

is to allow a retired coalminer or his dependants, after he has been compulsorily retired from the industry at 60 years, and cannot receive a social services pension until he reaches 65, to earn a little more. In other words, a coalminer compulsorily retired from the industry at 60 years will be allowed to earn, in another form of employment available to him, such remuneration as would not affect his pension rights until he reaches 65.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why don't they allow the coalminer to stay in the same job, then?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: It has been said that in this industry a man has worked sufficiently long when he has reached the age of 60 years. This is because of the great health hazard in the industry, and not everybody reaches the age of 60. Therefore, the thought should not develop that because a miner retires at 60 years he can earn a lucrative income in another industry, because that is not so.

When explaining the object of the Bill to the House the Minister, in effect, said that an application must be made by a coalminer for a pension. This statement rather intrigued me, but on making inquiries I found it is quite correct. It means that a miner attaining the age of 60 cannot continue in his employment even if he should desire to do so. He does not become eligible for social services benefits until he reaches 65. The increased income he will be allowed to earn under the proposal contained in this Bill—if his health will allow him—will actually amount to a mere pittance until he reaches the age of 65, when he can apply for a pension under the social services legislation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 7.59 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 8th April, 1970

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE

Referendum: Petition

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned, residents and electors of the Warren district in Western Australia do hereby pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the subject of the proposed alteration of the law governing the legal drinking age.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to the holding of a Referendum to the people of Western Australia, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 209 signatures.

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE

Referendum: Petition

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [4.33 p.m.]: I have a second petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned, residents and electors of the Denmark Shire area of Western Australia, do hereby pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the subject of the proposed alteration of the law governing the legal drinking age.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to the holding of a Referendum to the people of Western Australia, and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 50 signatures.

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE AND EXTENSION OF TRADING HOURS

Referendum: Petition

MR. YOUNG (Roe) [4.34 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the proposed reduction of the legal drinking age and extension of trading hours as recommended by the recent Liquor Inquiry.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to the holding of a Referendum to the people of Western Australia, and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 201 signatures.

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE

Referendum: Petition

MR. DUNN (Darling Range) [4.35 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned members of the Hills Districts and certain other districts in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the subject of the proposed lowering of the legal drinking age to 18 years of age.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to the holding of a Referendum to the people of Western Australia, and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 551 signatures.

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE AND EXTENSION OF TRADING HOURS

Referendum: Petition

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [4.36 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will grant a Referendum on the question of the proposed reduction of the legal drinking age and the extension of trading hours as recommended by the recent Liquor Inquiry.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to this request; and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 235 signatures.

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

LICENSING ACT: PROPOSED ALTERATIONS

Referendum: Petition

MR. KITNEY (Blackwood) [4.37 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

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

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will grant a Referendum on the question of the proposed changes to the Licensing Act as recommended by the recent Liquor Inquiry.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give immediate consideration to this request; and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is to certify that the above petition conforms to the rules of the House.

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 349 signatures.

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

QUESTIONS (51): ON NOTICE LAND

Mundaring Shire

Mr. DUNN, to the Minister for Lands:

Further to my question of the 26th March, 1970, concerning the former Bellevue-Mt. Helena railway, and in view of the considerable time lapse since its closing, and the fire hazard the area represents—

- (1) What is the up-to-date position in regard to the deliberations of the various bodies concerned?

- (2) Has any target date been set for a final decision?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) The requirements of the Main Roads Department are known. The requirements of the local authority are set out in the shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 1 which is at present under consideration by the Town Planning Board, which will also consider the views of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.
- (2) A final decision on the request by the Mundaring Shire Council will be given as soon as the town planning scheme is approved.

2.

POLICE

Station at Scarborough

Mr. LAPHAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is the police station at Scarborough manned for 24 hours a day?
- (2) If "No" will he have action taken to ensure a 24 hour average in view of the large area covered by the station?
- (3) Are any women police attached to Scarborough station?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Scarborough Police Station is manned from 9 a.m. throughout the day and night until 5 a.m. the following morning. From 5 a.m. to 9 a.m. emergent matters are attended by the resident officer in charge or mobile patrols operating from the C.I.B. or Central Station. This is considered suitable for the present.
- (3) No.
- (4) It is not the present practice for women police to be attached to suburban stations. They operate as found necessary from their base at Central Station.
The posting of women police to country and suburban stations is a matter kept constantly under review.

3.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Appointments

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Premier:

- (1) What are the names and addresses of those persons appointed Justices of the Peace since the 1st January, 1968?
- (2) On what dates were they appointed?
- (3) Who was the nominator in each case?

- (4) What powers, functions, or duties has a Justice of the Peace in excess of a Commissioner for Declarations?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) Statement Tabled.
- (3) All information in connection with nominations for appointment of Justices of the Peace is considered to be confidential.
- (4) Statement Tabled.

4.

POLICE

Natives: Quairading Incident

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Police:

With further reference to the two incidents at Quairading involving alleged police action against natives, is he yet in a position to report to the House and, if not, when does he anticipate being able to do so?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Inquiries have been completed, but in view of impending court proceedings it is not considered advisable that the facts be made known.

5.

NATIVES

Quairading Incident: Police Action

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Has he completed inquiries into the incidents at Quairading several weeks ago and which allegedly involved police action against natives recently?
- (2) If so, will he make a statement to the House?
- (3) If inquiries have not been completed when does he anticipate they will be?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) to (3) Statutory declarations have been completed by the complainants and these are being referred, at their request, to the Commissioner of Police for investigation.

6.

CITRUS ORCHARD

Wiluna

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Referring to my question on the 16th April, 1969, regarding the establishing of a 2,000 acre citrus orchard in the Wiluna district by a Queensland citrus grower—

- (1) Has any development taken place by anyone in this area for the purpose of citrus growing?
- (2) If so, by whom?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No plantings of commercial citrus have yet been made at Wiluna, but preparations are in hand to develop land and facilities for this purpose, and it is understood that limited plantings will be made in the near future. In the meantime, annual horticultural crops are being grown.
- (2) The development is being undertaken by a company operating under the name of Desert Farms Inc.

7. ALBANY HIGHWAY

Waverley: Deviation

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that extensive development is proposed for a shopping complex at Waverley, Cannington, in the near future?
- (2) If "Yes" has his department a proposal or any intention to deviate Albany Highway through this particular area?
- (3) What arrangements is the department making to ensure the safety of pedestrians and ease of traffic flow?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) I am aware that development is proposed on the north side of Albany Highway east of Cecil Avenue, Cannington.
- (2) No.
- (3) There are many existing situations in the metropolitan area where funds are required to ensure the safety of pedestrians and ease of traffic flow. Funds cannot be diverted to solve possible future problems.
It is proposed that departmental officers will discuss the problem shortly with representatives of the developers and the shire council.

8. TOWN PLANNING

"Whaleback"

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Does his department propose to acquire the already gazetted regional open space named "Whaleback" on the northern boundary of the proposed Roe Freeway located in the Shire of Canning?
- (2) If "Yes" what is the proposed use for this land?
- (3) Will the department make available alternative land for regional open space in lieu of "Whaleback"?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) to (3) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, not the Town Planning Department, is responsible for acquiring regional open space. It is at present discussing with the district planning committee the feasibility of acquiring this area, but no decision has yet been reached.

9. *This question was postponed.*

10. EDUCATION

Eden Park Primary School

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When will the grounds of the Eden Park temporary primary school, Westfield, Kelmscott, be sealed and to what extent?
- (2) Is a temporary fence to be constructed for the control and safety of the children?
- (3) If "Yes" when will the fence be erected?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Quotes will be accepted on the 14th April, 1970 for the construction of—
 - (a) an eight-foot wide apron of concrete slabs in front of the classrooms;
 - (b) a concrete slab path to connect to temporary toilets and parking area;
 - (c) a parking area for the permanent school as a playing area for the temporary school.
 The estimated completion date is the 11th May, 1970.
- (2) No.
- (3) See answer to (2).

11. EDUCATION

Kelmscott Primary School

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it intended to construct additional toilets at the Kelmscott primary school for students and teachers?
- (2) If "No" will he have the adequacy of the present facilities reviewed?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The total number of toilets at the school is considered to be adequate for the enrolment.

12. EDUCATION

Roleystone and Karragullen Schools

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

When will another classroom be provided at—

- (a) Roleystone;
- (b) Karragullen, schools?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Roleystone and Karragullen are both listed for additional accommodation on the 1970-71 Loan Estimates.

The proposed additions are dependent on the availability of loan funds for the coming year.

13. LICENSING ACT

Number of Licenses in Western Australia

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) How many clubs are registered in the State?
- (2) How many publicans general, limited hotel, canteen, and wayside house licenses are there in the State?
- (3) Of the numbers in (2) how many are situated within 20 miles of Perth Town Hall?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) 258.

(2) Publicans general	420
Limited hotel	10
Canteen	14
Wayside house	39
(3) Publicans general	140
Limited hotel	9
Canteen	Nil
Wayside house	Nil

14. *This question was postponed.*

15. ABATTOIRS

Committee of Inquiry Report

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

When will the report of the committee of inquiry into abattoirs in Western Australia be made available to Parliament?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The report has not yet been received by the Government.

16. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Special Leases: Useless Inlet

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What are the names of the members of the committee who were appointed earlier this year, or late

last year, to make recommendations in respect of the granting of special leases at Useless Inlet to a consortium headed by Garrick Agnew Pty. Ltd.?

- (2) Which department or departments did they represent?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) A. E. Heagney, Under-Secretary for Lands.

B. K. Bowen, Director, Department of Fisheries and Fauna.

W. Y. R. Gannon, Principal Registrar, Mines Department.

T. J. Lewis, Industries Promotion Officer, Department of Industrial Development.

- (2) Answered by (1).

17. RAILWAYS

Kalgoorlie-Perth

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

- (1) Has a timetable been approved yet for the running of the Kalgoorlie-Perth standard gauge passenger service?
- (2) If not, would he indicate the departure and arrival times which are considered most favourable?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Timetable has not yet been approved and will not be finalised prior to discussion with representative goldfields bodies.

- (2) From Kalgoorlie—2.35 p.m. Sunday to Friday inclusive.

Perth arrive—11 p.m.

From Perth—8.30 a.m. Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Kalgoorlie arrive—4.40 p.m.

From Perth—2.40 p.m. Sundays, Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.

Kalgoorlie arrive—10.50 p.m.

18. GOLDMINING INDUSTRY

Assistance

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

Would he outline the fiscal measures that it would be competent for the State Government to effect for the purpose of assisting the gold mining industry, having regard to the inordinate cost/price ratio confronting that industry?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

The financial resources available to the State Government, in particular the level of the financial assistance grant from the Commonwealth, are not sufficient for this Government to contemplate direct subsidy to the industry.

This is an accepted responsibility of the Commonwealth Government and substantial subsidies are paid by that Government under the Gold Mining Industry Assistance Act.

19. EDUCATION

North Kalgoorlie School

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

- (1) Has he considered a recent and urgent request by the North Kalgoorlie School Parents and Citizens' Association for an additional (demountable) classroom to be erected at the above school?
- (2) When will this classroom be provided?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes. North Kalgoorlie has an enrolment of 528 pupils accommodated in 13 classrooms and the library. The average per class is less than 38 pupils. A demountable classroom is not available at present as existing supplies are needed more urgently at other schools.
- (2) It is proposed to build a cluster of three new permanent rooms at North Kalgoorlie this year—to be ready for February, 1971.

20. WATER SUPPLIES

Glen Mervyn Dam

Mr. KITNEY, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What quantity of water in acre feet has been released from the Glen Mervyn Dam from the 5th December, 1969 to the 31st March, 1970?
- (2) What was the actual amount of water used by settlers in the same period?
- (3) What amount of water was still held in the dam at the end of this period?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 719 acre feet.
- (2) 295 acre feet.
- (3) 164 acre feet.

21. PINE PLANTING

Purchase of Farms

Mr. KITNEY, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) When did the Forests Department commence its policy of purchasing farming properties for the purpose of pine planting?
- (2) How many farms have been purchased each year since this policy was adopted?

- (3) What is the locality, area of farm, date of purchase, and price paid per acre for each individual property?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (3) I ask that this question be postponed until Tuesday, the 14th April. In explanation I might say that in an examination of the position today I found that it would appear that the purchase of land for pine plantings goes back as far as 1924, so quite a lot of investigation is necessary.

The question was postponed until Tuesday, the 14th April.

EDUCATION

Kewdale Junior Primary School

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In view of his answer to question 38 on Tuesday the 25th March, 1969, regarding Kewdale Junior Primary School site location, how does he reconcile his answer to question 38(2) on Thursday the 26th March, 1970?
- (2) Is he aware that as member for the district in good faith I passed on the original information to the local governing authority and other interested organisations?
- (3) In view of the glaring inaccuracy between the two answers would he request his departmental officers to be more careful in future when replying to questions that may lead to the questioner supplying wrong information to persons concerned?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The information given to the honourable member on the 25th March 1969 referred to negotiations which the department was then conducting for extensions to the site of the Kewdale Primary School. At that time the department had no precise knowledge that the new site for the Kewdale Junior Primary School had been vested in the Education Department, as this site had been under consideration for other usage. However, an extensive search which was conducted subsequently revealed that this area had been reserved for educational purposes on the 3rd December, 1967.
- (2) No.
- (3) The information given on the 25th March, 1969, accurately described the situation as known at that time, while that given on the 26th March, 1970, provided additional information which had come to

hand in the meantime. The acquisition of both sites will be an advantage to the department in view of potential growth in the area.

23. *This question was postponed.*

24. EDUCATION

Tuart Hill Senior High School

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Education:

When will the construction of the library of Tuart Hill Senior High School be commenced and what is the expected date of completion thereof?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

A commission will be issued to a private architect in approximately two weeks. The dates for calling of tenders and completion of work are not known at this stage.

25. IRON ORE

Royalties

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

What procedure is followed by way of audit and/or otherwise in order to establish with certainty the tonnage of iron ore upon which royalties are paid to this State?

Mr. COURT replied:

In the case of ore shipped, the tonnage of iron ore the subject of royalty is vouched for by photocopies of the following documents supplied to the Mines Department by the iron ore companies—

- (1) Bill of lading.
- (2) Report of draft survey of vessel at port of loading or certificate of weight, ascertained by an independent inspection company from weightometer readings taken during loading.
- (3) Report of draft survey at port of discharge.
- (4) Final invoice.

In the case of ore carried by the Western Australian Government Railways, and subject to royalty, the tonnage, as recorded by the Western Australian Government Railways and adjusted in accordance with the ascertained moisture content of the ore, is accepted as correct.

In addition, the iron ore agreements ratified by Parliament permit the Minister, or his nominee, to inspect the books of account and records of the companies relative to any shipment or sale of iron ore. Copies of extracts of

these records may be made for the purpose of determining the f.o.b. revenue payable in respect of any shipment of iron ore and companies are required to take reasonable steps to satisfy the State, either by certificate of a competent independent party acceptable to the State or otherwise to the Minister's reasonable satisfaction as to all relevant weights and analyses and to give due regard to any objection made by the Minister as to any particular weight or assay of iron ore which may affect the amount of royalty payable.

26.

TRANSPORT

Glendalough-Perth

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it so that early morning buses leaving from Glendalough for Perth rarely run on time and that some buses take about 40 minutes to do the journey of about three miles?
- (2) If "Yes" what action will he take and when to remedy this?
- (3) If (2) is "No Action", why?
- (4) Is it so that the 5.05 p.m. No. 14 bus from Perth regularly runs late and is overcrowded?
- (5) If "Yes" what action will he take and when to correct this?
- (6) If (5) is "No Action", why?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Checks are continuously taken and buses leave on time. During the morning peak the allowable running time for the trip, which is 5.3 miles, is 36 minutes; this includes delays at congested traffic areas.
- (2) and (3) The service is kept under review.
- (4) Census checks showed that the 5.05 p.m. No. 14 bus was on some occasions departing late because of heavy loading on the inwards trip.
- (5) and (6) An additional bus was introduced into the service on the 31st March and results have been satisfactory.

27. APPRENTICES AND TRADESMEN

Numbers in Western Australia

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) For each of the years ending the 30th June, 1967, 1968, and 1969, what was the number of apprentices in—
 - (a) the electrical and metal trades industries;

- (b) the building trades industry—
 (i) for five-year term;
 (ii) for less than five-year term?
- (2) For each of the years ending the 30th June, 1963 to 1969, what was the total number of apprentices registered in—
 (a) the metal trades industry;
 (b) the building trades industry?
- (3) For each of the years ending the 30th June, 1963 to 1969, what was the total number of—
 (a) tradesmen employed in industry in Western Australia;
 (b) electrical and metal tradesmen employed in industry in Western Australia;
 (c) building tradesmen employed in industry in Western Australia?
- (4) In respect of his answer to question 38 of the 24th March, 1970, could he advise the reason why the 1,911 total shown differs from the 2,145 total appearing in the March issue of the Master Builders' Association journal?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) (a) 30th June, 1967	3,836
30th June, 1968	4,183
30th June, 1969	4,493

(b)

	(i) 5 Year Term	(ii) Less than 5 Year Term
30th June, 1967	1,525	50
30th June, 1968	1,579	97
30th June, 1969	1,506	177

(2)

	(a) Metal Trades	(b) Building Trades
30th June, 1963	2,217	1,052
30th June, 1964	2,422	1,214
30th June, 1965	2,736	1,423
30th June, 1966	3,011	1,491
30th June, 1967	2,937	1,575
30th June, 1968	3,152	1,676
30th June, 1969	3,346	1,753

(3) (a) and (b) This information is not available.

(c) The following figures supplied by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics refer only to carpenters, bricklayers, painters and plumbers working on jobs carried out by builders of new buildings—

30th June, 1963	6,094
30th June, 1964	7,017
30th June, 1965	7,478
30th June, 1966	7,344
30th June, 1967	8,608
30th June, 1968	10,109
30th June, 1969	11,395

(4) No, the correct figure is 1,911.

28. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION FLATS

Eden Hill

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Who was the original plastering subcontractor for the Jaxon Construction contract for State Housing Commission flats in Korbosky Road, Eden Hill?
- (2) What period of delay has been caused to the contract by faulty plastering?
- (3) Has the State Housing Commission any financial responsibility in this subcontract?
- (4) Has the faulty workmanship now been corrected?
- (5) Has the contractor been given additional time to complete his contract as a result of this problem?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The commission deals with the main contractor. All matters relating to subcontracts are the concern of the main contractor.
- (2) According to the contractor—four (4) weeks.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No request for an extension of time has been received.

29 and 30. *These questions were postponed.*

31. RIVERS

Canning: Deepening of Upper Reaches

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that the mosquito problem along the Canning River is the worst it has been for years?
- (2) To assist in the conservation of the Canning River together with assisting in the control of mosquito breeding, would he be prepared to approach the Swan River Conservation Board to—
 (a) deepen the upper reaches of the Canning River;
 (b) use spoil to fill stagnant pools;
 (c) generally clean up banks on either side?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I will refer the matter to the Swan River Conservation Board for a report with a view to giving further consideration to the problem.

32.

EDUCATION

National Production

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What proportion of the growth in national production is spent on Government schools in Western Australia?
- (2) Has his department made comparisons with other countries or States?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Growth in the national production of Australia is reflected in the increase in the total expenditure of the Government of this State. The proportion of this growth in national production going to Government schools can best be seen by examining the increasing percentage of State expenditure going to education. The following figures taken from Consolidated Revenue Fund estimates of expenditure illustrate this increase—

Year	Total State Expenditure	Education Expenditure	Education as Percentage of State
	\$	\$	
1950-60	131,587,452	17,231,614	13.13
1962-63	153,687,286	22,810,762	14.40
1966-67	228,173,962	36,735,733	16.10
1967-68	249,009,203	41,223,031	16.50
1968-69	276,136,050	49,441,255	18.82
Est. 1969-70	313,143,000	55,376,000	17.68

- (2) Comparisons have been made but the different systems of national accounting used by various countries and the decision as to which items of expenditure should be classified as education expenditure make the interpretation of such comparisons very difficult and of doubtful value.

Even State comparisons are very difficult because of the various classifications of expenditure.

33.

RAILWAYS

Indian-Pacific Service

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) In connection with the Indian-Pacific rail service from Perth to Sydney, what is each State's proportion of—
 - (a) first-class fare;
 - (b) economy-class fare?
- (2) With regard to passengers entraining from Adelaide for Sydney, what is—
 - (a) cost of first-class fare;
 - (b) cost of economy-class fare;
 - (c) each State's proportion of these fares?

- (3) During the period week ending the 5th March, 1970 to the 26th March, 1970, how many berths were vacant for the through journey Perth to Sydney?
- (4) How many South Australian allotments were not taken up for the abovementioned periods?
- (5) Has any complaint been received from the Commonwealth Railways with regard to loss of revenue from unfilled allotments?
- (6) What notice is given to the Western Australian Government Railways booking office with regard to South Australian unfilled allotments?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Perth-Sydney "The Indian-Pacific".

	1st class single	1st class return
	\$	\$
W.A.	16.75	31.57
C.W.	37.66	70.10
S.A.	6.98	12.80
N.S.W.	26.26	49.23
Total	87.65	163.70
	Economy single	Economy return
	\$	\$
W.A.	12.82	24.35
C.W.	28.44	53.37
S.A.	4.89	9.00
N.S.W.	20.35	38.48
Total	66.50	125.20

- (2) Adelaide-Sydney "The Indian-Pacific".

(a) 1st class single \$33.60; 1st class return \$60.88.

(b) Economy single \$27.25; Economy return \$48.28.

	1st class single	1st class return
	\$	\$
S.A.	8.55	14.45
N.S.W.	25.05	46.43
Total	33.60	60.88
	Economy single	Economy return
	\$	\$
S.A.	6.57	11.51
N.S.W.	20.68	36.77
Total	27.25	48.28

- (3) First-class—Nil.
Economy-class—26.

(4) Nil.

(5) No.

(6) Eight days.

34. This question was postponed.

35.

SEWERAGE

Bentley

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Will he advise when the following institutions will be completely sewered—

- (a) W.A. Institute of Technology;
- (b) Ningana Home for the Frail;
- (c) Longmore Assessment Centre for Boys;
- (d) Nyandl Assessment Centre for Girls;
- (e) Baptist Theological College;
- (f) New Minbalup Day Activity Centre?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) The W.A. Institute of Technology is being sewered at present.
- (b) to (f) It will be necessary to provide a new pumping station to the east of Hayman Road and Kent Street intersection to sewer these institutions.

As they are non-ratable properties, the Metropolitan Water Board does not provide finance required for this work.

Sewerage connections can be made to the properties within twelve months of funds being made available to the board.

36.

PENSIONERS

Assistance

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Premier:

What forms of assistance, concessions, and benefits of whatsoever nature are granted by the State, including under State law, to persons in receipt of social service pensions and to organisations which cater for these people?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

Assistance, Concessions and Benefits Granted to the Social Service Pensioner.

- (a) Blind persons—

Free metropolitan travel and two country rail passes per year.

- (b) Social service pensioner who qualifies for free medical treatment under the Pensioner Medical Benefit Scheme—

Transport—

Approximately half-fare concessions on all metropolitan and country public transport services.

Medical—

Hospitalisation—subsidised to an estimated value of \$12.00 per day.

Free outpatient clinic services.

Free prosthetics (artificial limbs, etc.).

Free loan of home aids (wheelchairs, special beds, etc.).

Dental—

Free dental services.

- (c) Invalid pensioner and the invalid pensioner when transferred to an age pension—

Motor vehicle license—

Free where the income per week does not exceed the basic wage.

Half cost where the income per week does not exceed \$6.00 above the basic wage.

- (d) All social service pensioners—

Transport (restricted to North-West residents)—

Free return travel on State ships once in every two years.

Emergency relief—

Subject to the particular necessity (granted under the Welfare and Assistance Act).

Land Tax and Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax—Exemption.

Rates—

Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage, Country Water Supplies, Country Towns Sewerage, Water Boards, Land Drainage, Rights in Water and Irrigation—Deferment.

Housing—

Rebate of S.H.C. rents subject to means.

Assistance, Concessions and Benefits Granted to Organisations which Cater for the Social Service Pensioner.

Grants and subsidies are made to a number of organisations, some specifically related to the social service pensioner and others mainly associated with the social service pensioner. These are too numerous to list. The honourable member's attention is directed to pages 46 to 49 of

the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1970.

37. **WHEAT**
Quotas

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will he outline the basis of allocation of wheat quotas to each category of farmer?
- (2) What categories of wheat producers will have no quota whatsoever this year?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) An announcement will be made within a few days regarding the method of applying Wheat Quotas in Western Australia for the 1970-71 season.
- (2) Farmers who have not delivered wheat to the Australian Wheat Board during the seven years prior to the 1st April, 1969 will not receive a quota entitlement unless they qualify as new land farmers.

Mr. Graham: Scandalous!

38. **PAINTERS' REGISTRATION BOARD**
Complaints

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) During 1969 how many reports were made to the Painters' Registration Board concerning faulty or inferior painting?
- (2) In how many of such cases were the complaints sustained?
- (3) Of these, how many respectively resulted in—
 - (a) the complaint being rectified by the painter concerned;
 - (b) the complaint being rectified by another painter at the direction of the board;
 - (c) the registration of the offending painter being suspended;
 - (d) the registration of the offending painter being cancelled?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 203—in regard to both painting and paper-hanging.
- (2) 188.
- (3) (a) 188.
(b) Nil.
(c) 1.
(d) Nil. Five registered painters were cautioned to uplift their standards or disciplinary action would be taken.

39. *This question was postponed.*

40. **PORTS**
Wyndham

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

Is it envisaged that the existing port facilities at Wyndham would continue to be used for the landing and handling of general cargo if and when a deepwater port is developed at Still Bay or an alternative site in Cambridge Gulf?

Mr. COURT replied:
Yes.

41. **RIVERS**
North-West: Fish Steps

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Public Works Department and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna given consideration to the provision of "fish steps" at one of the man made structures on the Ord or Fitzroy rivers?
- (2) If "Yes" with what result?
- (3) If "No" when will the matter be considered?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. The Department of Fisheries and Fauna issued a report at the end of 1969 titled "Report on the Baramundi Fishery in Western Australia." This report discussed the migratory habits of the baramundi in the northern rivers and possible "fish steps" at the Fitzroy barrage and the Ord Diversion Dam.
- (2) Further research on the habits of the baramundi is required before the necessity for "fish steps" at structures on northern rivers can be determined.
- (3) Not applicable.

42. **FRUIT**
Imports to Kimberley from South Australia

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that an article appeared in the Press recently quoting South Australia's Agriculture Minister as saying that his State's biggest danger from fruit fly infestation lay in Western Australia and claiming that of 22,675 vehicles which were stopped at Ceduna for checks in 1969, 22 of the vehicles carried infected fruit?
- (2) In view of the apparent fact that less than one in a thousand vehicles had carried infected fruit and considering the improbability

of people from the East Kimberley region bringing fruit to the south of Western Australia, will he consider relaxing the ban on the importation from South Australia to Kununurra and Wyndham of apples, pears, quinces and grapes?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am prepared to look further into this matter.

43. CROWN LAND

Kimberley: Private Auctioneers

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has consideration ever been given to the use of private auctioneers for the conduct of Crown land sales at northern centres?
- (2) Based on previous experience and after taking the salary, air fares and hotel accommodation of a Government auctioneer into consideration, would it be more economical from the Government's point of view to have land sold on a commission basis?
- (3) Will consideration be given to utilising the services of a resident auctioneer at Kununurra for the forthcoming land sale in that town?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) It is considered desirable for the Government Auctioneer to conduct the sale referred to.

In addition to economic considerations the auctioneer is required to dispose of Crown land in accordance with the provisions of the Land Act. Some auctioneers might not be conversant with that Statute, and infringements may occur.

44. PENSIONERS

State Concessions

Mr. HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government been considering for six months whether or not State concessions will flow to persons receiving a pension under the tapered means test amendments approved by the Commonwealth Government in September, 1969?
- (2) If so, can he now make a decision?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) Information sought as to the procedure being followed by the Commonwealth and other

State Governments has been obtained and is now receiving the attention of Cabinet. A decision will be made in the near future.

45.

NATIVES

Ceremonial Sites: Protection

Mr. HARMAN, to the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) How many aboriginal sacred, secret or ceremonial sites or combination of such type sites were recorded by the W.A. Museum during 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68?
- (2) What is the total number so recorded?
- (3) Will legislation "to protect important sites and objects of aboriginal origin" referred to in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech on the 25th July, 1968, be introduced this session?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Sites in the categories sacred, secret, or ceremonial were recorded at the W.A. Museum between 1965 and 1969 as follows—

1965	108
1966	53
1967	18
1968	61
1969	32

- (2) Total number of sites—including archaeological sites—recorded in that period is 375. Approximately 650 sites are known altogether.

It should be noted that the categories under which these sites are listed are subject to future analysis and possible revision.

The Government has provided funds for the appointment of a department and registrar of sites by the trustees of the museum during 1969-70. The registrar of sites will co-ordinate studies and collate information relating to sites. It is anticipated that this work will commence during 1970.

- (3) No.

46.

FRUIT FLY

Compulsory Baiting Scheme

Mr. HARMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he received complaints relating to the efficiency and effectiveness of the compulsory fruit fly baiting scheme where it applies in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Does he contemplate any further action in respect of this scheme?
- (3) If so, can he give details and when such action will be taken?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes. Difficulties have been experienced due to the very favourable conditions for build-up of fruit fly this season coupled with problems of recruiting and retaining satisfactory baiting staff.
- (2) and (3) These schemes are implemented if agreed to by a poll of ratepayers eligible to vote. They are a service to the community financed by a levy and administered by a local committee. Government assistance will continue to be limited to an initial subsidy and technical advice. Control in commercial orchards is not dependent on control in the metropolitan area.

47. *This question was postponed.*

48. MOORING FACILITIES

Seagoing Racing Yachts

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) As the river is becoming crowded to overcrowded by large and small pleasure craft, has he or the Government any intention of creating safe mooring facilities outside Fremantle moles for seagoing racing yachts?
- (2) If so, where would such facilities be provided?
- (3) Would any associated expense be the responsibility of the Government or a shared responsibility by the Government with the various clubs having appropriate craft?
- (4) If there is any intention of creating such facilities, when is work likely to commence on the project?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department has prepared plans of a suitable small boat harbour to cater for ocean sailing craft.
- (2) The plans show a suggested location south of the existing fishing boat harbour and extending southwards to Scott Street.
- (3) The site is within water areas under control of the Fremantle Port Authority. Last year this authority gave a business syndicate a 12-month option of the site to enable them to carry out a feasibility and cost study of their proposal to establish a boat harbour with full servicing facilities. The option time has not yet expired.
- (4) Answered by (3).

49.

TRANSPORT

M.T.T.: Fuel Reserves

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What reserves of fuel were held by the M.T.T. on Thursday, the 2nd April, 1970?
- (2) When was the decision not to run buses over the Easter period taken and by whom?
- (3) What was the approximate fuel requirement for bus services over the Easter period in each of the last three years?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) M.T.T. has storage tanks at each depot. On Thursday, the 26th March, when officials of the Transport Workers' Union were given permission to check, the total reserves at the eight metropolitan depots was 2,369 gallons.
- (2) The announcement that it would not be possible to operate buses until stocks of fuel were obtained was made by the Chairman of the M.T.T. late on Thursday, the 26th March. This was after the second request to the Transport Workers' Union for the M.T.T. to be treated as an essential service, had been turned down.
- (3) 1967—8,374 gallons.
1968—8,690 gallons.
1969—8,960 gallons.

50. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 14th April.*

51. UNECONOMIC SMALL FARMERS

Number in Western Australia

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

In view of the statement made recently by the Minister for Primary Industries, the Hon. D. Anthony, that the net income figure of \$2,000 per annum is accepted as an academic criterion of the uneconomic small farmer, will he indicate the number of farmers which fall into this category in Western Australia?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The choice of \$2,000 as the cut-off point for "low income" farms is a judgment taking into consideration factors such as the level of the basic wage and the average earnings of industrial workers. All farms averaging \$2,000 per annum or less are not problem farms, although some are. Low net farm incomes can reflect factors such as early development

stage, a high family labour content, or a conscious desire for substantial leisure. Some are part-time or retirement enterprises or are operated by people who might not expect to earn a larger income in any alternative enterprise.

There are no recent figures available to indicate the number of farms in Western Australia which have farm incomes below \$2,000 per annum.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE TRANSPORT

M.T.T.: Fuel Reserves

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to my question 49 on the notice paper: In view of the fact that the M.T.T. held in excess of one-quarter of the fuel required for the Easter periods during the last three years, why was it not possible to provide a skeleton service to the public over the recent Easter period?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

The M.T.T. held approximately one-quarter of the supplies of fuel needed in previous years, and it did not want to inconvenience the public to a great degree as had been done by the Transport Workers' Union as a result of its action. We felt that had we endeavoured to run a service it would have been only a partial service. We did not know what part of the service should be run, so we felt it best to discontinue the services at that time.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. O'Neil (Minister for Labour), and read a first time.

2. Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Opposition), and read a first time.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. O'NEIL (East Melbourne—Minister for Labour) [5.9 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.10 p.m.]: I would like to take this last opportunity of again voicing objection to

the proposed amendment to section 8 which attracted the attention, and drew the disfavour, of certain members of the Opposition last evening. I do this for the purpose of asking the Minister whether he will consider—before the Bill proceeds and finally passes another place—trying to convene the *ad hoc* committee which brought forward these propositions for the purpose of bringing before the notice of the members of that committee the objections we raised to the proposed amendment to section 8. This amendment is to reduce the period of time in which a worker is able to sustain a claim for compensation for diseases included in the third schedule.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melbourne—Minister for Labour) [5.11 p.m.]: As I understood the trend of the debate in the Committee stage of this Bill last night, the member for Kalgoorlie indicated that the committee which he now asks me to reconvene did not have his wholehearted support. I think he indicated that the committee was not completely conversant with the matter under discussion. I pointed out quite clearly that this committee consisted of the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board as its head; members of the Trades and Labour Council—in fact, members of the workers' compensation committee of the Trades and Labour Council, and I might point out here that one of the representatives from that organisation happened to be the employees' representative on the Workers' Compensation Board—together with the State Government Insurance Office and other insurers, as well as the Employers Federation.

I am certain those people gave adequate consideration to the point raised, which was apparently a submission by one of the parties represented on the committee. The ultimate determination of the committee as a whole was to not recommend this particular proposal.

I cannot give an undertaking that I will call together this *ad hoc* committee—as it has been referred to—to consider this point. However, I am certain that its members will read the report of the debate that has taken place in this Chamber and will appreciate the attitude adopted by the member for Kalgoorlie and his opinion of them. I can only indicate to him that this matter will receive some consideration.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

SHARK BAY SALT PRODUCTION

Control of Inlets: Motion

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [5.13 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of the House no lease of any inlet or portion of any inlet other than which was covered

by temporary reserve No. 4172H, Useless Inlet, and Lands Department special lease No. 3116/3451, Useless Loop, be granted or if granted shall not be enclosed for the production of primary brine for the production of salt until:—

- (a) the proprietors of the solar salt project at Useless Loop can produce salt profitably by using the already enclosed areas, namely Useless Loop and that portion of Useless Inlet which was the subject of temporary reserve No. 4172H;
- (b) a joint survey, conducted by the Fisheries and Fauna Department and the Tourist Development Authority over a period of five (5) years, determines that the closing of any inlets or portions of any inlets will not be detrimental to the commercial and other marine life living and breeding in the waters of Denham Sound, Freycinet Reach or Freycinet Estuary, Shark Bay, or to the livelihood of the people of Denham;
- (c) it can be proved that any area closed off can be rehabilitated if reopened at a later date.

Since I moved a disallowance motion in respect of temporary reserves last September a great deal has happened. The first thing that happened was a news item published in *The West Australian* on the 6th November, 1969. It was quite a lengthy item, but it dealt with a report issued by the Adelaide Steamship Company on its subsidiary company, Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. In that report the company pointed out it was having a good deal of technical trouble with its production of salt; that it was trying to sell the enterprise, or to find a partner to continue with it; but it also pointed out that there was no Australian chemical company that wished to participate in the venture, and at the same time it called in Bechtel, an American consultant firm, to make a report on the production of salt in that area.

The next Press report appeared in *The West Australian* dated the 13th March, 1970, which is similar to a report published in *The Financial Review* on the 16th March, 1970. I think I should read this report to the House because it sets out quite clearly what is happening to the Shark Bay solar salt areas. It reads as follows:—

Solar Salt Venture adjusts to New Conditions at Shark Bay

For long the problem child of Adelaide Steamship Co. Ltd., the solar salt venture at Shark Bay in Western Aus-

tralia has again encountered a snag for its new operators, a consortium of developers.

Partly because the areas are fish nurseries, the consortium is to give up rights to 19,000 acres of temporary reserves granted to Shark Bay Pty. Ltd. in the Brown Inlet and Depuch Loop regions in February, 1967.

Instead, the consortium will be offered a lease over 15,000 acres including an area already dammed under the terms of the temporary reserve. in Useless Inlet.

However, the consortium believes it is possible to develop a major salt industry by reorientating its plans to the Useless Inlet area, where it is already active.

Concentrated brine from the primary concentration area goes by open flume to Useless Loop, about 15 miles north, to supply a crystalliser at the main works area.

The operating consortium headed by Garrick Agnew Pty. Ltd., took over the salt project last year from Adelaide Steamship.

Previously, the consortium was involved solely in a gypsum venture in Shark Bay.

It plans to export at least 500,000 tons of salt a year soon, raising this to one million tons annually over a longer term.

I interpolate here to say that the production figure is excessive and this is a matter with which I will deal later. Continuing—

Adelaide Steamship had spent \$5.8 million on the salt project up to the end of last year, before handing the venture over to the local developers.

Another \$2.8 million is now being spent on the project.

A partner in the consortium is the listed Amad N.L., whose chairman, is Mr. Kenneth McMahon, head of Mineral Securities Ltd.

Cancellation of the temporary reserves followed recommendations made by a committee of senior officers from the W.A. Departments of Fisheries, Lands, Mines, and Industrial Development.

The committee studied the area that could be made available to Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. when the company asked for an extension of its temporary reserve in Useless Inlet to allow expansion of the primary brine concentration area.

It can be seen, therefore, that a great deal of activity has taken place since I last spoke on the subject. It now appears

that the Government has granted another 8,800 acres of Useless Inlet to the new company, Shark Bay Gypsum Pty. Ltd.

Also, since last speaking in the Chamber on a similar subject I have received a petition addressed to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna, the Minister for Mines, and the Minister for Tourists, and it reads—

We, the undersigned, residents of Shark Bay, hereby petition you to not permit the areas known as Brown Inlet (Temporary Reserve 4173H) and Depuch Inlet (Temporary Reserve 4174H) to be sealed from the ocean at Freycinet Estuary, Shark Bay, for the purpose of a source of primary brine for the solar salt project at Useless Loop, Shark Bay, until the following can be conclusively proved:

- (1) That the proprietors of the solar salt project at Useless Loop can produce salt profitably by utilising the areas already closed, namely Useless Loop and Useless Inlet.
- (2) That a joint survey conducted by the Fisheries and Fauna Department, the Mines Department, and the Tourist Development Authority over a three to five year period, determines that the closing of Brown and Depuch Inlets will not be detrimental to commercial and other marine life living and breeding in the waters of Shark Bay, or to the livelihood of the people of Denham.
- (3) That the areas mentioned above can be rehabilitated if closed and re-opened at a later date.

That petition was framed and signed prior to the people at Shark Bay learning of the news items which have appeared in the Press. The petition is signed by 180 people who are living and working in Shark Bay. Following this, on the 24th March, 1970, I received three telegrams. The first is addressed to me and is from P. M. Colliver, President of the Shark Bay Progress Association. It reads as follows:—

This Association strongly opposed to the granting of further acreage of fish breeding and nursery areas within Useless Inlet Shark Bay for salt/gypsum production stop a petition in respect Brown and Depuch Inlets temporary reserves 4173H 4174H reflects feeling of Shark Bay community toward any repeat any further closure of Shark Bay waters.

That telegram confirms that the local residents are still of the same opinion as that which they expressed in the petition.

The next telegram is from J. Poland, who is President of the Shark Bay Fishermens' Association, and it reads —

Fishermens Association strongly object to granting of additional acreage of nursery at fishing area within Useless Inlet stop industry cannot stand additional drop 5/10 per cent of catch as stated by director of fisheries.

The third telegram is from Mr. J. M. Lee-Steere, the shire president, which reads as follows:—

Shark Bay Shire Council herewith lodges strong protest to further closure of areas at Useless Inlet can foresee collapse of whiting fishing here further drop in income to fishing industry as forecast by director would seriously effect economy of district stop revenue of salt works paltry to shire stop shires obligation must go to fishing industry the backbone of Denham.

I thoroughly agree with the remarks expressed in all those telegrams, particularly those of the shire president of Shark Bay.

I now wish to recount a little of the history of this industry, because it deals with the first point set out in the motion; namely, the economic production of salt within the area now enclosed. Useless Loop was closed in 1963. It is an area of 4,888 acres, and was the initial evaporation area fed with seawater which went on into the primary ponds and then into the crystallising area, which is closer to the sea. In itself, this was a small project, and the area has now become a crystallising site for the production of salt at that point.

In these production areas only one pumping operation was necessary; that is, the pumping of the water from the sea into the primary ponds, and from there the primary brine was gradually fed into the crystallising areas.

On the 18th November, 1966, application was made for a temporary reserve of 6,000 acres of Useless Inlet. This was eventually closed by two bars. One was placed at Bibbigiddee outcamp and was completed by the end of February, 1967, well over a month prior to the granting of the temporary reserve to that particular company. How this occurred, I do not know, but this portion of the inlet was closed off before the temporary reserve was granted.

The second bar followed almost immediately, being put across from a point known as Guano Dump. This meant that 6,000 acres was closed off, and of course the evaporation progressed very rapidly. The southern area, the first to be closed, had an average depth of 11 feet, and the second area to be closed had an average depth of three feet. It can be readily realised that the second area to be closed

off would evaporate more rapidly than the first, and this is what actually happened.

From the depths I have mentioned it will be seen that it was necessary to pump the primary brine across the bar at Bibbigdee into the northern bay that was closed off and then pump it another 14 or 15 miles by open flume into the crystallising areas. Of course every time the pumping operation is carried out, the cost of production is increased. Therefore in view of the high operating costs I cannot understand how the venture could prove to be economical. The price received by Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. was \$9 c.i.f., so it can be realised that there was not a great deal of profit to be made.

Up to a month ago these areas had not been recharged. By that I mean the fluids had been evaporated and pumped out and for nearly four years no water had been put back into them. Therefore not much use had been made of them. In regard to the production of salt over the total period, exports have been made over the past two years, but the total tonnage exported has been less than 200,000 tons. In its last year of operation, Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. lost over \$800,000.

When this temporary reserve was applied for Mr. Dodd, who was the manager of Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. at the time, in putting in an application to the Fisheries Department for the closure of the areas concerned stated that he anticipated the company would produce 500,000 tons of salt per annum from the Useless Loop area; and that if he were given the other areas, which were referred to in a previous debate, the company would produce 1,000,000 tons of salt per annum. I should point out that 500,000 tons of salt per annum was to have been harvested and processed from just over 10,000 acres of enclosed inlet areas.

When Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. really got worried it called in the Bechtel Pacific Corporation to undertake a survey. In this connection a report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 25th October, 1969. This is an abridged report of Bechtel Pacific.

The SPEAKER: You have, I presume, verified that this is a factual account of the report?

Mr. NORTON: The report states that the Adelaide Steamship Company had lost more than \$800,000, and that this was revealed in the company's latest report. I take it this information is authentic, because the company revealed it. I assume this is an abridged report for the Press. It states—

The American consultants, Bechtel, had advised in July that hydraulic transportation should be replaced by a causeway linking the island to the mainland.

To interpolate, the method adopted for transporting the salt from the mainland to the island was the slurry process. The salt was mixed with brine and pumped through a conduit to the island. The report continues—

To ensure continuity of production, a further source of primary brine supply would have to be piped over several miles to the present pond system.

All of this would cost at least \$2 million and though the company's consultant believed it would enable the company to produce at least half a million tons of good quality salt annually, they could not guarantee success. There was a risk element.

In other words, there was a risk element. Here we find this firm, Bechtel, saying that the venture was virtually uneconomic.

If we read some of the debates which have taken place in this House in respect of other salt agreements we will see just what the companies concerned asked for and what they expected. All the other companies which have developed a solar salt industry have done so on land which could not be used for any other purpose.

According to the debate in this House, when Dampier Salt first approached the Minister it intimated that it planned to put salt over a part of the sea which was a prawn nursery; but the Minister gave the company an alternative area, so the prawn nursery was not included. So, some cognisance was taken of the productivity of certain of the areas that were required.

If we examine the Dampier salt agreement we will find that the company was granted 28,600 acres, and that its estimated production was 650,000 tons of salt a year—which is an average of 23 tons per acre. If we look at the Leslie salt agreement—and this company is probably the most experienced of the salt project operators in Western Australia—we will see that it asked for the release of 48,000 acres to achieve an estimated production of 1,000,000 tons of salt per year. This company estimated that the production of salt in that area would average 20.8 tons per acre.

Under its agreement, Exmouth salt obtained a lease over 30,000 acres, and it expected to produce 800,000 tons of salt per annum, or an average of 26.6 tons per acre. From the figures which I have given it will be seen that the estimated production of salt per acre by the salt producers mentioned is, on the average, in the vicinity of 23 tons per acre.

We now find that Shark Bay Gypsum, which is the company now operating in the Shark Bay area, has been given a further 8,800 acres of inlet. It therefore has approximately 20,000 acres on which to evaporate the seawater. According to

the report given by Mr. Garrick Agnew, the company expects to achieve a production of 500,000 tons of salt in the very near future, rising to 1,000,000 tons. This will mean that he expects to start off by harvesting 25 tons of salt per acre, rising to 50 tons of salt per acre. This shows that either he is not *au fait* with the production of salt from seawater, or else it is his intention in the very near future to make a further application for at least another 20,000 acres in the same loop. That would then give the company—if it was lucky—a production potential of 1,000,000 tons of salt a year.

As the Minister for Industrial Development told us when he introduced the Bill containing the Exmouth salt agreement, the salt production areas do not employ very many men. In fact, he said that Exmouth Salt would expect to employ less than 50 men. In Mr. Dodd's application to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, for the closure of Useless Inlet, he said that the company would employ between 30 and 40 men in that area. So, the companies do not employ very many men in the production of salt after the projects have been established.

One of the reports discloses that 83 men are employed at Useless Loop at the present time. That is quite correct, because the company which is contracting to do the construction work—that is, to build the causeway from the mainland to the island—has quite a big work force there; but if we took that work force away I doubt whether there would be 40 men engaged in the production of salt in that area.

As I understand the position, when Garrick Agnew Pty. Ltd. went into production at Shark Bay it intended mainly to produce gypsum. If we look at the answer which was given to a question I asked recently, we will note that Garrick Agnew and his associate company have 14 mineral claims for gypsum in that area. Even if this motion was agreed to, the company would not experience any hardship, because it has ample room for expanding the production of gypsum whilst it is endeavouring to prove the productivity or otherwise of salt in the area.

The next section of the motion calls for a survey to be undertaken in relation to the closure of the loops and inlets which have been shut off, to ensure that such closure will not be detrimental to the livelihood of the people in Shark Bay, or, as I should call it, Denham.

We should look into the history of the fishing industry since the commencement of the salt industry. A committee comprising senior officers of the departments concerned was appointed recently to make a recommendation as to what area should be allocated to the new company. Mem-

bers will recall that the Minister for Industrial Development stated that this committee consisted of Mr. A. E. Heagney, the Under-Secretary for Lands; Mr. B. K. Bowen, Director of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna; Mr. W. Y. Gannon, Principal Registrar of the Mines Department; and Mr. T. J. Lewis, Industries Promotion Officer of the Department of Industrial Development. We therefore find that top-ranking officers of four Government departments made the recommendation; but one wonders just how far and into what reports these officers went before they made the recommendation.

If we look at a document that was tabled in the House on the 15th October of last year we find that it contains two reports by Mr. B. K. Bowen. One of them was made by him when he held the position of Senior Research Officer in the Department of Fisheries and Fauna. I shall not read all the report, but only those portions which are appropriate. This report is addressed to the director, and is dated the 18th November, 1966. That was exactly the time when Mr. Dodd of Shark Bay Salt applied for the temporary reserves over these inlets. The report states—

The areas required by Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. are most certainly occupied by small fish of commercial importance at the present time. Last year Research Officers Slack-Smith and Lenanton carried out a brief study of Useless Inlet area, especially that part which Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. now requires for the production of salt. The study showed that the area is important for small whiting, snapper, yellow-fin bream and mullet. It is not possible to say exactly what part this Inlet plays in the maintenance of the Shark Bay fishery. However, there is little doubt that the shallow water areas of Shark Bay are of major importance as a habitat for small fish and as these habitats are destroyed the fishery will gradually decline.

The annual production of fish from Shark Bay is usually about 1.2 million pounds, with the dominate species being whiting (0.4 million pounds), mullet (0.45 million pounds), and snapper (0.3 million pounds). These are the species, the young of which inhabit the lower portion of the inlets.

Snapper also support a fishery outside Shark Bay. During June, July and August Fremantle fishermen work the snapper patches and catch up to 1.5 million pounds per year worth approximately \$150,000. Recruitment to this fishery is also probably dependent upon the Shark Bay nursery areas.

I might mention that some years ago Mr. Bowen carried out a long survey into snapper fishing in Shark Bay. His survey particularly covered the area mentioned in the last paragraph of the report.

The same document contains another report by Mr. Bowen, made when he became Director of Fisheries. The report is dated the 1st April, 1968, and is addressed to the Director, the Department of Industrial Development. The report is headed, "Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd." and reads as follows:—

I have been perusing the file in this Department on the Shark Bay salt project, and have noted that the Company has a mineral reserve over part of Useless Inlet, Boat Haven Loop and Depuch Loop. I have also noted that the subject was discussed at a recent meeting of the General Fisheries Advisory Committee held in Shark Bay. Many of the Shark Bay fishermen were perturbed that Boat Haven Loop and Depuch Loop might be cut off to the sea before the feasibility of the venture had been proven in terms of the original expectations.

In a minute on our file, Mr. Fraser advised my Minister that Mr. Dodd, of Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd., had said that if the Company's application for the Useless Inlet area was granted, the production of salt would rise to some 500,000 tons annually.

Again, we see that the company is estimating that it will produce 500,000 tons of salt from 10,000 acres. That is, 50 tons of salt per acre, which is not at all practicable. To continue—

Later, if the Cararang area (Boat Haven Loop and Depuch Loop) could be secured, production could possibly be doubled. If the Useless Inlet area, which has now been cut off for about 12 months, does produce 500,000 tons annually then there is no doubt, I presume, about the success of the venture in terms of the original expectations. Also, under these conditions the closure of the Cararang area would be an obvious next step. However, from what I can gather, there are fears in Shark Bay that the Cararang area will be closed off before final success has been assured.

I think the next portion of the report is very interesting, because it refers to a discussion which Mr. Bowen had with one of the lecturers in Geology at the University of Western Australia. I refer to Dr. B. W. Logan, and I quote from the report as follows:—

Quite recently I raised this matter with Dr. B. W. Logan, Geology Department, University of Western Australia, who has been undertaking research in Shark Bay for a number of years and

has a very sound knowledge of shallow water areas in the Bay. I found that he also had considerable doubts about the success of the venture to date, and the return likely to be forthcoming from the Useless Inlet area. It is mainly because of the comments of Dr. Logan that I thought I should draw the matter to your attention for any action you consider might be desirable.

Here, again, is another person who should know and he has his doubts as to the profitability of the venture. To continue—

Dr. Logan has advised that the northern segment of the Useless Inlet area, which was closed off about six months ago, now contains a very small quantity of water because of the extremely high evaporation rate. He questions the economic feasibility of pumping this water into the southern segment and then gravity feeding it to the Useless Loop area.

That is the point I queried earlier this evening. To continue—

He also has some concern about the effect of cutting through sand dunes to put down an open drain from Useless Inlet to Useless Loop.

The drain he refers to is the open flume which carries the primary brine to the crystallising area. To continue—

If large amounts of the holding vegetation are destroyed, considerable trouble could eventuate with shifting sand, as is the case in a nearby area.

This could come about quite easily when some of the large sand dunes are shifted for construction work. The sand will shift as is the case in other areas. To continue—

The subject of the height of the freshwater table has also been raised in relation to the wells on Cararang Station. I am advised that the water level has fallen and that this might be correlated with the reduction in the salt water level, by evaporation, in the areas now closed to the sea.

I might mention that the wells at Cararang Station have gone dry, and no doubt this has been caused by the reticulation of the water through the limestone to the inlets which have been closed off. To continue—

There is little doubt that the closures, both extant and contemplated, are desirable if the original expectations of the venture are assured. However, some doubts have been cast in my mind by the various pieces of information which have been brought to my notice. I believe, therefore, that it would be a pity if permission were granted for the Cararang areas

to be closed off before the feasibility of the venture had been proven in terms of the closures effected to date.

I would be most grateful if you would give me any information which would permit me to allay the concern in Shark Bay that Boat Haven Loop and Depuch Loop will be closed off before the success of the Useless Inlet closure has been evaluated in terms of the original expectations, and shown to be successful.

There again Mr. Bowen is very doubtful of the success of the venture. I do not think he had much opportunity to out-vote the other members of the committee if he still had the same thoughts. I very much doubt that he would have altered his opinion to any extent in that respect because he knows the area so well. As I have already said, he has carried out research there.

In the same report it will be seen that the local fisheries inspector shared the same concern. His reports are quite short but he emphasises the effects when he states as follows:—

The closing of these areas would have an adverse effect on the fishing in the Shark Bay area.

That is the essence of the report which he forwarded to the Fisheries Department when the area was first closed off. Referring to the falling-off of fish production in the area, I asked the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna to confirm a newspaper report which stated that the closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet at Shark Bay would reduce the production of fish by 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. only. That does not sound a very great percentage, but if we examine the actual figures it will be seen that the estimate of 10 per cent. is a long way from the actual effect. I would like to quote from the preliminary report on whiting fishing at Shark Bay. I wish to read two extracts, and the first is dated the 5th December, 1967, and reads as follows:—

It is suspected that the fall to a lower level from 1964-1967 (Fig. 11, 111) is a result of the Salt Works closing off valuable nursery areas in early 1963. Another substantial nursery area was closed off in August 1967. This may further deplete the fishable stock.

Later the report reads as follows:—

On August 14 last at a public meeting held at Shark Bay fishermen presented a request to the Committee that no further shallow water areas be made available for salt production in Shark Bay. The fishermen contended that these were nursery areas for prawns and fish.

The Committee obtained a report from Research Officer R. C. J. Lenanton who is conducting a research

project on the whiting fishery at Shark Bay. A copy of this report is attached hereunder.

Incidentally, the report is not contained in this file. To continue—

His report indicates a sufficient decline in the whiting fishery to suggest that there should be no increase in the fishing effort on that fishery.

Although it is suspected that the closing off of nursery areas for salt processing has contributed to the decline, it is not possible to say conclusively at this stage that this is so.

It can be seen that research officer Lenanton was of the opinion that the closing of the loops and inlets would have an adverse effect.

Mr. Bovell: He did not go so far as to say that; he said there was no proof to show that was so.

Mr. NORTON: I will now refer to some questions I recently asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna. My first question was as follows:—

- (1) Has any research been done over the past two years into the effects on the fishing industry by the closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet for salt production?

The Minister replied:

- (1) No research specifically related to effects of salt industry in the Shark Bay fishery.

It can be seen that no research has been done in this respect. It has been taken for granted that everything will go along quite nicely. My questions continued—

- (2) If "Yes" has his department been able to reach a firm decision; if so, what were the findings?

The reply was—

- (2) No firm decision has been reached. The Director of Fisheries has advised that it would take years of detailed research to determine the precise role Useless Loop and Useless Inlet play in the life history of the various Shark Bay fish populations. However, an examination of Shark Bay shows that Useless Loop and Useless Inlet form a relatively small percentage of the total area. The director has further advised that it could be said from this examination that the loss of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet to salt might result in a 5 to 10 per cent. reduction in the fish populations.

The young fish do not go into open waters. They go into bays and inlets where they are protected from storms and bigger fish. Besides the natural protection, the inlets and loops at Shark Bay have some particular attraction for small fish. Those inlets have a slightly higher salinity than the

surrounding sea. I am also advised that the inlets contain a type of plankton which develops very rapidly and which is one of the main sources of food for the young fish and prawns.

It is wrong to say that the area involved is small as far as fish nurseries go. Fish nurseries are not to be found in open waters such as Shark Bay itself. As I said before, the fish look for the creeks and estuaries in which to feed and grow. One report stated that whiting took three years from the stage at which they entered the nursery until they became of fishable size. The figures which I shall produce shortly reflect the drop in the catch over that period.

Regarding the decline, I now want to refer to the report on the Shark Bay fishery submitted to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna by the General Fisheries Advisory Committee on the 17th November, 1967, which was about the time the pinch was being felt in the fishing industry. The conclusions, which are on page 1 of this report, state—

1. The committee considered it to be important that both the fishery and the fish processing works be maintained at Shark Bay because of the contribution they make to the economy and living standards of the local community.

There are a number of other things, and No. 8 states—

8. As the fishery can only decline with the closing of nursery areas for salt production no further leases for this purpose should be granted in Shark Bay, without reference to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna.

We cannot say that reference has not been made to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna because we find that Mr. Bowen was a member of the committee which made recommendations just recently.

Mention is made of Shark Bay whiting in this report. It says—

However, there has been a decline in the last three years of catches of whiting and snapper. These species are important as they bring the highest prices . . . whiting represents approximately 30% of the catch and 50% of the value . . .

It can be seen that whiting is one of the most important species in Shark Bay; it is second to snapper.

Regarding the closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet, the committee's report states—

The Committee found opinion unanimous that the closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet for the production of salt was harmful to the fishery. These were nursery areas for prawns and fish.

Three years after the closing of Useless Loop there was a big drop (60,000 lbs.) in the whiting catch. This period represents approximately the time it takes for whiting to grow from spawning to catchable size.

The committee formed the opinion that the shallow water areas of Shark Bay are inhabited by juveniles of the dominant species in the catch. They felt that there is little doubt that further closing off of these nursery areas can only lead to the continued decline of the fishery.

This will mean a lower take of fish and a lesser supply of fish available to the local processing works.

I now want to have a look at the actual decline in the fisheries and compare it with the decline stated by the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna; namely, between 5 and 10 per cent. Taking the figures for the five years from 1964 to 1968, supplied to me by the department through the Minister, the decline from 1964 to 1965 was 11.7 per cent.; in the next year there was a further decline of 14.8 per cent., and this is getting into the period when the fish would have been most affected by the closing of these areas; the next year showed a drop in the decline to 13.6 per cent. In 1968 we get to the levelling off period, when the decline was 4.7 per cent.

The total decline over the period from 1964 to 1968 was 37.5 per cent. which, taken over a catch of about 1,500,000 lb. of fish, amounts to a very considerable poundage and is quite a loss for the fishermen and the district. Since then it has been difficult to get an accurate figure because at that time the fish processing works closed down on account of the shortage in the supply of fish, and the fishermen had to get rid of their fish in the best way they could.

One of the fishermen bought a mobile freezer and put in a small freezing plant; he was thus able to take some of the catch from the fishermen. Later, another fisherman put in a small plant of his own and another small factory opened up. A very reduced catch was then able to be handled in Shark Bay. Therefore, after the closing of the processing works owned by Planet, the figures are not a reliable indication of the actual catch in the area or the maximum catch that the area could actually produce. It was a big blow to Shark Bay when the factory closed down and the fishermen were laid off, one might say. Quite a number of women who had been employed in the processing works were also put off at the same time.

The third point raised in the motion is the opening of the loops for their natural purpose if the salt project becomes uneconomic. I still say, as I have always said, that these areas cannot be opened again as natural nurseries for fish. It has to be remembered that once these loops are closed off and salt is evaporated

a sediment of gypsum occurs, and when the gypsum is deposited on the bed of the ocean it causes the bed to become barren. By that I mean it kills all the sea vegetation which is so necessary for the production of food for the young fish which have not been long out of the egg stage.

These inlets which are being closed off are such that they cannot be flushed. They are inlets which run into the land and come to a dead end, so it is not practicable to flush them or to wash out the gypsum. Gypsum is not sufficiently soluble to be dissolved by passing water back over it, as can be done with salt.

Examples of barren sea are a bay at Hamelin Pool and a bay at Port Maud, about 150 miles north of Carnarvon, which is probably known to most people as Coral Bay. The last-mentioned bay is in two or three sections, and there is one section where the sea is completely devoid of sea vegetation or fish of any sort. I believe that is due to a gypsum sea bed which has prohibited the growth of the various forms of sea vegetation which encourage the fish. Hamelin Pool is virtually a dead sea and it is never empty; it merely ebbs and flows, which has caused the sea bed there to become absolutely barren, there being no fish or vegetation in certain parts of it.

If, by removing the bank, these inlets could be flushed out that would be at least some compensation, in that they could be returned to their natural function of harbouring and feeding the small fish which are so valuable to the industry in Shark Bay. These things must be thoroughly investigated.

The motion also refers to the tourist potential, which is becoming quite a big feature at Shark Bay. With the closing of the loops it is becoming less attractive; previously quite good fishing and quite big fish were to be found in these areas. I was told by the overseer of Carrarang Station that at the southern end of Useless Inlet, which was closed, large numbers of snapper carcasses were heaped up on the edge of the enclosed area, where they had died; he estimated that the weight of these fish would be anything from 15 to 20 lb.

These inlets and loops are very popular places for tourists. Carrarang Inlet is a particularly attractive place; it has two very large hills on either side of it; it is approximately 20 to 25 miles long, and it is quite deep. Not only does it give good fishing; it also gives protection to people who are not used to the waters of Shark Bay. Many people like to take a boat and go out to fish in the open sea, but there are others who like to fish in the sheltered spots, particularly when there is also reasonable scenery. Snapper is the fish that the average tourist likes to catch, and the decline in the production of snapper has lessened the interest of the visit-

ing fishermen. If they have to go out into the more open waters to catch this fish, they are likely to give Shark Bay away for some nearer spot, such as Kalbarri, in the Premier's electorate.

Sitting suspended from 6.13 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. NORTON: Prior to the tea suspension I was saying how it was considered that the closing of the various loops and inlets at Shark Bay would tend to affect the tourist industry as well as the fishing industry. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not against development; I want development. However, when development is taking place we must consider what reaction it will have on any industry or industries already established within the district.

Over the past 50 years a wet fish industry has been established at Shark Bay. This is an industry that has built up the town, and the people of the town have been able to exist and, in fact, have thrived over a period of time as a result of that industry. On the other hand, over the past seven years, a salt industry has developed but all reports indicate that this industry will not be an economic one. In fact, if we look back over the seven years we find that less than 200,000 tons of salt has been produced. Indeed, firms like Bechtel Pacific, which is a consulting engineering firm established in America, have indicated that they have grave doubts about its future. Dr. Logan from the University also has expressed grave doubts about the industry, as did the Director of Fisheries in his report. All these people have expressed grave doubts about the economic value of the industry and concern about what it will do to the fishing industry.

Therefore we have to decide whether we want a salt industry, which has every prospect of killing the fishing industry or whether we want the fishing industry to continue and maintain and stabilise the town as it has done in the past.

Mr. Bovell: Can't the two industries work together?

Mr. NORTON: We find that those engaged in salt production have big interests in gypsum and, as I said previously, Garrick Agnew Pty. Ltd. has 11 mineral claims in relation to gypsum and, in conjunction with Pilbara Minerals, another four claims. Therefore, those interests are not short of areas in which developmental work in relation to gypsum can take place. While those interests are exporting gypsum they can develop the salt industry that has already been established. If the industry is established in the proper way there is no reason why the company cannot produce the 500,000 tons of salt on the area already allocated, although I have grave doubts about the economics of it.

Garrick Agnew claims that he will increase production to 1,000,000 tons; but, as I said before, either he does not understand salt production, or, in the very near future, he will be submitting a claim for another 20,000 acres.

A new plant has been established at Shark Bay for the processing of fish and it has cost \$100,000. It is a plant that can process 1,500,000 lb. of wet fish every year. That is sufficient to keep 30 fishermen employed in supplying fish, and a factory of that type would employ between 50 and 60 on its staff throughout the year. So it can be seen that the fishing industry alone can virtually support over 100 people in the town; whereas the salt industry, from information I have been given, and according to figures given in debate in this House, would not support more than 30 or 40 people.

The telegram from the shire council, which I read to the House, indicates that the council is not behind the salt industry. As a matter of fact, the industry is a big liability to this small shire which has a very small income and practically no equipment. The shire is responsible for maintaining 90 miles of road from the turnoff at the Shark Bay road to Useless Loop, where the salt works are located. While the Main Roads Department helps out in supplying the necessary machinery, and some money, it is still a big responsibility to the shire. In addition, the money the shire receives from the salt industry is practically nil because the rates are extremely low and very few of the company's vehicles are licensed with the shire; they are operated within the boundaries of the lease. So the shire gets virtually nothing from the salt company but it is responsible for maintaining 90 miles of dirt road although, as I said, the Main Roads Department does help out.

The point is this: Do we want to maintain a stable industry, which has developed itself over the years, and is capable of continuing with very little help from outside, or do we want to support an industry which has a very doubtful future and one which, at the same time, could kill the industry which has been the means of supporting the town over the years? I trust that members will analyse what I have said, and when the matter comes to a vote they will take these points into consideration and ask themselves what industry they would want in their districts. Would they want one which is not likely to succeed or one that has proved itself and has been prosperous over the years?

Mr. Bovell: Both industries can work together.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister has no idea; he has not been there. He knows Bunbury and places like that, but he has

never been in areas similar to those to which I have been referring—

Mr. Bovell: My word, I have!

Mr. NORTON: —to see what is going on. I trust the House will give the motion every consideration and vote in favour of it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands).

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Police Act Amendment Bill.
2. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

FISHERIES ACT

Disallowance of Regulation 3AA: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 25th March, on the following motion by Mr. Jones:—

That "Inland Fishing License" regulation 3AA, made under the Fisheries Act, 1905-1969, as published in the *Government Gazette* on the 17th December, 1969, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 17th March, 1970, be and is hereby disallowed.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [7.41 p.m.]: I find this motion for the disallowance of inland fishing license regulation 3AA a most interesting one; and it was particularly interesting to listen to the speeches delivered by the mover of the motion, the member for Collie, and his colleague, the member for Warren.

I think one of the most significant points in each of those members' speeches was that they seemed to have no doubt about the necessity for the conservation of the species. Perhaps if I could be more specific I would think that the opposition that has been raised, and the point which roused the member for Collie, was in regard to marron fishing more than any other type of fishing. Actually, marron fishing is a most popular sport in the south-west, and I was probably indulging in it before most members in this Chamber were doing so.

There are a number of ways to fish marron. One can have a scoop net or a drop net, but when I was young the way I liked best was to snare marron. This is a sport, whereas the other ways are merely scooping marron or catching them in a drop net. I suppose scooping marron is a sport, but netting for marron with drop nets is not really a sport at all. Members who indulge in marron fishing as a sport will appreciate that. Snaring marron is a sport of no little consequence.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Those days have gone.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I still think one can find places in the south-west where it can be done.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I would like you to show me some.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In any case, the interjection of the member for Warren seems to indicate clearly that the days to which I refer, when I was young—which was some considerable time ago—have gone and the conditions which I experienced no longer apply. This indicates the necessity for stringent conservation measures; but I reiterate the point I made: Both members seem to realise the necessity for action of some kind along the lines to which I have just referred.

In 1967 the Government appointed a research officer (Dr. N. Morrissey) who undertook research into the trout and marron sport fisheries in Western Australia. The appointment was made as a result of concern expressed by country people as well as city people, and the concern was centred around the fact that unless some action was taken, both of those sport fisheries could be fished out and the native sport fishing of marron could well go into complete discard.

In his report Dr. Morrissey has shown quite clearly that the percentage of larger marron in the streams is being progressively reduced as fishing pressure increases. With the greater use of the motorcar and with more tracks giving access to various rivers in the south-west, serious inroads have been made into the marron population. We also find that trout fishing at this point of time—as a result of the drought year—is also in jeopardy.

I say again that I am not sure of the role that is played by the member for Warren, because I heard him make a most interesting speech some time ago—I think it was possibly last year or the year before—in which he stressed the danger of over-fishing and the necessity for conservation measures of some kind in relation to fishing in Western Australia.

We find that there is necessity to take some action, but as soon as one who is in a position to make a decision makes that decision, somebody else gets up and says it is the wrong decision; that such a decision should not have been made and that something else should have been done. That this should be so is, I suppose, all part of human nature.

The Government feels that the decision made is the correct one; that it is one which will more properly balance the need for conservation of the various species and at the same time meet the people's desires and requirements.

The people concerned cannot have it both ways; they cannot have their cake and eat it. The question of conservation is not applicable only to trees, or to rivers, or to beauty spots; it applies to everything that requires conserving and the Government is taking the action it is as a conservation measure.

Both members who have spoken to the motion—and I refer to the mover of the motion and the member for Warren—represent areas where the fishing of inland waters for various species is considered to be a very attractive pastime.

The action taken by the Government has been at the request of people who are concerned about the position quite as much as the two gentlemen here are concerned.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is merely a matter of interpretation and clarity of regulation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has endeavoured to give an interpretation of the manner in which the regulation will be administered. He has gone to Press on these matters.

Some of the remarks made by the members who have spoken on the question of sport fisheries and on the matter of conservation, generally, were rather surprising and it would appear that in certain cases perhaps not sufficient research has been carried out by them.

It should first be established that since 1963 it has been necessary to hold an amateur fisherman's license before one can legally take marron. This fact seems to have escaped the understanding, certainly, of one of the members who has so far spoken. This is a very significant matter.

The member for Warren probably appreciates this fact, because he mentioned that the license should not cost \$2 but \$1. If I remember rightly that is what he said. The amateur fisherman's license has been virtually divided into two parts and under the new regulations it is necessary to have an inland fisherman's license before one can take marron, red-fin perch, trout, cherabin, barramundi, and cobbler. These licenses are supposed to cost \$2.

There are members in this House who can verify the fact that if a party goes prawning, only one member of the party needs a license. It is obvious that if one is going to use a net for the catching of prawns, one is usually accompanied by someone else. There is, however, a bag limit. The same sort of thing applies with the taking of marron. One license will permit the taking of a bag of 30 marron.

Mr. Jones: When taking marron you only require one person to handle the net.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If a man takes his family and only has one license he is entitled to take a bag of 30 marron.

Mr. Toms: But if he has six licenses?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Then he can take a bag containing six times 30.

Mr. Toms: A family of six can take six nets and as long as the father has one license they can take 30 marron.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Under the one license the six could only take a limit of 30 marron.

Mr. Jones: He is the only one who could use the net.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not think so. This would not be so in the interpretation of this regulation. The basic idea is conservation. That is the entire point and, of course, as the regulation stands at present it is not perfect by any means. It could be circumvented in a number of ways. For instance, it could be circumvented by paying more money, by getting more licenses, and so on. But the attempt to do something is there. In any case, for one to be able to legally take marron one should have had a license since 1963.

It seems to me that the main complaint made by the members concerned was that they did not see the need for a license and they particularly did not see the need for a license for children or pensioners. The main reasons for the introduction of licenses are conservation and the establishment of a body to whom one may refer for information. This will give an indication of the pressure on the particular resources. Those who want to enjoy the sport, and who wish to enjoy the continuation of such a sport, should be prepared to pay \$2 a year; they should appreciate the fact that the department would be interested in these matters whether it was administered by a Liberal Government, by a Country Party Government, by a Coalition Government, or by a Labor Government.

As we all know there are certain costs involved in the administration of these sport fisheries, though I do not think the sum involved is very great. I agree with those who feel that too many licenses are required in our day-to-day life and that this becomes a burden on the people. I am sure we all feel this from time to time.

These actions, however, are not taken lightly; they are not taken with a desire to impose further paper work on Government departments, or to make things inconvenient for the public at large. The reason such action is taken is for purposes of conservation. The department feels that with the passage of time the present bag limit of 30 marron might well have to be reduced, particularly in the light of what is taking place. It might be found that the number will not stop the reduction of the population of marron and other species of fish in our inland waters.

Mr. May: Would not the situation ease if there were better policing during the off-season?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is a very sound suggestion. As a matter of fact the policing of fisheries has been increased and will continue to be increased but, as I said earlier, the administration of all this costs a good deal of money and it is felt that the people who indulge in the sport should perhaps pay a moderate sum for the sport they enjoy.

It will undoubtedly be necessary to try to police this aspect more and more and it is hoped—though I know it is probably a forlorn hope—that the majority of people will have a sense of responsibility about this state of affairs. As a matter of fact I know a large number of people who are really quite responsible while indulging in this sport. It is mainly the irresponsible people in connection with whom it is necessary to take action.

I would like now to touch on the question of licenses for school children and pensioners. School children are not required to hold a license if they are accompanied by parents who hold licenses. I mentioned this aspect earlier. If school children are, however, unaccompanied by their parents, they will be required to hold a license. If such children desire to fish and take their bag of 30 marron they must hold a license. If this were not so, what would be the good of having a license at all; what would be the use of having a bag limit?

Mr. Jones: Do you mind repeating that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: School children accompanied by parents are not required to hold a license, but if they wish to take a bag limit of 30 marron it would be necessary for them to have a license. If a father and son go fishing and they want to bring back 60 marron they must each have a license.

Mr. Tonkin: How does that conserve marron?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the Leader of the Opposition had been listening he would have heard the point I was making.

Mr. Tonkin: I have been listening, as you will find out.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will be looking forward with eager anticipation to hear what the honourable member has to say.

Mr. Tonkin: You will not be disappointed.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am agog, as always, to hear the words of wisdom that flow from the lips of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Tonkin: I have been following you closely and you have been putting your foot in it all the time.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is interesting, and I would like to hear the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. Does this mean he proposes to take

the matter out of the hands of the member for Collie?

Mr. Tonkin: I am only going to support him.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I thought the Leader of the Opposition might follow his usual procedure. It is also felt by the department that the requirement of a license will assist children in understanding the necessity for conservation and that in effect it will be a step toward adulthood. It is hoped that it will impress on the children the necessity to obey the laws of the land with particular emphasis on the conservation of all the species of fish and wild life which constitute a real feature of Western Australia.

The Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has pointed out to me that to allow any group of people to fish without first having obtained a license would undermine the whole principle regarding the securing of information concerning the pressure being brought to bear upon the resources available.

The question was asked why cobbler and perch had been included. Here again it is felt that some doubt exists about these matters and if people fish for these species, the department must eventually be faced with a problem concerning the welfare of them. It has been considered desirable that children and pensioners be licensed if they wish to take their bag limit; but, again, it has been pointed out to me by the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna that it is very difficult to foresee—and, indeed, it is highly improbable—that any child would be prosecuted under this regulation. That is about as much as I can say about the possibility of children being prosecuted for taking more than their bag limit or for fishing without a license. It is the education aspect we are considering in this respect.

I would imagine that, in the main, children will be warned about these matters—and continually warned—in an endeavour to educate them so that they will realise that any action they might take could militate against the continued existence of the various species.

A query was raised as to why 30 had been decided as the limit. I have already indicated that this number might well have to be reduced in the future. One of the reasons for this particular number being decided upon was that 30 was perhaps a reasonable number for a reasonably-sized family. In other words it was felt that 30 marron might be a fair number for a meal or two for a reasonably-sized family.

I have one other comment I wish to make. The member for Warren stated he did not find a great deal of fault with the other provisions in the regulation. He added that he believed the policing of

this regulation was of considerable importance; and this matter was also raised by interjection by the member for Clontarf.

Mr. May: How would they police someone fishing for marron from 11 p.m. until 1 a.m. the following day? If the license covers one day's fishing, what would be the situation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member has just referred to one of the difficulties which arises right throughout the whole facet of policing all regulations and laws, including the laws already on our Statute book.

Mr. May: I raised the matter because marron are mainly caught at night, and, indeed, late at night.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Might I say that inspectors do not operate only in the daytime?

Mr. Tonkin: There will not be any inspectors.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am referring to the men who will police the regulations. We are merely changing the name. We all know that the Leader of the Opposition is an erudite person; but we all know the expression, "A rose by any other name . . ." In the same way, "An inspector by any other name . . ." We all know that the Leader of the Opposition was teaching at a time when inspectors in schools were inspectors indeed. However, I am waiting with anxiety to hear the Leader of the Opposition on this matter, but I hope he will contain himself for a few moments longer.

We know it will be difficult to police the regulation. This is undoubted. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to police the regulations applying to the rock lobster industry. Many infringements are still taking place concerning undersized rock lobsters. In the same way we know that many difficulties will be associated with the policing of the inland fisherman's license. However, every effort will be made to police it with the limited resources at our disposal.

It is believed that the majority of people will accept this regulation in the spirit in which it has been promulgated, and endeavour to be as sportsmanlike as possible in the taking of the various species of fish concerned. This attitude generally applies in regard to duck shooting. By and large, people have regard to the bag limit concerning ducks, and also the seasons. Is it therefore too much to hope that the same situation will apply concerning the taking of trout and marron?

I would like again to refer to the fact that the two speakers who have taken part in the debate so far have been incorrect in asserting that four licenses will be

necessary. Actually only two will be required. The member for Collie was incorrect in saying that a license was not for the moment necessary for the taking of marron, because such a license has been necessary since 1963.

Mr. Jones: Not many knew about it.

Mr. Toms: Not many have been caught during those years either.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The interjections of both members are probably very true; but it is a legal fact that such a license has been necessary and now the cost of the license has been set down at \$2, which is a very small amount to enable people to anticipate the continuation of the sport in future years. The license fee will also assist in defraying administration costs.

I believe that this regulation should be given a trial. It is important that we should follow the situation closely to ascertain whether or not any relaxation might be possible in the future or whether it will be necessary to impose further restrictions. I believe that, by and large, members appreciate this very point. I also want to remind all members that this regulation has no regard whatever to politics. As I said right at the outset, the regulation has been promulgated as a means of trying to conserve the species of fish which should be preserved for the future. It is a facet of conservation which is important. I therefore believe that we should reject the motion of the member for Collie.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [8.9 p.m.]: I have some admiration for the way the Minister struggled manfully to submit what is really a very weak case—one of the weakest I have known.

Last Monday I had the pleasure, in company with the member for Blackwood and the member for Wellington, to be present at a meeting of the South West Shire Councils Association. One of the items on the agenda, and submitted by the Shire of Bridgetown, was carried unanimously. It reads—

That a protest be made to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna against the recent amendment to the inland fishermen's regulations making it necessary for a license to be obtained at a cost of \$2 for catching marron and cobblers.

That is the considered opinion of the delegates from the shire councils in the southwest, and in due course the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna will, I take it, be in receipt of this protest.

So the member for Collie and the member for Warren, in supporting the disallowance of this regulation, are really putting into effect the desire of the South West Shire Councils Association; and one

can very well understand why they want to do just that. The Minister attempted to show that the basic idea of this proposal is conservation. If that were true it would be most laudable.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is one of the reasons.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister said it was the basic reason.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes, the Minister did. I copied it down when he said it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Show me where you copied it down. Let me see it.

Mr. TONKIN: I will let the Minister see it, but I want the notes back straightaway. The messenger will show the Minister what I wrote down. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will permit a slight pause to enable the Minister to see it. Is the Minister satisfied?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But you did not write down the rest of it.

Mr. TONKIN: That is what I wrote down: the basic idea is conservation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is one of the basic reasons.

Mr. TONKIN: Now it is one of the basic reasons! If the Minister wants to correct his speech after he has made it I suppose I cannot stop him. All I can do is to follow him when he makes it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Fair enough. Make your point.

Mr. TONKIN: Let us see how much conservation there is going to be. The license is to cost \$2. That will scarcely cover the paper work. How much money will be available from these licenses which are taken out to provide for any system of policing at all? Absolutely none. It will be non-existent, and there will be no attempt to police this regulation because there will be nobody to police it. There will be no inspectors or anybody else, because there will be no money to pay them. I cannot imagine the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna will use other funds from his department for the purpose of sending inspectors out in the middle of the night to see whether people are catching more than 30 marron. The fact of the matter is there will be no policing at all, so no steps will be taken for conservation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not true.

Mr. TONKIN: There will be no more conservation as a result of this regulation than there was before. I put this question to the Minister: It is true that a license was required to enable a person to take marron, but how many people have been prosecuted in the last 20 years for taking marron without licenses? I suggest not one.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And what has been the result?

Mr. TONKIN: I suggest also that in the next 20 years no-one will be prosecuted under this regulation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is the result? Why is the member for Warren worried about this?

Mr. TONKIN: He is worried about the regulation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He is worried about the conservation of the species.

Mr. TONKIN: This will not take away his worry, because there will be no policing.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We are taking a step to try to do something about the matter.

Mr. TONKIN: Not a single delegate present at the South West Shire Councils Association meeting at Bunbury on Monday last felt there would be any policing at all. If I remember rightly they had some indication from the Minister that there would not be any, but I am not sure.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: As I understand it there will be.

Mr. TONKIN: Who will pay for it? Will the cost be met out of the \$2 licenses?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There are men employed by the department from time to time to do the work. You ought to know that.

Mr. TONKIN: I think the Minister will agree that, from the license fee of \$2 from the few people who will apply for these licenses, there will, after the paper work is paid for, be no money left to pay for the employment of inspectors to police this regulation.

The Minister talks about a bag of 30 marron per license. If a party of 15 people go out to catch marron, and they are not satisfied with a catch of 30, they will not hesitate to pay \$2 each for a license. If they do, they will be able to catch marron by the thousand. How will that aid conservation?

If it were to be stipulated that no one party could catch more than a certain number of marron, one might say there was some reasonable attempt to ensure that a large number of marron would not be caught; but if all one needs is a \$2 license to catch 30 marron, then people who go out on a marron party will be prepared to pay the \$2 for a license so that they can catch any number of marron, if the marron are there to be caught. So, as a method of conserving the marron, this regulation is completely futile; and that is what the south-west shire councils thought about it—and not only thought about it, but said it.

I think these words of the Minister are pitiful: Every effort will be made to do our best. That is, on conservation. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much effort can you afford to make on a \$2 license?

The Minister said every effort would be made to do the best. These are just words with no meaning whatsoever, and with no possible effectual result.

Let us look at the absurdity of this matter. A licensed fisherman who fishes on the coast catching snapper, herring, or any other fish, will be required to take out a \$2 license in order to catch a few marron. He is already a licensed fisherman operating on the coast, but if he wants to catch a few marron one night for a party, he has to obtain another license to do so. What a farcical situation!

I think the whole thing is ridiculous, and whoever thought up the idea does not deserve any promotion. It is neither one thing nor the other. If it were intended to conserve marron, then the license should have been of sufficient value to ensure that people would be careful about going out to catch marron, and there should have been some attempt by the department to do other than say, "We will provide inspectors, so you be careful if you catch marron without a license." Within a very short time it will be known that people can catch marron whether or not they have licenses, because nobody will worry about the matter. So, the whole situation will become farcical.

The Minister also said that one of the reasons—not the basic reason—was to enable the department to obtain some information. How much information can the department expect to obtain from school children who go out and catch marron? Will they be filling in returns and saying that on the Monday night they caught 15 marron, and on the Wednesday night they caught 25 marron?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But there will be many responsible people who will give the information.

Mr. TONKIN: The information will be valueless, because the department will not be able to ascertain from the figures submitted whether they represent 10 per cent., 15 per cent., or 50 per cent. of the actual catch. So, for the purposes of computation the information will be of no value at all.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine that responsible delegates of shire councils in the south-west, which is the area concerned, would have unanimously passed a resolution protesting against this regulation, if they did not believe that the position was ridiculous and that the regulation should never have been promulgated? That is the situation, as the member for Wellington and the member for Blackwood could tell the House if they were so disposed. There was not a single argument in support of the proposition and, without any hesitation at all, the intention to protest to the Minister was carried.

Consequently, there is every justification for the action which has been taken on this side of the House by the member for Collie. I hope members will be sensible on this subject, will support the south-west shire councils in their protest, and will throw out the regulation.

MR. JONES (Collie) [8.21 p.m.]: I listened with interest to the Minister's reply and I agree with my leader when he said that the Minister was really battling to answer the case put forward by the member for Warren and myself. Had we been in an industrial court instead of the Parliament and had heard the Minister trying to give the reasons why the Government had introduced this measure, the president of the court would have said, "Case dismissed" and "No case to answer." This is the precise position in which we find ourselves tonight. At no time did the member for Warren or I argue against the necessity for conservation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But you do not want anything done.

MR. JONES: We did not argue along those lines, and I will deal with the Minister's comment in a moment.

The Minister completely evaded one of the main questions I raised when moving the motion; namely, the right of pensioners to be able to catch perch and cobbler without a license. Reference to the motion I moved in the House will clearly prove that I raised this matter as one of the main arguments in opposing the acceptance of the regulation. The Minister has not made one reference to this question in his reply tonight. He did not mention the plight of pensioners or of school children, who will be compelled to have a license to catch perch and cobbler.

I should like to consider the points he raised in sequence; but in fairness to him, I do not think he put up a very good case. The Minister started off by saying that it was a very interesting subject. He said he had listened with interest to the views expressed by myself and the member for Warren. He then referred to the question of conservation. However, the member for Warren and I did not argue against conservation, because we feel there is a need for conservation in some form or other.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What form?

MR. JONES: The Minister then moved on to other matters I had raised and said that my arguments were centred mainly around the size of the catch permissible for marron and the license required by every person to catch marron. Nowhere during his reply did he mention school children; and the position, so far as they are concerned, is still very clouded to say the least. Reference to the speech I made

on Wednesday, the 25th March, will show that even one of the shires in the south-west is still not clear on what the regulation prescribes. Apparently the Minister is of the opinion that the regulation will remain in the form in which it is gazetted. However, he did not explain the full intention of the regulation.

Reference to the speech I made on Wednesday, the 25th March, will show that the Bridgetown Shire is concerned about the intentions of the regulation. The shire council wrote to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna and asked for his interpretation as to the meaning of the regulation. Reference to the *Blackwood Times* of the 6th March, 1970, will show that the position was not clear then and it certainly has not been clarified by the Minister's reply tonight. I should like to refer members to the main part of the letter written by the Minister to the Bridgetown Shire Council on the 6th March, 1970. I quote—

With regard to your concern for boys in your district, I cannot imagine any circumstances which would lead to a prosecution being taken out.

However, I refer members to regulation 3AA "Inland Fishing License" which says—

3AA. (1) A person who catches or attempts to catch for his personal use any species of fish described in the Schedule to this regulation by any means of capture shall hold an inland fisherman's license which shall be issued in Form B4 in the Appendix to these regulations.

Then the number of different fish which come within this category is listed.

On the one hand, the Minister has said tonight that if a school child goes out with his parents and participates in fishing, the Minister does not think a prosecution will be taken against that child, even if he uses a net contrary to the regulations.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It happens with prawning.

MR. JONES: However, the Minister also said that if the child went out on his own he would have to obtain an amateur fisherman's license. What is the difference? This was one of my major complaints when I moved the motion, but the Minister completely evaded it in his reply.

I raised the matter of pensioners, too, but the Minister completely evaded my questions. What will the position be so far as pensioners are concerned? Where does the Government stand on this issue? I said that pensioners should be able to catch cobbler and perch in inland areas without requiring a license, in the same way that pensioners are able to fish at seaside towns, but the Minister completely

evaded this point. In this regard, he did not mention the question of conservation of perch.

There is no shortage of perch in our rivers. In fact, in my view they are a menace to the existence of marron and also of trout. Anyone who has had experience in this type of fishing will know that perch eat as many marron as they eat small trout. If anything, the catching of perch would assist in the conservation of marron. If there is no shortage of cobblers or perch in the inland rivers, why is it necessary for everyone to obtain a license before being able to catch these types of fish.

Mr. Fletcher: Do cobblers eat marron?

Mr. JONES: Cobblers also eat marron. I made this point, too, but the Minister made no reference to it in his reply.

Reference to *Hansard* should refresh the Minister's memory and would show conclusively that one of my main arguments was that we should not place extra burdens on pensioners.

The Minister must admit that at no time did he say that there is a need to conserve perch or cobbler. This being so, why include these species of fish in the regulation? The Minister completely evaded the issue and evaded the main points I made when moving for non-acceptance of the regulation.

I am not going to take the Minister up on the question of snare fishing, because I clearly see that his experience of marron fishing in the south-west leaves a little to be desired. I agree with the member for Warren when he says that it is very difficult to find a spot in the south-west of our State to snare marron at the present time.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It could not be done in the Wellington Dam.

Mr. JONES: Or in the rivers. I do not know whether the Minister has tried.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I must confess that I have not done so for a number of years.

Mr. JONES: The Minister then raised the question of a license to catch prawns. This may be a fact and I am not disputing it.

The Minister raised the question of a party of people going out to catch marron, but he forgot to mention what the situation would be if the people in the party split up, with only one license between them, and the inspector came along.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is only a single bag of 30.

Mr. JONES: What if there is more than one net?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is the bag limit.

Mr. JONES: They may be hundreds of yards away from each other, and I cannot see that the argument has application.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is the bag limit.

Mr. JONES: The Minister also said that he feels \$2 is not too much to ask. What about tourists? There is a great deal of tourism in the south-west, especially in the Manjimup and Collie areas. Tourists often come for a weekend and enjoy some fishing. In all probability they will not have the opportunity to go marron fishing and will be denied the sport because they have not obtained the necessary inland fishing license.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If a person goes to other countries in the world as a tourist he has to obtain a license.

Mr. Gayfer: This applies in Canada, too.

Mr. JONES: The honourable member had plenty of time to make his contribution but I did not hear him when he had the opportunity.

Mr. Gayfer: Carry on!

Mr. JONES: The honourable member was not game to get on his feet. He had plenty of opportunity.

Mr. Gayfer: Cheer up!

Mr. JONES: We will see, shortly, whether his members support the South West Shire Councils Association. It will be very interesting to see; very interesting indeed.

The Minister mentioned that if 12 people wished to go out in a party they could easily obtain 12 licenses. That is not going to aid conservation. If 12 people go out, they can catch 360 marron. I do not think that is a means of conservation. I think it would be preferable to introduce a measure whereby a reasonable catch could be made, but I do not think the necessity to obtain a license will be the deterrent that some members and the Minister apparently think it will be. I am very disappointed that the Minister and the Government have done nothing about it.

As my leader said, the South West Shire Councils Association moved a resolution in protest last Monday, and it is quite apparent that it is not happy about the regulations we are now discussing; neither is the Bridgetown Shire. I would have liked to hear the Minister on the question of pensioners and school children. Rather than impose a license fee of \$2 on their parents, we should encourage school children to go fishing.

Mr. Lewis: Not in school hours, I hope.

Mr. JONES: Unfortunately they have not got the facilities for schooling these days.

Mr. Lewis: That is not a marron; that is a prawn.

Mr. JONES: I think we would all agree that it would be far preferable to see school children fishing along the river than getting up to mischief of some kind. Let us

be realistic. We are living in a changing world. We know the problems with juveniles. I would rather see children fishing along the rivers and enjoying sport than getting into mischief.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Who wouldn't? The point is that they will not be able to do any marron fishing unless some step is taken. That is the point.

Mr. JONES: That is the point.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Ask the member for Warren.

Mr. JONES: The question I raised, which has not been answered by the Minister, was: Who decided on this catch of 30? Was it people who go marron fishing a lot?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I told you when I spoke.

Mr. JONES: Who made the decision that the catch should be 30?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I told you it might have to be reduced. Let us have a go at it.

Mr. JONES: Who was it?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was made after discussions with Dr. Morrissey, who did the research in 1967.

Mr. JONES: I did not think that the question was answered clearly. I come back to my point and ask: Would the Minister reconsider his attitude on the matter of pensioners and school children being required to have a license to catch perch? I ask: Why is this necessary? If there are no conservation problems, if there are perch and cobbler in the rivers, why impose the burden on pensioners and school children? The Minister did not say anything about conservation in relation to pensioners and school children. If it had been a matter of conservation, undoubtedly he would have raised it, but there was no mention anywhere in his speech of the problems of conservation. If there are no conservation problems, why must pensioners pay \$2 before they are allowed to go fishing?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think the Minister might have another look at this.

Mr. JONES: Didn't I raise this in my submission?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was one of the points you raised.

Mr. JONES: One of the points the Minister did not answer. Would he disagree? That was one of my reasons for moving the motion. Nowhere in the Minister's reply did he refer to this question.

Mr. Bovell: Did you tell us how many pensioners were involved?

Mr. JONES: How many pensioners go fishing in Busselton? Could the Minister for Lands tell me?

Mr. May: There will be another one soon.

Mr. JONES: The Minister is not coming forward very quickly with an answer to that question.

Mr. Bovell: I am not moving the motion.

Mr. JONES: But the Minister is asking a lot of questions.

Mr. Bovell: I am not getting many replies.

Mr. JONES: Nevertheless, I do hope that the Minister will have a look at the situation. If the Government feels that there is a need to introduce conservation, I think it could be achieved by the closed season. I agree somewhat with the comments of my leader, and I think that representatives of the South West Shire Councils Association clearly know the position in the south-west of the State.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am glad you only said "somewhat".

Mr. JONES: I do hope the Government will have another look at the question of pensioners and school children requiring firstly a license, and, secondly, to obtain a license for perch and cobbler fishing.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moir
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Toms
Mr. Graham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Harman	Mr. Norton

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Burt	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cash	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stewart
Dr. Henn	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Young
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. W. A. Manning	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Davies	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Dunn

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

PLASTERERS' REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 25th March.

MR. TOMS (Ascot) [8.40 p.m.]: When introducing this Bill the member for Belmont indicated that the measure was on a similar basis to that of the Builders'

Registration Act and the Painters' Registration Act, but that it did include several additional provisions. One of the main differences between the Plasterers' Registration Bill and the Acts I have mentioned is the intention to have State-wide application.

In view of the earnest desire for decentralisation, and because of the number of large contracts being undertaken in country areas, this Bill is a move in the right direction. There was a time, of course, when large buildings were not being constructed in country areas. The necessity for this particular measure would, perhaps, not have occurred until recent years. By that, I mean that until recent years artisans of all trades took a pride in their work. Rather than perform a shoddy job they would not do any work at all. A bad job would have been abhorrent to their nature. In those days the tradesmen were proud of the jobs they did, and they understood their jobs very well. It can be said, of course, that times have changed, and they certainly have!

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. TOMS: In earlier days there was not the number of tradesmen we have today. Many members will recall that in earlier times a builder would have known most of the tradesmen in his area, and their ability to perform work to the required standard. Indeed, standards in those days were very high.

I remember that during my time in the trade a particular architect used to go around the jobs with a walking stick. On the end of his walking stick he had a mirror which he could raise above the architraves to see that the boards had been sanded and painted properly. That was the standard of work required in those days.

The position today is that speed seems to be the essence of the contract, and the necessity for good workmanship does not necessarily apply. The rule seems to be to get over the work as quickly as possible and onto the next job. I believe that has been the yardstick which has made the Painters' Registration Act, the Builders' Registration Act, and now—we hope—the Plasterers' Registration Act necessary.

I believe it would be fairly safe to say that many members in this House have, in recent times, received complaints regarding inferior work carried out on buildings. If any member has not received such complaints he is extremely fortunate. People buy a home, or have one built for them, and it is not long before it is apparent that inferior work has gone into the building. They then go to their member of Parliament and complain. As I have said, I worked in the building trade and even now when I have time during

weekends I have a look at some of the houses under construction. I compare them with some of the older homes and I know quite well that there is no comparison whatsoever. From time to time one sees mighty shoddy work.

Whilst it might be said that the various local authorities employ building inspectors and those inspectors should police the jobs that are done, it should not be expected of local shires that they should employ an extra dozen inspectors for what is usually a passing phase in the area.

Not only should painters be registered, but plasterers should have the opportunity of being registered also. I do not believe there is sufficient control regarding the quality of work being performed at present. We have the Builders' Registration Act which has a certain amount of power, but that Act is not sufficient to control all the complaints which are received and the very unsatisfactory work which is done.

Members will realise that because of today's costs it is necessary to give young couples the greatest protection possible. Those young people usually have to make high payments for the greater part of the balance of their working lives. By registering tradesmen and having them under reasonable control we would be able to make sure that the work performed is up to a certain standard.

The Minister, when opposing this particular proposal, touched on three points. First of all he said the registration of plasterers was undesirable, even in the face of the evidence produced. I do not know what the Minister means by being "undesirable". I have been to the opening of several buildings constructed for the Government—not by the Public Works Department—and I know that those who are accustomed to the building game would be able to see many faults. In many of the new buildings I have seen wavy walls and wavy ceilings. Nothing has been done to the level or the plumb. These faults have been evident in work done for the Government but the Minister still says it is undesirable to register plasterers.

I think it might be as well, at this stage, to compare the attitudes of two Ministers. Only last night during the debate on a Bill before this House the Minister concerned said that if all parties agree on a point, that point should come before Parliament. I refer to both the workers' representatives and the employers' representatives. In this particular case we have the Master Builders Association of Western Australia, the Builders' Registration Board, The Master Plasterers' Association of Western Australia and the union concerned, namely, the Operative Plasterers and Plaster Workers' Federation of Australia, all in agreement that

plasterers should be registered. Yet the Minister for Works, in his reply, said that this was something which was not necessary.

That gives some indication of the different attitudes which can be taken by different Ministers. The Minister for Works also said that it is not in the public interest. After what I have said in regard to the quality of work, I ask members: Are those organisations not entitled to the utmost protection we can give them?

Finally, the Minister expressed some doubts as to the need for any further registration legislation. I think members here can take it from me that the remarks I have made tonight are honest and true. I have been in the building game now—or I was until I came into this House—for a number of years and I believe that every section of this industry needs proper policing. Members of the public are entitled to all the protection they can get, particularly in these times when, as I said before, their hard earned money and the balance of their working lives will be taken up to pay off even one house. Not all people will have the opportunity, as some are fortunate enough to have, of building beach cottages, etc.

I am concerned for the young people of this country and I believe it is necessary to register every possible tradesman so as to give the necessary protection to the people who plan to buy homes. I believe the member for Belmont should be congratulated for bringing forward this measure to the House and I trust that, even though the Minister made what I believe was a feeble attempt to down this move, members will see the wisdom in agreeing to the Bill. I support the measure.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [8.52 p.m.]: The member for Belmont, who introduced the Bill, said in his second reading speech—

Some members may wonder why it is that the Opposition is putting forward this legislation.

I, as a Liberal, do not wonder; and I was very pleased indeed that the Minister in his answer rejected it. The reason that I do not wonder is because this is proposed legislation which, with its restrictive nature, is against Liberal principles.

I know that we on this side of the House do from time to time introduce such restrictive legislation, and it is always the member for Belmont who is quick to recognise and point out on such an occasion that it is a socialistic measure—with which I agree.

Whenever such restrictive legislation is introduced, the explanation for its need—and I venture to say, rather, the excuse and pretence for it—is twofold. Firstly, it is stated that it does protect the public

although this argument is very often used the other way round; and, secondly, it is stated that it secures higher ethics within the profession, trade, or occupation to which it refers.

Let us examine these explanations—or as I called them, excuses—to see whether they are necessary or even only helpful in anyone's interest.

When we examine the protection of the public, let us consider which ways building operations can be executed today. I think it is fair to say that there are three avenues or courses for an owner to erect a building, whether it is an industrial, commercial, public, religious, or domestic building.

Firstly, the owner can commission a professional architect who, in turn, will use the services of various consultants and invariably will contract with a registered builder.

The second avenue is that the owner can, without the services of an architect, employ a builder who then will execute the job from the beginning, by drawing the plans and specifications, to the completion of the job.

Then the third course—which relates only to domestic buildings—is that the owner can subcontract himself, in which case we in the building industry call him an “owner-builder.”

In all three cases, apart from expert trades being involved, many of which are licensed and need permits, there is the local authority who has to approve of the plans and specifications including the specification of plastering, quality of materials, proportion of mixes, etc. We pay rates to the local authority, whose duty it is to supervise the buildings under construction.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, who would be protected in the first two cases I mentioned? If the owner employs an architect or a builder, then we have these professional or qualified people through whom the public—according to the arguments we hear from the Opposition—is protected because they are registered with the Architects' Board or the Builders' Registration Board. In these cases, therefore, only the architect and the builder would be protected because the owner has nothing to do, as the member for Belmont knows, with the subcontracting plasterer. The owner contracts with the builder and does not have any interference with the work of the plasterer. I think in these cases it would be definitely an over-protection to protect the already protected professional or trades people in order that through them we shall protect the public.

On the surface it may appear that there is some justification for protection—which even could be based on my previous arguments—of the owner-builder. But if we do examine the owner-builder's position

closely, we find that even in his case there is scarcely any protection needed. Undoubtedly there are very few owner-builders. They are restricted to the building of residential, domestic, buildings, and according to the latest amendments to the Builders' Registration Act, they are also restricted to only building their own homes where they have to live for a certain period. It can also be reasonably assumed that whoever decides to build a house himself or subcontract it himself, without employing the services of either an architect or a builder, will obviously have some sort of previous experience and knowledge of the building trade. In any case, even the owner-builder is still under the protection of the building surveyor of the local authority.

I feel, therefore, that in all three cases of building avenues which are open for an owner to build, and which I have mentioned, there is sufficient protection already.

The member for Belmont offered one more argument in favour of plasterers' registration when he said in conclusion of his second reading speech at page 1909 of *Hansard*—

People will, through the operation of the board, have some redress against individuals who perform shoddy work. Not only will members of the public have somewhere to go, but the board will be able to take action to see that the work is made good when shoddy work is found to exist.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a justification. Even if the board did remind plasterers as it does remind painters, if the painter or plasterer refuses to do the work, the only avenue open for the board is to threaten him with disciplinary action. If the plasterer does not comply with this warning, the owner finally has to revert to common law action, whether there is a board or not. Does the member for Belmont suggest that the board will supply a solicitor or legal adviser to the owner? I do not think he does.

Mr. Jamieson: The tradesmen could be deregistered and then they could not undertake any further work.

Mr. MENSAROS: Yes; I said the board can take disciplinary action but that in itself does not help the owner; it is only a threat but it does not necessarily remedy the shoddy work.

Let us come to the second argument or excuse in justification of these restrictions and registrations: that it secures higher ethics. I have never believed in the idea that higher ethics can be secured or maintained by a big stick. Ethics result from education, social conditions, and the moral view of environment. If we want to con-

trol them, it should be through education, through incentives, rather than deterrents. Punitive measures are not for obtaining or maintaining ethics; they are only for a few trespassers. If somebody believes that ethical standards should be obtained by waving the big stick, by deterrent only, this person has lost all confidence and hope in mankind.

Going over to more realistic ground: I ask—knowing the building industry—are there any higher ethics or is there less trouble in those trades or professions where registration already exists? Would anyone say that there are fewer cases of indiscriminate acceptance of the lowest tender by some architects and consequently fewer bankruptcies causing inconvenience to the owner, suppliers, and others involved, since the inception of the Architects Board? Would anyone say that there is less trouble or fewer bankruptcies in the building trade because of the Builders' Registration Board? There might have been, I admit, a few cases of reprimand, but this is all, and it does not raise the ethics.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to my overseas experience. I did not go overseas to study the methods of building but, being connected with the industry, I could not help but observe them. The experience I gained does not show that the quality of the work is in any way connected with existing restrictions, registrations or the like. If it is, it is connected definitely the other way around. I would take the example of Austria for instance. There is perhaps no country in the world where there are more regulations, red tape, or permits than Austria. This is quite understandable, because Vienna used to be the head of a huge empire, the members of which were cut off, but the head is still there and the administrative authorities remain.

I can state that nowhere have I seen worse quality of building than in Austria. I had to accompany the Australian Ambassador to examine a newly-completed building which he wanted to rent for purposes of the Immigration Commission. I was shocked by the quality I observed, despite the fact that there is far more competition in Austria than there is in our State; and further, this is despite all the overreaching permits, restrictions, and regulations.

Going a step further, I could refer to Hungary. In Hungary, of course, being a socialistic State—the Government does not claim to be communistic as yet; it only claims to be socialist—there is no need for registration because there are no self-employed tradesmen, only workers employed by the one employer—the State. We could perhaps describe it with the term which was so frequently used here about 11 or 12 years ago; that is that

everyone is on day labour. Yet the quality of the buildings there is almost as bad as it is in Austria.

On the other hand, I had experiences in Teheran where, according to my inquiries, scarcely any restrictions or registrations exist. Yet I was quite surprised about the high quality of building there, despite the primitive methods still used. The same applies to Greece where there are very few, if any, restrictions or registrations, yet this was the country where I experienced perhaps the highest quality of building of all the countries I visited.

Having shown that—at least as far as I can see—there are no advantages in this restrictive measure, may I point out the disadvantages which I can find in it.

Firstly, it would obviously create a new closed shop to which of course I would not agree in principle, because the result is always that the people who are in want to keep others out. This is, perhaps, best illustrated by what the member for Ascot mentioned; namely, that the already existing, or registered, bodies, like the Master Builders Association, the master plasterers, and the Builders' Registration Board, are in favour of this type of registration.

I would like to mention here, by the way, that I cannot see the importance or significance of whether the Builders' Registration Board is for or against this proposed measure, because there are only a few people on the board and they did not send out circulars or questionnaires asking their members—the registered builders—their opinion on this question. So the Builders' Registration Board offers only its own opinion without having even tried to acquire the opinion of its members. Apart from this side issue, any such closed shop takes away the incentive and results by creating less free competition.

Secondly, I can see a disadvantage from the point of view of migration. During the five weeks I assisted the Immigration Department in Vienna in an advisory capacity, I gained first-hand experience and knowledge of this fact. It is a recognised, and unfortunately a well-advertised and known, fact in Vienna that Australia is the most restrictive country amongst the migrant intake countries in regard to recognition of professions and trades.

This was the reason we lost so many quality migrants from Czechoslovakia. The other intake countries like Canada, the United States of America, and Sweden, suspended restrictions for this reason, or they promised Government jobs for these migrants.

I found that the rumour goes around amongst prospective migrants in Austria, which is not quite unfounded, that—as they somewhat exaggeratedly term it,—everyone in Australia from a medical practitioner down to the street sweeper needs

some sort of permit or registration; that no qualifications or experience are accepted except perhaps British qualifications. I was able to talk, during the hundreds of personal interviews and some public addresses I made, about all the benefits Australia can offer. Yet when it came to the inevitable question of acknowledging professional, trades, or occupational qualifications and experience—and I must say that I was prepared for these questions because I made various and numerous inquiries before I left as to the requirements of acceptance of qualifications—I had to admit that most qualified people cannot be accepted in Australia.

One of course, could say: What does this have to do with the plasterers? If somebody, however, knows the trade here in this State, he will be aware that a great number—I would not know whether it is the majority—of plasterers are of Italian or Yugoslav origin. These are people who, if confronted with a formal examination, despite the fact that they are very good tradesmen and might be reasonably good in colloquial English, will simply not sit for this examination because they will not be able to do the required written papers. This, of course, will not be an incentive for these people to migrate to Australia.

Thirdly, a registration such as this could result—and I think it would result—in fewer small enterprises, which in turn would create more union members. I can appreciate that the member for Belmont is in favour of registration from this point of view, but of course he can also appreciate that this is one of the reasons I would be against registration. I prefer to see small self-employed people rather than more employees.

The trend is generally towards bigger industrial enterprises. I think that the building trade or within the building trade, the subcontracting trades are one of the few exemptions where this trend does not necessarily exist. We find that it is still more economical to employ small plastering contractors or small concreting contractors.

I wish to conclude my short contribution to this debate by repeating that I cannot see any advantages in this proposed measure, but I can see many disadvantages. Because of this, I am glad to support the Minister and I do not accept the proposed legislation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. May.

NURSES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [9.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a very small Bill to amend the Nurses Act and I am certain that it will in no way be controversial. In 1968 a new Nurses Act was passed and under that legislation an autonomous board was created with the necessary powers to deal with the many complex problems of nursing in our community.

The Minister for Health advises that the new board has been duly constituted and is showing a determined attitude to the discharge of its responsibilities. This short Bill seeks to make two small amendments both of which have been requested by the board itself. Both the amendments relate to conditions under which the staff is employed.

The first amendment is dealt with in clause 2 of the Bill. At the time the Nurses Act was being prepared for drafting the Public Service Arbitration Act was not in force. Reference was therefore made to the Industrial Arbitration Act in section 15 of that Act.

It is generally known that it is uniform practice to treat staff of statutory boards and other Government instrumentalities as Government officers and to provide the same machinery for salary fixation and other conditions of employment. The Bill provides for the reference to the Industrial Arbitration Act to be deleted with a view to substituting a reference to the Public Service Arbitration Act of 1966.

The second amendment is dealt with in clause 3 and this will enable the board to extend to its employees the same superannuation benefits as are enjoyed by the State Public Service. The cost will be borne by the board and by the employees. The staffs of a number of other statutory boards and Government instrumentalities already enjoy this benefit and it is logical that this amendment should be made.

Both the amendments in the Bill are sponsored by the board, which has worked quite well in its endeavours to solve the many complex problems associated with nursing. I have much pleasure in commending the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bateman.

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [9.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In introducing this Bill on behalf of the Minister for Justice, I would advise members that the Chief Justice has suggested that the procedure for appeals from local courts to the Full Court should be the same as the procedure for appeals from a single judge.

The Supreme Court Rules are at present being revised and it is therefore opportune to give consideration to this legislative change in accordance with the suggestion which has been made.

Members are informed that appeals from a single judge to the Full Court are regulated by Order No. 58 of the Supreme Court Rules, whilst appeals from the local courts are regulated by section 107 of the Local Courts Act and the provisions of Order No. 33 of the rules made under that Act.

This Bill proposes the amendment of section 107 with a view to introducing a useful uniformity and simplicity in the matter of appeal procedures. I am advised that there is no valid reason why appeals from the local courts should not be dealt with under the Supreme Court Rules.

The amendment to which I refer is contained in clause 4 of the Bill. Clause 3 merely regularises a mistake in terminology introduced when a 1921 amendment to the principal Act was before Parliament. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bertram.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [9.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.
May I have your permission, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to members that because of the state of the notice paper it might not be necessary to sit after tea tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.19 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 9th April, 1970

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

1. HOSPITALS *Kambalda*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the rapid increase in population warrant the erection of a hospital at Kambalda?
- (2) If so, when will hospital facilities be provided?
- (3) Will the establishment of such hospital facilities improve the prospect of a doctor opening a practice in the town?