his ideas, and in particular explain his other motion which is before this House. He would have been able to show to the producers the heart, soul, and feeling of the the Labor Party for the whole-milk producers. They were very disappointed that he did not arrive and I am certain they would have asked him some very interesting questions.

Mr Blaikie: He is regarded as being astute.

Mr SHALDERS: I want to conclude by saying that the amendment before the House is one which is to be commended because it is an attempt to assist in the long term producers in the dairying industry. We know that some producers are in particularly great need of assistance and I believe this is a most worthwhile effort on the part of the Government. I support the amendment.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [9.02 p.m.]: The operations of the Dairy Industry Authority are being carried on in accordance with the directions given by the Government. When the authority was set up it was for the purpose of doing the best it thought possible for the industry. If the authority is to act under direct instructions from the Government it is conceivable that those instructions might be contrary to the desire and intention of the Dairy Industry Authority.

I claim to have some knowledge of the dairying industry itself because in 1945, as the then Minister for Agriculture, I introduced a Bill for the purpose of making some contribution towards the improvement of the supply of milk. That Bill was defeated in the Legislative Council, but a similar Bill which was introduced by me in 1946 was passed. The purpose of that Bill was to try to assist those in the dairying industry. Here we have a situation where there is a motion before the House setting out that the Dairy Industry Authority should be permitted to do what it believes it ought to do with regard to the negotiability of milk quotas so that those milk quotas would be used in the best interests of the industry. However, the authority is hamstrung because the



Government has deliberately issued instructions to it as to what it will do.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Shame.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Now, what is there in the amendment which is worth while supporting? Let us have a look at it. It states that the Government should continue its discussions; that is, have a lot of talk. The Premier is good at talking. Quite often he says a lot of words which mean nothing. So, let us have a discussion; let us continue discussions. What will be derived from that? Will that enable the Dairy Industry Authority to put into operation the policy which it wants to follow? So, we could vote for more discussions. However, I understood discussions have been taking place for many months past.

Mr H. D. Evans: Only for 18 months!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: That is the first part of the amendment—the Government should continue discussions which it has commenced with the Dairy Industry Authority concerning the plans of the authority. Why on earth should not the authority be allowed to put its plans into operation? That is what Parliament set it up for. Why is it necessary to have discussions with the authority while it is operating under directions from the Government?

What is the next part of the amendment? In the process of those discussions with the Dairy Industry Authority, the operations to date regarding quota negotiability and allocation should also be reviewed. These are the operations which are being carried out under the direction of the Government. So, add all that up and what does it amount to? A lot of discussions.

After further discussions is it necessary to have a resolution in the Parliament to determine that there should be discussions between the Government and the Dairy Industry Authority? Surely to goodness we have more important things to do than carry resolutions in connection with a matter such as that—that the Government should have discussions with the Dairy Industry Authority. Why on earth does not the Government realise that the Dairy Industry Authority is in the position to know what is in the best interests of the industry. The authority should be permitted to carry on and put its policy into operation.

Surely, if there is any organisation which is in a position to know where the milk quotas should be allocated it is the Dairy Industry Authority, and not the Government. Under the legislation the authority is charged with the responsibility of doing its utmost to preserve the industry and to look after the various sections of the industry. It should not be necessary to come to this House and advocate that there be further talks, and during those talks that there be a review of what the Government has instructed the authority to do with regard to the negotiability of milk quotas.

Surely we ought to be able to make up our minds on the question of the negotiability of milk quotas. It is my very strong belief that the organisation which is in the best position to decide where milk quotas ought to go is not the Government. The milk quotas should not go to the people who have the most money and who are in the best position to buy the quotas. Quotas should be allocated where the Dairy Industry Authority thinks they would be in the best interests of the industry.

That is the question which has to be determined. We are being asked by the amendment to vote for further discussions. Well, for how long are these discussions to go on? What guarantee is there in this motion that following the discussions something worth while will emerge, and that there will be a change of policy? We want a change of policy. We want the Dairy Industry Authority to be able to do what it thinks is necessary in the interests of the industry. If we do not have confidence in the Dairy Industry Authority to do that we should disband it. Why set up an organisation—an authority—to regulate an industry if we cannot trust it to do the right thing in accordance with the legislation under which it operates?

To put forward the suggestion that we should have discussions, and during the course of those discussions review what the Government has instructed the authority to do, is beyond reason. Are we to waste our time considering a proposal to carry on discussions with no guarantee at all that there will be any change in the policy? If members are prepared to swallow that, they will swallow anything. It is simply a ruse on the part of the Government to try to defuse the issue and get this matter out of the way so that it will not be an embarrassment to the Government.

I say most definitely that if there is any real concern for the industry, as such, the Dairy Industry Authority ought to be permitted to do what it is charged to do under its legislation, and put into operation those ideals and principles which it believes are necessary in the interests of the industry.

Surely to goodness it is obvious to anybody who takes any notice of the situation at the present time that the industry is in a parlous situation. It does not want to be fettered with Government instructions as a result of some special Government policy which will be inimical to the best interests of the dairying industry as a whole. I am strongly opposed to the amendment because it is nothing but a subterfuge.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [9.10 p.m.]: What the Leader of the Opposition has said makes the position sound so very simple.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: It is simple.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Has the Leader of the Opposition ever bothered to read

the Act? Of course, it happens to be an Act which his Government put on the Statute book.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Exactly, and we want it put into operation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Quite obviously, the Leader of the Opposition has not read section 30 of the Act—his own Act.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The Premier should read the section which says that the Dairy Industry Authority is charged with the responsibility of doing its best for the industry.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition has not read the Act.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Oh yes, I have.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He has not read the Act which his Government put on the Statute book, otherwise he would not have said what he did.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I have read the Act far more thoroughly than has the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition can say what he likes. The situation he relates back to 1945 and 1946 is entirely different. I want to say it is an absolute disgrace to the Opposition that its members are prepared to make cruel use of a certain section of this industry which is struggling for its very survival. The Labor Party is using the industry in an effort to place a wedge between the Country Party and the Liberal Party, and hammer it home. That is all the Labor Party is interested in doing.

I will get back to the real purpose of the amendment and the real objective of the Government. I believe the Minister has made the position clear enough and I want to emphasise that the discussions going on between the Government—and I talk about discussions and not directions—and the Dairy Industry Authority could not be on a better level. I know this is very disappointing to the member for Warren who hoped to come here with a motion and make it appear that the Dairy Industry Authority was in turmoil within its own ranks and in turmoil with the Government.

Mr H. D. Evans: You are joking.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to tell the member for Warren that I defy any member to claim that the discussions which have taken place between the Minister and myself, and the Dairy Industry Authority, have not been on the most sensible and practical basis they could possibly be.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: How long have they been going on?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Let us look at the situation. The industry today is in the worst situation it has ever faced because of a set of circumstances beyond its control. One of the problems faced by

all producers has been worsened because of the situation in the beef industry. The manufacturing section of the industry is in a parlous state, but do not let us run away with the idea that the quota section of the whole-milk industry, by whatever name it goes, is rolling in money. It has serious problems, too. However, those producers are absolutely disgusted at the assessment of their section of the industry, and the attitude of the member for Warren. Those producers are able to read the claims of the member for Warren about their rolling in money. Obviously, the member for Warren does not understand taxation law when he talks about paying for a quota in two years, because that cannot be done.

I make the point: the objective of this amendment moved by the Government is to try to get together with the authority in a sensible way to work out a proposition for the development of the industry. The member for Vasse, who has probably a deeper connection with the manufacturing-milk producers than anyone else in this Chamber, put the position fairly and clearly when he talked about a total approach.

The member knows, as one who is right in the middle of this problem, that what the authority and the Government seek to do is create something additional rather than to tear down some people and leave them all impoverished. We are trying to keep them strong, and at the same time to create something to build up the other sections of the industry. If the member for Warren does not want us to do that, let him say so.

Mr H. D. Evans: Why do you think we set up the Dairy Industry Authority?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The control of quota transfers by the authority is not the answer to the problem of the manufacturing-milk producers. They have to have something new, something additional. Now of course the authority has to talk to the Government, because it wants to fix a price to be paid by the consumer that will create the wherewithal so we can return something to the unfortunate section of the industry. Of course the authority had to talk to the Government, and it found the Government very receptive. Discussions that have taken place between the Government and the authority have been very harmonious.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: When did they commence?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to tell the member for Warren—

Mr H. D. Evans: You have had 18 months and you have come up with nothing. You have only overridden the authority.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the member for Warren will just listen, he will be surprised when I tell him—

Mr J. T. Tonkin: He will be surprised, and I will be surprised if you tell me when you started discussions.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —that it was not the Government which initiated the present scheme. It so happens that the authority discussed with us a proposition, because it wished to create something for those in the greatest need. It needed Government support. We said we thought it was a proposition which could be implemented if the authority thought it could sell the idea to the producers. The authority has been trying to sell the proposition to the producers, because there are two very strong factions in the industry that have to be convinced it is a fair and equitable scheme. It is no good tearing down one section to create something for another section so that everyone goes broke.

The authority is doing this very delicate job, and it should be encouraged by the member for Warren rather than be frustrated by him. It would do him good to attend some meetings with these people when the authority tries to persuade them to reappraise their attitude to cream quotas and the like.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Did the meetings at Dardanup do you any good?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to say to the member for Warren that the Government was quite prepared to go along with the proposition if the scheme could be implemented; and I want to assure the member for Mt. Marshall that if there are some queries about the scheme, they will come from the producers and not from the Government. The Government and the authority would be quite foolish to ignore the reaction on the part of some of these very practical people who have spent their lives in the industry, and who want to spend the rest of their lives in the industry. We want to discover the reaction of these people to some of the suggestions that have been made. The authority will come back to the Government, and I will be amazed if there is not some revision of the original scheme that was put up. However, the authority will come back to the Government with the reaction of the producers—both manufacturing and whole-milk producers—and the Minister and I have committed ourselves to consultation with the industry as soon as we are wanted. We must look at other ways in which the Government can help in addition to what we have offered to do with the original proposition.

I want to support this amendment very strongly, because it brings in the whole question instead of our becoming bogged down on the issue of quota negotiability. The amendment brings the whole question

into proper perspective so that the Government can continue the discussions with the authority—

Mr J. T. Tonkin: When did you start them?

Sir CHARLES COURT: —and they are progressing very satisfactorily. At the same time, in view of the time that has elapsed since the authority has had a chance to see the industry at work under its administration, we can see what other amendments have to be made. It is not just a question of jumping the first hurdle, because the first proposition that will be implemented by the authority will not deal with the total question. I suggest that the authority might be lucky if it solves half the problems with the first bite. If it solves half the problems, it will have done a remarkable job. Then the authority must set out to try to achieve the next objective within the industry so as to make every component of the industry—manufacturing and whole milk—stronger, and within a few years, I hope, we will have a situation of just one industry; the problem of quotas and negotiability will just disappear. These matters will never be mentioned in a few years' time because this will be a strong industry.

Mr H. D. Evans: You have lost your opportunity by forcing the policy of negotiability.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It can only become a strong industry if something is created, if we can get people to consume more whole milk, and put more milk on the market. Out of that we will get natural growth. The member for Warren knows that to be true—the best milk of all for distribution to unfortunate sections of the industry is from the natural growth milk because the conditions of quotas can be free. The authority can lay down the quotas which can be free, and this should be our objective. It is the objective, and the Government has concurred, without any question at all, in the amount that the authority wants to set aside as its promotional figure out of the greater revenue that we will create for the industry from consumers. If the member for Warren wants to play around with a mean petty thing like the quotas, let him.

Mr H. D. Evans: Who said it was a mean petty thing?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If he wants to deal with the total problems of the industry, this amendment must be passed.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Yes, for more talks.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This amendment is for more action.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: How long have the talks been going on?

Sir CHARLES COURT: For quite a while.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What—since last week?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, not from last week. They have been going on for quite a while.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Say when.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition knows; he could have read it in the Press. We even announced it after we had a meeting.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I do not believe everything I read in the Press that you say.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to make the point that when one is dealing with this industry one is not dealing just with gallons of milk; one is dealing with people's lives.

Mr H. D. Evans: Is that why No. 17 is there?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to tell the member for Warren that the industry understands thoroughly the import of his next motion, and one cannot ignore it when one considers the meanness of this one.

Mr Jamieson: You must be slipping; you have not blamed the Federals all night.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The only way for this industry to make some progress is by creating something additional for producers, because the problems of the industry will not be resolved by pushing quotas from A to B. They will be resolved only by creating something new and that is what the Government is setting out to do in complete harmony with the Dairy Industry Authority. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—21

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mr Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shaiders
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Thompson
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Clarko
Mr Mensaros	

(Teller)

#### Noes—18

Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Stephens
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr McIver

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr O'Connor	Mr Harman
Mr Laurance	Mr Taylor
Mr Young	Mr May
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Davies
Mr Sodeman	Mr Moller

Amendment thus passed.

**MR OLD** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.25 p.m.]: I move an amendment—

Substitute the following for the words deleted—

The Government should continue the discussions it has commenced with the Dairy Industry Authority concerning the plans the Authority has and the actions it is taking in efforts to improve the economic conditions in the dairy industry generally and, in particular, amongst the producers who only produce and sell manufacturing milk, or have market milk quotas which are below an acknowledged economic level of operation.

In the process of these discussions with the Dairy Industry Authority, the operations to date of quota negotiability and allocation should also be reviewed to determine whether changes are necessary in the light of experience since the provision of the initial basis of negotiability.

Mr Hartrey: That was a speech!

**MR H. D. EVANS** (Warren) [9.27 p.m.]: The words contained in the amendment moved by the Minister express substantially the attitude we have had towards the Dairy Industry Authority all along, and they indicate the purpose for which we set up the authority—to provide the organisation and the avenue for reformation of the industry. Up till the action was taken by the Tonkin Government, this was not possible as the division in the industry was too great and the cleavages were too deep. So we initiated the instrument whereby the industry could be revitalised and thereby become an economic industry in Western Australia.

The very authority we established—the very means by which there could be some improvement in the industry—has been overridden by the Government. The policy that should have been followed was to allow the authority to reorganise the industry. The authority should have been allowed to continue to do this.

This reorganisation was not for political motives. The policy of the Dairy Industry Authority, the policy of the Farmers' Union, and the policy of the Country Party was overridden because it suited the Liberal Party to do just that. The Liberal Party has its own reasons for its actions, and amongst these, of course, was maintaining the dairying elite which this type of negotiability of quotas will lead to. I am sorry that the honourable member concerned is not in his place because he said when the Bill was introduced there would be an open slather so far as negotiability of quotas was concerned. That

statement was ridiculous. It was never envisaged at any stage, and if the debates of the day are read and the explanations examined, this will be shown very clearly indeed. However, the Government has chosen to override the intentions of the Australian Labor Party—now in Opposition—and to override the attitude of the Farmers' Union and the recommendations put forward by the body which should be controlling the industry.

These have been brushed aside, and the narrow confines of Liberal Party policy have prevailed. While the content of the amendment is in itself quite commendable, it leads us to ask: What has been going on over the last 18 months?

Mr Hartrey: They have been putting things right!

Mr H. D. EVANS: The authority has had the opportunity to present its ideas relating to the restructuring of the industry, but to what extent it has done this, only the Government knows. But why, after 18 months are behind us, are we now to go back and discourse still further? While one cannot object to meaningful discussion taking place with the authority, or encouraging the authority to come forward with recommendations, action is what is needed. Against this background, it was noticeable that when the member for Mt. Marshall sought an assurance that the Dairy Industry Authority would control the negotiability of quotas, he did not get it either from the Minister or from the Premier.

Mr Old: He did!

Sir Charles Court: He did; he was asking about a proposition that was announced, and sought an assurance as to whether it would be handled by the authority. The answer is "Yes". I refer to the proposal contained in the Press statements from which you were reading.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The proposal in the Press release refers to the fact that the Dairy Industry Authority will control negotiability. How remarkable.

Mr Old: That was not the undertaking at all; it was that we would investigate negotiability. That was the undertaking asked for, and given.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Unfortunately, *Hansard* has my copy of the Press release, but I am talking specifically about the Press release, and not about the amendment.

Sir Charles Court: If the proposition referred to in the Press release and discussed with the Government is to be implemented it must be implemented by the authority. But I want to make it clear that the authority is not firm on that as the final proposition. That is the one it has been discussing with the industry, as you know.

Mr H. D. EVANS: My recollection of the Press release is that negotiability of quotas will be the responsibility of the DIA, at least for a period.

Sir Charles Court: For that transaction.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Is this a firm assurance?

Sir Charles Court: For that transaction. Do not try to put into our mouths words that we never uttered. For that transaction.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am asking the Premier to verify that statement.

Sir Charles Court: For that transaction, as set out in the Press statement. That was the situation as we understood it. I want to make the point that the authority could easily come back tomorrow and say, "We want to vary the proposal" and the Government would say, "Very well, we will receive your recommendations."

Mr H. D. EVANS: So if it comes back with a recommendation, the Premier has given an assurance that the authority will be allowed to do this.

Sir Charles Court: Do not try to distort the matter. It applies only so far as that proposition is concerned; it is based on the authority handling the quota.

Mr H. D. EVANS: But when it comes back with a recommendation, the Premier has given an assurance that the authority will be allowed to do this—not like the last time. Is that correct?

Sir Charles Court: For that transaction.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What transaction?

Sir Charles Court: The one set out in the Press statement to create quotas for a substantial number of producers. Then you have your cream quotas to ascertain. It is clearly set out.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What about negotiability in the field? If the recommendation comes back, will it be accepted?

Sir Charles Court: That is another issue altogether.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Premier is hedging.

Sir Charles Court: Do not try to distort it with me, my boy. We have heard you in action before.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I realise I am dealing with an expert; I do not deny that.

Sir Charles Court: You will also remember the explanation you gave to the Parliament in relation to section 30.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I wish the Premier would have a good look at that section, and the subsequent page; it is time he did.

Let us come back to the assurance the Premier has given. Is it not rather remarkable that he should say in his explanation negotiability should not be under the control of the DIA and now has clearly accepted that it can be done? It is rather strange to say the least.

Mr Rushton: You do not seem to know what you are talking about.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has come awake; I am quite surprised. The sentiments contained in the amendment are in themselves quite useful, and it would be difficult to argue against them as such. But when they are looked at in their proper perspective—I refer to the method by which the amendment has been brought forward, and the influence it will have on the present discussions between the Government and the DIA—I do not believe we can place a great deal of faith in them. However, all we can do is to hope for the best.

Amendment put and division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—22

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Stephens
Mr Grewar	Mr Thompson
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

## Noes—17

Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Carr	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr McIver
Mr T. D. Evans	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr O'Connor	Mr Harman
Mr Laurance	Mr Taylor
Mr Young	Mr May
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Davies
Mr Sodeman	Mr Moller

Amendment thus passed.

## Motion, as Amended

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

## LAMB MARKETING BOARD

## Extension of Operations: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 20th August, on the following motion by Mr H. D. Evans—

That in the opinion of the House Section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act, 1971, should be gazetted forthwith and the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board be directed to extend its operations into the sale of all forms of sheep meats.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.39 p.m.]: The wording of the motion is intriguing in that it refers to "section IV" of the Marketing of Lamb Act. I assume the honourable member means part IV because section 4 is already gazetted. Part IV, section 24 (1) of the Act reads—

The Minister may from time to time, on the recommendation of the Board, by notice published in the *Government*

*Gazette*, declare that during such period or periods as are specified in the notice, the Board is authorised to accept the delivery of sheep . . .

This relates to a recommendation of the board, not a direction from Parliament. Until the board asks for the gazettal of part IV of the Act, it is not gazetted.

Reference has been made to an application last year by the WA Lamb Marketing Board for the gazettal of part IV to allow it to deal in hogget. I should like to refer to a communication from the board. It states—

The Board's objective earlier this year in seeking a declaration of Part IV of the Act was in order to obtain more satisfactory prices for summer or old season's lambs than had previously been available.

The need to proclaim Part IV merely for this purpose was questioned by Crown Law Department which indicated that the Board was already empowered to acquire all lambs including summer lamb. Having acquired summer lamb the Board was able to sell that summer lamb as young sheep or hogget—provided that product was in accordance with the export regulations set down by the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture.

You may recollect that in this respect the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture amended its regulations with effect from March 6 to provide for three categories of "young sheep"—derived from ovine carcasses shown to possess no more than four permanent incisor teeth.

The Chairman of the Board has confirmed that the ability to process summer lamb in this way would enable it to fulfil any contracts for lamb which eventuated and which were contingent upon the inclusion of a proportion of young sheep or hogget.

The matter is being kept under constant review. I can assure the House that in the last three months I have been in communication with the WA Lamb Marketing Board to ascertain its trading situation, and I have been assured on each occasion that it is trading well and needs no further powers. It has been given to understand that if the necessity arises where it needs further powers, it should make an approach to the Government, when consideration will be given to gazettal.

The House is well aware that recently, the Lamb Marketing Board entered into contracts with the Middle East which greatly relieved the sale of lamb in Western Australia; it signed contracts for 10 500 tonnes of lamb with an option for a further 2 200 tonnes included in the contracts. As a large number of merino lambs were included, it represented a marvellous sale to the Western Australian industry.

In a recent communication from the lamb board regarding these contracts I was told that there is no liability on the part of the WA Lamb Marketing Board to supply hogget under these contracts. If there were any need for the lamb board to market hogget or young sheep we have an excellent vehicle whereby this can be done; namely, the Midland Junction Abattoir Board which, under the management of Mr Wilson, is regularly trading in mutton and young sheep.

Not only would this be an advantage to the lamb board; it would also be a great advantage to the Midland Junction Abattoir because, as members will know, the Midland abattoir is purely a service works and as such has no chance of breaking even or making a profit. I think the break-even point is 75 per cent of throughput, which is almost an impossibility to obtain.

Mr McIver: What do you think of the prices they have been getting at the abattoirs lately?

Mr OLD: They are improving. By utilising the Midland Junction Abattoir in the purchase of stock, if necessary—this has been agreed to by the Lamb Marketing Board—it is helping the industry generally by keeping the works viable and, as members opposite well know, these works cost the Government a great deal of money to maintain.

It has been stated that by trading through Midland Junction Abattoir there are disadvantages, and that the system is clumsy. I cannot agree with that claim. The manager of Midland Junction Abattoir is skilled in the meat trade. How can it be said that to trade through the board is clumsy? The only difference between the Lamb Marketing Board providing the young sheep and Midland Junction Abattoir providing them is that in the case of the Lamb Marketing Board the lambs are wrapped in muslin bags branded "WA Lamb Marketing Board", whereas in the case of the Midland Junction Abattoir the bags are branded "Midland Junction Abattoir Board".

As for the claim that the Government is breaking faith with purchasing countries, that is balderdash, because the board does not deal direct in lamb. It is a marketing board, and it sells under contracts to the shippers. The shippers are the ones who sign the overseas contracts. The Lamb Marketing Board merely supplies the shippers with the product they are selling.

The advice which I received in a letter from the Lamb Marketing Board recently indicates there is no need for a recommendation to the Minister for the introduction of part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act to provide for hogget. The letter goes on to state that in any event it does seem at this stage that the availability of hogget suitable for summer slaughter is barely sufficient to meet the Austrian requirements.

At the time the board applied for the gazettal of part IV of the Act it was of opinion that lamb sales would be contingent on the supply of hogget. The board has now decided this is not the case, and there has been no effect on its sales in any way. This is amply illustrated in the contracts that have been signed this year.

The members of the Lamb Marketing Board are responsible persons who represent various facets of the lamb marketing trade. They are quite capable of making an assessment of the situation; and their assessment, as I indicated from a couple of extracts I have read from letters, is well known. In a letter the board has stated—

In the event of changed circumstances, and a request through a producers organisation direct to the Minister, the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board would review the whole situation prior to making the recommendation for the introduction of Part IV in accordance with the terms of the Act.

At this stage the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board has received no requests from any producer organisation nor from the Minister.

I reiterate that the advantages of co-operation between the Lamb Marketing Board and the Midland Junction Abattoir are evident. I am sure all members will agree this is a very desirable objective. I think it is one which this House should foster and encourage, rather than discourage by giving the board greater trading powers.

I also reiterate that the board is free at any time to make an approach to me as Minister for Agriculture, and I give the assurance that any such approach will be treated on its merits. If there are advantages in the board trading in hogget and young sheep, and if it can be proved that this is necessary, the matter will be given every consideration.

In the meantime we have a very able operator in the Midland Junction Abattoir which, as I have said before, is already trading and currently fulfilling mutton orders overseas, and this is a fairly regular occurrence.

I conclude by saying that this motion is the second piece of political mischief we have had tonight. This motion was put forward for no other reason than to cause dissension within the ranks of the coalition Government. I ask members to vote against the motion.

MR McIVER (Avon) [9.50 p.m.]: I rise to speak to the motion for no political gain whatsoever, but only at the request of many sheep producers in my electorate. I can see nothing political in the motion, so what the Minister has just said is utter rubbish. In fact, he did not touch on the motion at all. We heard a great discourse

on Mr Wilson, the Manager of Midland Junction Abattoir, and we heard about his ability, but the Minister did not tell us anything new.

We have to look at the motive behind the motion and the problems which confront the sheep producers. In the main the 1975 season has been a very good one for sheep producers. There was a very good average rainfall, and as a consequence feed has been plentiful. There are good holding facilities on the farms in electorates such as Avon, and these are holding more sheep than they usually do.

It must come to pass soon—I would say before the end of the year—that large consignments of sheep will come forward. If the present rate of consumption of sheep per head of population does not improve the sheep producers will be placed in the same predicament as that in which the dairymen are now placed. So, I think it is essential that part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act be gazetted, as indicated by the member for Warren when he moved the motion.

Several meetings have been held in the electorate of Avon, in such centres as York and Beverley. In all cases when a motion along the lines of the motion before us was put it was agreed unanimously that part IV of the Act to extend the operations of the board to the sale of all forms of sheep meat should be gazetted.

Surely these are the people in the industry who should know the situation. They are not happy with what takes place at Midland Junction Abattoir, with all due respects to the manager, Mr Wilson. If the Minister will look at the history of that abattoir he will understand the dissatisfaction of the producers. If the Government had not spent millions of dollars on the operations of the abattoir probably it would not be in the predicament it is in today.

I agree with the Minister's comments about the markets in the Middle East. Let us look at the economic position of the Lamb Marketing Board. Surely the Minister is anxious to curtail costs. The extension of the marketing operations of the Lamb Marketing Board would gainfully employ the employees of the board in the slack period, if the board were empowered to sell sheep meats. Economically this would be a good step, and not a retrograde one.

Let us not have politics intruding into this motion. This is a genuine move by the member for Warren to assist the sheep producers. I have received dozens of letters from farmers in my electorate, and in each case they have asked me to keep politics out of the matter. That is what they want, and we should keep it that way.

I am very disappointed, as I am sure are all members on this side of the House, that the Minister has adopted the attitude he has just expressed. Has the board

really had time to prove its worth? I agree that some producers are opposed to it, and regard its operations as being too bureaucratic, but we must give it a trial. We do not give boards a trial by choking their growth. In this case I believe we are choking the growth of the Lamb Marketing Board by not agreeing to the gazettal of part IV of the Act to extend its operations.

From my point of view there is nothing political in what I am saying. I am only doing what I have been requested to do by many of the sheep producers in Western Australia. I have no hesitation in saying they will be very disappointed with the Minister's remarks. However, the matter rests on his head, and if the Minister so desires he can continue to take that line. It does not satisfy me. It would be ridiculous for me to continue further in this debate, because I could speak on the subject until the sun came out tomorrow morning. Even if I did that I know the Minister would not change his mind.

I do express disappointment. I have to inform the people who have written to me about the attitude of the Government towards orderly marketing. It is parallel with the policy of the Government that its members have opposed the other motions moved by the Opposition in a genuine endeavour to bring relief to the rural centres and the rural industry generally. I reiterate that I am very disappointed with the attitude of the Minister.

**MR MCPHARLIN** (Mt. Marshall) [9.58 p.m.]: The motion moved by the member for Warren requests that the gazettal of part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act be proceeded with, and the board be directed to extend its operations. If one looks at part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act one finds it is headed "Marketing of hogget and mutton". Section 24 states that the Minister may from time to time, on the recommendation of the board, by notice published in the *Government Gazette* accept delivery of sheep other than lamb, etc. However, that is only on the recommendation of the board.

At no time has the Minister given a direction to the board, but he said he would consider any recommendation made by it. The motion does not say that; it asks that a direction be given to the board. In this respect the motion is a little off the beam in that what it seeks does not comply with the Act.

The Minister stated that recently he had received a letter from the Lamb Marketing Board indicating it was content to go along with the operations it was undertaking, and was not concerned about going into the marketing of sheep meat other than lamb.

A similar thing occurred while I was Minister in charge of the administration of the Marketing of Lamb Act, and there were discussions in this House. After some



considerable time and discussions, the board wrote to me as Minister indicating that an amendment to the export regulations had been made by the Australian Meat Board through the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, and that such amendment did in fact provide the board with the opportunity to fill orders with young sheep which would enable the board to process old season's lambs.

The board still cannot deal in hogget, but the reclassification did allow it some flexibility regarding old season lambs. "Young sheep" is the classification which fills the requirements of the Middle East countries. They do not worry a great deal as long as the sheep is young and is in a desirable condition.

From time to time the farmers have expressed their desire to have the operations of the board extended. Of course, when the legislation was first introduced and debated in this House, the provision was included because it was envisaged that at some future date the producers might make this request. It was felt that if the board were successful in its holding of lamb—the grading and price scheduling—which is a very important part of its operations, it could be of benefit to producers if its operations were extended to sheep meats other than lamb. That was the very reason the provision was included in the Bill.

We know that when the matter was raised earlier there was argument from many quarters for and against the proposal. Eventually the decision was made not to extend the operations.

The application made to me by the board at the time did not include mutton. It specifically mentioned hogget because the board was of the sincere opinion that the fulfilment of orders for the Middle East required a percentage of hogget. The reports to me indicated that the matter had been examined by the manager of the board who had been to the Middle East and had talks with the various authorities there. The Iranian Meat Organisation is the only authority there which can purchase meat for Iran and it indicated it would like orders filled with a percentage of hogget meat. For that reason the board sought permission to trade in hogget in order that it might take advantage of the old season's lamb.

We know now that after all the discussion which ensued, the application was refused.

Many arguments were raised for and against the proposal. One was that there was not a great deal of hogget available anyway so it did not matter much if the board did not get permission to trade in hogget. Another argument was that if there was not a great deal of hogget available, why was there so much fuss and bother about giving permission? One could argue both sides on that one.

In my opinion the board has proved itself, although some people are still not in favour of it. I consider it is doing a good job and that a greater percentage of producers are in favour of it than are against it. I take every opportunity I get to discuss the board's problems with farmers in the lamb producing section of the meat industry, and my assessment is that more favour the board than are against it.

It must be remembered that there is no compulsion on any producer in Western Australia to deliver to or sell his lambs through the board. If he desires to do so he can sell them by auction or private treaty to any butcher, operator or to anyone else. A number of producers do that.

Criticism has been made of the acquisition powers of the board. I believe that if these powers were taken away from the board, as has been suggested in several quarters, it would be the end of the board. At a meeting of approximately 30 producers a motion was discussed concerning the removal of the acquisition powers from the board. The result of the vote on the motion was 27 against and only three in favour. That indicates the satisfaction that is felt about the board at this time. I know there are still some who would like to see it go out of existence, but I believe before such a move is ever contemplated the desire of the producers should be known. This should be obtained by the same method used to ascertain whether the producers wanted the board in the first place; that is, by a referendum. The result of the referendum concerning the establishment of the board was 1 764 in favour and 228 against, out of a total of 2 038 who voted.

The Minister has indicated that the board has not requested permission to extend its operations into marketing of meat other than lamb; in other words, it has not requested the gazettal of part IV of the Act. Therefore I believe that the Government would be contravening the Act if it were to accept the motion before us because that motion is designed to give a direction to the board. Such a decision should be made by the board itself. If the board sincerely believes that the gazettal of that part of the Act is necessary for its successful operations it will request that it be gazetted. It is fulfilling its responsibility in an efficient manner and so will take any steps it considers necessary for the better administration of the industry. If we directed the board to extend its operations, we would not be complying with the Act.

Mr H. D. Evans: If those words are offensive, would you care to delete them?

Mr McPHARLIN: I come back to what I said before. To the best of my knowledge—and the Minister has confirmed this—the board has not applied to have its operations extended. If it did make such

an application I would certainly support it. There is no doubt about that; but it has not done so. I do not consider that the motion before us is in line with the Act.

**MR STEPHENS** (Stirling) [10.10 p.m.]: I have mixed feelings about the motion. I do not wish to cover what has been said before, but for the sake of continuity I wish to say I support most of the remarks of the member for Mt. Marshall.

The provision under discussion was included in the Act to allow for a situation which could possibly occur after the Lamb Marketing Board had become operative and had established itself as a successful venture. It was intended that the provision should be included so that the board could deal in mutton and hogget if necessary. It was part of the evolutionary process in involving itself in the marketing of our meat.

Having been closely associated with the meat section of the Farmers' Union, I know that it was the long-term view of that section that eventually it might be desirable to move into the marketing of beef, but it was thought preferable for the board to crawl before it walked. Therefore it was decided that the board should start with lamb and if it proved itself and ironed out all the problems associated with marketing it could then, step by step, move on.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of producers support the board and that from its very difficult beginnings it has now established itself as a sound operation.

Last October, or thereabouts, when the board originally requested permission to deal in hogget, the request was made because of the situation which existed in the Middle East. There was a market there for hogget and I was told by an officer of the board that had it been able to deal in hogget at that time—that is, October of 1974—it could have advertised a schedule of prices at something like 15c a pound whereas the ruling rate at that time for the contract available was something like 9c a pound.

That was probably correct because it is borne out by the fact that eventually under the same contract the firm paid 15c per pound, and on select grades it paid as much as 17c. So, had the board the power to trade in hogget at that time there could have been considerable financial advantage to the producers in Western Australia.

We know of course the situation was never finally resolved and that that particular contract has passed and that market for hogget is not available for the time being.

There was also the added problem of the disposal of our summer lamb with financial advantage to the producers. The summer lambs could always be sold, but

the quality and grading were such that they were sold at a financial disadvantage to the producer, whereas had the board been able to deal in hogget considerable advantage would have accrued to the producer.

In opposing the motion the Minister indicated that the Midland Junction Abattoir has power to trade and therefore the producer is now covered in this situation. The Minister is not quite correct because although the Midland abattoir has power to trade and does, in fact, trade—Mr Wilson has been quite categorical about this—it will not publish a schedule of prices. This would have been one advantage had the board been permitted to trade in mutton and hogget because it would have published such a schedule and that would have made quite a difference.

**Mr H. D. Evans:** Midland was not given these powers to become a trading organisation; it was in the interests of the abattoir operations.

**Mr STEPHENS:** Although the board has indicated that at the moment it may not desire to trade in hogget and mutton, I still think it desirable that the provision be gazetted so that if the need to trade in hogget and mutton arises at any time in the future we will not have to go through three or four months of political argument to decide whether the board in fact should have that power. Let the board have the power now, and when it comes to the board's attention that it is in the interests of the farming community that it commence a commercial venture dealing in mutton and hogget, it will be free to engage in that trade without going through the political wrangle.

However, just as I opposed the Dairy Industry Authority's being directed to do anything, I am also opposed to the provision in the motion moved by the member for Warren that the Lamb Marketing Board be directed to extend its operations.

**Mr H. D. Evans:** Would you like to delete that?

**Mr STEPHENS:** I am opposed to the board being directed to do just that. I believe the board should have the power to deal in mutton and hogget when it considers it is commercially viable to do so in the interests of the producers, but I do not believe this Parliament or anyone else should direct the board on what to do.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

I move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "forthwith" in line 3.

If my amendment is carried, the motion would then read—

That in the opinion of the House Section IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act, 1971, should be gazetted forthwith. I could then support the motion. I think it would be to the advantage of the farming community and I know it would be in

line with the policy of the Farmers' Union. In 1974 the Farmers' Union approached the Minister for the gazettal of part IV of the Act. It wanted the board to deal in mutton and hogget, not just hogget as had been requested by the board. Although I have no corroboration of it, I also understand the Lamb Marketing Board might give favourable consideration to requesting the gazettal of part IV of the Act if a farming organisation approached it to do so.

If this House decided to support the amendment and the motion in its amended form, there would be provision to enable the board to operate immediately the necessity arose.

**MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.18 p.m.]**: The amendment moved by the member for Stirling is quite acceptable to the Opposition and is consistent with the spirit and intention of the original motion. It was intended to allow the Lamb Marketing Board to seize whatever opportunity presented itself, and it would be a matter of commercial judgment just how and when the board became involved in trading. We are quite happy to go along with the amendment that has been proposed.

In his concluding remarks when speaking to the motion, the Minister claimed the motion had been presented purely out of political mischief. Let us have a look at the bona fides of both sides of the House in the matter of meat marketing to see whether political mischief was the motivating force.

First of all, I draw attention to the platform, constitution, and rules of the Australian Labor Party. This item figures very prominently in the rural policy—

To establish a statutory marketing authority for the control of domestic and export sales. The form and method of implementation to be dependent upon the experience indicated by the operation of the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board.

That policy has been in the platform of the Australian Labor Party since the last State conference, and indeed since the one before that. That is the attitude of the Opposition towards marketing.

Let us see how the Opposition performed when it was in Government. Meat marketing was a shambles when we came to office. It was a disgrace of the highest order. There had been total neglect of abattoir space in Western Australia. The Towns and Austen report had been totally ignored, and the provision of abattoir space was one of the first requirements forced on us. At the expense of many millions of dollars we did expand the killing space in Western Australia. That was one of the prime requisites to getting sufficient abattoir space, the lack of which had cost the producers in this State

millions of dollars during the drought years, to the eternal disgrace of the previous Liberal-Country Party coalition Government.

At the same time we gave the Midland Junction Abattoir the right to trade. It was stated at the time that it was not the intention to make the abattoir a marketing authority but to assist it in its operations as a service abattoir. To try to say now that the abattoir is already a trading concern is purely looking for some rationalisation so that the Minister does not become involved. It is so weak and wishy-washy that it does not hold any substance at all.

The Lamb Marketing Board was established by the Tonkin Government, and part IV of the Act about which we are talking was deliberately included to provide a developmental and evolutionary stage in the process of meat marketing, consistent with the policy we have embraced. So to say this is political gimmickry is rubbish.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Might I suggest to the member for Warren that the remarks he is now making are more in line with a reply to the debate on the original motion than with speaking to the amendment before the House.

**Mr H. D. EVANS**: I take it the Minister was rejecting the motion in toto, including the words which it is now sought to delete. So in a way my remarks have relevance to the amendment. I assume the Minister also intends to oppose the amended motion if the amendment is passed.

I point out that while the Lamb Marketing Board might not have made a recent request to have sheep meats brought within its powers of trading, that is not the whole story. The establishment of the Lamb Marketing Board is a stage in the development of all sheep meat sales and indeed of the whole meat marketing process in Western Australia. The board may not have made a specific request at this time, but that does not mean it should not be given some initiative and encouragement.

Indeed, in a speech he made during the Greenough by-election campaign the Premier said the Liberal Party was in favour of orderly marketing and when it could be shown that producers required it they would have orderly marketing. We have heard the remarks of the member for Avon in relation to the reaction in that area. Surely it is not asking too much of a Government which is sincere about establishing orderly marketing to find out what the true position is. Not the slightest effort has been made.

The attitude of the Farmers' Union is certainly consistent and still stands. It has been on all fours with the Labor Party in the matter of meat marketing. The request of the Farmers' Union for gazettal of part

IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act still stands. This will allow the board to trade on a voluntary basis in sheep meats as well as lamb. The request of the Farmers' Union to this effect was first made in October last year and it is an ongoing thing.

The Lamb Marketing Board also requested the gazettal of part IV of the Act, and this has been alluded to. It was intended primarily to cope with a seasonal situation in relation to summer lambs, but that is not the total situation. Surely the Lamb Marketing Board should be encouraged, urged, and given every opportunity to proceed, as it has demonstrated its capacity up to this point. The principle which is espoused by the Farmers' Union and every producer in Western Australia is the right of a producer to dispose of a rural commodity as he sees fit. The opportunity to do this is being denied by not giving the board a further avenue of disposal in a competitive market.

The present Government claims to be desirous of seeing competition in all fields, yet it will not provide further genuine competition in this field, and the reason is not very hard to see. The reason that the Government is not prepared to allow this further avenue of competition in the selling of sheep meats is that it is protecting the vested interests in the industry. That is the situation which pertains. We have denied this additional avenue required by the producers, who wish the board to function in this way.

In a number of ways on a number of occasions the Government has demonstrated the political gimmickry which is afoot in some quarters. The issue of consistency with the wishes of the producers of this State and with policies which have been enunciated was raised in connection with the Select Committee of inquiry into the beef industry, and in the matter of dairying; and it is now raised in connection with the marketing of lamb.

When we look at the situation which is displayed here, we have to go back something like 2 000 years to find a sell-out of equal significance, but in those days it was the jingle of silver coins which mattered, not the rustle of portfolios which we have seen in this House. If Judas Iscariot were abroad in the modern world, and inclined towards politics, he would have a place in one political party in this House. He would probably become an officer of that party in a very short time. It would be tailor-made for him.

The producers have been double-crossed well and truly. They have been given to understand their interests are being represented but they have been sold down the river in very short order, in deference to the vested interests in the meat industry. That is the first sell-out of major proportions.

The second sell-out is in relation to policies, not only the policies of the Farmers' Union, which have been denied, but also those of the Country Party which were put to the electorate at the last election. Judas Iscariot would be an amateur in this field, when we get down to the Ministry and the point which was made earlier this evening—that the President of the Country Party and the present Minister for Conservation "exhorted Matt Stephens to see McPharlin stood firm".

We find that the pressure was not only on the member for Stirling, but also on the previous Minister for Agriculture (Mr McPharlin), because the present Minister for Agriculture went to Mr McPharlin's office to ensure that the Premier was acquainted with the party's determination on the quota issue. Those who were pushing from behind suddenly were out in front; and even though the principle of dairy quota negotiability has been shown this evening to have been reversed, that is not sufficient to alter in any way the situation of the present holders of office.

As I also remarked earlier, it would be only fair to offer the guernseys back to the previous Ministers. When people talk about political gimmickry and mischief in this place they should look at their own hands first to see whether they stand alongside Judas Iscariot.

I am prepared to accept the amendment moved by the member for Stirling for the deletion of all words after the word "forthwith" in my motion. I second the amendment.

**MR OLD** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [10.32 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment because section 24 (1) in part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act states—

The Minister may from time to time, on the recommendation of the Board, by notice published in the *Government Gazette*, declare that during such period or periods as are specified in the notice, the Board is authorised to accept the delivery of sheep, and the Board may, subject to the succeeding provisions of this Part, exercise, in relation to sheep delivered to it during such a period, and sheep products obtained therefrom, all or any of the powers and functions conferred on it by this Act in relation to lambs and lamb products.

I reiterate: there has been no application from the board.

**Mr H. D. Evans**: Does this have to be a prerequisite?

**Mr OLD**: Has the member for Warren read the Act? Despite his assertions and the fact that he implies I have not been in communication with the Lamb Marketing Board, I have been in communication

with the board on several occasions. If the member bothers to check he can verify that.

Mr H. D. Evans: Does it have to be a prerequisite that the board create the situation? Of course it does not.

Mr OLD: He implies that we are ignoring the policy of the Farmers' Union. The policy of the Country Party is to take note of the opinions of producer organisations. That is what we are doing, and the Farmers' Union is not the only producer organisation. We are canvassing all producer organisations and seeking their opinions on matters relating to rural policy. I am quite convinced that we are carrying out the policy the Country Party wishes to be carried out.

I oppose the amendment in total because, as I claimed earlier, it is up to the Lamb Marketing Board to make an approach. I have quoted from letters where in the board has said it does not require this power. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and suggest that when the board makes an application for the gazettal of part IV, that is the appropriate time for this matter to be debated.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—19

Mr Barnett	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr McPharlin
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Stephens
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr McIver
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

## Noes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Mr Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neil
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mr Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Silson
Mr Grayden	Mr Thompson
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Harman	Mr O'Connor
Mr Taylor	Mr Laurance
Mr May	Mr Young
Mr Davies	Mr F. V. Jones
Mr Moiler	Mr Sodemam

Amendment thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

Question put and negatived.

Motion defeated.

*House adjourned at 10.39 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 2nd October, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (12): ON NOTICE

1.

#### RAILWAYS

##### Kukerin: Freight

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What tonnage of forward freight has been handled by Westrail from Kukerin railway station in the years—
  - (a) 1972-1973;
  - (b) 1973-1974; and
  - (c) 1974-1975?
- (2) What tonnage of grain is estimated to be left awaiting cartage from the Co-operative Bulk Handling bin at Kukerin at the present time?
- (3) What tonnage of superphosphate has been received into Kukerin station in the years—
  - (a) 1972-73;
  - (b) 1973-1974; and
  - (c) 1974-1975?
- (4) What is the cost of the freight in questions (1) and (3)?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) 17 722 tonnes (Including 17 126 tonnes grain).
- (b) 26 795 tonnes (Including 26 198 tonnes grain).
- (c) 11 709 tonnes (Including 10 920 tonnes grain).
- (2) 357 tonnes of barley only.
- (3) (a) 4 428 tonnes.
- (b) 5 184 tonnes.
- (c) 3 468 tonnes.
- (4) 1972-73—\$130 605.  
1973-74—\$213 759.  
1974-75—\$114 389.

2. *This question was postponed.*

3.

#### PEARSON STREET.

##### Realignment

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) What charge is being made on the City of Stirling for the resiting of services as a consequence of the widening and realignment of Pearson Street for work carried out by the—
  - (a) Metropolitan Water Supply Department; and
  - (b) State Energy Commission?
- (2) What has been the variation in the cost of the work being carried out by these authorities since an application was made in 1974 by the City of Stirling for a grant to undertake this work?