installed since then but it is a far cry to 330,000 volts to be carried by the lines under discussion. There are several installations of 330,000 volt cables in the world today, but none of any great length. It would be technically unsound to install a short length of 330,000 volt cable in the run of an otherwise overhead line, even if it were economically acceptable. The prodigious cost of this type of cable would completely rule out the possibility of using underground cable over any substantial distance.

Yet it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that extra high voltage cable will be developed to the extent that the second line on the foothills route could be constructed in underground cable in 10 to 15 years' time, but at the present moment we have to deal with facts not possibilities.

I oppose the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

House adjourned at 3.41 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 30th May, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (17): ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Gas Standards Bill.
2. Gas Undertakings Act Amendment Bill.
3. Justices Act Amendment Bill.
4. Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill.
5. Public Works Act Amendment Bill.
6. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.
7. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
8. State Housing Act Amendment Bill.
9. Public Service Act Amendment Bill.
10. Police Act Amendment Bill.
11. Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill.
12. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.
13. Legal Contribution Trust Act Amendment Bill.
14. Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.
15. Zoological Gardens Bill.
16. Construction Safety Bill.
17. Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Scarborough Beach Road

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Police:

(1) How many fatal and nonfatal traffic accidents involving—
(a) pedestrians,
(b) others,
have occurred during the last 12 months in Scarborough Beach Road between the Main Street lights and the Innaloo Shopping Centre?

(2) How many crosswalks are located in this section?

(3) What is the average density of traffic in Scarborough Beach Road between these points between 4.45 p.m. and 5.15 p.m.?

(4) What action, if any, has been taken to reduce the number of accidents in this section of Scarborough Beach Road?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

(1) For the 12 months ended the 1st May, 1972, the following accidents were recorded:—
(a) Fatal—Nil.
Nonfatal—6.
(b) Fatal—1.
Injury 45.
Vehicle damage only—294.

(2) One, adjacent to Oswald Street.

(3) 1,200 vehicles—400 eastbound, 800 westbound.

(4) The upgrading and improvement of this section of Scarborough Beach Road is the responsibility of the Stirling City Council. The council, with assistance from the Main Roads Department, is planning channelisation treatment at several busy intersections.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

LAND

Reserve No. 14163

The Hon. F. R. WHITE, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my questions on Wednesday, the 3rd May, 1972, and Wednesday, the 10th May, 1972, relative to Reserve No. 14163 (Parkerville Lot 336), would the Minister advise—

(a) why the "vegetation growing on this attractive piece of bushland" is being destroyed by the Main Roads Department as a result of its excavation of gravel;

(b) why the local authority and owners of property adjoining the Reserve were not notified that gravel was to be removed;

(c) why the Lands Department lacks knowledge of the use and desecration of this Reserve by another Government instrumentality?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(a) This is the first information the Department has received. Main Roads Department acknowledges the excavation of a small area of the Reserve, which they propose to regenerate.

(b) Neither the Main Roads Department nor the Lands and Surveys Department has any obligation to do so.

(c) See answer to (a).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.34 p.m.]: I move—

> That the House at its rising adjourn until 11.00 a.m., Wednesday, the 31st May.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.35 p.m.]: I desire to address myself for a few moments to this motion which, I would like it clearly understood, I do not oppose. It is a form of motion which has been used in the past, and the present Leader of the House has availed himself of the opportunity to use this type of motion since the present Government has been in office. It is a very good idea because in the early part of the day members know exactly what the Government has in mind for the following day's sitting.

I assume this is a substantive motion, or near enough to one, and therefore the Leader of the House will be permitted to reply to a matter I propose to raise concerning adjournments. Could you, Mr. President, satisfy me upon that point, because if the Minister does not have the right of reply, I must take some other course of action?

The PRESIDENT: I will allow the Leader of the House to make a personal explanation in reply. This situation has never occurred before.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: New circumstances are always arising.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: There is nothing new under the sun.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right. I take it that this motion is near enough to a substantive motion and therefore the Leader of the House will be permitted to reply to whatever remarks members make in connection with the adjournment of the House. The debate on the motion to adjourn the House is not new.

The PRESIDENT: A substantive motion requires a seconder.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well then, in case there is any risk that the Minister might be out of order in attempting to reply, you will observe the course I propose to follow as I go on, Mr. President, if you will be tolerant with me for a moment or two.

I wish to speak about our notice paper and the notice paper in another place. It is my understanding that the Government intends to conclude this first portion of the session on Friday. Am I correct in my understanding?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Can I interject, and say, "Yes"?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the Leader of the House. Bearing that in mind, I would like the Minister to supply some further information, and he can probably do so in the same unruly manner; that is, by interjection. First of all, it is the intention of the Government to go right through our notice paper from Order of the Day No. 1 to Order of the Day No. 19, leaving No. 20 and dealing with all the other matters involved. In other words, the Government wants all items on our notice paper to be attended to in one way or another. Would that be correct?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The notice paper in another place has on it a considerable number of items and we will ultimately receive in this Chamber many of the Bills still on that notice paper. For the guidance of members I would like the Leader of the House to indicate what items on the notice paper in another place will come to this Chamber in the next four days. Because the Leader of the House has been good enough to disclose this information to me privately, I understand those items to be Orders of the Day Nos. 1 to 4, 7 to 9, with the likelihood of Nos. 17 and 18—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Plus another one; that is, the Fuel and Power Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: — and another Bill which is to be reintroduced in another place with the title of Fuel and Power Bill.

The Bills I have mentioned have been initiated in another place but have not yet been dealt with by this House. There is on the notice paper of the Legislative Assembly a considerable amount of legislation in the category of Bills which have been passed by this Chamber together with other Bills which are in the course of being debated but which the Government apparently intends will not reach the Legislative Council in this session.

This is the situation and, even though there is a limited number of Bills to come from another place, one or two could be quite controversial. It is quite obvious we will be busy people in trying to finish the Government's business between now and Friday.

I return to the notice paper of this Chamber. Do I understand it is essential for Orders of the Day Nos. 16, 17, and 18 to be dealt with in this week of Parliament? Does the Minister want them dealt with?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Yes, I certainly do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is great emphasis on the words, "Yes, I certainly do."

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I would certainly like them to be dealt with.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Is it the Minister's intention that they should also be dealt with by the Legislative Assembly, if they happen to pass this Chamber?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: If possible, yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the Minister and his colleagues for this information, because I think it will help members to know what the Government expects of the House this week. From my point of view I would like to make it perfectly clear it is the Government's intention to finish the session this Friday, not the Opposition's intention. As far as I am concerned we will sit here as long as is necessary to deal with the Government's legislation.

I simply wanted to form a clear picture, as I have been able to do with the assistance of the Leader of the House and his colleagues, of the legislation with which we are expected to deal. Of course every Bill must be debated and argued on its merits. I support the motion and, at the same time, I apologise because it is possibly unusual for the Leader of the Opposition to ask these questions but, then again, the circumstances are also unusual as there are only four sitting days left.

Personal Explanation

The HON. W. F. WILLESEE (Leader of the House): By way of explanation, I shall take the opportunity to add to the final remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition wherein he said that he is quite prepared to sit until the notice paper is completed. I thank him for that co-operative spirit. However, this is only part of a session and we must establish a stopping point. It is my opinion that we would be sitting for another three weeks if we were to deal with all the legislation which is before us. This would take us very close to the opening of the next session for which several Bills have already been prepared.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We have been sitting so constantly for a year that it does not matter.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I am growing accustomed to your face.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You ought to after all this time.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: One other point which I would like to mention is that we aim to finish on Friday afternoon before the tea adjournment, if possible.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What time?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I would not be as specific as that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Approximately?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The approximate time is in the hands of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Approximately what time?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I would not guess. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would not like me to guess.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: After afternoon tea.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I think that is as far as I can go by way of personal explanation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What you are saying is that any business which we do not finish by 4 p.m. on Friday will be carried over to the next session?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: No. I said that we are aiming and hoping to finish the business in hand before the tea adjournment.

Question put and passed.

WOOD DISTILLATION AND CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th May.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.45 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill is laudable and commendable but the manner in which it seeks to achieve it is totally foreign to any thoughts I have ever held. When Mr. Baxter rose to speak on the Bill he made the true purpose perfectly clear; it is to save the people of Wundowie. No-one on either side of the House, or in another place, could have anything but sympathy with Mr. Baxter's speech. Far be it for me to say that Wundowie should go. Successive Governments over the years probably would have been glad to say it but, in point of fact, they have had a sense of responsibility and have not done so. I wish to make it perfectly clear that this afternoon I wish to present an argument for the retention of Wundowie on a

safe and permanent footing for the future and not on the basis of stumbling from crisis to crisis as time goes on.

In the last 22 years since this industry has been established it has lost $5,500,000. At present in loan funds it owes $1,300,000. Consequently the State cannot be said to have been ungenerous to Wundowie and its activities. However, I think it is time for us to have a good hard look at the Wundowie operation.

The purpose of establishing the industry at Wundowie was for the production of pig iron. It has gone on from there and, "like Topsy it has just growed." The Bill before us now will allow it to grow just a little more. People will tell us that pig iron produced at Wundowie under the charcoal process is one of the finest forms of pig iron. This is not in question. In point of fact this process of producing pig iron ceased in the United Kingdom in 1883. The reason was that the people in the United Kingdom—call them the conservationists of the 19th century if we like—were alarmed at the amount of forests that were disappearing to produce this iron.

People tend to think that Wundowie has a unique product, but it is not unique at all. In point of fact pig iron is rapidly becoming out of date. For instance, its purity is matched by Swedish pig iron only because of the content of the Swedish iron ore. When mixed with coke not as many impurities are present in the Swedish ore as there are when low grade ore, such as Wundowie uses, is mixed with coke.

Pig iron, as such, and the pig iron market are both in doubt. This is why I have risen to speak about it this afternoon. The whole of the pig iron market in the world is in doubt because there are now far cheaper ways of producing the same type of iron. It is a reverse process and is called synthetic iron. It is made by melting—not smelting—scrap iron with the addition of silicon and carbon. The quality of the product is far higher and the product itself is much cheaper because nobody seems to be able to get rid of scrap steel.

In point of fact one company in this town is now well ahead in the process of having one of its induction furnaces installed. Accordingly, to say Wundowie is under threat of extinction does not mean it is under threat of extinction because of any proposed parliamentary action; any threat of extinction there may be is due to the natural processes of industrialisation and advanced technological usage.

It is possible to obtain from the blast furnaces at Kwinana the same quality of pig iron that is obtained from Wundowie. The methods of control being what they are these days, it is also possible to acquire the same degree of purity in the iron.

It is, however, the State with which we must be concerned, particularly when we are aware of a loss of $5,500,000 having been written off in 22 years. There was supposed to have been a gentleman's agreement—and I stress that because this agreement has not been kept on both sides—that Wundowie should produce pig iron, and that local manufacturers should use this pig iron in preference to the pig iron produced by B.H.P.; although if we study the various tables we will find that pig iron can be landed cheaper from Whyalla than it can be produced at Wundowie; and yet at no stage have the manufacturers reneged on the question of purchasing pig iron from Wundowie to keep that industry going.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is good grade.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I realise that, but we must take cognisance of the grade all along the range—there are many grades.

The Bill before us seeks permission to borrow an amount of money in order that a new type of furnace can now be installed in Wundowie. This morning, and only this morning, I heard an item of news—I think it was on 6AM—to the effect that there was general concern expressed by the President of the Metal Workers' Union that the state of the metal industries and the heavy engineering and casting industries in this State was as depressed at the present time as it had ever been since 1930.

Members will be well aware of what goes on in their particular provinces, but if we care to look around this State it is possible to obtain some facts and figures which are truly remarkable.

If members care to visit the Bassendean area where foundries are established they will find that the men's working hours have been reduced from a 50-52 hour working week—which, incidentally, they were pleased to work—to a 40-hour working week, and their production has dropped by at least two-thirds—they have a two-thirds capacity.

If we consider the example of the Midland area where another foundry is established we will find it is working at only one-third of its capacity. In the Fremantle area there is also another foundry which is working at two-thirds of its capacity and yet we are told there is this gentleman's agreement on pig iron.

While I am on my feet I propose to say this gentleman's agreement is a one-way agreement—there is no two-way agreement about this at all. The taxpayer subsidises Wundowie which is then supposed to be competitively engaged in commerce in the metal industry.

But what do we find this year? We find that the Indonesian Government called for tenders for railway bed plates and an Eastern States company tendered $6.20 per plate, while a Perth company—and I had access to the figures—tendered $5.40 per plate. On the figures given to me, and which I was allowed to look at and give to an independent accountant, we find

that in the case of the Perth company there could not have been more than a 1 per cent. margin of profit. The owner wanted to keep his foundry going and his men employed, despite the fact that production was going to be undertaken at cost.

The firm that obtained the contract was Wundowie at $4.10 per plate, which is 20-25 per cent. below cost. That is what it amounts to, because nobody will persuade me that so wonderful is the Wundowie operation that it can operate at 20-25 per cent. below cost.

The management of Wundowie complains that wages have escalated, but that is no argument. That has happened to every family in Western Australia. Yet, here we are being asked to give a blank cheque, because that is what it amounts to, for $700,000; we are to be the rubber stamp and place our signature to the arrangement.

There must be such a thing as competitive and fair trading. It may suprise members to know that within one week of the Government taking office a non-ferrous foundry was told it would get no more Government work. The firm's production was cut by one-third and this was passed on to the State Engineering Works.

This is the type of competition and trading that faces us today in a competitive situation when the market is depressed to the bottom. I admire the manager at Wundowie who made a study of the question and submitted a report, and I deliberately refrain from reading this feasibility study even though the Government has given me every opportunity, to do so.

The manager is fighting for Wundowie and its people; he is fighting to keep production going and I admire him for that; but by the same token I could have produced figures in such a way as to convince any board, no matter how well organised and tutored, that this was the case and that this was the amount of money that was used in the process.

One does not expect a manager of a foundry complex to know the intricacies of international marketing in the metal market. While he may have a surface knowledge of this I say, with all due respect to him, that there is no need for the manager to be aware of the picture in the entire world; that is, of course, if he is aware of the picture in Australia.

I tried to get some figures on pig iron from South Australia, because I thought that State used pig iron quite a lot. When I asked them what their prices were last year, because they usually bought about 500 tons, I was told, "We do not use it any more; we used exactly four tons last year. Do you want those figures?" So I think it can be said that the pig iron market has failed.

So when we consider what Wundowie proposes to do with its capital expenditure we are forced to look closely at the market. Let us, for example, consider the question of grinding media. I believe these are balls of iron used to crush ore. It is reasonable to assume that the Western Mining Corporation would use a tremendous amount of this stuff, particularly when we consider the amount of nickel that firm gets out of the ground. When ore is crushed in this manner contaminants are being passed on to the ore. These must be cleaned which of course means a further item of cost to the production.

Being what he is, man has sought to find a shorter way and we now use a process called autogenous grinding which is a process in which the ore is crushed by itself. This obviates contamination. I doubt whether the Western Mining Corporation will take more than a few tons of this pig iron over the next five years.

A foundry in Midland produces an item called cylhebs which is used in the crushing of cement but this foundry only has the capactity to supply two-thirds of the quantity needed. Wundowie's intention is to go into the production of these items and to sell more of them to offset the installation of a new machine.

Where in Heaven's name will they find a market within this State, let alone in Australia? We find that in Melbourne and Sydney no less than 80 foundries have closed in the last 12 years as a result of the fierce competition which exists in those States. Is it intended to say that Wundowie can supply these things to other States and add on the freight charge; or is it intended to say that Wundowie will be able to undercut the price because the taxpayer of Western Australia will continue to foot the bill?

If Wundowie goes ahead with this new machine to produce the castings I mentioned, the deathknell will be sounded for most foundries in this State; and apart from employing another 25 or 30 workers at Wundowie, 400 to 500 people in the metropolitan area will be put out of work. I am not vying the metropolitan area against the country areas; nor am I vying centralisation against decentralisation. However, one of these pieces of equipment is installed and almost ready to go in a foundry in the metropolitan area. It will be ready to commence production in October; but the foundry forecasts that it will be able to use that piece of equipment at best for only three months of the year. In that time it will satisfy the total market requirements as they exist at present.

So let us put another $700,000 into the kitty to find out that in three years' time we have another useless piece of machinery, or that we are cutting the throats of the other iron founders in the metropolitan area! Are we to make cut-price deals

under the counter? Only yesterday we received news that General Motors-Holden is to close its plant in this State, so there will be no chance of supplying castings to that firm.

I ask the House very seriously to consider the fact that either Wundowie must go—which no one wants—or we must have some authority go to Wundowie and investigate the position. I have presented an amendment to the Bill with which I do not propose to deal at the moment, but with which I propose to deal when we are in Committee. The amendment simply states this: Let us have a look at how much money is really necessary in order to make Wundowie a feasible and workable organisation; but before we do that let us call upon the best experts available in the world to undertake a feasibility study, even if it costs $100,000 or $200,000. If we are to ensure the continued existence of the community at Wundowie, and the continued operation of the Wundowie industry without the taxpayers of this State being called upon, year after year, to subsidise it, and without industry in the metropolitan area being called upon to subsidise it, then let us have the courage of our convictions.

This is not a vote-catching business. We are concerned with the people at Wundowie; and with the best will in the world even our extremely high-class public servants would be forced to admit that they themselves sometimes refer their problems to other expert authorities. All I am asking is simply this: Consider the number of letters I have received —and those I am holding up represent but a fraction of them—not from iron founders, because iron founders do not handwrite their letters on plain paper, but from people off the shop floors who have written because they knew this Bill was to be considered, and because they knew it would threaten their jobs. I have a letter from a man whose name I do not propose to disclose. This letter has already been sent to the Premier; I am merely producing copies of letters written to the Premier of this State by ordinary people.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And to all other members.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I hope so, because if members are aware of the problem they will support my amendment. The letter is as follows:—

> As a steel foundry employee of 23 years service I am dismayed at the news that the State Government intends to extend the Wundowie Iron Works to manufacture steel castings.
>
> We are all fully aware of the depressed state of the industry in this State and there have been made retrenchments since October of 1971.
>
> Surely the industry cannot afford to have an extra competitor, particularly one financed by monies supplied by the very people who are now being retrenched.
>
> It is earnestly hoped that common sense will prevail and that the proposed extensions will be shelved, at least for the time being, until the industry is again bouyant and there is a demand for steel castings once again.

That letter was written by a man from the shop floor, and I have several more in that vein. Several members of this House have received similar letters. I read out that letter because of its significance; that is, for the time being, while the economy of this particular industry is in such a depressed state, we should have a really good, authoritative look at at the industry. Let us have a feasibility study undertaken, have that study presented to the Minister, and then let the Minister, in conjunction with the manager at Wundowie, decide what is best for the assured future of the people of Wundowie.

When one reads the history of Wundowie one finds that it is like a flea on a dog—hopping from spot to spot, stumbling from crisis to crisis. That is no way to run an industry economically. There is no blame attaching to any Government past or present. It is simply a matter of very seriously looking at this industry. I have nothing more to say at this stage, but I will have much more to say during the Committee stage when I propose to move the amendment I have foreshadowed.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West) [3.07 p.m.]: After examining this Bill, I find it most difficult to arrive at an answer to the problem. As Mr. Williams said, undoubtedly the market is depressed; undoubtedly some employees of private foundries are concerned; and undoubtedly the employees at Wundowie are concerned. I think each and every one of us must be concerned about the future of the employees both in the private sector and at Wundowie.

It is fairly obvious that over the last two years a large amount of money—something like $800,000—has been spent on upgrading some of the present foundries. It has been intimated to me that over the last couple of years at least 400 employees of private foundries have lost their jobs as a result of the downturn in the economy. If this is the case, why put more money into something which is failing?

I realise that in his second reading speech the Minister said it is intended to upgrade the foundry by installing a new machine to handle automotive mouldings. Also, a feasibility study has been mentioned, and it is claimed that it is possible to lift Wundowie out of the doldrums. I

have not read the feasibility study, and I would like more information before I can be convinced that the scheme would work. As far as the market in Western Australia is concerned, the automotive mouldings required would comprise only a very small part.

I would like the Minister to inform me whether there are any markets available in the Eastern States or overseas which the existing foundries in the Eastern States are not already supplying; particularly the markets supplying the automotive industry.

We read in this morning's newspaper that the General Motors-Holden plant at Mosman Park is to close down. I am very loath to make a decision which will have the effect of lowering the rate of employment at Wundowie; but I am also very loath to make a decision which will put men engaged in private foundries out of work. That is why I say it is a very difficult decision for me to make.

I do not know whether the amendment which has been placed before us is the answer to the problem. However, there is another aspect which has to be considered. One Bill has been introduced under which it is proposed to raise $4,000,000 in semi-governmental borrowings, so as not to interfere with the loan-raising efforts of the Government. Another Bill has been introduced under which it is proposed to enable the State Implement Works to raise $700,000 in semi-governmental borrowings; and in the Bill now before us it is proposed to enable the industry at Wundowie to raise $700,000 also in semi-governmental borrowings.

I would like to know where all the money will come from to fill these semi-governmental borrowings. As I stated in the House before the last adjournment, over the years some local authorities have found they could not raise sufficient moneys to fill their loan requirements, and I refer to loans of $50,000 and $60,000. They were not able to raise the money because it was not available. Therefore, I would like to know the source from which the money will come to meet the needs of the three Government instrumentalities I have mentioned.

On each occasion that a semi-Government instrumentality borrows over $300,000 in any one year, the amount in excess of $300,000 is taken off the General Loan Funds of the Government. We have not been told anything about this aspect; or that if a semi-Government instrumentality borrows over $300,000 in any one year, the loan funds of the State will be reduced by the amount in excess of $300,000. We have not been told about this, nor whether the industry at Wundowie will borrow $100,000 this year, $200,000 next year, or another $200,000 the following year.

We have not been given any information in that regard, but we have been told that by the passing of the Bill we will be supporting a foundry which will produce automotive mouldings, and $700,000 is required for that purpose.

I am not sure where the State is heading in this respect. At the moment there are four major foundries in Western Australia—Forward Down, Ledgers, B.H.P., and Chamberlains. There are also about a dozen smaller ones. In addition, there are four steel foundries which are somewhat different, and they are Bradford Kendall, Vickers, Hadwa, and Chamberlains. They produce different types of forgings and mouldings.

I have yet to be convinced that there is a market for automotive mouldings which warrants the proposed expenditure to maintain the Wundowie industry on a better basis. In view of the fact that the State has been and is subsidising the industry to the tune of $5,500,000, it might be better to continue subsidising the industry and not compete with private enterprise in the production of mouldings. In the long run this might be cheaper. Under the proposal in the Bill the State might expend $700,000 to set up a foundry, but then find it is making further losses over and above the losses in the other sections of the Wundowie industry.

We know that the industry at Wundowie relies on the income from the sale of by-products and chemicals produced from its timber industry, as well as the sale of pig iron which originally was the purpose for establishing the industry. We know that at present its timber industry is not a very payable proposition, and it is not making anything out of the production of chemicals; and that sales of pig iron have been so reduced that fairly substantial losses have been sustained.

If it is possible to find some alternative decentralised area, other than at Wundowie, to set up another industry we may be better off; but I repeat that I am placed in a very difficult situation in trying to make up my mind as to the best way to go about this matter. I do believe that other members are in the same quandary. However, I have raised a few questions, and I will reserve my judgment until the Minister replies, as he may be able to ease my mind in respect of some of these problems.

We have been delivered what amounts to an ultimatum, in the name of decentralisation. It has been indicated to us that if we do not support the proposal then the Wundowie industry will collapse, and the State will lose a decentralised industry. That is the sort of ultimatum that has been delivered to us. I suppose it is fair enough to put it that way from the point of view of the industry at Wundowie, and I suppose it is fair enough for us to look at the matter from that angle.

I do not altogether classify the industry at Wundowie as a decentralised industry, because Wundowie is almost a suburb of the metropolitan area. In that respect this is an entirely different proposition from an industry which is established 100 miles or further from the city.

In view of the unemployment situation in the State at the present time, I do not want to see any further unemployment created; but whether we can provide more employment at Wundowie by the passing of this Bill, or whether we can maintain employment by allowing private enterprise to operate I do not know, and I would like someone to tell me. Until such time as I can be given that information I will have to keep my vote in the balance.

Debate adjourned to a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

(Continued on page 1602.)

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 11th May. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3: Section 20 amended—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Members will recall that when we were last debating the Committee stage of the Bill I agreed to progress being reported, and I gave an undertaking to refer clause 3 (b) to the Parliamentary Counsel to see whether he could resolve the impasse.

The result is that the Parliamentary Counsel has sought to overcome the difficulty by dividing the two points at issue. There was one point at issue between Mr. White and myself as to whether the word "may" takes precedence over the word "shall." The Parliamentary Counsel has sought to overcome the difficulty by including the word "may" in paragraph (a), and the word "shall" in paragraph (b) of the proposed amendment.

I feel that if Mr. Medcalf and Mr. Clive Griffiths inspect the proposed amendment closely they will see that the Parliamentary Draftsman has overcome the impasse, and that it is quite obvious there is no obligation. I move an amendment—

> Page 3, lines 26 to 30—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following:—
>
> (b) by deleting subsection (4) and substituting a new subsection as follows—
>
> (4) Where the Board has approved a plan of subdivision of land upon condition that a portion thereof be set aside and vested in the Crown for parks, recreation grounds, or open spaces generally—
>
> (a) the owner of the land may, if the Board and the local authority in whose district the portion is situated approve, pay to the local authority in lieu of setting aside any such land a sum that represents the value of that portion; and
>
> (b) the owner of the land shall, if the Board by notice in writing so requires, on or at any time after entering into a contract for the sale of any land to which the plan of subdivision relates pay to the local authority, within the time specified by the Board in the notice, in respect of that sale a sum representing the value of the portion of that land which he might otherwise have been required to set aside.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I do not wish to do an injustice to the Minister but I gather that he said there is no obligation for the owner to pay any money under the new proposals which the Parliamentary Draftsman has prepared. It will be up to the owner whether he pays the money. Is that the situation?

The Hon. J. Dolan: No. The first part of the amendment says that when agreement has been reached he may pay in lieu of making land available. In those circumstances the word, "shall" comes in.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I think the Minister is saying there is no obligation on the owner of the land to pay unless he voluntarily agrees to pay. Is that what the Minister is saying?

The Hon. J. Dolan: I understand that is the situation.

The Hon I. G. MEDCALF: I regret to say I believe that is not correct. I understand this is entirely in line with what the Minister said during his second reading speech, except there are more words now than was the case previously.

Paragraph (b) has nothing to do with paragraph (a); they are two separate and distinct paragraphs. Paragraph (a) is permissive and sets out that the owner of the land may do certain things. However, paragraph (b) sets out that the owner of the land shall do certain things. What the owner of the land shall do is pay a sum representing the value of the land which the board requires to be deducted in certain circumstances.

It seems that paragraph (a) preserves the position we already have. The owner of land may, if he wishes—and if the board and the local authority approve—pay money instead of giving his land. The proposed amendment will preserve what we already have, but will add the provision set out in paragraph (b).

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr. Medcalf has quite adequately summed up the situation. In my opinion the intention of the proposed amendment is to delay the paying of the money in lieu of land until such time as the first block of land is sold. That is the only alternative I can see included in the new proposal. We have already pointed out that it would be a most unsatisfactory situation if a person were called upon to pay money in lieu of land before he sold any of the land at all.

I think all the draftsman has done is include the situation that the subdivider does not have to pay that money in lieu until after he has sold his first lot of land. When he first spoke today, the Minister indicated that the reason for reporting progress was that Mr. Medcalf and I disagreed with Mr. White's interpretation of the contents of the Bill, and this was shared by him, notwithstanding the fact that we had reminded the Minister that the introductory speech contained this sentence—

> This amendment to section 20 will enable the board to require a payment in lieu of a land contribution.

The Minister said he shared Mr. White's view, notwithstanding what he said when he introduced the Bill.

Whilst the Minister might have changed his mind about the interpretation after he introduced the Bill, when he introduced the Bill he shared the view that the board could make it compulsory for the subdivider to pay money in lieu of contributing land. I repeat that the only alteration is that the money need not be paid until after the first lot of land has been sold.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: It might be advisable for me to read the opinion which was given by the Parliamentary Draftsman. I think it will clarify the matter because he deals with it in legal terms. He begins by referring to what he proposes as being an amendment to satisfy the objections that have been raised. He says—

> As you will appreciate, it is now proposed in the interest of clarity to delete from Section 20 of the Act, the whole of subsection 4 and to substitute a new subsection which will:—
>
> (1) still allow a subdivider to request permission to pay cash in lieu of land—

The subdivider can make an approach to the board and the local authority, who will eventually reach agreement that he may pay cash in lieu of land. I hope that fact is clear.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: There is no argument about that.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The Parliamentary Draftsman continues—

> —where the Board on granting its approval in principle to subdivide has required the setting aside of land as open space for recreation purposes.

The board and the local authority agree to the request that he be allowed to pay cash in lieu. The opinion continues—

> The new Clause 4(a) provides for exactly the same administrative procedure to be followed as the provision of subsection 4 of the Act now provides, although the wording has of course been altered, and
>
> (2) allow that the Board, as a condition of approval in principle, require that a subdivider shall make a cash payment to the local authority in lieu of land for open space purposes.
>
> Members will recall that in the Second Reading speech, mention was made of the fact that subdividers of less than two and a half acres are not called upon by the Board to make a pro rata contribution to open space reserves, although the occupants of the new lots will themselves create a demand for recreational facilities. Clause 4(b) will allow the Board in exercising its powers to decide whether or not that subdivider will contribute cash to the local authority to acquire land, or otherwise use it in terms of section 20(6) of the Act.
>
> Clause 4(b) will, of course, allow the Board to specify the sum payable and when it shall be paid by the subdivider to the local authority.

I think it is quite reasonable that they should fix the time. The opinion continues—

> In elaboration, it is envisaged that the Board would require in accordance with current policy for 10 per cent. of the value of each new lot to be paid as endowment, and for that figure of 10 per cent. to be assessed at the time of sale of the new lot.

I take it that when the first lot is sold for, say, $2,000, the first payment of 10 per cent. should be made. I think that is perfectly reasonable and accords with the previous provisions of the Act. The opinion continues—

> It is also envisaged that the Board will specify a time after the signing of the contract of sale within which the money must be paid to the local authority.

I think that is also reasonable. The opinion continues—

> In making this statement, Members are reminded that the Act requires that application for consent to subdivide be determined by the Town Planning Board. I believe that Hon. Members will agree when I say that the Board has always exercised its duty with a deep sense of responsibility, and there is no reason to doubt that it will not continue to do so in the future.
>
> I believe, therefore, that Clause 4 will allow for a subdivider to continue to exercise an option to pay cash in lieu of land and that it will also now ensure that all subdividers contribute equally towards the provision of open space, or for recreation facilities and not just the subdivider of larger parcels as has previously been the case.
>
> In conclusion, I would also remind Hon. Members that where a subdivider is not satisfied with a decision of the Board, he may always ask that it be reconsidered—

The subdivider says, "I do not think this is quite reasonable," or something like that, "and I ask you to reconsider it." I suppose at the same time he will make his submissions. The opinion continues—

> —and if he is still not convinced that the Board is acting in the community's interest, he has a right to appeal to the Hon. Minister for Town Planning or to the Town Planning Court.

I think the Parliamentary Draftsman has come up with a very reasonable compromise.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I regret it is impossible for me to accede to the suggestion that this Bill does not contain any compulsion. If I did so I would belie all the education I have ever received, which is that words are to be interpreted in accordance with what they appear to be.

It is quite clear to me that this Bill contains a provision that the board may give a notice requiring a contribution in cash and that this is to be the additional part of the section. I do not dispute what the Minister said in reading the Parliamentary Draftsman's opinion but I dispute the suggestion that there is nothing in the proposed amendment other than provision for time payment—an obligation to pay within a certain time. That is not so. I am sorry to have to say so, but it is not so.

If that is what the Minister believes, I regret it and I do not think anything I can say will change his mind; but it seems to me I should make it clear that according to my understanding of these words we are asked to provide under paragraph (b) that the owner of land will be compelled to make a cash contribution in certain circumstances; that is, (1) where the board has laid down that a certain amount of public open space must be contributed, and (2) instead of contributing public open space the owner shall contribute cash. In those circumstances it is obligatory upon the owner to pay cash. If anyone doubts that, I ask him again to read carefully the wording of paragraph (b). It must be appreciated that the two paragraphs stand entirely separate. One reads paragraph (a), then paragraph (b), and paragraphs (a) and (b) are qualified by the preliminary part of the section, which reads after the figure "4"—

> Where the Board has approved a plan of subdivision of land upon condition that portion thereof be set aside and vested in the Crown for parks, recreation grounds or open spaces generally—

Either of two situations may then arise —that mentioned in (a) and that mentioned in (b). As the Minister has quite rightly said, subclause (a) is simply a restatement of section 20 (4) of the Act. If the local authority and the board agree, the owner of land may pay cash in lieu of land.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He can pay cash if they agree.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: That is the existing law.

The Hon. J. Dolan: That is right.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Right throughout the Minister and I have agreed that this has exactly the same meaning. However, we differ when we come to consider proposed paragraph (b).

Let us study proposed paragraph (b) separately. It will read, "The owner of the land shall"—this is clearly compulsory— "if the board by notice in writing requires, pay a sum representing the value of the land to the local authority." If this is not the meaning, there is no point in including it. The Minister has quite properly explained that this provision is to include the small subdividers who have escaped contributing in the past. Obviously the Town Planning Board did not want a multitude of small blocks all around the countryside. This provision will now ensure that everyone contributes. The only alteration to the previous Act is that the board now issues the notice in writing which was previously issued by the local authority, and that the payment of money is not required until such time as one of the blocks of land is sold. However, as soon as one block of land is sold, the whole 10 per cent. of the value must be paid.

In view of the recent parliamentary recess, I would like to again mention the type of people who will be affected by this legislation. The owner of a house on a half-acre of land will have to contribute 10 per cent. of the value of that half-acre excluding the value of his

house if he wishes to subdivide it into two quarter-acre blocks. It is obvious that the price of the land will increase, and we are hoping to avoid this. In many cases it is quite unnecessary to ask for a contribution, yet we cannot make fish of one and flesh of the other. How can we say to a man in one street, "You do not have to contribute," but say to the man in the next street, "You must contribute"?

This proposed paragraph is not satisfactory. I cannot agree with the Minister and I oppose it.

Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.07 p.m.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I feel that Mr. Medcalf and I are at cross-purposes, because I am sure that something he said a moment ago is not in accordance with what I read and so I will read my notes again. So far as the subdivider is concerned, he has two courses. He can pay cash in lieu of the land, or he can make portion of the land available. We are agreed on that. The subdivider can go to the board or the shire and agreement can be reached between the three parties if the subdivider wishes to pay cash. If members are satisfied up to that stage, let us see what happens after that. The notes that I have read are as follows:—

> In elaboration, it is envisaged that the Board would require in accordance with current policy for 10% of the value of each new lot to be paid as endowment, and for that figure of 10% to be assessed at the time of sale of the new lot.

It is not the whole of the subdivision, but only each new lot that is mentioned; if he sells only one. There is only one payment and the subdivider will make arrangements with the local authority as to when he shall make the payment. The local authority may grant him a period of three months in which to make it, and if he fails to do so at the end of that term it may grant him an extension, but it must be in regard to each new lot.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do the words, "to which the plan of subdivision relates" mean?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: A plan is made of any subdivision, and the subdivider will pay for each new lot. I also wish to draw the attention of members to a letter which I have received and which has been completely unsolicited. It is from the Royal Australian Planning Institute (Western Australia Division). Judging from the prefix "Royal" I should imagine that this would be an institute to which members could pay close respect. The letter is addressed to the Minister for Town Planning and it reads—

> The Western Australia Division of the Royal Australian Planning Institute have studied—

In view of the fact that only two clauses have to be studied, the word "studied" really means studied to me. The letter continues—

> —that the Bill for an Act to amend the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-1970, and would like to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the basic points behind the proposed legislation.
>
> It is appreciated that the Government is amending and improving this most important Act.

This is a completely independent body and I have never heard of the person who signed that letter.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is the date of that letter?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The 13th May, 1972.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A very unlucky day—the 13th.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: It generally is; particularly up this end.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Depending on who is handling the Bill.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The subdivider does not pay his 10 per cent. on the whole subdivision; he pays it lot by lot when he has the money.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I do not think that is so.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: That is the opinion I have here; that the figure of 10 per cent. would be assessed at the time of the sale of the new lot, and I take it that it would be each new lot.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I do not think it is.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The honourable member does not think it is because he is determined not to do so. I will leave it at that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I agree with the Minister that the amendment does make provision for the payment of 10 per cent. in cash in lieu of portion of the land, and that the cash is to be paid after the first lot is subdivided. However, it does not matter whether it is the whole subdivision or only one lot. As far as I am concerned this new provision will take from the subdivider the right to decide whether he shall pay cash instead of allocating portion of the land when the subdivision is made. I ask the Minister: When the Government introduced this Bill, was it its intention to take from the subdivider this right to make a decision as to whether he should pay cash in lieu of land, and give that right to the board or the local authority?

The Hon. J. Dolan: The answer is, "No."

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That satisfies me. The Minister has indicated that it was not the Government's intention to do this, despite what he said concerning clause 3 (b) when he introduced

the Bill. On that occasion he concluded his remarks on this clause by saying that it would enable the board to require a payment in lieu of a land contribution. This is all we are arguing about. I believe that the legislation should remain as it is and that the sole right should remain with the subdivider, and not the board, to initiate the move. In my opinion paragraph (b) is a further proviso in case the owner decides not to offer cash in lieu of land. That is the whole argument. We believe paragraph (b) should not be included and that the sole right to make the decision regarding the payment of money in lieu of the provision of land should be left to the subdivider.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The Minister has outlined the intent of the proposed provision, and I think Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Medcalf would agree with that intent. However, Mr. Medcalf has dealt with the printed word and this is what we must consider when studying legislation.

I believe the Minister is ignoring the paragraph (b) prefix which means that the proposal is that the owner of the land may pay to the local authority certain moneys in lieu of land, and if the board requires it, then the owner shall pay the money at a certain time. That is what the provision would mean if the prefix to paragraph (b) is ignored; and that is how I believe the Minister is interpreting the amendment. However we must consider the written word before us.

If we ignore paragraph (a) and link paragraph (b) directly to the introduction of the proposed new subsection, then we would have the interpretation Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Medcalf placed on the clause. It appears we are all bent towards a solution along the lines of the intent outlined by the Minister; and I believe this solution could be achieved by including both paragraphs (a) and (b), and inserting at the beginning of paragraph (b) the word "where" and after the word "land" the words "has agreed to pay cash in lieu of land referred to in paragraph (a) he."

I offer this to the Minister, Mr. Clive Griffiths, and Mr. Medcalf as a suitable solution.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I think that suggestion conveys what we want. Although I am sure my interpretation was perfectly correct, I am prepared to accept Mr. White's solution.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I am quite prepared to agree to that arrangement. It takes care of my objection. We are indebted to Mr. White for his comments and I commend the Minister for accepting his suggestion.

However, I would like to make one comment. I wish to chide the Minister ever so gently for saying I was determined to take a certain line. I think I have indicated in my remarks that I was bending over backwards to try to help the Minister in what seemed to be a difficult situation for him. However, no doubt he made the remark on the spur of the moment.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I was trying to bend over backwards to accede to your request.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: In view of Mr. White's suggestion, I move—

> That the amendment be amended by inserting before the words "the owner" in the first line of paragraph (b) of proposed new subsection (4) the word "where".

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Mr. DOLAN: I move—

> That the amendment be further amended by inserting after the word "line" in the first line of paragraph (b) of proposed new subsection (4) the following:—
>
> > has agreed to pay cash in lieu of land referred to in paragraph (a) he".

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with an amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Section 6A added—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Doubtless members have seen the amendment standing in my name on the notice paper. I refer the Committee to clause 10 which appears on page 7 of the Bill. My purpose is to delete the words commencing with the word "The" in line 6 down to and including the word "Council" in line 8. Actually it will delete the words—

> The Governor shall appoint the Chairman of the Advisory Council from amongst the members of that Council.

The Committee will recall that I explained when speaking to the second reading that virtually all senior officers in most departments if not all—and certainly in the Health Department—are grossly overloaded with committee work. Generally they find they are chairmen of a great number of committees. Many have volunteers acting on the committees but I think the senior officers of the department feel they should set an example. Unfortunately this example leads to their being out evening after evening on committee work. For this reason it was felt the chairman ought to be drawn from people outside the department. Consequently it has been suggested that members of the advisory council should appoint the chairman from those persons who are mentioned in paragraph (b); namely—

(b) two persons not being employed in the Department, nominated by the Minister;

Therefore, I move an amendment—

Page 7, lines 6 to 8—Delete all words commencing with the word "The" down to and including the word "Council" and substitute the following words:—

The members of the Advisory Council shall appoint one of the persons nominated by the Minister under paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of this section to be the Chairman.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I cannot accept the amendment. I can give numerous examples of legislation brought in by the previous Government wherein the chairman of a board has been appointed by the Minister or the Governor. Let me give the Committee just a few examples. The Murdoch University Planning Board was established in 1970. This has a chairman and 11 members, all of whom are appointed by the Minister. The Minister also has the power to appoint additional members, if necessary. Let us take, as an example, the Consumer Protection Council which was established as a result of legislation passed in 1970. Again it has 12 members including the chairman, all of whom are appointed by the Governor. For variety, let us consider the Museum Trustees. The members, chairman, and vice-chairman are also appointed by the Governor. In the case of the Fremantle Port Authority the five commissioners and the chairman are all appointed by the Governor. Not only that, but the Governor and the Minister can also appoint the chairman annually, because there is that power. The Licensing Court established under the Liquor Act of 1970—which is one of the latest—comprises three members, one of whom shall be chairman, and they are all appointed by the Governor.

In a case like this I feel the Minister should have some power to manoeuvre. I am sure the only thought in the Minister's mind would be to obtain the best man to act as chairman on the advisory council.

Mr. MacKinnon wishes to limit the choice to the two persons mentioned in paragraph (b) who are not employed by the department and are nominated by the Minister. I feel it would be most unwise to take the power away from the Minister in these circumstances.

I have shown already the numerous precedents that have been set and, after all, the Minister should have this right because he is the man responsible for the board operating satisfactorily. I feel he should have the right to manoeuvre and be able to pick the man he thinks best suited to the job. It should not be confined to any one section; not to the two persons nominated by the Senate of the University of Western Australia nor to the person nominated by the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association—although it could be one of these. The Minister wants the power to manoeuvre and the right to appoint. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This council is, in many ways, extremely different in its purpose and its function from those which have been enunciated by the Minister. Most of the committees which the Minister has mentioned are managing committees; they actually conduct the day-to-day affairs of a harbour, museum, the Licensing Court, and the like. This committee is quite different and, in effect, it sits in judgment, because its function is to advise the Minister upon such matters which relate to the provision, co-ordination, and utilisation of the clinical and teaching facilities, services, and resources that are or ought to be available in teaching hospitals.

For example, the Perth Medical Centre, which is currently Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, has attached to it a radiological clinic and X-ray laboratories. It has a linear accelerator. Royal Perth Hospital, which is a major hospital, has a cobalt bomb and hyperbaric unit, which are both for the treatment of deep-seated cancer. Another piece of equipment is required which could go to either hospital. The committee in question will, in effect, sit in judgment and recommend to the Minister which hospital should develop which speciality. It has long been felt it is extremely uneconomic for each and every hospital to develop each and every speciality. I think that virtually goes without saying. Consequently one would expect matters gynaecological to be handled at King Edward, matters pediatric to be handled at Princess Margaret, matters concerned with the chest to be handled at Sir Charles Gairdner, and so on.

The committee will not manage anything like those aspects handled by the committees mentioned by the Minister. The purpose of this committee is to advise and the advice is in a very delicate area

because each hospital is jealous of its range of specialities. In saying this, I mean that each hospital is properly jealous. I do not mean it is an improper thing for the hospitals to be jealous of their reputation and the like. This is a healthy sign, but it could be a somewhat expensive one. Consequently it is a delicate area in which to operate.

I think the Minister would be well advised to accept the amendment whereby the chairman is appointed from two persons not being employed in the department and nominated by the Minister. I know the rules and also that it is not supposed to happen, but the chairman always seems to have some influence (because he is looked up to by the other members. He ought to be someone who is not employed by the department and someone who sits outside the scheme of things. After all he will have to be somewhat more of a judge than the others since he will be the major spokesman for the committee. In taking all these things into account, the Minister would be advised to accept the amendment.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I still persist the Minister should not be limited in any way whatsoever. I consider it is wrong to leave it to the council to make the appointment. If the principle has been established and written into many other Acts as a valid one, the same principle should apply here. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As I see the situation there are eight members of the council of which, under proposed subsection (4), the Governor shall appoint one. Under the amendment before us the Governor will have the choice of only two.

The Hon. J. Dolan: In paragarph (d) it is a little different.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The advisory council shall consist of eight persons, who are listed in paragraphs (a) to (e) inclusive.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Look at (d) again.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It refers to one person.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There will be five in all.

The Hon. J. Dolan: There will be five because it refers to one from each teaching hospital.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I see that makes 12 in all. At the moment the Governor may choose from 12 but, under the proposed amendment, his choice would be restricted to two. I consider this would inhibit the Governor's ambit too much, and I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Section 7A added—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The amendment which appears in my name on the notice paper is completely different from the previous one. I refer the Committee to page 8, lines 15 to 17, which gives the Minister power—

> (b) to establish and conduct centralised catering, laundry, and other services and facilities for any public hospital;

This provides for the establishment of a completely centralised laundry. I think I made it clear when I spoke to the second reading that I do not object to the principle of centralised services but I do object to another Government-conducted enterprise. We have seen these operate in the past more frequently than not to the detriment of the State.

In this case a considerable number of hardships could be induced by accepting the Bill as it stands. I also mentioned that certain tonnages of laundry are currently being done by private laundries. There are no laundries at the Bentley, Osborne Park, or Sir Charles Gairdner hospitals. All the laundry is being done outside. The laundry at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital is currently being done by the Hollywood Repatriation Hospital which has given notice several times that it will not be able to continue this work *ad infinitum*. The Fremantle Hospital Laundry has not been increased in size and I think about 10 tons a week goes out from that laundry to private contractors. Other hospitals have difficulties with their laundry because space is always a problem. Further problems are the generation of steam and the like.

The situation is that private launderers have enlarged their plant and staff to cope with laundry and can now adequately handle the laundry that is required to be done.

Accordingly I believe this subclause should be deleted. We should continue the proposals which were established of gradually farming out laundry work to private laundries so that they might cope with the situation that exists in the various hospitals. I move an amendment—

> Page 8—Delete paragraph (b) of proposed new section 7A.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I support the amendment, but I feel a bit more strongly about this than does Mr. MacKinnon.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have not got started yet.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Mr. MacKinnon has said he favours centralisation in certain respects. I could never favour centralisation. The present Government has, indeed, presented a policy of decentralisation, but in this case it is playing both ends against the middle.

During the last few days we have stood adjourned I took the opportunity to visit one of the laundries in Fremantle. I was able to do this through the good offices of the institute of laundries. I might add, in case anybody gets alarmed, that this is in my province. The laundry in question processes 10 tons of laundry per week and all necessary precautions are taken to prevent any cross-infection. This is done by sterilisation with various chemicals imported from America. Anything with rust on it is rejected and reprocessed. Those things that need repair are repaired before being returned.

When such a laundry could double its capacity within three to six months, where is the sense in spending $4,000,000 on what appears to me to be the establishment of a useless centralised laundry, in order that the Government might have its little thing in the matter, while at the same time put out of business the private laundries that exist?

Mr. MacKinnon said that on several occasions the Repatriation Hospital has given notice that it can no longer cope with the laundry from the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

Members can well imagine what would happen if there were just one breakdown in a centralised laundry. To whom would we appeal in such an event and from where would the hospitals get their clean linen? It is a stupid move to consider establishing centralised laundries.

As Mr. Logan said, it is the Government's right to interefere if private enterprise cannot cope and if it is unable to provide the necessary service; but when those facilities do exist—and this has been told to the Minister as recently as the 10th May, 1972, but the Minister says he is no longer interested and he is going on with his intention to build a huge new centralised laundry complex—the Government should not interefere with the work done by the private laundries.

The Minister has also said, "Regardless of anything you say, I have already appointed the manager for this complex, and the building of it will go ahead despite the fact that it will cost $4,000,000."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you find it hard to reconcile the expenditure of $4,000,000 when the Government is short of loan funds?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: It cannot be reconciled. We find in another case where somebody wished to borrow $700,000 that the Government said, "We cannot take that from Treasury funds; we have not the money; but you can go on and do it."

Here is a case in point in which the Government could save itself money. The Minister gave us the history of the case before us. I am not interested in the history; I am interested in the type of service that will be provided; the facilities that we possess now and the facilities that we will need in the future.

Mr. MacKinnon rightly pointed out that the amount of laundry work required to be done in future could very well decrease because of the use of disposable and throw-away items. In this case we are about to commit ourselves to a complex costing $4,000,000.

Until I visited the laundry I did not know that the tunnel washer will cost $100,000 but that its installation will cost another $250,000. This being the case it will be difficult to convince me that there will not be teething troubles and that the machine will not break down.

The laundry in Adelaide broke down the other day and I ask: "Will not the one at Fremantle break down?" If it does, there are other resources available and these facilities already exist in this State. To consider the establishment of a centralised system is a form of suicide. It will be of no use to cry out to the private companies if the central laundry breaks down because some of the private laundries will have gone to the wall.

There are about 15 women working at the Fremantle Hospital—and when I say working, I mean with a capital "W". The laundry in question received items to be laundered on Monday morning in a particular week and these were returned, because they happened to be required urgently, on Monday evening. The Government institutions do not have to worry about profit and loss as we have seen recently, but it is very necessary for private enterprise to be concerned about tender prices, profit and loss, and so on.

I have seen centralised laundry systems trying to work in the United Kingdom under the great hoo-hah that goes on there, where the taxpayer does not begin to think about what it costs him, because if he did he would go out and commit suicide and become a charge on the State.

I can see no sense, rhyme, nor reason for a centralised system of laundry control, and I support the amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I expressed myself strongly on this aspect during the second reading debate. I took the opportunity to visit the steam laundry at Fremantle the other morning, and Mr. Williams accompanied me. When the Fremantle Hospital was incapable of doing its own laundry work these premises were established at considerable cost to carry out this purpose. Machinery was installed at great cost and an efficient organisation was set up.

I have not seen anything quite as efficient as the working of the steam laundry at Fremantle. The laundry work connected with the hospital staff is kept separate and 15 very efficient girls are working in that laundry. If we have a centralised laundry all this efficiency will go by the board.

One of the reasons given for the establishment of a centralised laundry is that it will be able to handle the laundry needs of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. But this only amounts to about 10½ tons a week and there is something wrong if this cannot be done by the private laundries.

The laundry facilities at the Claremont Mental Hospital have been upgraded at considerable cost, as have those at the Princess Margaret Hospital. What will happen to these facilities when a centralised laundry is set up?

As Mr. Williams has said, there was chaos when the laundry system in South Australia broke down. One only needs a single link in the chain to break for there to be complete confusion.

What will happen to the private laundries from Kwinana to Osborne Park which are at the moment catering for the needs of the "C"-class hospitals and the Government hospitals? The manager of the Fremantle steam laundry told me that 33 to 34 per cent. of their hospital work had been reduced. In such an event the laundry in question must become an uneconomic unit even if we do write off the capital cost of the work it has to put in.

In the event of the establishment of a centralised laundry, 15 people will be unemployed in the steam laundry at Fremantle. They would not be prepared to leave the area in which they work because their homes are there and they are well satisfied. I am perfectly satisfied, therefore, we cannot have a centralised laundry system and I support the amendment.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I propose to read a statement on matters that have been mentioned. In the second reading debate, Mr. MacKinnon said—

> There is no shadow of a doubt in my mind that it is becoming increasingly necessary in the five major hospitals—the Royal Perth Hospital, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, the King Edward Memorial Hospital, the Fremantle Hospital and the Princess Margaret Hospital—and also the peripheral hospitals at Osborne Park, Bentley—and Rockingham when it is built—that there is an absolute need for such services.

Mr. Ferry then said—

> I believe the private sector could, in fact, be given the encouragement that may be necessary to meet this challenge. It has been my experience that a challenge always seems to bring out the best in a person; and this, of course, also applies to the business and the private enterprise world. If the laundry facilities are not sufficient to meet the challenge I would say to the private sector, "Here is your chance to do a job."

I will show the Committee that such an opportunity was afforded and it could not be availed of. I am perfectly sincere and determined in the statement I make. Mr. Logan said—

> If private enterprise has not been approached and given the opportunity to tender for and process the work necessary I think this ought to be done.

I hope that by reading the following statement I will convince Mr. Logan that this has been done and that private enterprise could not measure up:—

> Attached is a copy of the press advertisement calling tenders (with a closing date 18th August, 1967), together with the Memorandum of Information.
>
> It will be noted that initially the laundry requirement was estimated at 80 tons per week and should grow to 120 tons by 1973.
>
> Only one tender was received, that of Western Linen Supply Co. Ltd.
>
> Long and careful consideration was given to this tender. On 6th May, 1968, the then Minister for Health (Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) advised the company that it had been decided not to accept the tender submitted.
>
> Other proposals put to the Government by the Hon. Mr. MacKinnon were rejected, but the principles of the removal of the laundry service from hospital environs and of a complete laundry and linen service were accepted but it was decided to again pursue the privately owned laundry concept.
>
> The Departmental file discloses much investigation, which did not produce any results by the time the Government changed.

In case members feel I have overstated the case, I refer them to a letter dated the 20th December, 1966 from the then Minister for Health (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) to Mr. Margetts, which reads as follows:—

> Dear Mr. Margetts,
>
> I wish to confirm that there is a need in Western Australia for a central laundry and linen service to serve hospitals, as no such combined service is available at the present time.
>
> I am very interested in your proposition as we have discussed and await the submission of firm proposals, which would be given very serious consideration.

If necessary I will read the rest of the letter later. Although that occurred almost six years ago nothing has yet been done. The statement continues—

> In respect of existing operations of metropolitan private laundries, the Fremantle Hospital has a contract with the Fremantle Steam Laundry,

whilst in relation to the Monarch Laundry, which handles the work of the King Edward Memorial Hospital and two Departmental hospitals, Mr. Baldock many months ago in discussion with the Director of Administration, Medical and Health Services, was made aware of the Department's intentions. Mr. Baldock agreed that because of increasing demands for private laundry, no serious difficulties would be encountered in relinquishing the laundry work of public hospitals.

The following is the notice calling for tenders for a central laundry and linen service:—

Tenders closing on 18th August, 1967 are invited for a laundry and full linen service for certain public hospitals in the metropolitan area.
Initially the laundry requirement is estimated at 80 tons per week and should grow to 120 tons by 1973.
General Conditions are set out in a Memorandum of Information available from—

Under Secretary,
Medical Department,
514 Hay Street,
Perth.

The memorandum of information is quite interesting and all those who have taken up cudgels on behalf of private industry in this particular matter should listen very carefully to it. It is as follows:—

1. Tenders are to provide for a complete hospital laundry and linen service including—

(a) Linen repairs

(b) Handling of all foul and infectious linen.

2. Initially the following hospitals are to be served:—

Royal Perth Hospital (and Shenton Park Rehabilitation Hospital)

Princess Margaret Hospital
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital
Sunset Hospital
Bentley Hospital.

3. Tenders are to be submitted on the basis of providing the necessary facilities in either—

(a) one unit capable initially of processing 80 tons of laundry per week, or

(b) Units capable initially of processing 40 tons per week.

4. Price is (a) to be stated as firm per pound dry weight clean and (b) to cover all types of linen including uniforms.

Any discount or price reduction applicable as the tonnage increases to 120 tons under 3(a) or 60 tons under 3(b) etc. is to be indicated.

5. The price is to be payable on the weight of clean linen returned to each hospital after laundering.

6. The contract may be for a period of five, seven or ten years.

Tenderers are to state any difference in price which would be occasioned by the different terms of the contract.

7. Tenderers are to state the amount per pound the price is to be adjusted for every 10 cents or part thereof increase or decrease in the award wages of female employees applicable to the industry.

8. Tenderers are to state the earliest practicable date after 1st July, 1968 on which the full laundry and linen service can be operational.

9. Tenderers must give firm advice of availability of—

(a) Land

(b) Finance.

10. Tenderers will be required to negotiate with the Hospital Authorities concerned for purchase of existing hospital linen and laundry equipment and the hospitals may if they so desire accept in payment, shares carrying full voting rights, in the organisation.

11. A permanent Standards Committee will be established by the hospitals and the Medical Department.

The functions of this committee will be to determine hospital requirements on all aspects of linen and laundry standards including—

(a) Sizes and patterns of articles

(b) Quality of materials

(c) Standard of manufacture and/or repair work

(d) Measures to avoid cross infection

(e) Size and type of containers for clean and dirty linen

(f) Type of transport to and from the hospitals

(g) Effectiveness of the laundry processes as to colour of wash, finish of uniforms and control of infection.

12. Tenderers are to provide for—

(a) Collection of linen from the hospitals on seven days per week.

(b) Delivery of clean linen to hospitals on five, six or seven days weekly, dependent on the requirements of individual hospitals. Tenderers should specify if delivery on six or seven days weekly would affect the price.

Note: This section does not mean that laundering would have to be done on more than five days weekly.

13. Tenderers are to describe the type and state the size of linen containers they propose to use.

14. The hospitals and the Medical Department are to have the right to inspect the laundry and linen service buildings, equipment and methods of working including vehicles at any time and to arrange laboratory tests. Normally this would be done through the Standards Committee.

15. Staff employed in hospital laundries at the date of commencement of the central laundry and linen service are to be offered employment in the new service. Any who are surplus to total staff requirements in the new service will be offered alternative employment in the hospitals.

16. Contractors will be expected to accept full risk in relation to damage by transport accidents, fire or any other cause.

17. In the event of a successful tenderer failing to provide and maintain a full service satisfactory to the hospitals, the hospitals will have the right to take over and operate the service as an emergency measure.

18. Disputes between the parties will be referred to an Arbitrator suitable to all parties. If the parties fail to agree on an Arbitrator the Hon. Minister for Health will appoint one.

19. The lowest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

20. The successful tenderer(s) will be required to deposit $2,000 for retention by the Medical Department in the event of failure to abide by the conditions of the contract.

After three years of satisfactory performance this sum will be returned.

21. When submitting tenders, tenderers are required to certify that their tender is submitted in accordance with this Memorandum of Information.

22. Tenders are to be forwarded by registered post and marked "Tender for Linen Service" to:—

Under Secretary,
Medical Department,
514 Hay Street,
Perth.

to arrive not later than 10 a.m. on Friday, 18th August, 1967.

Tenders will not be opened until that time.

Only one tender was received, and it was not accepted by the Minister. I think it has been established that the then Minister saw the necessity for the establishment of a central laundry service. As was indicated in his letter to Mr. Margetts, investigations were being carried on constantly, yet a solution could not be found.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What consultation has your Government had with private industry on this matter since it has been in office?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I could not answer that question truthfully.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Had it had any consultation I feel sure you would have told us.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The previous Minister sent a high-ranking officer to Adelaide to inspect the central laundry in that city. We are prepared to accept, in base, the report submitted by that officer. We feel perfectly justified in proceeding with the course of action outlined in the Bill. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am highly delighted that the Minister did not recount all the efforts I made to remove laundry services from the precincts of hospitals because I am sure we have been delayed quite long enough by his reading just one effort I made. I do not want to get into an argument with my friend, Mr. Williams, regarding centralisation, but I repeat what I said before: I believe it is desirable that laundry and some other services should be removed from the site of the hospitals.

The reason that only one tender was received at that time is a matter of history. Suffice it to say that a tender was submitted. I know the manner in which that tenderer constructs laundries because I have inspected his present laundry and I know it to be good. I still believe that laundries ought to be away from the site of the hospital, but I believe laundering should be done in conjunction with the policy I tried to implement; that is, the Bunbury Regional Hospital laundry work is carried out by the Bunbury Steam Laundry—a private enterprise—and Mr. Logan has already mentioned the arrangement for the Fremantle Hospital.

The reason that several hospitals which were constructed whilst I was Minister have not their own laundries is that they were told not to put in laundries but to arrange satisfactory contracts outside. I believe this should continue to be done.

All sorts of efforts have been made—not solely for the purpose of obtaining one central laundry, although I do not deny there was a period during which we looked on that with favour—with the idea of removing laundries from the sites of hospitals.

A further reason why I believe that laundering should be placed in private hands is that there is a fast-growing tendency for big establishments to hire linen, cutlery, and the like. If ever Jumbo jets land here, with their huge passenger loads, the only way in which we could handle the work would be to have scattered around the metropolitan area a large number of

large laundries able to cope with the quick turnover required. So I believe it is necessary to have a number of large laundries. I believe this can best be done by the Government spreading its contracts and encouraging private firms to expand their facilities.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It seems to me that the Minister is relying on history rather than on fact. He has told us what took place in 1967, but he has not given us any indication of what his Government did in the last 15 months in respect of private enterprise laundries. At times we have seen the galleries of this Chamber filled with interested people when certain pieces of legislation have been before us. On this occasion we have only to cast our eyes around the Chamber to realise that many people are interested in the Bill now before us.

They are interested, because they can see their welfare being partially destroyed —I do not say totally destroyed—and with the partial destruction of their industry goes the loss of employment of some of their employees. I am concerned with that. I know the answer is that any surplus labour will be taken up in the central laundry.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It would seem obvious.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It would seem obvious to the Minister, but he nods his head in assent without giving the matter the slightest consideration. What concerns me greatly is that for a period of 15 months we have been told about the parlous condition of the State Treasury, and about the bankrupt Treasury which the outgoing Brand Government left! However, on this occasion the Government is able to find $4,000,000 for the project, and we have not been told anything about that finance. It is just a matter of fact that the money will be found for the establishment of what is nothing more nor less than a socialised industry, when there are already private enterprise undertakings employed in the very region where the Government proposes to set up a State laundry.

If there was only one tender received in 1967, would it not be better to approach these people again? It could turn out that better arrangements might be made in 1972. In that event, would not the sum of $4,000,000 be employed more beneficially in the building of houses, schools, and other facilities required by the community, rather than be used to satisfy the desires of a socialist Government to set up a socialised industry?

We see this reflected in the Bill before us; and it is also reflected in the Bill relating to the State Implement Works. We see there is a desire on the part of the present Government to enter to an ever-increasing extent into State trading. I wonder about the wisdom of such a trend, particularly as the Government says it is short of money in other directions.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I am indebted to the Minister for filling in the background of what happened before. Mr. Griffith has asked what the present Government has done about this matter, and from what I have been able to learn the Secretary of the West Australian Institute of Launderers must have approached the Government some time before the 29th March, 1972, because I have before me a letter from the Minister for Health to the secretary of that institute, which states—

> Dear Mr. Baldock,
>
> I refer to your letter of the 17th March, 1972 which the Hon. H. G. Graham, M.L.A., Minister for Development and Decentralisation, has forwarded to me for attention.
>
> The Government is proceeding with the planning of a Central Laundry and Linen Service which, it is intended, will serve Public Hospitals in the Metropolitan area.
>
> It is not intended that the service will extend to Private Hospitals or bodies other than Public Hospitals. I think it pertinent to remind the members of your Institute that the previous Government tried for several years to interest private launderers in the establishment of a Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. Those attempts were unsuccessful.
>
> At this time I cannot see that very much purpose would be served by your institute sending a deputation to meet me. However, if you still wish to put some other points before me I will be prepared to meet you and you should contact my Secretary, Mr. D. Fitzpatrick to arrange an appointment.

In other words, the Institute of Launderers had expressed a desire to see the Minister for Development and Decentralisation to discuss these problems relating to the laundries. The answer, as indicated in the letter, was that it could not, and that the Government was going ahead with the plans for setting up the central laundry.

I followed this matter up by seeking information as to the existing capacity of the members of the Institute of Launderers —not the capacity as it was in the past. The information I have been furnished with is as follows:—

> Indications received from our members previously and another check up today reveals that they would be interested, from an industry point of view, to carry out more work for Government controlled hospitals. They would also be prepared to invest in further plant and if necessary buildings to bring about a further flow of Government work to members of this Institute. An indication of the amount

of work which could be done has revealed that with three month's notice some thirty-five (35) to forty (40) tons of work could be handled with existing equipment augmented by further installations of modern machinery. With a six month's notice it had anticipated that some sixty-five (65) to seventy (70) tons could be handled on the same basis providing a five year contract is given in each case. We would point out that these laundries are modern, efficient, and geared for future expansion. In the case of Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and the Medical Centre at Shenton Park, whose arrangement with the Commonwealth Department expires in December next, this could be handled initially on three month's notice so that this matter could not be used as an excuse for urgency because, as mentioned above, the offer has already been made to the Department.

The deputation asked to see the Minister, but the reply given was that no useful purpose would be served by seeing him, because the plans were in the pipeline and the project was on its way. There was no question of some research being undertaken to determine how the situation could be coped with.

I would like to pose this question: If the Hollywood Repatriation Department cannot do this laundering in December, will the new laundry be able to do it, or will private enterprise be asked to assist on a *pro tempore* basis? Will the Government say to private enterprise, "When we have finished with you we will discard you just as we discard the dirty linen which you have been laundering"?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am staggered by the views that have been expressed in the debate. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to a socialised industry, but he conveniently chose to neglect another aspect that might be involved in the running of a laundry service. He did not express any concern as to what might happen to the employees of private laundries, if one of the larger laundries decided to increase its capacity to the extent that it would take business away from its competitors. It only seems to be a source of concern when it is a laundry to be established by the Government!

We need not be surprised that the Government has decided to expend $4,000,000 on this central laundry; that obviously indicates the Government is concerned. Negotiations with the private laundries have been going on since 1967, but no headway has been made.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Why did not the present Minister receive the deputation?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Receive the deputation in 1972! Why was not something more concrete put forward to the Government? It is the duty of the Government to ensure that the health services of the State are run efficiently. If a central laundry has to be built the Government must make the decision, even though the cost be $4,000,000, which could be used in other directions. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: We all appreciate the need to have efficient laundry services. Nobody can deny that, but the manner in which the Government seeks to achieve this is of concern to me. It appears that the Government has brushed aside the private sector in respect of this matter. It has also brushed aside the employment angle of the people who are involved with private laundries. On this occasion the Government should be concerned more than ever with the employment of the people in the private sector.

Recently we read pronouncements by the Premier in the Press when he spoke on behalf of the Government in relation to employment in another industry—the motor industry. He indicated that he was prepared to fly half-way around the world in order to stimulate employment in Western Australia; yet under the Bill before us the Government is doing the opposite.

The Government is prepared to depress the private sector, without regard for the employment of the people. I do not believe that for practical reasons all the displaced employees in the private sector will be prepared to take on employment in the new Government laundry. Some of them will accept employment at the Government laundry, but for practical reasons others will not.

I refer to the matter which has been raised by Mr. Williams: the approach made by the private laundries to the Government, and the request to talk the matter over with the Government. We have been led to believe that this is to be a Government of the people, to which the people can make representations and approaches. I suggest the Government is not speaking to the people, but is touching the people to the tune of $4,000,000. I oppose the proposition contained in the Bill, and I am prepared to support its deletion.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Mr. Griffith wanted to know what has been done by this Government in the last 15 or 16 months. I know the Minister for Health. He is always prepared to investigate any proposition that is put before him. I have the utmost respect for the work and the investigations which he has undertaken in this matter.

He gave a good example of what happened in South Australia, of a laundry that had been established in that State not in the term of office of a Labor Government, but in a term of office of an L.C.L. Government which saw the merit of establishing such a facility. That Government established the facility, and it was happy to do so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The integrity of Mr. Davies is not in doubt.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I am not talking about that. The Leader of the Opposition asked what had been done in the last 15 or 16 months, and the Minister is the man who does the work. Knowing the man, I say he has investigated the matter from every possible angle. I think that by asking what has been done the Leader of the Opposition is saying that the Minister has not shown the efficiency he should have in carrying out his investigations.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, we did not say that.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: This matter has been on the plate for many years. Mr. Williams indicated that 80 tons of laundry are now being handled and that by 1973 it will be necessary to have facilities to cope with 100 tons.

Regarding the cheap jibe that this Government does not meet the people, my office is open to anybody, including members of the Opposition. Nobody has ever been refused entry, and nobody is ever likely to be. I resent any insinuation that the Minister has not made a thorough investigation. I am quite satisfied that the Minister is convinced this is an absolute necessity, not only for efficiency, but in the interests of economy. Money will not be poured down the drain.

The centralised laundry will follow the same procedure as the one established and profitably run in Adelaide. I have the utmost sympathy for anybody who is out of work, but this will not happen. Nobody will be put out of work by the establishment of a centralised laundry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The only heat which has been engendered in this debate has been introduced by the Minister himself.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The Leader of the Opposition started it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not start it at all. If somebody crosses the purpose of the Minister, or deigns to ask a question about something, he gets irritable, upset, and annoyed, and tries to defend himself by raising his voice. That does not wash with me. If the Minister will recollect, all I said was—and I believe I said it quite politely—tenders were called in 1967. That is five years ago. I asked what had been done in the period his Government has been in office during the last 15 months. I made no mention whatsoever of the present Minister for Health. I did not mention his name and I did not in any way suggest that he had not done anything or had done something.

I asked the Minister what had been done and because he knew he could not tell us he thought the best way out was to get annoyed.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The Leader of the Opposition implied it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not at all. I attempted to interject but the Minister was shouting so much he could not hear me. Nothing displeases me more than this type of thing. When members in this House direct themselves seriously to a Bill before them the Minister tries to fob them off by becoming annoyed. However, that will not wash with me at all.

If the Minister for Police will reflect, and perhaps read in *Hansard* at a later stage what took place, he will know that what I have said is correct. So forgive me if I feel a little displeased at the Minister's approach, because it was completely unjustified.

All I desired to know was whether the Government had called the laundry operators together since it came into office, and did the Government manage to do anything with them. The Minister did not know the answer and he endeavoured to get over the problem by pointing out how sincere Mr. Davies is. I am sure he is a sincere gentleman.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He did not say "sincere"; he referred to a detailed study.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well, I think I know what took place. I simply ask the Minister not to get excited in this way because it does not do his blood pressure any good.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: In conclusion I just want to say that the Leader of the Opposition referred to something which happened in 1966 or 1967 and which is past history. Mr. Williams asked what the situation was with regard to the private sector and what had been done. The previous Government had the period between 1966 and 1967 until it went out of office in 1971 in which to do something, and in comparison we have had the period since 1971.

The question which asks what we have done since we have been in office implies that we have not been doing much in this respect. I defended the Minister and said that he would have investigated every particular facet of this project. The Minister decided on the procedure outlined in the Bill now before us.

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

Ayes—15

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. V. J. Ferry
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	*(Teller)*

Noes—9

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. L. Hunt	*(Teller)*

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. D. K. Dans

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 13 to 19 put and passed.

Clause 20: Section 18 amended—

The Hon. N. McNEILL: My interpretation of this clause clearly spells doom for hospital boards which are in existence in Western Australia. A total of 65 hospitals are under the control and management of boards. The proposed two new subsections read as follows:—

> (2) The Minister may, after consultation with a hospital board, give to it directions as to the exercise of its functions.
>
> (3) A hospital board shall give effect to any directions given to it under this section.

It is interesting to note the general progression of amendments to the Act. I will firstly refer to section 18 as it appeared in the original Act. It states—

> A board shall be responsible for the control, management, and maintenance of the public hospital or hospitals for which it is or has been appointed, and may exercise such other duties and functions for the purposes of this Act, as may from time to time be prescribed.

In 1969 section 18 was amended to give the Minister a power of direction requiring the board of a public hospital to furnish to him, or persons nominated by him, statistical or other returns or information on matters relating to the hospital and arising there or elsewhere. The amendment also fixed the times at which the returns were to be furnished.

I believe those powers are quite acceptable, but under the present proposed amendment the powers of the hospital boards in the operation, management, and administration of their hospitals will be reduced almost to a minimum. I wonder what are the real reasons for this. I wonder whether the Minister and the Government have sufficient reasons for including in the Bill an all embracing clause such as this.

In his second reading speech the Minister referred to some matters in which it is necessary for the Minister to have powers of direction, and I can understand that those powers would not be unreasonable. The Minister said—

> This is essential for several reasons, but it is not intended that it will interfere with the normal day-to-day management of a hospital by a duly appointed board of management.

Perhaps it is not intended but the words of the Bill clearly give the Government the power to exercise that sort of direction. It may not be the intention today, but will it be the intention tomorrow or at some other time in the future that decisions made by a board on day-to-day management will not be agreed to by the Minister or his administrators in the department?

Clearly, then, the Government has the power to give directions to a hospital board. I fail to see that hospital boards will accept this. I think it is a power which will do nothing to encourage the work, efficiency, and operation of the hospital boards. I am speaking particularly of those about which I know in the country areas in Western Australia.

As indicated in the second reading speech, some of the powers relate to the raising of money for such purposes as the establishment of a centralised laundry or other centralised facilities. In the matter of hospital fees, I can see there needs to be some power available to the Minister.

I have in mind the instance of the Murray District Hospital during the period of the previous Hawke Government. The hospital was sorely in need of renovation and expansion and the Government then, as now, said it had no capital funds available for the purpose of building staff quarters at the hospital. The staff quarters had already been condemned by the local authority. The Government said to the board, "If you really need these quarters, and as we have not got the money, we suggest you go to the local ratepayers and ask the road boards"—as they were then—"to rate the local people in order to raise the necessary funds." I am pleased to say I was one of those in the shire who were instrumental in blocking that move. I did not believe it was the function of local authorities and the local people to subscribe to hospital buildings. The new Government in 1959 very quickly corrected this matter. If we agree to this amendment we could resurrect the attitude which was apparent during the term of the Hawke Government in 1958-59.

A more recent instance is that of the little Yarloop Hospital. My colleagues in this House are well aware of the circumstances of that hospital and the tremendous lengths to which the board and staff of the hospital and the local people have gone in order to raise funds for the necessary facilities and amenities at the hospital. During the last 12 months additional quarters for the matron have been required. The Medical Department and the Government were unable to provide the funds. The funds to build the additions to the matron's quarters were borrowed from the Yarloop Hospital Board. Without the amendments now proposed, the hospital board has a certain degree of power in the consideration of any recommendations or suggestions from the Government, but with the passing of this Bill the power, if not completely removed, will certainly be reduced to a minimum. The local hospital board will virtually have no power to exercise discretions of its own making.

I could not let pass this opportunity to challenge the provisions in this Bill. I think they are very dangerous and I regret that the Government feels it necessary to include powers such as these.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 21 to 29 put and passed.

Clause 30: Section 37 repealed and re-enacted—

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I move an amendment—

Page 15, line 13—Add after the word "Act" the following—

but this power shall not extend to any fees charged in respect of the professional services of a medical practitioner

This amendment is consistent with a promise given by the Minister in another place.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 31 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and passed.

IRON ORE (GOLDSWORTHY-NIMINGARRA) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th May.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.57 p.m.]: May I say at the outset it is my intention to support the second reading of this Bill. However, I want to make some comments concerning, particularly, the schedule to the Bill, which is the agreement between the Government and the parties.

The reason for the Bill being in its present form is that the Government decided there would be no assignment of the Sentinel Mining Company (Ludwig) Agreement. The Sentinel Mining Company Agreement was always known locally as "the Ludwig Agreement" because of the fact that it was negotiated with Mr. D. K. Ludwig. I think the background to these negotiations is well and generally known.

It was originally hoped that Ludwig, in an extensive search he undertook, would succeed in finding a way to process some of the lower grade ores and manganiferous ores which occurred in the area he held under a temporary reserve. I recall the discussions I had in Perth some years ago with representatives of the Ludwig group. I think it is fair to say the Ludwig organisation genuinely tried to find a way to process the lower grade iron ores and manganiferous iron ores to which I have referred. Had the organisation succeeded, we would have had a processing industry of a very large dimension and of long-term duration based on Cape Keraudren as the port.

The group centred its attention in this particular area as far as the port was concerned. Much of the ore which may now remain undeveloped for many years would have been progressively developed and processed into a marketable and desirable form. In its natural state it is very doubtful whether the ore would have an economic value in the foreseeable future. However, as we know, the Ludwig group was unsuccessful in its efforts and it is assumed from the Minister's speech and from the contents of the new agreement that the Ludwig group will be reimbursed for the whole or part of its costs and out-of-pocket expenses up to a point which it considers satisfactory. This is laudable. The previous Government certainly desired to see this group, or any company which took over this project, reimbursed once it could be shown that the party to the original agreement had satisfactorily undertaken the exploration and proving work to which it was committed. I assume this is the case.

Once the Government made the decision not to permit an assignment of the Sentinel agreement to Goldsworthy on negotiated conditions to which the Government would be a party, the Government was free to negotiate with Goldsworthy for the whole or any part of the deposits now relinquished from the terms of the Sentinel agreement. I do not object to this if the Government is taking adequate steps to ensure that the potential of the relinquished deposits, which are not to be mined immediately by Goldsworthy under the new arrangement contained in this agreement, are kept under constant review so that the ultimate development takes place in a logical manner.

It would be most undesirable if the Goldsworthy deposits in the area of Goldsworthy, Shay Gap, Cattle Gorge, Kennedy Gap, plus the new Nimingarra and associated deposits, were mined out over the next few years and the railway town and other facilities developed there were not used to their maximum to handle some of the less attractive deposits further afield. Some of these deposits could be logically handled through the present infrastructure.

I take it that the Government has received the full benefit of the research which was undertaken by the Ludwig group as part of the conditions for the termination of the original agreement. It would be a very undesirable state of affairs if this were

not so and the renegotiation with Goldsworthy did not ensure that Sentinel receives at least partial reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. I would like an assurance from the Minister on this point when he replies. Is the information in the hands of the Ludwig group to which I have referred in adequate form, and is it held by the Government?

I want to say a few words on the question of royalties.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Prior to the tea suspension I had mentioned that I proposed to make a few comments on the subject of royalties. From time to time much has been said about royalties, and I do not think it is unfair to say that the present Government has made great play on the increased royalties on iron ore that will be payable under this agreement. It has been claimed that this is the first time higher royalties under an iron-ore agreement have been negotiated. When the first announcement was made, back in October, 1971, the Goverment claimed that the royalty rate under the Goldsworthy-Nimingarra agreement was consistent with its election promise to negotiate higher royalties on the State's mineral deposits.

Members may recall that that statement appeared in the policy speech at the time. The Government had already created the impression that future iron-ore agreements would have to reflect this new level of royalties. However, what the Government did not tell the public was that the original Sentinel agreement already provided for a higher scale of royalties if the Sentinel Mining Company could not submit proposals which were economic and which were acceptable for processing the material that was being produced in the area it was working.

Under the original agreement this is the situation that prevailed. The 7½ per cent. or 60c a ton minimum would have become 11¼ per cent. or 90c a ton minimum. The 3¾ per cent. or 30c a ton minimum would have become 5¾ per cent. or 46c a ton minimum. In addition, of course, it is important to note that these increases would have been retrospective, and that was not all of it. The Sentinel Mining Company would have had to provide all the infrastructure that went with the project; that is, items such as towns, railways, and ports. Right from the start these would have had to be found by the company. Had it not been able to come up with a satisfactory proposal, these items, in addition to the higher royalty, would have had to found by the company.

Against this it must be understood that the Goldsworthy Mining Company can, under this agreement, mine the deposits it will now take over from the Sentinel Mining Company using, in the main, the infrastructure that exists, or that which is being provided to mine the deposits under its agreements. One does not have to use one's imagination to any great extent to realise that this is of tremendous benefit to the Goldsworthy Mining Company.

In my humble opinion all this highlights the fact that the Government's claims concerning royalties do not live up to reality. In regard to the claim that the agreement now submitted for ratification shows the first increase in royalties in negotiations with iron-ore companies, I cannot help but say that it is time this fact was brought to notice, because I do not think it is fair that the kind of impression that has been created in the past should be created when, in fact, it is not accurate. For some reason or other, we do not seem to be able to get this message over to the public generally. Initially a blast of publicity comes out in relation to what is to happen, but when the true situation is revealed it seems to pale into some order of insignificance. However, I cannot control that situation. I can merely speak on this agreement in the way that I see it.

Having said that, the basic concept of handling the Sentinel Mining deposits through the Goldsworthy facilities is not opposed. In the circumstances it seems to me to be the reasonable thing to do. It was substantially negotiated by the Brand Government which accepted the principle that if the Ludwig group could not come up with a viable proposal it was plain, common good sense to allow the deposits to be mined through the Goldsworthy facilities without separate infrastructure facilities being established by way of a new town, a new mine, special transport facilities, a new port at Cape Keraudren, and other matters that one may think of.

My main purpose is to ensure the agreement is considered in its proper perspective, and that it should be understood, at least by Parliament—and hopefully that it will be understood by the public as well—that the great rosy picture that seems to have been painted to depict the situation is not in fact real. The agreement negotiated by the Government with the Goldsworthy Mining Company is much less onerous than the agreement containing the conditions imposed by the previous Government on the Sentinel-Ludwig mining organisation.

For what it is worth, I have endeavoured, in support of the Bill, simply to make that position clear. At the time the Sentinel Mining Company agreement was entered into it was the hope of the Government of the day—as I said when I commenced my remarks—that Mr. Ludwig's group would be successful in the exploration and prospecting work it undertook, because without a doubt this was a new type of industry we hoped to get in

Western Australia; one which we did not have at that time and which we still do not have. The promotion of manganiferous iron ore, offers opportunities of a very interesting nature. The fact remains, however, that the company was not successful. The amount of work it carried out was creditable. I emphasise again to the Minister that it would be very interesting to know the amount of exploration undertaken, or whether information collated by the Ludwig group was made available and handed over to the Government, and whether it is on hand for use in the future.

I am firmly of the opinion that in projects of this nature, and in mineral projects generally, when one company undertakes exploration work and something along the road goes wrong so that it is unable to continue with the project, the Mines Department should be in a position to obtain that information, collate it, and retain it for future use, because I do not think there is anything more certain that even with the amount of work that has been carried out in Western Australia during the last decade, we are probably still only scratching the surface in relation to mineral development.

I feel sure—and I hope I am right—that the future of minerals in Western Australia generally is still very bright and that further exploration in many other fields will disclose minerals about which we have little or no information at present. Having made those remarks I am satisfied to support the Bill.

In conclusion, may I add that this is a Bill which contains a schedule to an agreement which has been signed by the Government, and that is the kind of agreement that suits me. A little later I will be obliged to say something about another agreement that has not been signed. I have made it clear in the past, and I reiterate now, that the Government should negotiate these agreements with the companies concerned in a fair manner and for the benefit of the State and, having entered into the agreements, the Government should bring them before Parliament. I support the Bill.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [7.43 p.m.]: On a measure of this nature one listens to the Leader of the Opposition with interest and respect, and one appreciates that he supports the Bill. One can only agree with the remarks he made on the failure of the Sentinel Mining Company to carry on with its development. However, that lag has been overtaken to a certain extent by the Government entering into this agreement with the Mount Goldsworthy Mining Company.

The point raised by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the information collated by the Sentinel Mining Company during the course of its exploration work is worthy of examination, especially, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, when we consider that the value of the exploration work carried out is over $5,000,000. Therefore, during the tea suspension I took the opportunity to speak to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and I asked him whether he could give me an assurance that this information was in the hands of the Government. He said that as far as he knew all the information had been made available. The Minister for Mines is not in the House at the moment and I did not have the chance, therefore, to make a double check with him in regard to this point. However, that was the answer I obtained from the Minister for Development and Decentralisation.

I think there would be no doubt that the information obtained would have been made available to the Government prior to the signing of this agreement.

The further development referred to by Mr. Griffith was covered in my second reading speech when I said—

> Once access is granted, the joint venturers are obliged to carry out further investigations and submit proposals for the development of the iron ore deposits. Initially such proposals will only cover the Sunrise Hill area, which will be worked in conjunction with the Shay Gap deposit, which lies in close proximity to it, and is at present being prepared for development by Goldsworthy.

The other point raised concerned royalties. It is true that, with regard to the royalties clause, I said the following in my second reading speech:—

> For the right to export iron ore, the joint venturers will pay a standard royalty of 11 per cent. with a minimum payment in respect of direct shipping ore of 85c a ton, and 55c a ton in the case of fine ore. There is no minimum payment on fines, or ore with an average pure iron content of less than 60 per cent. The royalty payable on manganese ore is 15c. This rate applies for a period of five years. Thereafter, the royalty payable will be as prescribed in the Mining Act. On manganiferous ore, and locally used ore, the royalty rate is 15c a ton. This is the first increase of royalties, in accordance with the Government's election promise, negotiated with an iron ore company.

In the analysis outlined by the Leader of the Opposition it appears he had an arrangement with the previous company which covered this situation, and I do not propose to debate that issue. I respect his point of view on the matter. I think what was said by me is probably right, but it was said in a different way.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think that is probably correct.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The final sentence I suppose is one we could expect, depending on which side of the House one sits. I do thank the Leader of the Opposition for his analysis of the measure, and I commend the Bill to the House.

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.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and passed.

WOOD DISTILLATION AND CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [7.50 p.m.]: I thank those members who have contributed to the debate on this Bill. Mr. Baxter was the first to speak in support of the Bill and he gave a lot of material for which I thank him. I have here a written reply concerning Mr. Williams' remarks and propose to read it for the benefit of the House, but before doing so I should add that Mr. Logan also contributed to the debate and, in the course of my remarks, he will find reference to the points he raised.

The specific points dealt with were those in the first instance made by Mr. Williams. He initially spoke of the losses of $5,500,000 by the industry in the last 23 years and he indicated it had moved from crisis to crisis and therefore needed some experts to put it right.

The losses and the statements made concerning them must be put into their proper context if a reasoned judgment of performance is to be made. Of the $5,500,000 an amount of $3,400,000 represents written-off capital as the cost of establishing what was Western Australia's first venture into heavy industry. In other words that amount was the cost of development. I might mention that as a result of this industry, ventures of a private nature benefited from the experiences gained in this development.

Since the inception of the industry $2,700,000 has been charged as interest. This is because all the capital is by way of loan as opposed to other businesses where much of the capital does not require the payment of interest.

It certainly is expected that dividends will be paid, but these are not mandatory and sometimes no payment is made. If interest had not been payable, a profit of $600,000 would have been made over that period. This places the losses in a better perspective, particularly when it is realised, as I have already advised the House, that during the last four years good profits have been achieved. This does not reflect a need to guide or change the management.

The next point made was that grinding media would not be required and therefore Wundowie would be taking business from other producers. One large local industry did ask the Wundowie establishment if it could supply a steady safe supply of 500 tons of cylpebs per year. As Wundowie was not able to do this the industry concerned imported two years' requirements from overseas as it was not able to obtain what it required anywhere in Australia.

In addition, it is a known fact that grinding media is being imported into this State from the Eastern States. I might mention that I am advised that even autogenous grinding steel still requires manufactured grinding media in certain circumstances; and, in fact, currently inquiries are being made by one of the mining concerns using the autogenous process for manufactured media. However, it is not from grinding media that Wundowie expects to obtain the bulk of the work.

The next point made was that as a result of the expansion of Wundowie all the work would be taken from local foundries and this would give rise to an increase of unemployment by 500 men. While the foregoing is a great compliment to the efficiency of Wundowie, in the light of the remarks on losses, it is just not true. Because of the nature of the proposed machine which is designed for the mass production of small castings, it expects to gain its markets mainly in the Eastern States and possibly overseas. Therefore the industry will have very little, if any, impact on local foundries which are enaged on jobbing work which is too large to be accommodated, or on small production runs which would not be worth while putting on the proposed machine at Wundowie.

Quite clearly, then, the expansion at Wundowie does not threaten other local Western Australian foundries in the main, or to the extent claimed by Mr. Williams. Incidentally, Mr. Williams quoted from a letter of a steel worker who expressed concern that the Wundowie expansion would possibly lead to his unemployment. Let us be quite clear. The Wundowie castings are to be in iron and not steel. Therefore, it does not threaten this man's employment or his employer in any way.

On this subject of employment, I would again emphasise that the board of the industry is certainly seeking viability of the industry it controls to maintain the employment of its 400 workers, but not at the expense of other Western Australians employed in the foundry business.

The next point raised related to the future of Wundowie because its process for producing pig iron is outmoded as a result of new processes. I can only repeat

what I have said already; that is, that these processes are not new. On the contrary they are well known to the industry which has competed with them for many years. They are capital intensive and suitable only for larger foundries. One of the two main processes requires very large outputs running into thousands of tons each year. The other is used only by foundries producing high-grade castings which can absorb the higher costs involved. Both processes are based on the ready availability of good quality steel scrap of suitable size and analysis.

Japan is a large importer of steel scrap, and foundries there, large and small, find it cheaper to use pig iron. In Europe the trend was for smaller foundries to shut down or amalgamate with others to form units big enough to deal with the new process, but scrap steel availability is a limiting factor.

Wundowie sold about 15,000 tons of pig iron to Europe last year and is still selling at about that level this year despite the downturn in the world economy and in spite of increased prices. It is therefore obvious that the alleged new processes have definite limitations and that quality pig iron will continue to find outlets at the present technological level. Consequently the board has every reason to believe its products will continue to be in demand.

I might add that in recent times a large charcoal iron and steel mill was established in Malaysia in conjunction with Japanese interests. The Japanese interests are Yawata, one of the largest steel companies in the world, and our general manager was consulted by the World Bank on the feasibility of this venture. I therefore find it difficult to accept that the charcoal iron process is outmoded or that the Wundowie expertise is not highly esteemed overseas.

Mr. Williams then stated that the pig iron produced in Sweden from selected raw materials was of quality equal to that produced at Wundowie and that B.H.P., by using coke, could also match the Wundowie quality. However, I am informed by the general manager of Wundowie that the industry is currently selling 2,000 tons of pig iron to Sweden at higher than local Swedish prices for special purposes demanding high quality and purity. Also every foundry in the Eastern States producing high-strength castings known as ductile castings which require pure pig iron for their manufacture sees fit to buy Wundowie iron in preference to that produced by B.H.P. despite Wundowie's higher landed costs.

Further, it was acknowledged in the Victorian Foundryman's Journal by the B.H.P. technical representative on pig iron that Wundowie iron was superior to that manufactured by B.H.P. for special purposes.

Mr. Williams raised the question of a "gentleman's" agreement between the Wundowie board and private foundries. He stated this had only been honoured on one side. He did not elaborate on what he meant by that. However, I am advised by two members of the board and the general manager that, to the best of their knowledge, no such agreement—gentleman's or otherwise—has existed.

I have said this because I do not want members to get the impression that Wundowie has some extraordinary arrangement with local foundries. Let me hasten to add that the general manager and the board acknowledge with gratitude the loyalty of the local foundries which have purchased the Western Australian product and so supported the industry. This, of course, is another very good reason why the industry would not want these foundries to close.

The foregoing, of course, raises the question of price. The current position is not as Mr. Williams stated it to be. For all general grades used by foundries in this State, the price of Wundowie iron is identical with that of B.H.P. The prices differ only in certain special grades, such as ductile iron, because Wundowie irons in these grades are of superior quality.

The next point made by Mr. Williams was that Wundowie was gaining business in competition with the Eastern States and, sometimes, local foundries by underquoting. He quoted figures on an overseas contract for railway chairs.

For his information and, as a matter of record, Wundowie, which enjoys the advantage of hot metal being supplied direct to its foundry, misses out on a number of quotes against other foundries. All this proves is that others can underquote Wundowie and that Wundowie does not deliberately underquote to gain business or it would have it all.

I would also mention that in the particular order concerned Wundowie will make a profit because of the volume and because it is in ductile iron, which particularly suits the industry's production.

Quite clearly each job is carefully costed before quotes are given and the industry does not quote to make a loss. This is a measure of its efficiency and not sharp practice, as implied. The proof of this is to be found in the fact that the last four years' accounts, which have been audited by the Auditor-General of Western Australia, show that the foundry section of the industry has consistently operated at a profit. I should mention that this is the total period over which the foundry unit has been in full operation.

Finally, Mr. Williams raised the question of the need to have what he described as world experts to put the management of the industry on the right track.

I do not intend to develop my arguments against this proposal at this stage until I hear the further promised comments from Mr. Williams during Committee, except to observe that the current management contains experts in the field of charcoal-iron production, processing and marketing, and in my opinion we would not only be wasting time, which can be expensive, but would be outlaying a considerable sum on consultants who may well have to rely on our own people for most of the information they require.

Mr. Logan expressed some reasonable doubts, some of which I have already covered in my comments on Mr. Williams' contribution. However, he requested answers on two points and on the advice I have been given I shall do my best to satisfy him.

His first point was that in view of the current recession in foundry business: Where are the markets? No-one, much less my advisers, are going to be naive enough to give cast iron assurances that the project is automatically guaranteed success. In fact, I have already said in the second reading speech that a share of the market must be obtained; that this market will be largely in the Eastern States; and possibly we will have some overseas contracts.

It is true that there is a recession at the moment. However, as I have pointed out it will take at least 18 months to install and bring the plant into operation, and by that time one hopes the economy will be showing marked improvement. In the long term, unless we have lost faith in our State, the recession will be of a temporary nature and the work will be there to be done.

However, in making the assessment of the market potential, the members of the board, although conscious of future improvement, did not rely on this but assessed the market as they found it during the study.

From investigations made by the general manager and the sales representative, it was established that in the small castings field there is a market in Australia many times the total capacity of the machine. Most of this is located in the Eastern States.

The board assessed that a reasonable share of this market is available to a manufacturer who is able to improve his efficiency and so lower his costs to a level where he may capture it.

It must be realised that the industry has been brought to a high level of efficiency. It produces the best iron in the world in a molten state ready for casting. It is already equipped with sophisticated analytical equipment. Given the highly efficient and technically proved system of moulding proposed, it will have one of the most efficient plants in Australia.

Incidentally, Mr. Williams mentioned that another of these machines is being installed in Western Australia. I understand from my technical advisers that this is not so. The machine proposed for Wundowie is a totally different type and will be the only one of its kind in Australia, producing ferrous castings.

For these reasons the board has every confidence that there are reasonable prospects of success with the current market available and even better prospects when the economy improves.

Mr. Logan's second question related to where the funds are to be raised. The answer to this is on the Australian market, but it will not be entering the traditional sources of local Government borrowings.

The board will be, of course, working in close co-operation with the Treasury on this matter and, as Mr. Logan observed, will be raising funds at the rate of only $300,000 per year so as not to exceed the limits imposed by Loan Council or enter the field which would reduce the borrowing powers of the larger local authorities.

In brief, the acquisition of the necessary finance is under the control of the Treasurer and will be worked out with the Treasury which has full knowledge and regard to the problems of other borrowers, particularly local authorities.

I think I have covered all the points raised by the speakers. I again thank them for their contribution and recommend the second reading be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th May.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.10 p.m.]: I commence my remarks by saying that I do not find myself terribly in favour of the Bill. However, I do not propose to offer any great opposition to its passage.

I listened closely to the Minister's remarks when he introduced the measure and I have since reread them in *Hansard*. I have obtained a copy of the State Trading Concerns Act No. 12 of 1917. In addition to its being a pretty old Act, to say the least, this will be the sixth time it has been amended if the number of amending Bills I have in my hand is correct—and I think it is. I suggest to the Minister it is about time this Act was reprinted.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I think so too. It is all in pieces.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think it has ever been reprinted in fact. I do not say that in any critical sense but merely to be helpful. In going to the

Statutes to look at what has happened over a long period of time one finds that a number of amendments have been made. It would be handy for a Statute of this kind to be reprinted.

The Act was first amended in 1930. On that occasion the only amendment was to section 25 of the Act. The title of the amending Bill was, "A Bill for an Act to amend section 25 of the Act." The amendment was to delete certain words and include other words.

The Act was again amended in 1932 when the expression, "The State Implement and Engineering Works" was deleted from the schedule. A couple of other amendments were made at the same time.

The next amendment was in 1950 and it was concerned with the Greenmount quarry which I think was called the Boya quarry. In 1956 the Act was again amended and, amongst other things, it brought the State Saw Mills and the State Brick Works together as one. I will not bother about the other amendments that were contained in the legislation.

In 1968 an amending Bill placed in the schedule of the State Trading Concerns Act the concern known as the West Australian Meat Export Works. The Bill in 1972—the one that is before us now—seeks to include, although perhaps I should say "it seeks to re-include," the expression "The State Implement and Engineering Works" in the schedule. In fact, it is a simple little Bill in that respect.

What we must appreciate is that when Parliament agrees to the Bill and thereby puts the State Implement and Engineering Works back into the schedule of the Act then, of course, everything in the principal Act and the amendments thereto pertain to the State Engineering Works, including borrowing power. The Minister told us in the second reading speech that this is the whole purpose of the Bill.

The Minister was kind enough to tell us that several months ago a committee was set up to examine the future of the State Implement and Engineering Works. He told us the committee was under the chairmanship of the Director of Engineering of the Public Works Department and the other members included the Under-Secretary for Works, the Assistant Under-Treasurer, the Plant and Mechanical Engineer of the Public Works Department, the Deputy Co-ordinator of the Department of Development and Decentralisation, a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures, and a representative of the Trades and Labor Council.

The gentleman came forward with a recommendation to the Government that this amending Bill should be introduced, and the works are to be expanded as a result of this recommendation. It is estimated that the cost will be in the vicinity of $860,000. That is about all there is to it.

Accordingly, when I say I am not terribly excited about the Bill, that is exactly what I mean; I am not terribly excited about it, because all it means is that we are further on our way towards establishing State trading concerns, and the House knows the attitude of the party to which I belong to State trading concerns. We have always felt that so much of the work done by State trading concerns can be done more efficiently and with greater advantage by private enterprise. That is a view we have held for a very long time, and I think it has been proved by practice that in matters such as this private enterprise is better equipped to carry out the jobs.

However, I do recognise that the works have been there for a very long time and that, as a result of the recommendation of the committee, the Government is trying to upgrade the works and keep it going. I will not say I reluctantly support the Bill; I will merely say that I support it anyway.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [8.17 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his exposition of the Bill. I agree with him when he says that the Statute in question is one that is overdue for a reprint, and I will see what I can do to meet that particular request of the Leader of the Opposition.

I do not wish to say any more, because I think the honourable member has covered all that needs be said. I commend the Bill to the House.

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.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and passed.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading: Defeated

Debate resumed from the 2nd May.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.21 p.m.]: The speech made by the Minister for Police when introducing this Bill is contained in *Hansard* No. 7 on page 1080. It is one of the shortest, complete, and most concise speeches I have heard the Minister for Police make since he has been a Minister of the Crown.

In about a dozen lines the Minister told us it was the desire of the Government to change the audit of the T.A.B. from that of a private auditor to that of the Auditor-General. That is about all there is to it.

The only reason that I refer to the Minister's speech is that I would like to draw the attention of the House to an interjection I made while the Minister was introducing the second reading of the Bill. I asked the Minister by interjection whether the private auditor has been unsatisfactory, to which he replied, "No, it is just a question of principle."

Accordingly, I feel the speech the Minister made could have been even shorter; he could have said, "It is because of a matter of principle that the Government of the day wants the Auditor-General to carry out the audit of the T.A.B. instead of having it done by the people who have been undertaking this work since the introduction of the legislation."

While that would have been a little shorter than the speech the Minister made, it would have been no different from what he said. Having had it established for us that it is a matter of principle that the Labor Government wants the Auditor-General to carry out the audit of the T.A.B. rather than have the work done by a private auditor, I thought the first thing I should do is to establish what the cost will be, and I accordingly asked the following question:—

(1) What cost is involved in the conducting of the audit of the accounts of the Totalisator Agency Board under the current procedure?

The Minister replied—

(1) The present audit is in two parts and the costs are as follows:—

(a) General Audit $3,200 per annum,

(b) Internal Audit $2,000 per annum.

The second part of my question which I asked on the 9th May, reads—

(2) What would be the cost in the event of the audit being carried out by the Auditor-General's Department?

The answer the Minister gave was long and interesting. In my parliamentary career I have always found when preparing answers to questions, that if I could answer "Yes" or "No", straight out, that would be the logical thing to do. I also found, however, that if an answer needed embellishing it was necessary at times to embellish it in order to convey to the member concerned the information one desired to get across to him. So, in the answer to the question I asked, embellishment was the order of the day. The answer reads as follows:—

(2) In order to be in a position accurately to state the cost, the Auditor General would require to have the position properly appraised and evaluated. He believes the cost of a general audit of accounts would be approximately $6,000. Any additional cost to the Totalisator Agency Board for audit requirements would depend upon the extent of computerisation and the strength and adequacy of internal controls existing and cannot be estimated without examination. It is incumbent upon the Totalisator Agency Board to ensure that, irrespective of audit requirements, there exists completely adequate and operative internal controls and the cost of this is not to be loaded on to the audit cost.

That is what I call an embellished answer because, in fact, what it says is—as I understand the position—that though at the present time it costs $3,200 to have the audit performed by McLaren & Stewart, I think the Minister said—though I am not interested in the name—if it is done by the Auditor-General, the Auditor-General's assessment of it is that it will cost $6,000.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What is the cost of the internal audit?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The internal audit is, of course, the sum borne by the T.A.B.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You gave two figures.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry. The amount paid to the private auditor for the general audit is $3,200, while the internal audit costs $2,000. This is not done by the general auditor; it is an internal audit and it is done in order that the auditor may come back, pick up the books, carry out his job, and make the charge.

If the Auditor-General takes this over, the cost will be $6,000, and any additional cost to the T.A.B. for audit requirements would depend on the extent of computerisation and the strength and adequacy of internal controls, etc.

So we arrive at a situation where in this case principle is much more important than cost. I daresay in some instances that can be a laudable state of affairs, because principle is really quite important—but in this case it is more important as a matter of principle to have the Auditor-General carry out the audit at a cost of $6,000 than have a private auditor—who has done this work since the inception of the legislation—carry it out at a cost of $3,200.

In these circumstances what would the House expect me to do? We are told that one of the reasons for this is that the Government of Victoria in relation to the activities of the T.A.B. changed from a private auditor to the Auditor-General. This is given as one of the reasons why we should do the same thing.

There is no mention of what happens in any one of the other States. I do not know whether the audits there are performed by private auditors or by the Auditor-General, but I do not think this really matters.

If we look at this matter purely and simply on the cold hard facts we must come down and say this Bill is not worth while; it is purely a matter of principle that the Labor Government of the day wishes the audit to be carried out by the Auditor-General rather than have it carried out by a private auditor who, in the words of the Minister for Police himself, has given very satisfactory service over a long period of time.

The present legislation was introduced in 1960, and as far as I know the auditing has been performed by a private auditor since that time. So I cannot find any support for the Bill. I feel I am obliged to say that I am surprised the Government should bother to bring forward a Bill of this nature simply to put into effect one small amendment. If the measure contained a whole host of amendments to the T.A.B. legislation, and amongst them was the question of auditing and who should carry it out in the future, I may have adopted a different view. However, I cannot see that it is terribly important as a matter of principle to sever the connections the T.A.B. has had with its private auditor in order to engage the Auditor-General at a cost nearly twice that which the T.A.B. pays to its private auditor. I think to say any more would be unnecessarily labouring the point. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [8.31 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition said that although my second reading speech was short I could have made it shorter. I am sometimes at a loss in such matters. Sometimes one makes a long story short, and is told it is not short enough; at other times one tells a short story and is told it should have been longer. So it goes on.

In my speech I drew attention to the fact that the present Government felt on a question of principle that this Government instrumentality which handles millions of dollars in a year should be audited by the Auditor-General. I mentioned Victoria as an example because the politics of the Victorian Government are entirely different from those of my Government. It has been thrown up at me often enough that that Government believes in free enterprise. The T.A.B. in Victoria for a long period of years engaged a private auditor. Yet it was decided that it was in the best interests of the Government to change from a private auditor to the Auditor-General.

I have examined the reports submitted by the Auditor-General in Victoria, and I found in them nothing whatever that anyone could cavill at. I was quite truthful. I repeat again that when I was asked the question about the two men who were conducting the audit I replied that as far as I am concerned—and I am the Minister responsible for the T.A.B.—they have given every satisfaction. I suppose if I were speaking on behalf of the Victorian Government I could say exactly the same thing about the private auditors involved in that State. But the Victorian Government decided to change over and to use the Auditor-General.

It was considered a matter of principle in Victoria to employ the Auditor-General, and we feel the same way. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for what he said, although it was in complete opposition to the Bill.

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

Ayes—9	
Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. L. Hunt	*(Teller)*

Noes—17	
Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. N. McNeill	*(Teller)*

Pairs	
Aye	No
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. J. Heitman

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th April.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [8.38 p.m.]: When the Leader of the House presented his second reading speech on this Bill he mentioned the successes of the Western Australian symbol. He mentioned that it had increased sales and had made the consumers of Western Australia aware of Western Australian products. I consider that is a tribute to the officers of the department who were responsible for the design and promotion of this particular symbol; and it is indeed a kindly tribute to the effective leadership of the previous Minister in this regard.

The Leader of the House went on to say that the Bill was brought forward to prevent the unlawful use of the symbol. I do not agree with that at all; the measure might have been designed with that object in the mind of the Minister, but I am afraid I cannot see it in that light.

I find there are many loopholes in this Bill. I find that it repeals the Western Australia (Sales-Promotion Labels) Act of 1957. The Minister said it would be better to bring forward a new Bill rather than amend that Act. I cannot agree with this because in fact there are more loopholes in the new Bill than there are in the present Act. At least in the present Act the Minister has some means of protecting the use of the symbol. As proof of this I will read section 7 (1) of the Western Australia (Sales-Promotion Labels) Act of 1957. It is as follows:—

> Where it appears to the Minister that the production or preparation of any goods is substantially carried out in the State, the Minister may, on application being made to him in writing setting out particulars of the goods, particulars of their production or preparation, issue to the applicant a permit authorising him to attach to the goods or to their container a prescribed label.

Now, that is a reasonably sensible provision and it does give the Minister some control; it does protect against the unauthorised use of the label. But where is that protection in the new Bill? I have searched the measure and I can find no protection whatsoever.

Possibly the Minister or any other member in the Chamber could look through the Bill and mark for me any passage which offers such protection. If anyone finds such a passage and gives it to one of the attendants in the House to deliver to me before I sit down I will be willing to consider it; it may provide me with fuel for debate. But if I receive no such marked passage I will assume there is no such protection in the Bill. I think members will find that I am correct.

I will read out some of the pertinent clauses in this measure. I refer firstly to clause 4 which states—

> The form of design, irrespective of its size and colour, depicted in the Schedule to this Act is the prescribed symbol for the purposes of this Act.

The clause says nothing at all about variations which could mislead the public and which could possibly be used. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent the use of misleading variations. I refer members to the symbol on the back of the country exchanges telephone directory—a P.M.G. production—which is a bastardised map of Western Australia, closely aligned to the Western Australian products symbol; but it is not the symbol prescribed in the Bill before us. What do we do in a case such as this? Could we say that the person using this symbol should not use it? Under the present Bill I do not think we could, nor do I think we need to.

I would like to point out by means of a series of sketches how hypothetical symbols could be used. One could be a registered trade mark of a company using the letter M and the abbreviation of the word "limited." Taking a hypothetical case, the letter M could represent a company called Maidstone Ltd., with a registered trade mark. The company may be registered in Australia and not just in Western Australia. The registered trade mark could depict the letter M over the letter L of the abbreviation of the word "limited." The sketch I am holding up shows that the letters could be so arranged as to resemble the Western Australian product symbol. The company could be producing in Western Australia; but it could well be producing its products in the Eastern States or overseas and still use its trade mark with impunity.

The second symbol in the sketches I am holding up shows the enthusiastic misuse of the symbol by an organisation which is proud of being Western Australian. It could use this symbol on a club magazine which could be saleable.

I will not mention the organisation that is doing this, as by doing so it might be embarrassed. However, this is happening in Western Australia at present, where we find the use of the Western Australian products symbol out of configuration with another symbol in the centre, and it appears on a saleable magazine. This is enthusiastic misuse of the symbol.

Should these people be punished for such use of the symbol? I do not think so, but if people are using it in a way that fools the public then they should be punished; but either way there is no means for punishing such unlawful use under the terms of the Bill.

I now deal with the third example of the use of the symbol. I imagine it looks exactly like the Western Australian products symbol. In this instance the only difference is in the centerpiece. Instead of the centerpiece having a serrated edge it happens to have a round one. This symbol is meant to mislead the public, but is not meant to defraud. In this instance in the centerpiece the words "Made in U.S.S.R. Distributed in W.A." could appear. Still, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent that symbol from being used.

I now turn to clause 5 of the Bill which states—

> A person who sells any product the production and preparation of which is substantially carried out in the State is authorised to affix to the product or its container a prescribed symbol.

This is not a positive boundary or definition. It would mean that any person who was a manufacturer in Western Australia could consider that he had a pretty high Western Australian content in his products, and he could make use of the provisions in the Bill. He could do that in all sincerity, but then he could be charged under the Act by an inspector. He could be fined, and that is absolutely crazy.

I have pointed out that there is no way of policing the misuse of the symbol. Here we have the situation where somebody can be fined for the use in all sincerity of the real symbol just because an inspector says he does not have a sufficient degree of Western Australian content in the goods. I consider clause 5 to be far too weak for it to be retained, and later I will move an amendment to the clause.

I turn to clause 6 which once again uses the words "of which is substantially carried out in the State." This clause is not positive enough and does not have distinct boundaries, so the public and the manufacturers do not know where they stand.

Turning to clause 7 it is provided that the Minister may appoint any person to be an inspector under the Act. To me this seems a little strange when we take into account the fact that we have Government departments with responsible officers who are appointed inspectors. I refer to the inspectors appointed under the Factories and Shops Act and to the health inspectors. At a later stage I will be placing an amendment on the notice paper seeking to amend the clause to allow health inspectors and those appointed under the Factories and Shops Act—and not just any person—to be qualified persons.

I have looked at the *Hansard* report of the debate on this Bill in another place, where the Minister for Development and Decentralisation said—

> When introducing the legislation I indicated that the whole spirit and intention of this measure was goodwill and co-operation. It has existed on that basis without legislation. If a person commits a breach because he does not know what content there should be or because he seeks deliberately to mislead the public for some trading advantage, he will not necessarily be fined or incur any of these penalties. First of all, it is necessary for him to be charged before a court and for the case to be proven, when the court will impose the penalty at its discretion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would direct the honourable member's attention to Standing Order 83 which states—

> No member shall allude to any debate of the current Session in the Assembly, or to any measure impending therein.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Thank you, Mr. President, for drawing my attention to that. I will not quote any further from the speech of the Minister in another place.

So that the time of this House will not be wasted on this debate I would ask members to vote for the second reading of the Bill. However, I give notice that I will be placing amendments on the notice paper, and I hope that when they are considered they will be agreed to.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG DEPENDANTS: TREATMENT

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 12th May, on the following motion by The Hon. R. J. L. Williams:—

> That a select committee be appointed to investigate and assess the present facilities and methods available, both Governmental and others, and to inquire into and report to the House on ways and means to develop, improve, and co-ordinate the treatment of alcohol and drug dependants.

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [8.52 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion before the House. We do hear a great deal of reference to the permissiveness of society today. We find that there appears to be a great indulgence in many things—alcohol, sex, and drugs both hard and soft. We find that a few of our impressionable youth have experimented in many of these fields; and that insecure adults who are emotionally disturbed very often over-indulge in many of these activities, particularly in respect of alcohol.

In moving the motion Mr. Williams made reference to some of the drugs which have caused dependency on the part of certain individuals. He referred to marihuana, heroin, LSD, and even the common aspirin and proprietary pain-relieving powders.

We find that in general the populace today are being bombarded from many sources on the use of drugs—bad in some cases and good in other cases—and on the use of alcohol. We find that virtually every day the newspapers deal with these matters. We find many publications virtually ranging over many of the areas in which the minority of society indulge, and ramming these things down the throats of the rest of society.

In the past there were only three areas which could be regarded as areas of experimentation, and they were in the field of smoking tobacco, drinking of alcohol, and indulgence in sex; but nowadays we find there are many other fields.

A publication that has had a tremendous amount of publicity recently in the newspapers is *The Little Red Schoolbook* which is aimed at students in high schools. It contains a section dealing with drugs. I quote from page 121 where under the heading of "Drugs" the following appears:—

> Drugs are poisons which can have a pleasant effect. People use drugs in spite of the fact that they can have bad effects, either because they simply

don't know about these bad effects, or because they think the risks are less important than the pleasure that drugs can give.

Many, if not most people who use drugs start using them because their friends do. A lot of people go on using drugs for the same reason, rather than because they really need to or because they find the effects of the drugs really exciting. So using drugs, like many other common activities in life, is a social habit. Social habits are not harmful in themselves, but they can be indirectly harmful if the particular habit has bad effects.

This is one of the problems of our society: just because friends indulge in something it tends to become a social habit, and when attention is drawn to it through the medium of books and newspapers the importance of the social habit is emphasised.

On page 122 of the same booklet appears a list of many different types of drugs. Under the heading of "Stimulants" the following appear: —

Coffee
Tea
Tobacco

Under the heading "Inebriants" the following appear:—

Alcohol
Marijuana
Hashish

Under the heading "Psychedelic drugs" are included LSD and mescalin.

Under the heading of "Narcotics, sedative or barbiturates" the following appear:—

Sleeping pills
Tranquillizers
Phenobarbitone
Nembutal
Amytal
Soneryl

So the list goes on to enumerate the various categories of drugs. Under the heading of "Amphetamines: stimulants or pep-pills" the following appear:—

Benzedrine
Dexedrine
Methedrine
Preludin
Drinamyl

Under the heading of "Strong narcotics or hard drugs" the following appear:—

Opium
Heroin
Morphine
Cocaine
Pethidine

Finally under the heading of "Technical poisons or sniffers" the following appear:—

Spirit glues
Cow gum
Meths
Pure spirit
Cleaning fluids

We are all aware that many of these substances have created a tremendous problem even in our comparatively young society. We find our mental hospitals are treating many of these people, particularly in the field of alcoholism. We find that our courts are dealing frequently not only with alcoholics, but also people who indulge in other drugs.

We find many others are affected, and many cases occur in our society of people over-indulging in things such as sleeping tablets and aspirins. We also find that such cases result in tremendous cost to society, but very little is being done about the matter.

We find that when most of these things are indulged in in moderation they do not lead to addiction, but we do find we have many addicts. The cases of addiction cause heartbreak and misery in homes, where very often the children and the wife have to suffer if the husband is a drug dependent—or even worse if the wife is a drug dependent. In such cases the family situation becomes much worse.

We find in homes where addiction occurs, particularly in the field of alcohol, that alcoholic behaviour and dependency is considered to be normal behaviour. I recently had the sad experience of dealing with such a family, the members of which were contented in their particular situation, even though alcoholism was one of the main problems.

It was not until the Mental Health Services dealt with this particular situation that the people themselves began to realise they were not quite as normal as they previously thought.

We find that the Press does create a morbid interest in a lot of these matters. Shortly after the introduction of this motion I picked up one newspaper at random to see how much reference was made in that issue to drugs. The paper I picked up was the *Daily News* of Wednesday, the 10th May, and I found there were six quite large entries in that particular paper. On page 2 appeared the heading "Ex-inmate tells of gaol drugs." Quite a lengthy article followed and dealt with alleged drug taking in Fremantle prison.

On a following page the Prime Minister was criticised over cigarette advertising. Later, on page 7 of the same issue, appeared an interesting article headed, "Who'll slow down first?" and referred to youth culture in Australia. It mentioned TATT's disease, which derives its name from "Tired all the time." The article referred to people who were tired of the life of our present society and who decided that they—male and female—would live together and get away from the world.

On page 13 of the same issue appeared the heading "Addicts panic as drug flow slows." The article referred to the drying up of the supply of illegal morphine in

Copenhagen and the resultant panic among users. On a later page appeared the heading, "No proof of advice on drugs: Chipp." The article stated that Narcotics Bureau officers had not been able to get evidence to support allegations that a large travel agency had provided information on smuggling drugs.

In that one issue of the newspaper there was quite a deal of reference to drugs. I would not say the intentions of the newspaper were not honourable; we can only be educated through this medium and through books and films. However, I do feel that many people—particularly our youth—are being over-bombarded with references of this type.

During his introductory speech, Mr. Williams quoted a report by Dr. Ellis of the Mental Health Services. The report makes quite interesting reading, and on page 41, under the heading "Education" appears the following:—

> Our present Health Education Council is undoubtedly using the correct approach in treating drug and alcohol dependence in the wider context of modern social issues. Overseas opinion agrees emphatically that we are right to ensure that only properly accredited representatives should give information on these matters to the young. Support of the Health Education Council will pay dividends in minimising or preventing the spread of drug and alcohol dependency among young people in Western Australia.
>
> In almost every country—with the exception perhaps of Czechoslovakia—the Press was regarded as a potent agent of morbid interest in drugs, sensationalism in reporting leading to increased interest and consumption. If the reporting of drug offences could be curtailed in the same way as has been done with divorce and matrimonial causes reporting, the Press would be performing a major public service. In a small community such as ours, private approaches to local newspaper proprietors should not be impossible. Generally, better information and a less hysterical approach to drugs, was believed to be the best way of combating the growth of this menace.

The motion before us deals with the treatment and the cure of the people who are dependent upon drugs. However, I feel that the wording of the motion as it stands does not convey the true intent which Mr. Williams had in mind when he moved the motion. Mr. Williams said that this State has a proud record for the eradication of tuberculosis, and at page 1159 of *Hansard* he had the following to say:—

> I say "eradication" because only a very small number of cases now occur. It could be that somewhere along the line, when alcoholism has been positively identified and it is positively known how to treat it, another wonder drug will be discovered, such as streptomycin was for tuberculosis.

I submit our success in this State—and in Australia—has been mainly not so much the treatment and the cure of the disease, but the prevention of the disease. We struck at the grass roots before the disease could get a hold and that is the best way to overcome dependency in our society. We found that this could be best done by co-ordination and co-operation by everybody concerned, particularly those in Government positions.

Once again I quote from the report submitted by Dr. Ellis, and under the heading "Unified Approach" appears the following:—

> Drug-dependence and alcoholism are social problems, and concern not only the medical disciplines, but social, legal, and educational ones as well.
>
> An inter-disciplinary committee should be set up to integrate the present activities in these fields, and should include representatives from the appropriate government departments, from churches, and from voluntary bodies. Sub-committees dealing with legal, therapeutic, preventive, social, research, and educational aspects, should report regularly on the progress of joint action.

We find that in most of our fields of treatment inquiry there is a lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the people who live within our society. We must get greater co-ordination and co-operation and we can achieve this with a unified approach to any particular problem. We would then have a greater opportunity to integrate the activities of the people concerned and overcome the problem more quickly and more swiftly.

We find, rather surprisingly, that when the Minister spoke to the motion—as recorded on page 1571 of *Hansard*—he made the following statement:—

> The position of drug dependency in this community is under constant review by the Public Health Department and the Mental Health Services, but it is considered that at present few drug-dependent persons here can be adequately catered for by existing facilities in the general and psychiatric hospitals.
>
> In the circumstances which have arisen only very recently, it seems that the appointment of a Select Committee at this point in time would be unnecessary and premature.

I say a thing is only premature if there is no problem in existence. We do have a problem. It may be comparatively small but I am rather grateful to the Leader of the Opposition, who, on the 18th April, 1972, asked a question regarding the drug

problem in Western Australia. The Leader of the Opposition asked, firstly, how many persons had been convicted in Western Australia in the past two years for taking drugs, and the answer was 97 persons. Secondly, he asked how many people had been convicted for trafficking in drugs and the answer was 13 persons. If we examine the segregation of the types of people who were dealt with in the courts it will be found that the ages ranged mainly from 16 to 25 years. Those over the age of 25 years numbered six at 26; three at 27; two at 28; and one at 34.

The remainder of the people who went before the court were between 16 and 25 years of age. We all know that not everybody is caught. A total of 97 people were caught and convicted, but how many others have not been caught? We are well aware that the Press quite often reports that somebody has been caught growing cannabis or marihuana in a backyard, in the bush, or even in a garden flower box.

We do have a problem and it is not premature at this stage to start dealing with it on an organised basis. However, let us not deal just with the treatment and the cure; let us also deal with the prevention. As we all know, prevention is better than cure.

I have placed an amendment on the notice paper to deal with the prevention aspect of the disease. I now take this opportunity to move the amendment standing in my name. I move an amendment—

> Delete the word "and" where secondly appearing in line 4 and add after the word "dependants", being the last word in the motion, the words "and recommend ways to combat the initial incidence of such dependency" .

Amendment put and passed.

Motion as Amended

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [9.14 p.m.]: I would like to thank Mr. Fred White for the contribution he has made to this request for the appointment of a Select Committee. What I intended was not spelt out sufficiently clear and I am grateful to Mr. White for suggesting the amendment. I am also grateful to the House for accepting it. I will say no more at this stage.

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

Appointment of Select Committee

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [9.14 p.m.]: I move—

> That The Hon. L. D. Elliott, The Hon. T. O. Perry, and the mover be appointed to serve on the Committee.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [9.15 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Committee have power to call for persons, papers, and documents, and to adjourn from place to place; that it may sit on days over which the Council stands adjourned; and that the Committee report on Thursday, the 16th November, 1972.

Question put and passed.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Dual Route: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 12th May, on the following motion by The Hon. Clive Griffiths:—

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

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [9.17 p.m.]: The motion moved by Mr. Clive Griffiths has caused a considerable amount of emotion among people who have been vitally interested in ecology and the protection of the environment, but I feel they are about four years too late in raising their voices.

I recall that I raised my voice when plans were being formed to site in the Kwinana area the particular power house which will feed these lines. Concern is being felt, mainly because the line will go through a public school. It has not been said that when this power station was planned it took away a public reserve and a beachfront, of which very few are left in Cockburn Sound at the present time. Those that are left are polluted by industry to such a degree that many people will no longer use them for swimming. The Macedonia Street reserve was enjoyed by people who had access to the beachfront from the roadway which then existed. No-one expressed any concern.

At that time I also raised my objection to the route of the line because the pylons were to be placed through the shadehouses of a nurseryman who had spent many years building up and establishing his nursery. These were the actions of the previous Government, not of the present Government. When complaints were raised in this Chamber, very little was heard of them.

That was the Government's policy. The Government wanted the power house in that position for some special reason which I have not yet found out. The power house is not serving industry at Kwinana. It is serving the area north of Perth, but no-one told us that at the time. Why was the power station not situated north of Perth?

There is now a hullabaloo about the power lines going through Guildford Grammar School. Like everyone else, I would like the lines to be placed underground if possible, but it is not possible at this time because of cost, we are told. I am not by any stretch of the imagination an expert on costing or electricity supplies. Mr. Clive Griffiths knows much more about electricity than I could ever hope to know.

This planning was carried out initially in 1968, and the State Electricity Commission, irrespective of which is the Government of the day, is virtually a law unto itself. It plans its own programmes, as do all other boards, trusts, and commissions. It is a semi-government department and it must look at all aspects of costing. Criticism has been made of the present Government's action in increasing electricity charges, but if the State Electricity Commission went to the full extent of its capacity and did everything that everybody wanted in respect of these power lines, the public would be paying much more for electricity than it is paying at the present time. Therefore, we cannot complain about the increased charges for electricity on one hand and deplore or criticise the actions of the Government on the other hand when the cost will be contained at the present rate if the power line is constructed.

I do not like to see power lines anywhere, but in the areas about which I have complained in this Chamber over the years, what has been done in regard to power lines from South Fremantle? The lines run right through the middle of Coolbellup, which is called the Floreat Park of State Housing Commission areas. Two power lines run through that area. I did not hear anyone raise his voice when that was done by the previous Government. The power lines then cross over the land on which the Murdoch University will be built, but this is not preventing the building of the university in the area north-east of Bibra Lake. The power lines go through Rossmoyne and pass through the high school. They go through Riverton and the grounds of the Kinlock Primary School in Lynwood.

Several years ago the action of the previous Government in putting a power line across the Swan River caused some trouble. I did not become embroiled in that argument because I had seen power lines stretching across the Brisbane River and I did not see anything objectionable about that proposal at that time. This was borne out early this year when a television station carried out a survey amongst residents close to Blackwall Reach. The people were asked for their opinions about the power lines across the Swan River. The reporter asked one woman, "What do you think of the power line that runs across the Swan River?" She said, "What power line?" She lived 100 yards away from it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: She might have been short-sighted.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The reporter said, "That power line there," and pointed to it. This proves the point that people can become emotional about things but after a time they accept them. Wherever the power line goes, it must interfere with somebody, somewhere, at some time. I have complained bitterly over the years. I have seen people who have had their livelihoods, their homes, their properties, and their future taken away from them because of resumption and the construction of a railway to service an industry. These power lines will service the community, not an industry; and I think there is a difference.

As I said before, costs must be contained somewhere. I do not blame anyone for getting up here and expressing his point of view. That is the right and privilege of all members. If we carry this motion, it will not mean much, in fact, because it only deplores the decision of the Government to adopt the dual route. If we listened to the previous speakers, we would know the meat of the motion is the concern expressed by Guildford Grammar School. Because of the people who were present in the gallery, most people probably believed the motion was intended to protect the rights of Guildford Grammar School. I have no complaint about that, but other schools suffer a similar disability and other people have suffered disabilities, and will continue to do so in the future, because of the actions of Governments.

We must be honest with ourselves if we want to contain costs so that the public will not have to bear an unfair burden. If the people are prepared to accept the burden, let us not have any power lines at all above the ground. Let Mr. Clive Griffiths and the people who support him tell their constituents that if we put the power lines underground their electricity charges will double. I wonder what their reaction would be then. I am sure they would say, "Let the lines stay where they are."

I consider it is vitally necessary to look at the rights of the individual, which I have always tried to defend. We should not criticise something which was planned years before this Government came into office. I do not think the motion is worthy of support. I think it was moved especially to air the issue raised by the pressure group from Guildford Grammar School.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [9.30 p.m.]: Firstly, I thank those members who spoke to this motion, particularly those who supported it. I intended to be brief in my reply because it was to be based on the Minister's speech. However, Mr. Ron Thompson has introduced several factors into the debate that should be answered and I think I should deal with those first, because they are fresh in my mind.

Mr. Ron Thompson commenced by saying that the cries for the protection of our environment came four years too late, because nobody said anything when a power station was being installed on a public reserve. The honourable member said that nobody had objected to this. Therefore, he failed to see why, in this instance, somebody was making objection to the encroachment on our environment. He then went on to say that many power lines had been erected across Coolbellup and other areas, and again nobody had raised any objection. To that I would reply that as the representative of the area where the power station was built it was his prerogative to raise the issue if indeed it needed raising. Further, if there were a lack of complaints being made by people against the erection of the power house at that time, I would remind him that the members of his party were the people who represented those areas where the power station was constructed, and I would have thought that it would have been from that direction that representations would have been made to draw the attention of Parliament to the matter.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you can recall my raising those complaints.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I cannot recall the honourable member doing so, but he did say tonight that nobody had raised any objections to the erection of the power house. I am not saying, however, that the honourable member did not raise objection to the erection of the power house at that time. Mr. Ron Thompson also said that he would have preferred the power lines to have gone underground, but realised that the cost was against such a move. I realise this, too. I understand that we cannot expect, at this stage, to put power lines of such voltage underground, because technically it would be most difficult and financially beyond consideration.

Mr. Ron Thompson went on to say that other schools were suffering under this disability, but I did not know of any other school that had suffered as a result of power lines going through its grounds. The honourable member did mention, however, the Kinlock primary school, and I presume he meant that this is the only school in Western Australia that is suffering under this disability. I was able to obtain a plan of the Kinlock primary school showing the location of the pylons and the electricity mains. For the information of Mr. Ron Thompson I would point out that these are outside the perimeter of the Kinlock primary school.

The Hon. J. Dolan: How far outside; 10 yards?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The scale of this plan is 100 feet to the inch. So, looking at the plan, the mains and the pylons would be about 75 feet outside the perimeter of the Kinlock school. However, they are outside the school area. I am not criticising the statement that has been made by Mr. Ron Thompson, because he thought they were within the property of the Kinlock primary school.

The reason that I happen to have this plan handy and that I knew about it was that recently there was a move to exchange some land that would have brought the pylons within the area of the Kinlock primary school, and representation was made to me to have this decision reversed, and I am happy to say it was, in fact, reversed.

Mr. Ron Thompson went on to say that people would react rather violently to any suggestion that we should place all pylons underground with the consequent result that electricity charges would be increased. I agree that people would react violently to such a proposal, but we are not asking that the lines should be constructed underground. We are asking the Government to submit this proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority for its comments prior to a final decision on the route being made. Mr. Ron Thompson suggested that this route was decided on during the term of the previous Government.

I remind him and the House of the point I made when I moved the motion; namely, that Sir David Brand, during the election campaign of 1971, gave a categorical undertaking that if the Liberal Party was returned to office the Environmental Protection Authority, set up under the legislation introduced by his Government, would be asked to comment on the proposal prior to a final decision being made. It is not good enough for Mr. Ron Thompson to say that because of the original decision for the desirability of these power lines this necessarily meant the Liberal Party would not have carried out the undertaking that Sir David Brand had given. I have every confidence that this would have been the situation.

That is one of the fundamental purposes of this motion; that is, to ask the Government to submit this proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority set up under its legislation, because it did not feel that the legislation introduced by the Brand Government had sufficient teeth. That is all I am asking. If the Environmental Protection Authority gives

a favourable decision, critics would then have no ground for complaint. However, the Government is not prepared to do that and I think it stands condemned because of it. So much for what Mr. Ron Thompson has said.

So far as the Minister is concerned, I think his reply is an indication of the Government's lack of sympathy for those people who will be affected by these power lines. This is emphasised by the absence of any comments on the majority of the points I made when I moved the motion.

However, I shall deal with one or two points on which the Minister chose to make some comment during his short reply to the motion. The Minister explained to us what outages meant. He said that common causes of outages are lightning, bush fires, fouling by mechanical equipment such as cranes and, less frequently, low-flying aircraft. He went on to say that the reason for the necessity to install duplicate lines separated by great distances was the possibility of outages being caused under those circumstances I have outlined.

I would point out to the House that after saying that outages were caused less frequently by low-flying aircraft, he went on to say that duplicate lines should be physically separated to avoid the risk of simultaneous outage of both lines from the one event. He also said that in regard to the lines under consideration the most likely risks were bush fires and low-flying aircraft which could cause simultaneous outages with shutdown of the system as a certain result.

So, firstly, the Minister tells us that one of the least frequent causes of outages is low-flying aircraft and then, in the next paragraph, he states that the most likely risks in regard to the lines under consideration are bush fires and low-flying aircraft. Therefore it would seem to me that the possibility of low-flying aircraft causing an outage is very remote indeed. Frankly, I cannot bring myself to understand how bush fires would have a major effect on these power lines.

While speaking on this part of the Minister's speech, I would point out that one of the matters he particularly refrained from commenting on was my main suggestion that in 1968, or thereabouts, when the original proposal was put forward for the construction of the two power lines—bearing in mind that two lines are necessary in case one fails; that is, there would still be one line left to carry power to the northern terminal—all the power-generating stations were in the south of the metropolitan area and therefore it was reasonable to assume that is was necessary to have two lines in case one of these remote outages the Minister spoke of occurred.

However, since then—as I pointed out when I moved the motion—early this year an announcement was made that the proposed new power station to be erected south of Mandurah was to be transferred to the north of Wanneroo. I made a suggestion that the location of this new power house removed the necessity for the second power line. However, the Minister did not make any comment on this suggestion when he entered into the debate on the motion. He made no reference to it whatever. I am therefore wondering how seriously the Government is viewing the motion. Obviously it is not viewing it very seriously at all.

I think this House is entitled to expect that the Government would at least consider the motion that has been moved in this House in a serious vein. I think that because of his reluctance to mention this particular point, it would make me all the more keen to suggest that this is a very important point indeed.

During his remarks, Mr. Ron Thompson stated that we could not justify any increases in the cost of electricity to the people. For the information of the House I would remind him that removing one of these power lines would represent a saving of $7,000,000 approximately. Therefore, we could go a long way towards not only removing the 21 per cent. increase this Government imposed on electricity charges, but we could do what the Liberal Party Government intended to do; that is, reduce electricity charges in country districts. Perhaps that could be achieved if the Government simply declared that it is prepared to give serious consideration to the motion moved in this House.

When replying the Minister went on to say that apparently I was under some misapprehension concerning the recommendation of the M.R.P.A. I am under no misapprehension—and I hope the House is under no misapprehension—as to what the M.R.P.A. was advocating; that is, that the line through the Guildford Grammar School be not proceeded with and an alternative route, preferably to the east of the school, be found for this line. There is no misapprehension about this. There are no "ifs", "buts", or "maybes" about it. The M.R.P.A. made the statment that as far as it was concerned the line should not go through the school. Now the Minister justifies his comment that I am under a misapprehension by saying that the M.R.P.A. did not offer a suitable alternative. However, it is not the M.R.P.A.'s prerogative to find a suitable alternative. It is not the function of the M.R.P.A. to set itself up as an expert on the choice of routes for power lines. What it is expert in doing is passing comment on good town planning, and as far as the M.R.P.A. was concerned the proposed route through the school was not good town planning, and it suggested an alternative be sought. It is the task of another authority to find a suitable route—an expert in the field; namely, the S.E.C.

However, the Government is not prepared to accept that suggestion. It merely states that I am under a misapprehension.

I hope the House will not accept that. The Minister went on—

> Nevertheless, the State Electricity Commission made strenuous efforts to find alternatives and continues to do so. The commission was and is prepared to compromise and a further amendment to the line is under consideration and will be presented to the shire and to school representatives in conference with the Minister.

This is a laugh! We have all heard the first compromise. Instead of having one route through the hills, a compromise was made so that two routes were planned! A compromise has been made with Guildford Grammar School because instead of having two pylons constructed within the grounds of the school, it will have four! The Minister said that an amendment to the line was being considered and would be presented to the shire and the school in conference with the Minister. On the 22nd May, the school received a letter from the Minister for Electricity which reads as follows:—

> The Chairman,
> Guildford Grammar School Council,
> Terrace Road,
> GUILDFORD . . . W.A. 6055
>
> Dear Sir,
>
> I enclose a copy of my letter of 22nd May giving my decision on the route of the transmission line through the School property.
>
> In coming to my decision, I have very carefully considered all the conflicting interests of those affected by the various practicable proposals and trust that the modified route which involves greater distance and cost than the original proposal will be of commensurate acceptability to the School.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> Don May,
> MINISTER FOR ELECTRICITY.

This is in consultation with the shire and the school. This is what the Minister said would occur, but the school was informed of the decision by a hand-delivered letter which was accompanied by a copy of an undertaking or agreement reached between the Minister and the local authority—not the school. The school heard about it after the Minister having consulted with the local authority reached a decision.

The last meeting the school had with the Minister was reported in *The West Australian* of the 24th May as follows:—

> The route Mr. May announced yesterday is east of the first proposal, still between the senior school and the preparatory school.
>
> The chairman of the school council, Mr. K. I. Brine, said it still divided the school property and seriously interfered with proposed future development.
>
> It involved four pylons on school property instead of two in the original plan.
>
> One of the pylons would be even closer to the school's historic chapel.
>
> Mr. Brine said that, at a meeting on May 11 between the Swan Shire Council, the S.E.C. and the school council, the school's representatives had specifically rejected the route now adopted by Mr. May.

I take exception to the fact that currently before both Houses of Parliament—although I am more concerned with this House—is a motion asking the Minister not to do anything about the matter until such time as the Environmental Protection Authority has considered it; yet, ignoring the possible decision of Parliament, the Minister has gone ahead and made a decision. This is a serious state of affairs because what will be the situation if this Parliament passes the motion which reads as follows:—

> That this House deplores the decision of the Government to adopt a dual route for the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line resulting in environmental desecration and personal hardship to a greater number of people than would lines installed along one route.

The last part of the motion is the part about which the House ought to be concerned. It reads—

> We ask that the Government reconsider the decision after a report is made by the Environmental Protection Authority and that, in any event, they adhere to the clear recommendation of the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority not to construct the lines through, or near, the Guildford Grammar School.

If this motion is carried what will be the result of the decision the Minister has already made? Will he change his mind again or do what he has already done; that is, say, "I do not care what the Legislative Council decides. I am not going to give it to the E. P. A. irrespective of what Parliament says." This is a pretty sorry state of affairs. The lack of regard for what this House thinks is an added reason we should pass this motion.

That just about sums up what the Minister said in reply to my motion. He said nothing about the danger to children which I suggested could be the result of the pylons being constructed in the school grounds. At that stage only two pylons were to be constructed, but now four are to be erected. He said nothing about that aspect and nothing about the danger to the 600 children. I wonder why the Minister refrained from making any comment to refute what I said. He could have said that no possibility of danger to children

exists or that the children will not climb the pylons. He could have at least said something, but he ignored that aspect completely as if he did not really care about the subject.

I would like to read to the House an interesting newspaper item from *The West Australian* of the 29th May, as follows:—

BOY KILLED ON POWER PYLON

MELBOURNE, Sun: A 14-year-old boy was electrocuted yesterday when he climbed on to a high voltage power pylon in Carlton, an inner Melbourne suburb.

That is a clear indication that 14-year-old boys do climb pylons notwithstanding the barriers placed around them by the State Electricity Commission. Boys are boys and it does not take a smart lad long to climb through barbed wire entanglements placed around pylons if he wants to do so. Boys are adventurous and if over 600 attend a school the possibility certainly exists of one or more climbing up these pylons and it is certainly something we ought to consider. However, the Minister gave the matter no consideration at all. He chose to ignore it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They do not seem to have done anything like that at Kenwick and Rossmoyne, which is in the heart of your district and to which you did not object when the pylons were erected.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They are not in the school grounds.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They are within 10 yards of the school grounds. What is wrong with you? Why not be dinkum?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister is displaying one of his tantrums mentioned earlier by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Why not be a little factual?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am being factual. Does the Minister deny that the boy was killed on the power line?

The Hon. J. Dolan: No. I did not say anything about that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Why not mention—

The Hon. J. Dolan: When did it happen?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What?

The Hon. J. Dolan: It happened after I spoke. It was after I spoke that it was in the newspaper.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course.

The Hon. J. Dolan: How could I have spoken about it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I mentioned the possibility when I spoke.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister is getting a little annoyed.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I am entitled to when he misrepresents the situation.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not misrepresenting the situation. Neither of the pylons mentioned by the Minister runs through the school property, and if he took a trip to the electorate occasionally he would see this.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I was there only last night or the night before.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Did the Minister see the pylon in the school grounds?

The Hon. J. Dolan: Yes. I was there on Sunday and saw it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It is not in the school grounds.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It adjoins them.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It would be just as dangerous five yards away as where it is. Have a little sense.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister can get as upset as he desires and say all he wishes to say.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No he can't.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He cannot alter the fact that the Government has failed to appreciate that this Parliament is currently considering a motion asking it to do what Sir David Brand said he would do; that is, present this matter to the Environmental Protection Authority for its consideration before a final decision is made. This is the reason I am asking this House to agree to my motion.

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

Ayes—14

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
	(Teller)

Noes—10

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. L. Hunt	Hon. R. Thompson
	(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. D. K. Dans

Question thus passed.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS PLANNING AUTHORITY BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.02 p.m.