

goldmines are phased out and nickel mining and processing increase?

- (2) Overall impact on population and other economic, community, and social activities in the goldmining areas like Kalgoorlie-Boulder, if the Commonwealth gold subsidy is not increased for a transitional period?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.

2. TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL

Code of Practices

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

I assume that the Minister for Labour has misinterpreted part (1) of question 11 on today's notice paper.

If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to explain in more detail what I desire to know, the Federal employers' organisations and the Australian Council of Trade Unions came to an agreement relative to the procedure to be adopted to prevent industrial disputes. Many unions in this State are under Federal jurisdiction, and the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia declined to endorse or ratify the procedures adopted federally, and by the other States.

My question is: Has the Trades and Labor Council in this State yet ratified the code of practices to be followed in industrial disputes as agreed to by employers and unions under Federal industrial jurisdiction?

I appreciate this is not a matter directly within the Minister's province, but since the discussions which are proceeding between the employers, the unions, and the Government in this State relate to this particular problem, would the Minister inquire whether the Trades and Labor Council has ratified the code of practices?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

Apparently, when replying, I have misinterpreted the question of the member for East Melville.

The secretary of the T.L.C. is away in the Eastern States and I did not feel it was the right thing to refer the matter to others. If the question is represented I will be pleased to answer it.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

2. Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

3. State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Taylor (Minister for Labour), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 29th July, on the following motion by Mr. A. R. Tonkin:—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to:—

May it please Your Excellency: We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [4.51 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those of previous speakers on your elevation to your high office. I cannot, of course, refer to your past performance in the House but, from your genial expression, I feel sure you will act with impartiality and will give encouragement and show tolerance to the new members. In my short time in this House I think I could safely say that the old members need neither tolerance nor encouragement.

I would also like to offer my congratulations to the members of the Labor Party who have been elevated to Cabinet. I trust that they will be successful, in the interests of the people of the State. I have always believed that our party system of Government operates best when there is a strong Opposition. I think we have a strong Opposition at the present time, so if our friends opposite are successful it may just be because of the strong Opposition.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all the members on both sides of the House and to the staff of Parliament House who have assisted me since my election to office.

In representing the electorate of Stirling I follow Mr. Clayton Mitchell, who represented the area for nine years. Prior to that he was the President of the Shire of Plantagenet and he held a wide variety of offices serving the community. I would like to wish both Mr. Mitchell and his wife a long and happy retirement.

I am also conscious of the fact that I represent an electorate that was once held by the late Hon. A. F. Watts, who served with distinction not only his party and his electorate but also the State.

I recognise the great honour and privilege that the electors of Stirling have bestowed on me. I also recognise the heavy responsibility I have accepted, particularly in view of the serious rural situation that exists in the country today and, of course, the urgent necessity for positive and prompt action to alleviate that situation.

As members are no doubt aware, the electorate I represent covers every facet of agriculture, and the towns therein are dependent upon agriculture. Because of the low prices, the drought, and the poor seasons in the last three years, it is an area that has seen a great deal of adversity and personal hardship, particularly in the newer and developing areas, which are quite extensive.

However, most people have faced up to their problems with resolution, and I would like to pay tribute to their determination to win through. They must win through because the backbone of our agricultural economy is still the family unit farm, and if the family unit farm were to collapse it would be the ruination of the country towns and would mean a consequent exodus into the city. The cost of providing the additional services that would be required in such an event would far outweigh any cost of keeping agriculture viable and keeping the family unit farm intact.

The problems facing the rural economy today are not insurmountable and, although they are serious, they are not as impossible as some sections of the community would have us believe. In fact, if the average price of wool were raised to 40c a pound—and I think that figure is not impossible—and if the price were kept relative to any future price increases, I believe 80 per cent. of the agricultural problems would be solved. The low price of wool has forced, and is forcing, a diversification into other areas of production. This, in itself, is not a bad thing but there is a very real danger that it could lead to overproduction in these areas, with consequent further problems arising.

A great deal has been said and written about rural prices, and I feel somewhat gully in speaking on the subject today. If I could paraphrase some words of Sir Winston Churchill's, I suppose it could be said that never in the field of agricultural economics has so much been said by so many with so little result.

Rural reconstruction is, however, only a corrective measure, and unless complementary action is taken the day of reckoning will only be postponed. Rural towns in country areas will be deserted and this, in its turn, must have an economic impact on the city. In fact, it is already being felt. Hotel licensees have felt the

impact that has been brought about by the farmers not coming to town so frequently and, when they do come to town, not staying so long. Salesmen who deal with people engaged in agricultural pursuits are finding that their order books are not being filled, which in turn has an impact on the city. The other day I had occasion to have a haircut, and the barber commented that the farmers were not coming to town and having their hair cut; he made the statement that we must get money back into the rural areas, with which most of us on this side of the House would heartily agree.

I would like to make a couple of points which I am sure would have the support of the large majority of the farming community. Firstly, the agricultural community has been forced to bear an excessive burden because of the Federal Government's tariff policy, which has resulted not only in protection to secondary industry but also overprotection.

As has been mentioned by a member on the opposite side of the House, it is possibly true that this has led to excessive profits being made by some companies, but it is also true that it has led to large pay packets for the workers. I feel that, in the main, opposition to pay increases has only been token opposition because industrialists have realised that they could cover themselves with increased protection. Costs, of course, are passed down the line, until they have hit the farmers, who have been unable to pass the costs on, with the result that farmers have been forced to produce on a protected market while selling on an unprotected or open market.

It has been stated that the annual cost to the Australian consumer as a result of the operations of the tariff policy is between \$2,500,000,000 and \$3,000,000,000. That is a consumer-paid subsidy, but how often does one hear any complaints about it? According to Press reports the wool industry is now to receive some extra assistance which could amount to some \$150,000,000. That amount, added to the direct assistance given to agricultural industries in the last Federal Budget of some \$215,000,000, makes a total of \$365,000,000. Let us round off that figure and call it \$400,000,000; and that is the amount the taxpayer is providing to assist agriculture. That is just a pittance when compared with the previously mentioned assistance that has been given to secondary industry. Yet loud protests have appeared in the Press—and some from members opposite—against the rural economy receiving that assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Is this assistance really such a great price to pay for an industry that has been the foundation of our economy for over 150 years, which still earns about 50 per cent. of our export income, sustains directly and indirectly the large proportion of our work force, and

will continue to be of importance long after our mineral resources are expended and Australia is left an empty quarry? In addition to tariff policies, there are other factors affecting the rural community such as probate, transport, and high interest rates, all of which constitute a heavy cost to agricultural industry.

It is not my intention to analyse these problems; but I feel that the problems I have mentioned, together with the interrelation of all sections of the agricultural spectrum, could and should be fully studied by a rural industries commission set up by the State and Federal Governments.

Initially the commission could review the cost to, and effect on, the agricultural economy of all the present policies, both financial and otherwise, and formulate a blueprint for a comprehensive agricultural policy. Thereafter the commission should continually analyse the situation and the effect on agriculture of any proposed legislation. The commission, properly functioning, could no doubt anticipate problem areas and recommend to the Government corrective action that would avert or at least minimise crises similar to the one we are currently facing.

Governments have been accused of being too slow to act in an effort to solve the problem of rural crises. I feel that to some extent this is true, but had such a commission been in operation detailed information would have been available to permit the Government to act immediately and with a degree of certainty that the corrective measures taken were the correct ones.

Having briefly reviewed the costs faced by agricultural industries, I would like to turn to marketing. This is an area which farmers have neglected for far too long. No doubt, of course, the overall returns have been reasonable and because of this the farmer gave very little thought to the costs and efficiency of those involved in handling his products after they left the farm gate. Today, however, in order to survive the farmer must receive every cent possible and to me—and I would say to the majority of farmers—this means the abolition of the auction system.

The auction system can be traced back at least as far as Babylonian days. Having existed for such a long period of time, it may be argued that it has stood the test of time. No doubt in an unsophisticated society it served its purpose during a time when there were many suppliers and many purchasers who established a supply and demand. However, in the society of today with its records, computers, and statistics, supply and demand can be accurately ascertained. Today the auction system is not a means of establishing supply and demand but rather a system by which operators can obtain produce at a price below that which they are prepared to pay.

Look at the situation at the Midland markets today. The price paid to the growers bears no relationship to the prices received by the wholesalers and processors, or to the price paid by the consuming public. It is interesting to note that those who advocate the continued use of the auction system, particularly in regard to wool and meat, rarely if ever use the system to dispose of the produce once they themselves have handled it. The auction system not only places the producer in an extremely weak bargaining position, but it is also open to collusion and outright malpractice.

For many years this has been thought to be so, but proof was established in the case which is now known as the Borthwick affair. I cast no reflection at all on the firm of Borthwick. However, this case—or cases—which resulted in three men being jailed, one being fined, and many others severely frightened, highlighted the weaknesses of the auction system—at least in regard to meat. What has happened in regard to meat could, and no doubt does, happen in relation to other products handled under the auction system.

The court proceedings to which I have referred were given wide publicity, but what is not known is that the head office management of at least one stock firm knew of the situation months before the police action took place, and yet it took no corrective measures. That this firm apparently condoned such malpractice leads me to suspect that what was happening in the Albany area is no doubt happening throughout the State, and possibly throughout Australia.

In fact, only yesterday I heard of a case—which I intend to follow up—which would bear out my statement. It is an historical fact that with the industrial revolution in England and the collapse of the cottage industries, the workers individually had no bargaining power and were exploited until they formed themselves into trade unions and were able to bargain for a fair return for their labour.

In my opinion a trade union movement in its true form—and by true form I mean one that devotes itself entirely to industrial matters and the welfare of its workers—is really only a commodity board in which the workers collectively negotiate the sale of their product—their labour, the only product they have to sell. The farmer must have commodity boards or statutory marketing so that he, too, is able to negotiate for a reasonable price for his product. I realise that this price may not always be what he would like, but at least it will always be the maximum the market will bear.

In discussing orderly marketing, any system must be based on majority grower control. Many have said that farmers can never reach any unanimity on marketing. I mention as an example the case of the wool industry in which since at least 1932

attempts have been made to achieve orderly marketing; but members will notice that whenever alterations have been suggested the buyers and the brokers have had more representation than the growers, and hence more say than the growers on any board set up to hold discussions.

I put it to the House: Would the workers tolerate a union controlled by the employers? Of course they would not. When one realises that the buyers and the brokers are to the farmers what the employer is to the worker, it is little wonder that progress in regard to improving the wool situation has been slow.

The sooner wool is acquired and sold by one grower-controlled selling authority—using modern technology as a basis for pricing the various types—the sooner will its true price be established. In other words, we want a system based broadly along the lines of the Wheat Board. If under such a system it is found that it is impossible to obtain a payable price—and I have every confidence that this will not be the case—then, and only then, should it be decided to phase it out or subsidise it in the overall national interest.

Any orderly wool marketing scheme can be effective only on a Federal basis. However, whilst using every endeavour to achieve a Federal scheme this State could and should go it alone in respect of the orderly marketing of meat. The Farmers' Union meat executive submitted a scheme for the marketing of lamb; a scheme which was endorsed by a large majority of growers when given the opportunity to vote on it at a referendum. Our leader, the then Minister for Agriculture and now the member for Katanning, obtained Cabinet approval to introduce the necessary legislation so that the scheme could be in operation by the 1st July, this year. We all know, of course, that there was a change of Government and that timetable will not be kept, but I am pleased to see that the new Government intends to continue with the legislation and I sincerely trust that it will treat the matter with urgency.

I will admit that at the time of the negotiations concerning this issue I was, as a member of the meat executive of the Farmers' Union, inclined to be a little critical of the then Minister for Agriculture. However, I realise now that had he insisted on the Farmers' Union meeting with the Meat and Allied Trades Federation, wholesalers, exporters, and representatives of the abattoirs in order to evolve a plan, any plan evolved would still be only at the discussion stage. I give the member for Katanning due credit for his foresight.

From lamb it is but a small step to include all meat. Once processed, meat is always sold according to its weight and grade and should be purchased from the grower accordingly. There is no room for guessing in today's economic situation

and it does not matter how experienced the stock buyer may be, he can still make mistakes, as the examples I am about to give will illustrate.

The first concerns one of my neighbours who had a pen of steers for sale, and he had the advantage of weighing them before the buyer arrived. The buyer—I will not name the firm because I do not think it is necessary for my purpose—offered my friend a price which was unacceptable, and further negotiations produced no progress. Eventually my friend asked the buyer the price per pound the firm was paying and he was told. He said, "If that is the price I am prepared to send them in on a weight basis." That was done, and my neighbour received \$1,000 more than the buyer was prepared to pay on the farm.

To give another example: Last year I went to Midland where a pen of lambs had been sold at auction. I asked four different lamb buyers what they considered the weights of the lambs to be and their answers ranged from 30 lb. to 36 lb. That is a variation of 6 lb. in the weights estimated by experienced buyers. I feel this indicates that it is imperative that all meat be sold on a weight and grade basis. The producer will then receive exactly what he is entitled to, and if the quality is down he will have a financial inducement to improve his standards.

With the establishment of an effective meat marketing organisation, it would be possible for the organisation to employ sales promotion officers to aggressively develop existing markets and explore new ones. In the past I believe markets in certain areas have been neglected because they were unprofitable. I do not blame private enterprise for that because people work to make a profit. However, under an orderly marketing scheme with a single marketing authority advantage could be taken of those markets and the price received averaged over all producers concerned.

In regard to reconstruction, with the operation of a rural industries commission and effective grower-controlled marketing boards the single unit farm could be saved to the undoubted benefit of the whole economy.

Having spoken a little on the possible erosion of the rural population I would now like to mention another form of erosion. I refer to the erosion of power of local government. As members are aware we have a three-tier system of government: Commonwealth, State, and local, and to me the most important is local government, because this form of government, being closer to the people is stronger, and the stronger it is the stronger is our democracy. Local government, being closer to the people, means that the ratepayers concerned realise that the money expended has been drawn from

their rates and virtually comes directly out of their own pockets and, therefore, they take a close interest in the expenditure resulting, I feel, in maximum efficiency for the money spent.

I cannot say that the same applies to Commonwealth and State expenditure, because, in the main, if there is excessive spending, people are inclined to say, "Oh well, it is Government money" and they could not care less. It is just over 100 years since local government was first formed, and I would like to read to the House the preamble to the original Act. It is as follows:—

17th January, 1871.

Whereas it is expedient that the inhabitants of the country districts should be empowered to construct and keep in repair the roads and bridges in their respective districts, and that all sums of money devoted to that purpose from the general revenue of the colony or otherwise should as far as practicable be expended under local authority and supervision.

I think the important words in that preamble are, "should as far as practicable be expended under local authority and supervision."

Quite rightly, during the next 100 years the scope and the responsibilities of local government increased. However, during the past few years the opinions and functions of the local authorities have been overruled by boards and authorities in Perth. This has led to the view, at least in rural areas, that local government is becoming just a rubber stamp. Let me cite a few examples. The Main Roads Department was originally set up to supervise main roads only, but what is the position today? In the opinion of one shire clerk—

Road Construction expenditure now requires Main Roads Department permission for the expenditure of one-half of its base road grant on works not necessarily of greatest advantage to local needs, whilst the level of Local Authority expenditure on road construction and maintenance is dictated by a Government imposed matching requirement being virtually guaranteed to ensure that an equitable share of the petrol tax fund allocated to road needs, is attracted as a rightful share of the tax that the ratepayer-motorist has paid.

In other words, the dominating force in regard to roads at the moment is the Main Roads Department.

Then there is the Bush Fires Board. Originally, country areas built up efficient voluntary bush fire brigades. It was then found that they should be co-ordinated, so a Bush Fires Board was established but this now tends to become

dictatorial and overrules local opinion. Recently, I was in one of the shire offices in my electorate and a telephone call came through from the Bush Fires Board in Perth. Apparently the local shire, in view of early and substantial rains in the area, had requested permission to lift restrictions that were imposed by certain sections of the Act. This decision had been arrived at by the councillors who were all practical men in the area. Nevertheless, some gentlemen in Perth had decided that restrictions imposed under some sections of the Act could be lifted, but not those relating to fire breaks. I ask the question: Who was in the best position to make the decision on this issue? Was it somebody in Perth or the local councillors residing in the area?

I now instance the Vermin Control Board. Originally, vermin was controlled by shires, but a board was set up as a co-operative compromise. However, once again it was not long before this board assumed dictatorial powers, and I believe the situation now is such that the Vermin Control Board receives all the rates that were collected as a result of the imposition of the vermin rate, and any shire that has protested and desired to assume its original authority has been told, "Yes, you can have the authority, but we will keep all the money." It is quite easy to understand that no shire could afford to operate under such a system.

I can even point to an instance where a member of a local shire was being victimised and he appealed to the local shire president for assistance. The president approached the field operator but he was not even allowed to read the field operator's book. Apparently a shire councillor has no authority whatsoever.

I now wish to refer to town planning in regard to which a council's decision can be overruled by the Town Planning Board. I can quote an example of this in the Albany Shire. Apparently a firm was interested in building a shopping complex within the area of the Albany Shire, and the shire council was quite agreeable to this being done. It agreed on the site selected and authority was granted to build, but the Minister for Town Planning visited Albany, inspected the site, and refused to sanction it. I understand his reason was that he could not allow anybody to lose his money by investing it in such a project. I cannot understand such benevolence in a free-enterprise society.

Under the Local Government Act the Minister can also amend the building by-laws. So I understand that now a by-law means exactly what it says except when the Minister wants it to mean something else. Lastly we now have the threat of the police taking over country traffic. The motive for this would appear to be the desire to centralise authority, because

there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that such a move will reduce the death toll on the roads.

Because of the interpretations of the Constitution by High Court judges, we are all aware that federalism is not working as we intended and that the State Government has responsibility without authority. This is because it is not financially autonomous. There is need for a review of Commonwealth-State financial relations and the working of federalism. This has often been mentioned, and we should press for such a review. If greater financial autonomy for the States cannot be obtained, perhaps we should investigate the possibility of abolishing State Parliaments in favour of a scheme of geographically-based regional areas, such areas to have their rights, responsibilities, and financial reimbursements clearly defined.

I am not a centralist, but if the State cannot break the shackles of domination by Canberra then the idea I have proposed could have merit. There need not be any greater control from Canberra than already exists and there would certainly be less domination from Perth.

I will now refer to a few specific matters affecting my electorate. I have noted from the Governor's Speech that the Government is dedicated to providing country areas with medical services equal in quality to those available in the metropolitan area. No country member will have any objection to that. However, it is a pity that a similar statement was not made in regard to education, because in the rural areas education is in a sorry plight.

In an advertisement published in *The Albany Advertiser*, the Labor Party stated that its education policy is based on needs and not economics. So I was really surprised that so little has been said in the Governor's Speech about education in the country, where the needs are great, particularly when incomes are such that it is virtually impossible for many parents to send their children away to boarding schools to further their education.

Mt. Barker is a case in point. That country town is seeking a five-year high school. However, the Dettman report has set down that no further high schools can be built unless such a school would have an attendance of some 700 children. When I asked one educationist where this figure was obtained, he said, "I think it is a figure that was just pulled out of the air."

I do not know whether it is correct or not that no further high schools will be built in country towns, but the position at the moment is that Mt. Barker lacks a five-year high school, which means that some children in the area have a round trip of up to 80 miles travelling to and from school. The distance from Mt. Barker is 60 miles, but parents have to travel additional miles in conveying their

children to the bus stops, often at 7.30 a.m. They are thus required to leave home at a much earlier hour to travel this extra distance. After travelling 80 miles in one day I cannot imagine any student in his fourth or fifth year at school being able to do justice to his studies so that he can successfully complete the course he is taking.

So I appeal to the Government to give serious consideration to the provision of a five-year high school with all the necessary facilities at Mt. Barker.

In the rural areas the question of school bus routes is another serious problem on account of the shrinking population. The policy of centralising country schools was laid down in 1935 or 1936, and to illustrate how the population is shrinking in the rural areas I will quote figures taken from the Bureau of Census and Statistics booklet. They are as follows:—

1944-1945 the total area of rural holdings were 206,001,371 acres.

In 1969-1970 the total area of rural holdings were 280,818,600 acres. That is an increase of 81 million acres.

However, children attending country primary schools in Aug. 1967 was 51,038, and 3 years later in Aug. 1970 had fallen to 49,042 pupils.

This has a serious effect in the smaller country towns, and I can quote Frankland River as an example, where the school bus will be carrying only 11 children. The minimum at the moment is 12 and the alternative is a subsidised bus service. Unfortunately, one of the parents living in this area is a shearer and for six months of the year he endeavours to earn enough money to develop his farm. He has stated quite emphatically that if his children are forced to rely on a subsidised bus service he will have to remove them from the school which will mean that the number of children carried will be reduced to eight.

If this policy is continued throughout the rural areas it will mean many country schools will be closing down. Even with a subsidised bus scheme the people cannot afford to pay to have their children travelling 60 and 70 miles a day to attend school. So once again I ask the Government to alleviate the plight of parents who are placed in this position.

The situation at the Albany High School is not a very happy one. In spite of allegations of neglect from the present Government, the previous Government did recognise the need for a second high school in the Albany area, and it is on record that this second high school would be ready by 1973. However, the Minister for Education has stated that at this stage he does not consider the situation is such that a second high school at Albany is justified.

At the moment the existing high school is hopelessly overcrowded and I would like to set out a few points relating to this

school which accommodates 1,230-odd children. There is only one room, which measures 32 feet square, to accommodate a staff of 65 people. If desks and locker accommodation are provided within this area members will realise the small amount of space that is left. There is a library measuring 52 ft. x 32 ft. and within this area an office for administration purposes, measuring 10 feet square is provided. This means if books are placed in the library the children are unable to enter the space provided; or, alternatively, the books have to be taken out to enable the children to enter.

Another room being used is a converted cloakroom with a cement floor. It is unheated and in winter it is completely unsatisfactory as a classroom. There are two Bristle prefabricated rooms which are overcrowded and barely satisfactory. An old rural school building is also in use. I do not know its origin, but it is more like an oven in summer and has a low ceiling. This is also completely unsatisfactory.

Another four classrooms have been made from what was originally a wooden manual arts centre constructed in about 1926. The original hall, also a wooden room and erected in 1926, is at present being used as a classroom and is also grossly unsatisfactory. Some 450 yards away from the school is a private shed which is being used as a classroom.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS: The Minister has stated that once the new technical school is completed the present annexe will be available to ease the accommodation situation, but once again, according to the principal of the high school, the technical annexe is already being used virtually full time by the school.

The situation is that of the 40 effective classrooms 12 are substandard and this number represents 30 per cent. Therefore I would again ask the Minister to reconsider his views with regard to the high school at Albany.

I had intended to mention quite a few other matters, but time being short I will have to be rather brief. I did want to support some of the remarks made by the member for Albany with regard to the situation at Albany. I would also have liked to couple the town of Mt. Barker with his remarks. Mt. Barker is in need of a better water service and the Minister for Water Supplies has indicated that a survey is at present being carried out. I would like to suggest that if this project could be speeded up the unemployed in the area might be able to remain if the Government could go ahead with the laying of the pipeline from the Denmark River. It is also necessary of course to give consideration perhaps to continuing the pipeline

to the Cranbrook and Tambellup area. In other words, we want a comprehensive water scheme for the southern areas.

The other topics in regard to which I would have liked to support to some extent the words of the member for Albany were tourism and education; and I did have some ideas on the Knox report. However, I will have to leave those subjects and conclude by referring to the following portion of the Governor's Speech:—

My Government will ask you to encourage Western Australians to positive action in improving the quality of life for this, and for future generations. It is proposed to do this by replacing the unproclaimed Physical Environment Protection Act of 1970 with more effective legislation to provide for an Environment Protection Authority, an Environment Protection Council, and an Environment Protection Appeal Board.

It requires more than this. It requires the realisation of the interdependence of all sections of the community—capital, labour, and the family unit farm. In our democratic society the Government should make laws to ensure that all sections of the community have equal opportunities. We should have laws which prevent capital from exploiting; and laws that require the trade union movement to concentrate on wage and industrial matters, leaving the task of government to those who have been democratically elected to perform the task.

For these reasons I support in principle the legislation for consumer protection, restrictive trade practices, and an ombudsman; and I only regret that there is no legislation for a Bill of rights.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House for listening to me.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.35 p.m.]: I desire to say a few words on the Address-in-Reply debate as I assume it will in all probability come to a close this week.

Mr. Jamieson: I hope not.

Mr. COURT: At the outset I should say that I do not intend to make any long comments regarding the Pilbara area. No doubt members opposite would have expected me to devote most of my time to that particular area. However, I believe the Opposition owes it to Parliament and to the record to take an opportunity on an appropriate occasion to record the real situation in respect of the Pilbara region. It amazes me how the Government seized on the cry that was started by two people with vested interests that there was allegedly no plan when in fact, of course, anyone who has been associated with the development of this State knows that the whole of the Pilbara region has developed