

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —to deviate me from the line I wish to follow. I can only apologise on their behalf. However, I want to conclude—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Thank heavens!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —by saying that I take strong exception to the suggestion that the people who voted for members of the Legislative Council did not know what they were doing.

I will save for a future occasion the other points about which I wished to speak. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth.

*House adjourned at 4.43 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 23rd March, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

### BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Presbyterian Church of Australia Act Amendment Bill.
2. Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Graham (Acting Premier), and read a first time.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 22nd March, on the following motion by Mr. Brown:—

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

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

MR. JONES (Collie) [11.06 a.m.]: I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. First of all, I would like to advise the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bunbury that the matters raised by them during the course of their addresses will be covered by me during this speech. I would also indicate that although the seat I now occupy is on a different side of the House—the seat

I occupied during my first three years in Parliament was on the opposite side—my views on power generation and the coal-mining industry generally have not changed one iota.

I came to this Parliament with an honest approach, and during my submission I will show that I have not changed my opinion, irrespective of the fact that through the change of Government I have changed from one side of the House to the other.

Mr. Williams: Good for you!

Several members interjected.

Mr. JONES: Before referring to the numerous matters I have in mind, I will mention a speech made by the member for Mt. Marshall while speaking to the Address-in-Reply on the 15th March. Members will recall that the member for Mt. Marshall referred to the increases in union fees which had been made by various unions in Australia. He said that in 1962 the annual fees paid to the Amalgamated Engineering Union were \$9.97, but they were up to \$16 in 1972. He also said that the increase in the Australian Workers' Union fees represented a rise of 133.3 per cent.

The honourable member also stated that the amount of profit made on capital invested at the market value of B.H.P. shares today reflects approximately 3 per cent, on investment. The most important part of his speech which I wish to deal with is the reference he made to the company being forced into the position of increasing its charges because of claims made by the industrial unions.

If we examine the share position, and be honest with ourselves, we will see that a number of companies have introduced a policy of issuing bonus shares. Records of such transactions are available at the Companies Office. My studies have revealed that one company operating in Western Australia paid a dividend of 9 per cent. last year. However, since the company was formed there have been four issues of bonus shares.

It will be seen that a person could buy a number of \$1 shares on the share market, and because of the issue of four bonus shares during the period of operation of the company, his actual share asset in the company would be considerably increased. Such an increase in shareholding would provide a greater return in the way of interest.

That brings me to the point where the honourable member referred to B.H.P., and said that the Federal Government approved of the increase in the price of steel. If we examine the history of the B.H.P. company it will become quite clear, in my view, that the honourable member did not do his homework. In fairness to him, he was quoting a submission made in the Federal Parliament.

Let us look at the B.H.P. situation which is revealing, to say the least. I have carried out an investigation at the Stock Exchange which shows that a person who bought 100 shares in B.H.P. in 1885 would have 12,300.37 shares today, allowing for bonus issues, par issues, and premium issues since making the investment. I realise 1885 is a long time ago, but the investigation I undertook revealed this information.

Sir David Brand: I will say it is a long time ago. You are not making a sound case for yourself.

Mr. JONES: In terms of value, a person who originally purchased 100 shares which, with bonus and other issues have now increased to 12,300, would find this represents 1.32c each. In considering what the honourable member was complaining about, we will see that companies have the knack of issuing bonus shares and dividends are payable on those shares. Obviously this reflects in the whole operations of the company. The current value of B.H.P. shares is \$12.70, and the par value \$2. The honourable member was complaining about the poor returns to investors in B.H.P. However, we must consider the issuing of bonus shares, etc., which applies not only to B.H.P. but to many other companies as well. Companies have a perfect right to do this and I am not suggesting, in any way, that they are acting illegally. However it is done and, in the overall, has an effect on prices.

He also mentioned increased union fees and said that whether or not a union increased its fees was a matter for the union. Another member interjected and asked what the position was within the Farmers' Union. The honourable member had indicated that the Australian Workers' Union had been forced to increase its fees by 133.4 per cent. but he completely forgot to mention an article which appeared in *The Countryman* last week to the effect that the annual subscription to the Farmers' Union has been increased from \$12 to \$30.

Mr. Gayfer: That is not compulsory subscription by any means.

Mr. JONES: I understand the member for Avon was present at a certain meeting, although he may correct me if I am wrong. Of course, the Farmers' Union has a perfect right to increase its fees but, in defence of the trade union movement which tries to pay officials the highest possible salary in order to attract the best men for the job, it must be placed on record that the Farmers' Union, which is supported by many members in this House, was forced into a similar position and recently had to increase subscriptions by 150 per cent.

Mr. McPharlin: Do you agree with the principle that increased costs demand increased charges to meet those costs?

Mr. JONES: I have only limited time.

Mr. McPharlin: Why do you condemn B.H.P.?

Mr. JONES: I am not condemning B.H.P. but I am trying to show the true position. I realise companies must make profits but I ask: What is a reasonable profit and what is an unreasonable one?

Mr. Williams: What is a reasonable profit?

Mr. JONES: The member for Bunbury had his opportunity to speak last evening; I will not be side-tracked by interjections. I understand the member for Avon was present at a recent meeting of the Farmers' Union, although he may correct me if I am wrong. At this meeting the matter of compulsory unionism was discussed. I understand a motion was carried by the Farmers' Union supporting the need for compulsory unionism—not preference to unionists, but compulsory unionism.

Mr. Gayfer: I am not arguing on this, but I say the amount of \$30 is not a compulsion at this stage.

Mr. Graham: At this stage!

Mr. JONES: Does the member for Avon deny that a resolution was passed at the meeting calling for compulsory unionism within the union?

Mr. Gayfer: The motion was put but not passed.

Mr. W. G. Young: A motion was put but not carried.

Mr. Court: It makes a mighty difference.

Mr. Gayfer: We are still free to vote the way we think.

Mr. JONES: I am drawing many interjections this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McPharlin: Before you leave the subject of B.H.P., would you say that some union members are shareholders in B.H.P.?

Mr. JONES: I do not know the business of union members. Does the honourable member think I am a spy for the trade union movement?

Mr. McPharlin: You seem to be setting yourself up as an authority.

Mr. JONES: If I am permitted, Mr. Speaker, I will continue. Some members on the other side of the House have expressed criticism of our Government since it assumed office and have said that we have done nothing. Last night the member for Bunbury alleged in the Chamber that the Coal Miners' Union and the town of Collie, generally, were unhappy with the Government's administration. Let us look at some of the things which the Government has effected since it took office.

It cannot be denied that since I have been member for Collie I have continually raised the matter of a boring programme for the Collie coalfield. This has been advocated not only by myself but also by the South-West Regional Council. All

requests to the previous Government fell on deaf ears. For the sake of the record I think we should look at some of the information given to the Labor Party when in Opposition and decisions taken by the previous Liberal-Country Party Government.

On the 23rd September, 1965, the then Leader of the Opposition (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke) asked questions on a boring programme for Collie. The question reads—

In view of the fact that Consulting Mining Engineer Marshall and other coalmining engineers at Collie disagree with the statement by the Minister for Electricity as published in *The West Australian* on the 20th November, 1964, in which he claimed known economic deposits of coal at Collie are sufficient for only 30 years, will he advise—

- (1) Has a decision been made to extend the new Muja power station?

There is more to the question, but I will not read the other parts. The relevant parts of the reply were—

- (1) No decision to extend beyond four units each of 60 megawatts.
- (3) and (4) The reserves of both the open cut and deep coal are well known following geological and geophysical examination, drilling, and the mining operations conducted over the years.

It is clear, to me at least, that the Government of the day thought it knew what reserves of coal were located at Collie. Subsequent to that the Premier of the day (Sir David Brand) visited Bunbury and made a public statement which appeared in an edition of the *South-Western Times* that there was probably more coal at Collie than the Government knew about. I cannot give the date of that announcement.

Mr. Nalder: Do you think that yourself?

Mr. JONES: I ask the Leader of the Country Party to wait until I make my point.

Mr. Nalder: In other words, you support the idea.

Mr. JONES: I ask the honourable member to listen and to allow me to make my speech. I was about to repeat that I had continually raised this question—and so had the South-West Regional Council—but it had fallen on deaf ears. I am pleased to say that following consultation with our Government a \$400,000 drilling programme is in progress in Collie.

Mr. Williams: This has been decided upon by the two companies, Peabody and Western Collieries. The Government did not open its mouth.

Mr. JONES: The Government worked in close co-operation with the two companies. The previous Government main-

tained that it knew what coal reserves existed at Collie but the joint venturers, Peabody and Western Collieries, have now decided the reserves are not known and, in consequence, a \$400,000 drilling programme is in operation.

Mr. Nalder: Who is paying for it?

Mr. Williams: The Government is not paying a cracker.

Mr. JONES: Even before this programme was announced, a company in Collie and the State Electricity Commission were discussing the possibility of a joint venture on a boring programme.

Mr. Williams: Maybe so.

Mr. JONES: But the two companies concerned in this programme decided to go it alone. As far as I am concerned, it emphasises my point that the companies, which I suggest have a better knowledge of the field than many members of this House, are of the firm opinion that the coal resources at Collie are not known. This opinion is contrary to the information which has been given in the State Parliament. Might I therefore say it is very pleasing to know that Western Collieries have gone into this venture with Peabody and that the Peabody Coalmining Company of America has established its Australian office at Collie. This augurs very well for the future of the coalfield.

Mr. Nalder: And the Government is absolutely sitting on the fence.

Mr. JONES: It is not sitting on the fence. I also advise Parliament that Western Collieries, in the interests of coal utilisation, have established a coal laboratory at Collie. I understand that in the whole of Australia there are only three such laboratories dealing with the utilisation of coal. The laboratory at Collie is under the control of Dr. Moran, who is very experienced in coal utilisation. It is pleasing to know this laboratory has been established. I think it brings back some security to the coalfields.

Mr. Williams: That has been in operation for some years.

Mr. JONES: Irrespective of the views expressed by members on the other side of the House, the companies, the unions, the South-West Regional Council, and I are of the opinion that the reserves of coal are not known. Surely the action of the joint venturers—the Peabody Coalmining Company and Western Collieries—supports the viewpoint I have been putting forward during the time I have been in this House.

Mr. Williams: What is your Government doing about it?

Mr. Nalder: Is the Government recommending further increases in electricity charges at Collie?

Mr. JONES: I move on to my next point. I refer to a statement appearing in the *Collie Mail* of Thursday, the 16th March.

Mr. Nalder: He is not interested in the S.E.C.

Mr. JONES: Under the heading "Coal contracts: Tom Perry supports claims by Miners' Union," The Hon. Tom Perry, who is a well-known member in another place, had this to say—

I support most strongly the Miners' Union in their request that the Government extend the term of coal contracts; give immediate consideration to extending the Muja power station and implement a policy for balanced production of opencut and deep mine coal that will give lasting security to the coal industry in Collie.

It is important to note that he also said—

Whilst I realise that such a policy may be more costly than that at present adopted by the S.E.C. it would aid decentralisation and benefit the State generally, as money spent on fuel for power generation would circulate within the State.

Let us now look at what the union was asking for. I understand a mass meeting of mineworkers called on the Government to consider three matters, namely—

1. Extensions to the Muja power house.
2. Alterations to the existing coal quotas.
3. The introduction of long-term coal contracts.

It seems to me The Hon. Tom Perry is trying to get on the bandwagon, for the reasons which I will now explain.

If we cast our minds back for, say, two years, we will find that all these policies were placed before the former Government and were declined by the Liberal-Country Party Government. It is all very well for Mr. Perry to come out on the side of the miners and say he fully supports them but we must look at the activities of his Government during the last three years.

Mr. Williams: Now read the Minister's letter on page 5.

Mr. JONES: I will come to that. Just give me time. Mr. Perry was so concerned about coal quotas that on the 22nd December, 1970, he introduced a deputation to his leader, who was then the Minister for Electricity.

Mr. Nalder: And the member for Collie was present by invitation.

Mr. JONES: During that deputation we discussed precisely what the miners are now asking for, which is supported by Mr. Perry. The result of the deputation was that on the 22nd December, 1970, the then Minister for Electricity, who is the Leader of the Country Party, told Mr. Perry the proposition was not on because it involved

cost. Yet because we are now in Government Mr. Perry is saying in letters to the *Collie Mail* that he is right behind the miners.

Mr. Nalder: He has not changed his views.

Mr. JONES: He is now supporting the implementation of their policy.

Mr. Williams: We did not make the promises your Government made.

Mr. JONES: I will come to promises in a moment. I now wish to refer to power generation. When a decision was made to increase the size of the Kwinana oil-burning station the Coal Miners' Union, when I was its secretary, strongly opposed this action. The Leader of the Country Party knows we had several meetings with the Country Party. While Mr. Perry, as an individual member, might have been opposed to the extensions at Kwinana, his party did not support him.

I go so far as to say that while I was secretary of the Coal Miners' Union, I addressed the members of the Country Party in West Perth in order to put to them the union's viewpoint. I understand that at the State conference of the Country Party a motion opposing the extensions at Kwinana was advanced. I am given to understand that motion was not supported by the Country Party. We therefore have the position that Mr. Perry is getting on the bandwagon and criticising our Government but he is not at the same time telling the public that the Government he supported when it was in power, had every opportunity to implement the first two policies I have enumerated.

Mr. Williams: His Government never promised to do so.

Mr. JONES: Is the honourable member saying that The Hon. Tom Perry has changed his views?

Mr. Williams: I did not say that.

Mr. Reid: You said he was on the bandwagon.

Mr. JONES: I said The Hon. Tom Perry, as an individual member of the Country Party, supported the Opposition at the time but his Government did not support him. It had ample opportunity to implement those policies. Now that Mr. Perry is in Opposition, he sets himself up as a martyr for the coalminers, saying, "I am right behind you in attempts to force the Government into something I could not force my own Government into." That is the situation that confronts us.

Mr. Williams: How much support did you get from your Government for the railways down there?

Mr. Gayfer: You are both very good members for your electorates. Congratulations!

Mr. JONES: The Coal Miners' Union was one of the bodies instrumental in bringing Mr. Perry to this place, and he would not deny that. Let us have a look at both sides.

I fully subscribe to the extensions to the Muja power house, and I will deal with this matter in the time left to me because I have something to say about power utilisation. Before I deal with that matter I want to say that last night the member for Blackwood raised the question of increased power costs. On the one hand we have him saying the Government must look at this matter, and on the other hand we have The Hon. Tom Perry, a member of the same party, saying we should not consider costs.

Mr. Nalder: He did not say that. You know he did not.

Mr. JONES: He is reported in the *Collie Mail*—

Mr. Reid: I said the charges should be reduced, not that they should be looked at.

Mr. Nalder: A moment ago you said he encouraged an increase in costs.

Mr. JONES: I will read this again.

Mr. Nalder: Be truthful.

Mr. JONES: I am truthful. I have never been dishonest since I have been in this place. For the benefit of members I say I still subscribe to the policies I spoke about when I was on the other side, and that is much more than members opposite can say.

The Hon. Tom Perry said—

Whilst I realise that such a policy may be more costly than that at present adopted by the S.E.C. it would aid decentralisation and benefit the State generally . . .

Mr. Nalder: He did not support increased costs. That is what you said.

Mr. JONES: What is that tantamount to? There must be balanced production of coal at Collie. A sensible policy of balanced production must be adopted to meet the requirements. I thought the member for Blackwood last night opened his campaign for the Forrest electorate later in the year.

Mr. Reid: You have a pretty poor opinion of me.

Mr. JONES: If we look at the honourable member's charges against the Government, we see that many of the problems were brought about by Federal Government policy. It would be true to say that the Liberal Government has not been operating in harmony during the past 12 months. The Press leads us to believe that there is dissension in the Liberal Party. There has been a little trouble in Tasmania and considerable trouble in South Australia.

Mr. Court: Don't believe all you hear.

Mr. JONES: It would be true to say that all is not rosy in the Liberal Party.

The member for Blackwood is concerned about increased power costs. We have to bear in mind that this Government has been in power for 12 months.

Mr. Williams: Much too long!

Mr. McIver: It will be in power a lot longer, too!

Mr. Williams: Not the way it is carrying on.

Mr. JONES: The policy of the State Electricity Commission is laid down up to 1976. Irrespective of our opinion of the correct policy, the former Government, in conjunction with the S.E.C., decided that the requirements of the State will be met when the No. 6 oil-burning unit is installed at Kwinana in 1976.

Mr. Williams: Are the same people in the S.E.C. giving you advice as advised the previous Government?

Mr. JONES: Giving me advice?

Mr. Williams: Giving your Government advice.

Mr. JONES: I cannot answer for Cabinet.

Mr. Williams: If I was in your position I would not answer for your Government either.

Mr. JONES: When the member for Bunbury is finished I will continue with my speech.

Mr. Graham: The Government would not want the member for Bunbury with a 40-foot barge pole.

Mr. JONES: Concern has been expressed by the member for Blackwood about the question of power policies over the next four years, but it is a fact that these policies were determined prior to the Labor Government coming into office.

Mr. Reid: That is not right: your Government put the charges up and the previous Government promised to bring them down.

Mr. JONES: We have many speakers today. I would like to return to the coal contracts.

Mr. Court: When you read us the letter written by your Minister to the South-West Regional Council on the 17th January, were you dealing with the power station?

Mr. JONES: This is the letter.

Mr. Williams: Does this letter concern the coal contracts or the power policy?

Mr. JONES: I only have limited time. I will not be side-tracked by members.

It is true that the Minister for Electricity wrote to the South-West Regional Council on the 17th January about coal contracts. I have a similar letter to the one in the possession of the member for Bunbury. However, since then changes have

been made. At that time the Minister decided that long-term contracts were not desirable for the reasons set out in the letter. However, the Government is looking at this question again. This is the point raised by the member for Bunbury.

Mr. Williams: This is a mirror Government. It says, "We are going to look at it."

Mr. JONES: Whilst Mr. Perry is mentioned in the main heading of the article in the *Collie Mail* there is also a subheading, "Action by Tom Jones." The action referred to in the paper was that following discussions between the Premier and the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission (Mr. Parker), the chairman would meet union representatives at a meeting next Wednesday.

I subscribe to the principle of long-term contracts. Unlike some members I do not go behind the bush. Long-term contracts are essential for efficient planning in the coalmining industry. This is especially so in deep-mine developments. Deep-mine development sections must be developed ahead of the working sections of the mine. Members will appreciate that a three-year contract does not allow sufficient opportunity for efficient planning and the purchase of necessary equipment for the winning of coal. I make no secret of the fact that I subscribe to this proposition. I have not changed my views and, as I indicated to the mining industry, I am of the firm opinion that long-term contracts are very necessary, even though the former Liberal-Country Party Government refused to introduce them.

Mr. Williams: The former Government never made any promises. Your Government has, but what is it doing? The Minister for Mines has said, "No dice."

Mr. JONES: I would like to refer to the comments of the member for Bunbury last night when he said it was reported that I would seek independent endorsement. Philip Pandal was responsible for this article and I wish to state to the House that I did not give this information to him. The article stated that I was being pressured to consider other endorsement for a seat in Parliament. That is totally incorrect and Philip Pandal had no right to state that. He rang me about this and I totally disagreed with it. Members of the Opposition well know that for 20 years I have subscribed to the trade union movement, and have ideologies in relation to certain policies. I have no thought of seeking other endorsement because I am very happy with the performance of our Government.

Mr. Williams: You are more easily pleased than I thought.

Mr. JONES: The member for Bunbury thought I was concerned about the change in electoral boundaries. I am quite happy with the alterations.

Mr. Gayfer: Again we disagree.

Mr. JONES: That is the honourable member's opinion. I am very happy with the decision handed down by the commissioners.

The member for Bunbury shot at the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, the Acting Premier.

Mr. Graham: Vitriolic!

Mr. JONES: As long as everything is all right in Bunbury, everything in the garden is rosy with the member for Bunbury. The moment mention is made of plans for other towns everything is wrong.

Mr. Williams: I did not imply that. We are quite happy.

Mr. JONES: Some members of your local shire are not.

Mr. Williams: I am not responsible for the shire.

Mr. JONES: Let us look at Councillor Payton's remarks. This is his statement in the *South Western Times* on the 11th November—

Cr. Payton claimed that Mr. Graham's hints at Collie were prompted by a clash between Labor M.L.A. Tom Jones and the State Government.

Nothing is further from the truth.

Mr. Williams: You might be correct, too!

Mr. JONES: As far as our Government is concerned, the decision whether Alwest will be based at Worsley or Picton will depend on circumstances.

Mr. Williams: So this was Alwest and not another industry?

Mr. JONES: That is the factual situation, and I am sure the Acting Premier will support me in these remarks.

The performance of our Government shows that we are interested in the coalmining industry. I do not want to repeat myself but I am forced to make this clear. During the 12-year period of the previous Government the Minister for Mines visited Collie three times. All we heard then was iron ore. I am glad to say this has changed and we have already had four visits from the Minister for Mines. He has examined the question of leases and coal contracts.

Mr. Reid: Do you agree it is the policy of your Government to increase the charges?

Mr. JONES: I am not going to be sidetracked as my time is running out.

The member for Bunbury alleged that the people of Collie were disappointed with the performance of the present Government. Let us study the pension amendments we passed last year. Requests for assistance in this area were submitted frequently to the previous Government but they fell on deaf ears.

Let us also look at the Collie Hospital. There is a special ward in the male section of the Collie Hospital. Last year it was

necessary for a policeman to be placed on duty all night at the hospital due to the fact that there is a scarcity of special wards, and it was necessary for certain patients to be protected. I am pleased to say that plans are being prepared to remedy this situation. At the moment asthmatics are required to accept accommodation in verandah beds. Anyone knowing the very cold conditions at Collie and the problems of asthmatics will realise that early attention should have been given to this matter.

I refer also to the building of the police station. This shows that our Government is at least taking some interest in Collie. Under the present conditions a prisoner serving time at the Collie gaol is not able to have a shower—not even a cold shower. This applies also to women. Even before men have been found guilty of a charge they are required to wash under a tap. I think that is a disgraceful set of circumstances, to say the least. So it is indeed pleasing to see that our Government is giving some consideration to the matter, and that it has agreed to build a new police station.

A new Mines Department building has also been constructed because the old one was riddled with white ants. Also, a canteen is planned for the Collie High School.

I turn now to the question of power generation. I am still not happy with the policies adopted by the State Electricity Commission. I think nowhere else in the world—and I stand open to challenge on this matter—

Mr. Williams: Is it the Government or the State Electricity Commission?

Mr. JONES: Let me finish my point. I have traversed the reports from all States in this Commonwealth and those from all other parts in the world, and I know of no instance where other fuels are being used whilst coal is available economically. Let us consider this situation in the limited time available to me. If we study the annual report of the State Electricity Commission of Queensland we will find that immense extensions are being made to old coal-fired power stations.

As a matter of fact, \$13,000,000 is being spent on extensions to the Swanbank power station, \$3,400,000 is being spent on the Gladstone power station, and \$3,000,000 on the Collinsville power station. So in that State coal is being preferred to other fuel.

Mr. Nalder: Those power stations are not in Brisbane, though, are they?

Mr. JONES: No, but they are in Queensland.

Mr. Nalder: But not in Brisbane.

Mr. Williams: Let us have a look at the economics.

Mr. JONES: We will consider the costs in a moment. If we look at the New South Wales Electricity Commission's annual

report for 1971 we will find that old power houses are being extended. I am sure the former Minister for Electricity will know the power houses when I refer to them. The extensions being contemplated in New South Wales include the addition of two 660 megawatt units to the power station at Vales Point, which is situated in the Newcastle area, and that is not a new power station.

Mr. Nalder: That is on the coal field.

Mr. JONES: We also find that in the north of New South Wales colossal extensions are being made to the Wallerawang power station. Time does not permit me to traverse the full situation. However, I will endeavour to deal with coal costs separately, possibly at another time.

It is true that in South Australia there has been a decline in the use of coal; but, of course, this is understandable because that State finds itself in a position similar to that of Tasmania where limited coal supplies are available.

Mr. Nalder: There is a Labor Government there, that is why.

Mr. JONES: However, in this State, if we look at the 1971 annual report of the State Electricity Commission, we find the following on page 8:—

The rapid growth of the system (an average of 12½% over the past 5 years) means that the Commission must double its generating capacity and extend and strengthen transmission every six years to meet the increased demand of its consumers.

So it is quite apparent that very shortly the commission in this State will have to consider ordering additional plant as a result of the delay between the date of ordering and the date of delivery of such plant. It appears to me—and I am open to correction on this—that nowhere else in Australia do electricity commissions prefer other types of fuel where coal is available at an economic cost.

Let us consider the situation which obtains in South Africa. The former Government argued the matter of the availability of water. What is happening in South Africa is anybody's business. I have recently received a report from the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa Limited. This is what is happening in that country as far as coal for power generation is concerned—

Initial deliveries have been made to the Electricity Supply Commission's Arnot power station in terms of a contract by which the Group will supply 5.5 million tons of coal a year to Arnot when it reaches full capacity. Work has started on the site of the 3000 MW Kriel station to which we have contracted to supply 7.9 million tons a year.

So it will be seen that once again coal is preferred.

I have with me the most disturbing statement associated with power generation in the world that I have read for some time. I hope members will listen to this. It is a publication which has just been released in America. To say the least, it is most revealing. It is an extract from the *Coal Mining & Processing Journal* of January, 1972. It is a fairly short extract and, with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will read it out. Under the heading of "New York orders utilities to keep coal units" the following is stated:—

The New York State Public Service Commission has ordered the State's utilities to maintain in service all present coal-fired generating capacity or to keep it in standby readiness. In addition, the PSC ordered utilities to submit detailed plans for meeting their power demands in the event of interruptions of residual fuel oil shipments. The commission acted after receiving a staff report indicating that a substantial shift from coal to residual oil for fossil-fueled power generation has made the utilities vulnerable to interruptions in foreign oil supply.

Mr. Williams: Wasn't there something about the environment in that?

Mr. JONES: I think that extract clearly spells out the problem, and it is a problem which could well confront our State. If any member took the opportunity to study the submissions of the late Sir Harold Raggatt before the Senate inquiry into fuel oil he will find that Sir Harold made a statement that we would have to find three Barrow Islands by 1972 in order to be self-sufficient in fuel oil. I know the question of natural gas must be considered; but at this point of time, and bearing in mind the planning of our State Electricity Commission, what would be our position if our fuel oil supplies were cut off?

As has been stated by the Joint Coal Board, it is quite clear to me that the oil companies set out to obtain the customers of coal, and in some States they have done this most effectively. I ask the question: What would be the position if we found ourselves in a situation of limited oil supplies in this State, because the Kwinana station cannot be converted to a coal-burning station?

Mr. Reid: How close is the natural gas pipeline to the Collie coalfields?

Mr. JONES: It is intended that the gas pipeline will go to Pinjarra, but I do not know how far it has gone.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr. JONES: The manager of the State Electricity Commission recently met a delegation from the coalmining unions and he told the delegation that so far as the cost of fuel oil is concerned there is very little difference between the cost of coal and oil

for power generation. However, he did say that the capital cost of a coal-burning station is far in excess of the capital cost of an oil-burning station. What puzzles me—and I have not found an answer to this time—is that this problem must also have application in all the other States of the Commonwealth, and in other countries of the world. They must be faced with a similar problem.

Mr. Court: They have more coal and cheaper coal.

Mr. JONES: We will have a look at the cost in a moment, if time permits. If it is possible to overcome this problem in other States of the Commonwealth and in other countries of the world, and to use coal in preference to other fuels, then is not that policy also possible in Western Australia?

The member for Bunbury raised the question of the price of coal, so let us consider it. I have not the figures for Queensland, but the Joint Coal Board indicates the situation in its annual report for 1971-72. It shows that in the northern districts of New South Wales the average cost of coal per ton is \$5.64, and in the western districts it is \$3.75.

Mr. Williams: Is this on the field?

Mr. JONES: Yes, this is the pit head price. In the southern districts the price is \$8.26. Collie coal is cheaper and gives greater heat. When one considers the moisture content of Collie coal and the ash content of the New South Wales coal, there is very little difference between the price of the two coals. So it will be seen that we are producing open-cut coal at Collie at the moment, and one open-cut is producing coal for just over \$2 a ton.

Mr. Williams: How much is your output and the cost of the coal in proportion?

Mr. JONES: Since the issue of the report to which I have just referred, there have been wage increases in the Eastern States and at Collie. It is true that the deep-mined coal at Collie now costs, on the average, \$7 a ton. It will readily be seen from the report of the Coal Board in New South Wales that the average price in one of the districts in New South Wales and at Collie is much the same. I will go further to say that if the mines at Collie were given larger orders they would be able to consider a reduction in price.

My time, unfortunately, is running out, but I have been pleased to hear all the interjections that have been made whilst I have been speaking. Obviously I have opened up a few old wounds. In fairness to the union which I served, as secretary, for 17 years, and in fairness to the people who elected me to this House, I want to make it clear that my policy has not changed. I have made many investigations into this subject and I could have quoted many more reports to the House because I have read closely the policies in regard to power generation that are followed in other parts of the world, and it is

quite clear to me that coal is still preferred as a fuel for power generation. Therefore the statement that has been issued in the United States of America should be a warning to all of us.

Mr. Court: What about the letter you were going to read?

Mr. JONES: I was pleased to see in the Governor's Speech the statement concerning the proposal to introduce legislation to establish a department under the Minister for Fuel. I think this is warranted. A further reference was made in the Speech to proposed amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. Williams: How about quoting the letter of the 17th January?

Mr. JONES: If any member would care to visit Collie to talk to representatives of the coalmining companies and to the men employed in the industry he will find that they are quite happy with the present Government's performance, not only in the coalmining industry but also in the town in general ever since this Government took office.

Mr. Court: What about that letter dated the 10th January you were going to read?

Mr. Jones: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not give me any time.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville) [11.53 a.m.]: I join with other members of this Chamber in supporting the motion for adopting the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. Prior to dealing with some aspects of His Excellency's Speech, and one in particular dealing with Government administration, I want to set the record clear in respect of certain statements that were made during the debate on the Address-in-Reply last night. Unfortunately I was absent from the Chamber because of a heavy cold and I trust my voice will last for the full period I hope to speak this afternoon.

I have had an opportunity to hear the statements relevant to what went on in the Chamber last night on the news over the air this morning, as well as reading a report of the proceedings in this morning's Press. Firstly, I take no exception to the motives of the member for South Perth in speaking the way he did. I have always said that one of the essential qualifications of a member of Parliament is that he shall have a skin half an inch thicker than the skin of a rhinoceros, and I have that skin. Although I admit that in the heat of the debate at the moment I made personal remarks about the member for Mirrabooka, to which he took exception during his speech on this Address-in-Reply debate, it is not often that I lose my cool—to use the modern idiom—but I did on that occasion, and if in fact he felt it was an unfair and unwarranted attack on him I can do no better than to use this public forum to

express my apologies to him for so doing. However, he will find, at some point in time, that no matter how he attempts to retain his sense of humour and decorum, he is likely to fall into the same sort of trap.

I want to make it perfectly clear that there was no collusion between myself and any member of the Government in respect of the question I asked. I also want to make it perfectly clear that if I were attempting to take advantage of, or to embarrass, any person, it was an attempt to embarrass the Premier.

Most of us can remember, I think, that during 1957 or 1958, the Premier, who was then Deputy Premier in the Hawke Administration, went overseas with a view to encouraging industry to come to this State and everybody was full of praise for this particular effort. Reading the newspapers of the day it was a bit like looking at a cricket score; because, firstly, there was the promise of one industry coming to this State, then a couple more, and then a few more after that, and we were given the impression that when the Deputy Premier of that day returned to Western Australia we could expect an influx of new industries to the State which all of us would have sincerely welcomed and appreciated.

However, the only industry that came to Western Australia as a result of this particular visit overseas was the Klinger Asbestos industry which is established in the electorate of East Melville, and I know it quite well. It is not a big industry. However, during the election campaigns, and after the general election, quite a deal of ridicule was directed at the member for Melville—who had become the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—because of the failure of this particular mission.

It does not matter to me whether Hancock and Wright, the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, a fellow called "Joe Blow," or anybody else brought this industry to Western Australia. I do not care who was responsible, as long as it is established in this State. My only purpose in asking the question, completely without any collusion with members of the Government, was to attempt to embarrass the Premier. This is a legitimate duty of any member of the Opposition. If my question backfired that is my bad luck, and I take no exception to the motives that were behind the speech made by the member for South Perth.

I now wish to deal with certain matters referred to in the Governor's Speech. In particular I want to deal with certain items of legislation that are foreshadowed, particularly in relation to housing. On that subject I will probably have a little more to say than on other matters I will raise. In the Governor's Speech the following statement appears:—

The Government proposes to introduce legislation amending the State Housing Act to give effect to the new

Housing Assistance Grant arrangements between Commonwealth and State.

Members will be aware that from now on the old Commonwealth and State Housing Agreements, which used to run for a period of five years, have been abandoned, not at the wish of the State, but at the behest of the Commonwealth.

Instead of housing funds being made available at 1 per cent. below the bond rate, they are now made available at the bond rate, and to replace the 1 per cent. concession, under an extremely complicated formula, there will be a cash non-repayable amount made available to the State which, in essence, would equate the old 1 per cent. interest rate concession. As I understand it, there is also a provision that if the State makes 30 per cent. of these loan funds available to building societies it will receive cash nonrepayable amounts in lieu of the interest concession.

In other words, the new system really puts into different words the same principles that obtained under the old Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. Put another way, if the State used the money in the future as it was required to do under an agreement in the past, then it receives a cash grant instead of an interest concession. One of the provisions is that 30 per cent. of the housing funds allocated to the State housing authority should be directed to the building societies. I want to point out—I will elaborate on this a little later—that under the system which has been adopted, which I have been questioning for some time, in effect, only 15 per cent. of the funds are made available unconditionally to the building societies.

We were critical of the fact that despite a very high level of unemployment, particularly in the building industry, these funds to the building societies were not made available until some six months after the normal time when they were generally made available. When I was Minister for Housing the allocation was made almost invariably in the month of July or early in August—at the beginning of the financial year. I regret the Minister for Housing is not in the Chamber, but to the best of my knowledge I understand that no allocation was made to building societies until half way through the present financial year; that is, some time in December.

The reasons given were acceptable in that, firstly, the Commonwealth had to legislate to make the funds available; and, secondly, the State had to work out under what terms and conditions the funds would be made available, because there were no prior discussions on this issue before the Commonwealth made its decision.

I tried to press the Government to find some way in which to release funds to the building societies—albeit the final agree-

ment was not completely settled—in order to alleviate the unemployment situation. I was told it was not possible to do that.

There is a rather strange statement which follows on immediately in the Governor's Speech—

State funds have been allocated to Building Societies to stimulate building industry employment.

I should point out that these are not funds provided under any Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, but they are State funds.

If it was possible to allocate State funds in December in lieu of the other funds to the building societies and to housing generally, why was it not possible to do that at the beginning of the financial year, especially when we on this side were pressing for that to be done?

Other suggestions contained in the Governor's Speech with respect to the housing legislation are to increase to \$9,000 the advance on first mortgage conditions. This is to apply to advances for the purchase of State Housing Commission homes. When the legislation comes forward I imagine we will have little difficulty in agreeing with this particular proposition.

There is the following comment in the Governor's Speech—

Legislation is proposed to raise levels of eligibility for Housing Commission accommodation.

It is perfectly true that over a period of time, because of rapidly increasing wages, certain tradesmen who would have been eligible for Housing Commission assistance at one point of time ceased to be eligible a little later. That is because the eligibility conditions applying to applicants are laid down in the State Housing Act.

I must make this point: There are no fixed terms for eligibility under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreements, but as a matter of policy, and to maintain uniformity, all Governments—whether they be of my political colour or of other complexions—determined that the conditions laid down under the State Housing Act would apply to houses constructed with either Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement funds or with State funds. That is quite reasonable.

I must point out that the only amendments which have been made to the eligibility conditions under the State Housing Act at this point of time have been made by Liberal Governments. I think I made that point previously. I would say this: During the latter period of my term of office as Minister for Housing very serious consideration was given to increasing the eligibility conditions, but there was one very important factor which had to be kept in mind.

There is little point in saying that the commission will accept applicants with an income higher than the present level if

there is no possibility of supplying them with accommodation. If there is no increase in State Housing Commission building activity, and no additional funds available for housing, all we will do by increasing the number of applicants is to increase the number on the waiting list and at the same time increase the waiting period.

Mr. Taylor: You could not change the philosophy from a demand situation to a needs situation to give greater flexibility?

Mr. O'NEIL: Different methods are used in each State of the Commonwealth for determining eligibility. We happened to adopt this particular system many years ago after we had tried other systems; but this was long before my time in Parliament. One State has adopted a method under which priority for assistance is determined by a points system relating to income, family size, and other factors. In some other States there are small district committees, of which the local member of Parliament is a member, to vet the applicants and to determine who is and who is not to be placed on the list. A similar system applied in this State immediately after the last war, but after a period of time in which different systems were tried out, the system currently still in use was adopted. This does not mean it is the best system.

A great deal of research has been undertaken into ways and means of determining the fairest method to allocate the limited resources of the State Housing Commission to people in need of housing. I would have to wait until the Government's legislation is introduced to be sure on this, but I would think from what I have read that once again we will perpetuate in the Statute a figure of salary or wage income which will establish the level of eligibility. The only way it can be altered is by introducing an amending Bill to Parliament to alter the eligibility level.

Mr. Taylor: Would you be happy with the fixing of eligibility by regulation from time to time?

Mr. O'NEIL: My own idea is that each year the commission, which after all comprises individuals, should make a survey of all appropriate factors to determine eligibility; and to proclaim that from a certain date until further reviewed the eligibility level will be set at a certain figure. So, the Minister, on the recommendation of the commission, may proclaim the requirements and qualifications for admission to the Housing Commission's list.

Mr. Taylor: You might find the Minister will be very happy to hear that.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am glad to see that an ex-Minister for Housing agrees with an ex-ex-Minister for Housing!

Mr. Taylor: He does on that point.

Mr. O'NEIL: I note that further on in the Governor's Speech the following appears:—

Legislation will be introduced amending the Housing Loan Guarantee Act to provide for more adequate advances.

This proposal was also on the stocks prior to the change of Government. It was a proposal to amend the Act to bring it more into line with the current prices of houses and land, to enable lenders of money for homes to apply for Government guarantees in respect of the money they lend. I do not think we will raise much objection to this proposal if it is, in fact, what we as the previous Government had in mind.

There is another terse comment in the Speech of His Excellency—

The Government also proposes amendments to the Building Societies' Act.

We have heard a good deal about the proposals of the Government. I know there is no particular reference or qualification to control the interest rate. So, I think that prior to his departure overseas the Premier, in answer to a question, finally admitted that he had had to give second thoughts to this ill-considered proposal which appeared in his policy speech.

In respect of legislation to be introduced to deal with labour matters, there is to be a construction safety Bill to repeal the Inspection of Scaffolding Act. I well recall two years ago my being taken to task by members on the opposite side of the House for not introducing this piece of legislation. It had been prepared for a couple of years, but certain commitments to have the matter vetted by the people concerned had yet to be met.

In fact I think my Government, through the Governor's Speech, announced its intention the year before last to introduce such a Bill. I understand the proposed legislation is in precisely the same form as was the Bill we intended to introduce two years ago; but now all the lines have been cleared and the Bill will see the light of day this session, I hope.

Mr. Taylor: The point has been well taken. The Bill will be before us on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

Mr. O'NEIL: Another paragraph in the Governor's Speech reads—

The Workers' Compensation Act is being reviewed, and amending legislation will be recommended.

I have a question on next Tuesday's notice paper as to what action will be taken in this regard so I will not comment any further on the matter at this stage.

I wish to revert to the subject of finance for State housing and the use of the Home Builders' Account, which is the fund through which certain moneys are directed

to building societies. I read with some concern that the Government has decided to make an allocation of \$300,000 to a new terminating building society established by and under the control of the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia. I noted that the maximum loan would be \$11,000 and the maximum period of repayment would be 25 years. A statement was made that borrowers would be charged interest at 5.95 per cent. reducible per annum, and a little comment which said that they would pay a management fee of 5c for every \$100 borrowed. This is a fee of which I understand the Premier was most critical in respect of the operations of permanent and other societies. So I asked a question to find out just what this 5c per \$100 was. The question reads—

Is the management fee of 5 cents per \$100 borrowed a single payment, or an annual charge per \$100 of loan, and, if neither, what is it?

The answer was that it was a continuing charge payable monthly, which I suspected it would be. I also asked what the management fee represented as a percentage charge per annum on the loan, and I was told this was  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. per annum. I then followed up with the following questions:—

Adding this management fee to the interest rate charged what is the effective interest (and other charges) rate to the borrower?

What is the interest rate charged to societies by the Government in respect of these advances?

Instead of giving the total interest rate, the information given was evasive, to say the least, the answers being—

The management fee approximately equals an interest charge of  $\frac{3}{4}$ % per annum reducible.

$\frac{3}{4}$ % below the long term bond rate ruling at time advances are drawn.

This makes the interest not 5.95 per cent., as quoted first, but 6.7 per cent. Whether or not this is accurate I do not know because other questions have adduced the fact that the funds made available to the building societies are at  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. below the bond rate, and the charge allowed by the societies is  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. Therefore the money lent by the society to the borrower should be at the bond rate; in other words, the Government carries  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. below the bond rate and allows the building societies to use that  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. for management. Therefore the effective rate to the borrower ought to be the bond rate. Whether that rate is 6.7 per cent. or 7 per cent. is something I have not had time to check; but I suspect the bond rate is 7 per cent. So the addition of this management fee and the interest seems to indicate some discrepancy I have not had time to analyse.

A further condition applied to money to be made available from the Home Builders' Account to building societies for lending to borrowers; and that was that 50 per cent. of the money must go to mutually acceptable commission applicants and must be used to purchase new State housing homes. This, to me, seemed to be completely ridiculous.

The commission already advances loans to borrowers to buy its own houses. It advances the money at  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum over a maximum period of 45 years; whereas the money from building societies—that is State money directed through building societies under terms and conditions agreed to between the State and the Commonwealth—will be advanced, in this particular instance through the T.L.C., for 25 years, which is 20 years less, and the interest rate is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. higher. So in fact what the State is doing is saying, "We will give more money to the building societies provided you use half of it to buy our stock at interest rates and terms and conditions far more disadvantageous to the borrower than those already existing."

Mr. Taylor: While I do not pretend to understand the situation fully because I am not the Minister for Housing, I believe the money referred to is not money which would normally go to purchase State homes.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right.

Mr. Taylor: It is money normally going to building societies and will enable people without a need situation but perhaps with a demand situation to get a house for which they would normally have to wait indefinitely although they are registered with the commission. I am thinking that this might be part of the answer.

Mr. O'NEIL: I have had difficulty in getting answers to some questions. I admit they have been answered accurately without any of the frills and explanations I would like. However, I have to admit quite frankly that had I been in the same embarrassing position as the Minister, I would have answered the questions in exactly the same way and forced the inquiring member to follow up with question after question because I suspect that this particular action by the Government could be illegal.

The terms and conditions of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreements were designed to promote home ownership for every Tom, Dick, and Harry, and to provide houses for people of low and moderate means through a Government housing authority.

The terms were that at least 30 per cent. had to go to building societies so borrowers could obtain money on different terms and conditions and without any salary eligibility. They could also buy houses in areas of their choice and of a design of

their choice. This was to help people not eligible for State Housing Commission assistance. The agreement stated quite clearly that not less than 30 per cent. of the funds must be used for this purpose.

Mr. Taylor: True.

Mr. O'NEIL: What this is doing is saying, "All right, we will give 30 per cent. of our funds away. That will qualify us for the cash nonrepayable grant in lieu of the interest subsidy, but then half that money must go back to buy houses for State Housing Commission applicants." So, in effect, only 15 per cent. of the funds have been made available to the building societies for use at their discretion, and this would breach the agreements which existed in the past. Whether or not the State has obtained the approval of other Ministers for Housing as well as the Commonwealth to use these funds differently is something of which I am unaware; but I suspect that if this matter were researched thoroughly it would be found that the Government is breaching the terms and conditions upon which the payment in lieu of interest is being made, or else it is prepared to forgo the cash nonrepayable grant which has replaced the interest subsidy.

Mr. Taylor: I think the Minister will be able to answer your points, but one matter which was a problem at the time, and you will appreciate this point, is that the new agreement meant the State would have to put a far greater proportion of Commonwealth funds into building societies because of the change of formula. Therefore when you mentioned only 15 per cent. instead of 30 per cent. being used, in actual fact the same amount will be going to building societies as has gone to them in the previous five years. The amount referred to would have been an extra bonus so no-one amongst those who received funds in the past will suffer.

Mr. O'NEIL: Well, I think the Minister for Labour—

Mr. Taylor: Is trying.

Mr. O'NEIL: —had better discuss this matter with the new Minister for Housing. It is important to note that it will be necessary to amend the State Housing Act to make arrangements for the financing of housing through the Home Builders' Account. The Governor also stated in his Speech that it is necessary to validate actions already taken. The actions which have been taken that need ratification will be of major interest when we debate the issue.

I am concerned that the Government in its endeavour to meet certain conditions in respect of granting approval for housing finance may, in fact, breach—in principle if not completely—the agreement under which the funds are made available. The Government has either done that or it is

prepared to forgo a substantial nonrepayable cash grant which was to be used to subsidise the rents charged on houses.

Mr. Taylor: We have not forgone any funds which we could possibly have received.

Mr. O'NEIL: A condition of the Home Builders' Account advances for 1971-72 is that 50 per cent. of the allocation to each society is to be applied to finance the purchase of State Housing Commission group built new homes by mutually accepted State Housing Commission applicants. There would have to be a breach of agreement in those circumstances because 50 per cent. of the money is being used to purchase houses.

Mr. Taylor: Through building societies.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am sorry the Minister for Housing is not present, but I appreciate the reason for his absence. I asked the question to find out what advantage this scheme would be to a home purchaser. We must remember that the purchaser, or the borrower of money, under this scheme must be an eligible State Housing Commission applicant. Also, he must be acceptable through his financial capacity to repay a building society loan, and that is fair enough. However, that same person could, in fact, purchase a house from the State Housing Commission on terms laid down in the Act.

Mr. Taylor: If the commission had enough houses to go around, yes.

Mr. O'NEIL: The money will be available only for the purchase of new houses, so the houses have to be built first. I also asked what the difference would be in the monthly repayments on a house purchased under the Housing Commission system and a house purchased under this shandy-gaff—for want of a better expression—arrangement. The difference will be \$15.34 a month. If we are to talk about the home owner paying less in outgoings per week from his wages, in respect of purchase accommodation, this figure is important. It is not so much a case of whether he repays the loan over 25 years or 45 years; what we ought to be concerned about is how much of his weekly pay is being spent in providing a roof over the heads of his wife and children.

If a person is successful in his application for a State Housing Commission home he can enter into a contract and pay \$15.34 less each month than would be the case if he was buying the same house and was forced to go to a building society to use State funds. That does not make sense and is completely off beam.

I further asked if a person was prepared to pay the extra \$15.34 a month would he receive priority, and the answer was "No." I asked for an explanation and I was told to put the question on the notice paper. I still do not see what advantage it is to tell a person that he is

eligible for housing finance, but if he obtains that finance through a building society he will pay an extra \$15.34 a month. That does not make sense.

Referring to the Home Builders' Account and the allocation of State funds to building societies either under the terms of the agreement or the new arrangement, we were told that some \$5,000,000 was allocated to various building societies throughout the State for the purpose of financing people into their own homes, and homes of their own choice, at least in respect of half of the money. There is an unallocated sum of \$390,000 in the account, and that is fair enough because it has always been policy to hold a certain sum of money in the account to meet requests for loans, in special circumstances, when money was not available from building societies.

The funds are distributed to two groups of societies: permanent and terminating. Terminating societies are essentially co-operatives and, in a great number of cases, are designed to help the ordinary workers. There is a society called Westminer at Kwinana which was established and funded, to a large degree, by the Western Mining Corporation and assisted by the State to enable workers to purchase homes. There is also a Westminer society at Kalgoorlie which is the same type of set-up and helps provide accommodation for the workers employed by the company. In some cases the companies concerned even go beyond making loan funds available to workers and advance the deposits.

Another terminating society is named Steelworkers. Other societies are related to specific industries. Some societies have been in operation for some years and are conducted by unions. I refer to the Postal Employees' Union which runs seven terminating societies, the Railway Employees Union with seven societies, and the W.A. Carpenters Union which, up to date, has run 14 societies. A new society is started when the funds of the previous society have been exhausted. The accounts are kept separately because terminating societies operate that way. The Police Union previously ran eight terminating societies, and I have already mentioned the Westminer societies at Kwinana and Kalgoorlie with nine terminating societies.

It seems strange to me that some of the societies which essentially assist the ordinary worker to purchase a home were not given an allocation. It is true that the policy which obtained regarding the allocation of State funds to assist in home building related, at least in the third year of operation, to the energy of the society and its ability to obtain funds from institutional organisations. That was a sprat to catch a mackerel, because for the first two years the State virtually supported the societies which loaned money. Once the societies were on their feet they were able to approach various institutions for additional moneys which they could make available by way of housing loans. It is

probably true that some of the societies were not over-energetic in obtaining those funds.

In reply to a question I asked on this matter the Minister told me that it has been long-standing policy in the case of terminating societies to require them, after one or two years, to establish some effort to raise funds from other sources. The Minister went on to say that the Western Australian Carpenters, Teachers, and Railway Employees Societies did not raise any funds during 1970-71, and therefore did not qualify for allocation in 1971-72. That is fair enough. However, he also said that an allocation had been made to the Postal Employees Society and that advances were being made.

The Minister then made a rather strange comment and said that the Police Society originally received an allocation. So one would assume that the Police Society had already raised some institutional funds to qualify for the allocation. However, the Minister went on to say that by agreement the allocation to the Police Society had been transferred to another society. I intend to ask a further question to find out to which society the money was transferred. I suspect it might have been the Trades and Labor Council because I understand it expects another \$100,000 from the Government. The Minister went on to say that the money had been transferred because of the lack of demand from persons eligible for advances from the Police Society.

I have also asked a question: Why is it that there are persons ineligible for advances from the Police Society? As I have said, the answer referred to the "Lack of demand from persons eligible for advances from the Police Society." What terms and conditions has this particular building society imposed upon its applicants to the extent that there is a lack of demand from eligible persons? I will be interested to see the answer to that question as well.

In other words, funds which have been made available by the State through co-operative building societies run by unions to support their members are being restricted in their use because the societies—or at least one of them—appear to have set certain standards of eligibility which their own members cannot meet.

Mr. Taylor: Could it be that the police are a mobile work force and there may not be a demand because they are continually being shifted?

Mr. O'NEIL: If this is the case why did not the answer stop at the words "lack of demand" instead of continuing with the words, "from persons eligible for advances from the Police Society."

Mr. Taylor: I think you may find that is the case.

Mr. O'NEIL: We will both know more when the question is answered. I had suspected from the answer—although possibly my suspicions were ill-founded—that some of the societies, including teachers, to whom no reference is made and, police, were not affiliated with the trades and labor movement. Perhaps that is an evil suspicion of mine.

Mr. Taylor: The member for East Melville should be able to recognise the style of the person who wrote those answers.

Mr. O'NEIL: I also asked which of the societies were conducted by unions not affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia. The answer given is, "Not known since it was not relevant to the criteria adopted in deciding allocations."

Mr. Graham: The member for East Melville has been associating too closely with the member for Bunbury.

Mr. O'NEIL: Surely an answer that something is not known because it is not relevant is rather curious. Something can be known even though it may not be relevant, but we cannot say that something is not known because it is not relevant.

Mr. Graham: This was the kind of reasoning which came from the member for South Perth last night when he tried to accuse the member for East Melville and myself of collusion.

Mr. O'NEIL: I thank the House for its indulgence. I appreciate that some of the matters I have raised are rather technical in nature. I simply say that I express sincere concern because, if I am right—and it would take many more questions directed by me and many more answers from the Government to find out whether or not I am right—I fear the State, in adopting a system of directing 50 per cent. of Home Builders' Account funds to purchase State Housing Commission homes is in breach of the conditions under which the State receives cash nonrepayable grants in lieu of concessional interest rates. If this is so, I can see we will be travelling over a fairly rough road in the future in respect of the allocation of Commonwealth funds for housing.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Harman.

*(Continued on page 296)*

## EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [12.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Provision was made in the State Budget introduced last year to increase the aid to independent schools to assist them in meeting the cost of increased salaries for

lay teachers. The purpose of this Bill is to give effect to that provision which requires an amendment to section 9B of the Education Act.

At present the subsidy payable to independent schools consists of \$20 for each primary pupil, \$30 for each student in years one to three at secondary level, and \$36 for each student in years four and five.

It is proposed to increase these subsidies as from the beginning of this school year to \$30 for each primary pupil and \$40 for all secondary students. These subsidies are estimated to cost an additional \$400,000 in the 1971-72 financial year.

This matter was fully explained at the time of the introduction of the Budget and I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Lewis.

## PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General [12.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now placed before members seeks to amend the Public Trustee Act. I notice the title is, "A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Trustee Act, 1941-1968." I cannot resist the temptation of making the comment that this Statute must have been, and basically still is, a very good one, because it was able to exist without obvious need for amendment during the years 1941 to 1968. It seems to me that many of our Statutes make an annual return to this Chamber. It is pleasing to find a Statute that has been able to serve the interests of the public for many years without needing to be amended. However, the Government considers this Statute is now in need of amendment.

The object of this Bill is to remove the restrictions imposed on the Public Trustee in respect of the fees and charges which can be imposed for his services. It is proposed that in future such fees and charges will be prescribed by regulation.

The Public Trust Office, established in 1941, provides a useful service to the community. Whilst the principal activity is the administration of estates of deceased persons, other matters, including some of a social service nature, are undertaken.

When required, the affairs of incapable persons are administered by the Public Trustee, who also undertakes the investment of moneys under the control of the courts and the Workers' Compensation Board. Persons may also appoint the Public Trustee to act as their agent. These services could not readily be undertaken by any other organisation on the same

economical basis. The State has always accepted a certain responsibility in respect of incapable persons, infants, and others who need some form of protection.

The present scale of fees and charges has been unchanged, except for some minor adjustments, since the office commenced to operate in 1941. Increases in operating costs which have occurred since that time are well known, and this obviates the necessity for any explanation of the need to increase fees and charges payable for the services of the Public Trustee.

There has been a significant change in matters which are required to be dealt with by the Public Trustee and, indeed, any executor or administrator. Additional costs in satisfying the requirements of the Commissioner of Taxation and other authorities should be borne by the respective estates. The time and expense involved in investigations to settle next-of-kin should be a charge against the particular estate to avoid the need to fix an overall rate at the expense of other estates where such investigations are not required.

The proposal to fix the fees and charges by regulation will allow changes to be made from time to time as circumstances warrant. No concern should be occasioned by the method of fixation as Parliament will be able to exercise surveillance of the regulations which are subject to ministerial control in the first instance.

The Public Trustee considers it will be necessary to fix a rate of 3 per cent. as compared with the present rate of 2½ per cent. In addition, rates will be prescribed for the extra services referred to previously, for which no charge at all is payable at the present time. These increases must be considered reasonable, having regard for the higher operating costs which the Public Trustee is required to meet.

Another amendment proposes to allow commission to be taken on income from earnings of investment of the common fund which is credited to estates. The present provisions provide that commission is not to be taken on such credits. The investment of moneys in the common fund involves considerable work and, therefore, some charge is reasonable. In order to allow comparison of the return from moneys held on behalf of estates in the common fund with that from other classes of investment, it is desirable that each should be treated on the same basis. The authority to charge commission on amounts credited from the common fund will require some upward adjustment of the rates, which is done with the approval of the Minister.

There should be no cause for concern in approving these amendments when it is realised that the greater part of the work undertaken by the Public Trustee is entrusted to him by persons who are free to choose his services and will be aware of

the fees and charges to be made. I might mention that the existence in this State of two private trustee companies will, in fact, make the fees chargeable by the Public Trustee competitive.

The Bill is recommended for favourable consideration by members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. R. L. Young.

*Sitting suspended from 12.47 to 2.15 p.m.*

## INHERITANCE (FAMILY AND DEPENDANTS PROVISION) BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [2.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to introduce a new Statute to be known as the Inheritance (Family and Dependants Provision) Act. This legislation was originally introduced in the previous session of Parliament and reached the second reading stage but lapsed when Parliament was prorogued. At that time certain amendments proposed by the member for Floreat had been considered by the Government. The Bill has now been amended to deal with the matters raised by the honourable member. The member for Floreat will recall that we considered his proposed amendments together and I feel he will be more than satisfied with the provisions of this Bill.

The Bill now submitted for consideration is an example of the need for a continuous programme of law reform. The laws must protect and serve the needs of the people, and to satisfy this requirement studies must be made of the changes in social and economic conditions.

The Testator's Family Maintenance Act, which is to be repealed and replaced by this proposed legislation, was first enacted in 1939. Since that time the provisions have remained virtually unchanged so that it is due time to introduce new provisions to meet present-day conditions.

As with the Testator's Family Maintenance Act, this new legislation does not—and I emphasise “does not”—confer any right to share in an estate. The only right conferred is the right to make an application to the Supreme Court for an order for provision of adequate maintenance and support of the family and dependants of deceased persons out of the assets of deceased persons' estates. However, the class of persons entitled to apply and the estates against which orders may be obtained have been widened.

The proposal to review this field of law arose in 1965 when the President of the Law Society of Western Australia proposed that the Testator's Family Maintenance Act be amended to extend the class of claimants from the surviving spouse or child of a testator to include the parents

of the deceased, children of a deceased child of the deceased, and to extend the scope of the Act to include intestate and partially intestate estates.

The proposals were still being examined when it was decided to appoint the Law Reform Committee. The then Minister for Justice considered the matter was a suitable one for reference to the committee which was asked to report on the desirability of amending or enlarging the provisions of the Testator's Family Maintenance Act, 1939-62, so as to—

- (a) Extend the right of application to new categories of persons;
- (b) Permit applications for provision from estates in which there is a total or partial intestacy;
- (c) Define more accurately the circumstances in which a distribution of the assets of an estate may be disturbed in order to sustain an order made under the said Act; and
- (d) Permit a variation increasing the provision made under an existing order.

The Law Reform Committee followed its usual procedure of preparing and distributing a working paper based on a programme of research by its legal officers into the laws applying in other jurisdictions.

It is considered that society's attitude to the right of a man, or of a woman, for that matter, to dispose of his or her property as he or she thinks fit even beyond doubt has changed. There is now a feeling that a deceased is under some moral obligation to make provision for the maintenance, education, and advancement in life of persons who in the normal course of human affairs had a close personal relationship with the deceased. Unless provision is made there should be means to satisfy the court that some provision should be made.

The decision to extend the right of application against intestacies or partial intestacies is a logical one. The terms of a will may be irrational or indeed immoral; but the same can apply where distributions of estates are made under a rule of law. For example, a wife who deserted her husband and children could take the whole of a small estate at the expense of children maintained by the deceased, this being pursuant to the present law found in the Administration Act. Such a case is not uncommon and the same redress should be available to deserving claimants in an intestacy as is given to claimants under a will.

The aim of legislation of this type is to do justice to dependants. For this reason it is proposed to continue the power of the court to vary the amount of periodical payments. Experience has shown that the powers have not been used extensively.

Courts generally exercise such a power with caution and only when clearly called for by a radical change of circumstances. As with legislation enacted during the last session of Parliament to deal with the granting of rights to illegitimates to share in the estates of deceased persons, protection must be provided for personal representatives.

Illegitimates, where the relationship stems from the paternal side, shall be recognised only if paternity is admitted or established against the father during his lifetime. Claims previously restricted to the surviving spouse and legitimate children may now be made from persons having a moral claim as well as the additional classes.

The Bill gives effect to the views of persons with experience in this field of law. It will overcome the obstacles which have prevented many persons from approaching the court to obtain some degree of justice where insufficient provision has been made by testators or where the arbitrary rule of distribution in intestacies has applied.

I commend the Bill to the satisfaction of the House and ask members to act as a kind of jury to its passage.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Mensaros.

## PARKS AND RESERVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR. H. D. EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Lands) [2.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before the House contains two proposals: firstly to permit the King's Park Board to arrange a lease of a kiosk sited near the adventure playground in King's Park; and, secondly, to permit boards constituted under the Parks and Reserves Act to make by-laws imposing a maximum pecuniary penalty of \$150 for breaches of such by-laws.

Members will know, or will have heard, of the popularity of the adventure playground in King's Park. During the school holidays and over weekends, crowds of up to 2,000 people and more enjoy the facilities that have been provided in the area for children. It was for this reason that an amount of \$30,000 was approved by the Treasury in the Estimates for the King's Park Board in 1971-72 to allow for the erection of a toilet/kiosk building near the adventure playground.

Plans and specifications were prepared by the Public Works Department and tenders were called and a contract awarded for erection of the building in order to cope with the heavy public usage of the playground area. The toilets have been in use for some months and the board

now wishes to make early arrangements for suitable control of the kiosk section by calling public tenders for lease of that portion of the new building.

Section 5(3)(b) of the Parks and Reserves Act provides that the board shall not lease the whole or any part of the park unless the consent of both Houses of Parliament has first been obtained. This then is the reason for the legislation proposed in this Bill, which I commend to the House.

The kiosk building is a most attractive structure and has been fully fitted out internally by the board which is anxious to put it into service as soon as possible.

The second proposal contained in the Bill is in relation to a situation which has caused considerable concern to the Rottneet Island Board. Most members will know of the common practice of unlawful use of bicycles on the island which is a constant worry to the police, the owners of the bikes, the hirers, and the board's staff. Very often, hours and hours are spent looking for a bicycle and if found it is very seldom that the offender can be apprehended.

It is estimated that there would be at least 100 stolen bicycles for every apprehension. Apart from the continuous searching by the police and the owners, on such occasions when the police do apprehend an offender it takes about two hours to finalise statements and questioning, and to arrange a prosecution date with the clerk of courts, the summons, the brief, and so on.

In view of the work entailed the fines imposed are, to say the least, most disheartening. It is felt necessary that the maximum monetary fine should be increased to a figure more in keeping with today's standards, and the board has proposed an amount of not less than \$150 as the maximum fine.

The Bill therefore seeks to amend section 8 of the Act to permit an increase in the maximum penalty for breach of any by-law from the figure of £20 to an amount not exceeding \$150.

I commend both proposals in the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## **BEE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR. H. D. EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [2.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill and the following one on today's notice paper appeared on the notice paper in the last session of Parliament. They are to be reintroduced now, and there is not really much of a sting in them!

The purpose of the Bee Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill is to amend the system for the payment of annual fees to a compensation fund which is tied to the registered number of hives held by a beekeeper.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a fund for the payment of the value of property required to be destroyed under the provisions of the principal Act. This would become necessary in the event of the contraction of a disease in a colony of bees.

The present fee may not exceed 5c per hive annually and it is proposed that payments be now made at five-yearly intervals with a maximum payment of 25c per hive and a minimum total payment of \$1. The maximum permitted credit in the compensation fund would thus be raised from \$6,000 to \$30,000 as it would be replenished at five-yearly intervals instead of annually.

It is also proposed that compensation fund collections coincide with the period of registration for beekeepers. This would provide for the implementation of an important feature in that application for registration of a beekeeper and the payment of contributions to the compensation fund may be combined on a single card instead of on two separate cards as at present.

This proposed five-year system of collections would bring about economy in the use of statements, postage, and other associated expenses. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

## **BEEKEEPERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR. H. D. EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before the House contains a small amendment to the Beekeepers Act for the purpose of providing a more economical method for the collection of registration fees of beekeepers which at present are paid annually.

There has been provision in legislation for many years to require beekeepers to register in order that their whereabouts may be known. At present the total number of hives in the State is approximately 45,000 and currently there are approximately 820 registered beekeepers operating in the State.

As a point of further interest, 3,024,888 lb. of honey was produced to the year ended the 30th June, 1971, valued at \$266,000. This was approximately 8 per cent. of the overall honey produced in Australia. In addition, 52,000 lb. of beeswax was produced for a value of \$29,000.

Because of the failure of the main honey-producing plants, basically caused by variations in climatic conditions, production for the year to the 30th June, 1971, was less than half of the annual average production.

The average production per hive for 1971 was 93 lb., compared with 199 lb. average production per hive in 1970. For the year ended the 30th June, 1970, Western Australia produced approximately 20 per cent. of Australia's honey.

Western Australia, over recent years, has exported in the vicinity of 70 per cent. of the honey it has produced. I feel there is probably some general interest in statistics of that nature.

Under section 8 of the Act registration and annual renewal of registration are required and it is proposed that this should be amended to provide for renewals of registration for five years. All registrations are to have a common expiry date and it is proposed that the present annual fee of \$1 remain as the fee for the new five-yearly period.

The actual registration of the beekeeper is an administrative act which needs to be done only once. Annual registration achieves nothing useful and costs public money in stationery and postage, and time spent in enforcement, which would be better used for extension work.

This, considered with annual registration, is not essential and it is evident that the five-year period will be more economical to administer.

I think this is a common-sense approach to the system of registration, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

## **PIG INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [2.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Funds levied under the Pig Industry Compensation Act are used largely for compensation to owners of pigs affected by compensable diseases which cause their death on the farm, or condemnation of the carcase at the abattoir.

For many years in this State there was no compensation fund, or Act governing the collection of duty for compensation purposes. However, following a severe outbreak of swine fever in 1942, when some 8,000 pigs had to be destroyed in a matter of a few weeks, an Act was introduced for that purpose.

The Act requires that the owners of all pigs sold in Western Australia pay a levy, which may be done by way of stamp duty.

Alternatively, agents on behalf of owners may, by permit, lodge with the Minister returns of purchase money from the sale of pigs or of carcases of pigs and remit the amount of duty payable.

The Bill now before the House contains four provisions: Firstly, to make it mandatory for processing companies to make deductions of levy money for payment to the fund.

There is provision under the Act that a processing company may apply for a permit—instead of the owner or his agent—to lodge returns of purchase money paid by the company to the owner, or his agent, on the sale of pigs or carcases of pigs, and to pay on behalf of the owner or his agent, all duties payable.

In practice, most pig levy moneys are paid into the fund by processing companies. It has, however, been ascertained that only a certain number of processing firms are remitting money whilst, on the other hand, there are others who are not doing so. All processing companies may legally claim compensation for purchased pigs subsequently condemned.

It is completely wrong that a few of the processors should comply with their legal obligations and collect the levy in accordance with the statutory requirements, while on the other hand quite a few of the processors do not do so. The Act at present places the onus for levy payments on the owner, and the department has no legal power to demand payment of the levy from processing companies, or to require them to submit returns of purchase money.

A further amendment has been inserted in the Bill to remove from the Act that section which provides that the cost of administration shall be paid out of the fund. There is always a danger with a levy that it might successfully be challenged as an excise tax, and acting on the advice of the Crown Law Department a clause has been inserted to remove this danger.

A further amendment is proposed to extend the time period in which an owner must lodge an application for compensation. The Act requires that the owner must lodge his application within 21 days of the destruction or death of the pig. On many occasions this period has proved too short and has required exercising of the Minister's prerogative to authorise payment up to a period of 90 days where special circumstances apply.

It is proposed, therefore, to amend the appropriate section in order that the time allowable to make application be prescribed in the regulations, and for the limitation of 90 days on the Minister's prerogative to be deleted.

There is also in the Bill a clause which would provide for inspections under the Stamp Act. If, as proposed, it is made

mandatory for processors to submit returns and payments it will be most desirable to have inspection under the Stamp Act. For this purpose a small amendment to section 16 is necessary.

These four amendments which I have outlined are designed to remove administrative problems and to give firmer control within the Act and for that reason I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Nalder.

## **PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR. JAMIESON** (Belmont—Minister for Works) [2.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Public Works Act with the objects of—

- (i) making statutory provision in respect of some procedures concerning the acquisition of land which have been adopted and reaffirmed by successive Governments, but which are not provided for in the legislation as it now stands;
- (ii) making provision to meet changing circumstances resulting particularly from the expanding functions of the Government through its various departments as authorised by other legislation which, in turn, has an impact on the operation of the Public Works Act;
- (iii) clarifying and amplifying such definitions as are necessary to accord with current terminology and practice, and to ensure adequate legal coverage of the functions which come within the scope of the Act; and
- (iv) deleting certain provisions which experience has shown to be superfluous.

Since 1954, in consequence of amendments made to the Act, and also by Executive direction, the incidence of this legislation on the public has been considerably alleviated, but experience has proved that the application of some of the concessions made requires rationalisation in particular cases. The Bill provides for amendments to meet this situation and these will be explained to members during the passage of the Bill.

A study of the measure will also reveal that some changes have been made in the definitions of works deemed to be public works within the meaning of the Act. In the main, such changes have been rendered necessary by the expanding role of Government, with consequential changes

in descriptive terminology in respect of Government authorities, institutions, and the like.

Due to recent developments in the mining industry it has been found necessary for the provisions of the Act concerning the matter of compensation payable in respect of mining rights on land required for public works to be clarified. Amendments proposed in the Bill will have the effect of avoiding payment of compensation for loss of unmined minerals and of minimising compensation otherwise payable.

The provisions of the Act which authorise the payment of interest and advances on account of compensation apply only following the formalities of resumption. It is considered that such provisions should also be applicable to informal negotiations for the acquisition of land, and the Bill proposes accordingly.

Members will be aware that the rate of interest payable on compensation under the provisions of the Act in this State is substantially higher than in other States, and that it is more than double that paid in some States. This I consider to be fair and reasonable but, if we are to retain this standard, ways and means of keeping expenditure on this account to a minimum must be instituted. To this end the Bill proposes an extension of the forms of acquisition under which advance payments may be made, thus reducing expenditure as interest abates on any payment so made. In addition, the Bill proposes to limit the period for which interest is payable after agreement to settle has been established when it is apparent that delaying tactics are being employed.

The incidence of two sections of the Act which relate to temporary and permanent occupancy of land in the construction of public works appears to have been clouded by recent amendments and it is proposed to rectify this situation without changing the intention or meaning of the sections.

In the drafting of the Bill opportunity has also been taken to make minor improvements in the phrasing of some recent amendments with the object of rationalising certain procedures in the interests of efficiency.

Although some of the amendments proposed in the Bill, such as the specification of additional purposes for which land can be compulsorily acquired, will widen the authorities of the Act, the well-established policy of acquisition by negotiation as far as is possible will still apply, and formal resumption will be resorted to only in necessitous cases to meet exigent requirements in development of the State or public services. The existence of these authorities does not mean that they would be exercised indiscriminately. This would be a decision for the Government of the

time according to the circumstances prevailing, and even then the owner and occupier would still have the rights of objection as provided for in the Act. However, in this regard, I think members will agree that it would indeed be untoward if a major Government project were held up or abandoned simply because of lack of authority under the Public Works Act.

This Bill is an attempt to modernise the Act. I think it is desirable to improve Acts, as we find the necessity arises, so that all persons being dealt with, and Government departments which deal with the public, have a clear indication where they stand. Consequently, I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

### **METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR. JAMIESON** (Belmont)—Minister for Water Supplies) [2.58 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill includes a number of proposed amendments to the existing legislation, all of a varying nature.

Firstly, there is a proposal to clarify the methods to be applied in claims for and payment of compensation for damages sustained as the result of works carried out by the board with the object of protection of all parties.

The most important proposal is that which would empower the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board to control the use of underground water where it is necessary to do so. Maintaining an adequate supply of water to the metropolitan area is coming to depend more and more on the supply of good quality ground water to supplement water available from the hills storages. It is believed that the maintaining of adequate supplies to the public is of prime importance and to do this with respect to ground water the board must be assured of two controls.

The first control is, of course, the prevention of pollution of ground water sources. In 1970 the board's controlling legislation was amended to enable the prevention of pollution of ground water to be controlled by the Metropolitan Water Board in specific areas in which the board was interested and which would have to be identified by proclamation.

The other control which the board believes is essential to the proper use of water, is that of managing the amount of water to be taken from the ground. As in the case of pollution control, it is not intended that a blanket authority over the whole of the area serviced by the

Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board be given to the board, but once again this control is to be given only in those areas where it is necessary to protect and manage the use of water and these areas must again be defined by proclamation.

In general this Bill proposes that within proclaimed public water supply areas, applications must be made to the board and a license obtained either to sink or construct wells or bores and also to cover the use of water from the bores and wells. So far as the use of water is concerned, not only new bores and wells will be affected but also existing bores and wells, the owners of which must apply for and obtain a license in order to use the water.

Members can be assured that the board has no desire to be unreasonably restrictive in the use of any powers given to it under the proposed legislation. Its one object is to preserve these necessary waters to be used for the greatest good of the community.

One of the essential provisions in the amending Act which gave the board the right to control pollution in proclaimed areas, was the right of appeal granted to people who considered they were adversely affected by a decision of the board. In this Bill a similar right of appeal is given to the owners of bores and wells and will act for their protection. The appeal is to a local court.

I believe, with the limited amount of water available to the public in the metropolitan area from hills resources and the increased importance attached to underground water, it is essential to have the statutory authority concerned with the public supply of water authorised to protect that water from indiscriminate use. I also believe that the statutory authority can be relied upon to act reasonably when making its decisions and that the public is protected by the right of appeal given to it.

**Mr. Court:** Does that include metering of private water supplies?

**Mr. JAMIESON:** I will deal with that later on.

Other matters in the Bill now being submitted cover the provision of a penalty for any person who "injures in quality or purity any stream, water course, or source of supply, within any water reserve or catchment area." The present legislation provides for a penalty for anyone who diverts any such water or who diminishes the supply. However, it does not provide a penalty for anyone who injures the water in quality or purity. It is believed this should now be rectified.

The board is authorised to carry out works as may be necessary for the proper functioning of the utility services which it controls. Among these works is the sinking

or acquisition of wells, bores, etc., and the erection of pumping stations, reservoirs, drains, etc., upon lands authorised to be taken by the board for that purpose.

Other works which the board is authorised to carry out, such as the laying of water mains and sewers and construction of main drains, may be carried out under, upon, or above any street or land without the requirement that the land must be acquired by the board for that purpose. Construction of pumping stations and the sinking of bores or wells do not in general affect a major piece of land, but particularly in the case of pumping stations it has normally been necessary for the board to acquire land perhaps equivalent to a building lot.

In some cases recently it has been possible to consider the joint use of reserves under the control of the local authority or public open space under the control of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. Requirements of land are very small and do not really affect the original purpose of the reservation. It is not thought necessary that such small pieces of land should be excised from the reserves or open space. When sinking bores or wells, and mainly those of a shallower depth than artesian bores, the board cannot always guarantee that they will be productive bores or wells. Consequently, there may be no need to acquire land if the well is not put into use.

In view of the current trends for joint use of land, the need for the board to acquire the land for the relevant purposes is proving restrictive. It is felt that as these are normal works of the board it should be able to carry them out in the same way that it lays mains.

There is no intention at all that the legal formalities which the board has to carry out before constructing works, and give people concerned the right of objection, should in any way be dispensed with. Further, the board will not in any way by this proposed legislation, alter its obligation to pay compensation to people affected by its works—that is, those who have the right of recovery against the board for actionable damage.

Another item covered by the legislation is the right of recovery of the board for excess water charges. At present this right of recovery is limited to the actual user of the water; that is, the occupier of the property at the time the water was used. Rates and charges in lieu of rates on non-ratable property are a charge on the land and may be recovered from any owner of the land but this does not apply in the case of water actually used over and above the allowance for those rates or charges. The debt to the board is the result of water actually supplied. It is therefore not unreasonable to give the board protection in

respect of that debt. In areas supplied by Country Water Supplies, the excess water charges are made a charge on the land.

The board would continue to recover from the actual user of water in the first instance, but where this becomes impracticable because the consumer has left the property and his whereabouts are not known to the board, the right of recovery of the debt due to the board should remain, and the owner of the land at the time, or subsequently, should accept responsibility because the water was used in connection with the land which he owns.

As an adjunct to this proposed charging of excess water on the land, any owner who pays the excess water charge normally due by the consumer is provided with the right of recovery against the consumer as if the excess water charge were rent due to him.

Another proposal in the Bill is one which would operate only in special cases. There are a few cases where, because of the particular circumstance of the owner, such as the state of his health, a poor financial situation, or his age, there is a possibility of a sale being made without the board being protected for its rates and charges. Also, because of the special circumstances of the owner, the board would not resort to its normal recovery or cut-off action. In these particular cases only, the board desires an authority to lodge a *caveat* on the land. A similar situation exists with regard to local authority rates and under the Local Government Act the local authority is given power to lodge a *caveat* to preclude dealings in respect of the land concerned. It is not unreasonable to place the board in the same position as local authorities.

I would just like to add a few comments in relation to the interjection made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I hasten to do this before the Press starts to rant and rave about the association of this legislation with a statement attributed to me earlier in the year. There is no relationship whatever.

On that occasion I received a phone call during the week from a reporter on one of the weekend papers. We were suffering a heat wave at the time and I was asked about the current water situation. Following a discussion concerned with granting concessions to people with their own water supply, I indicated to the reporter that these people should realise in some cases they could be drawing water from beneath their neighbours' properties. If everybody used this water the particular aquifer would probably very quickly run dry. I told the reporter it must be remembered that everyone has

equal rights. Everybody owning a quarter-acre of land over an aquifer has an equal claim to the water.

The reporter then asked me, "How will you give consumers equal rights?" I told him I did not know, but if this became necessary in the future we could consider a system such as that operating on the Gascoyne River. The local people have access to this river but supplies are metered so that there is an equality of supply.

When this newspaper was published it was stated that the Government intended to meter and rate private supplies. Members will know that there is no rate applied to the Gascoyne River water. The metering of the supply is merely a safeguard. This system is used in other areas as well. The newspaper article was quite out of perspective.

It made market gardeners very irate and it resulted in many individuals telephoning all sorts of people. My colleagues became hot under the collar about it—

Sir David Brand: That is an understatement.

Mr. JAMIESON: —due to a complete misunderstanding of what had been said. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had all sorts of interviews recorded and had made statements in regard to which a representative of *The West Australian* approached me and said, "We do not think you said this and we know there must be a way out." Members on the other side of the House can laugh, but I will tell my own story in my own way and they can assess it afterwards.

Following this, the first indication I had of what was to appear in the Press was that a *Sunday Independent* representative telephoned me and asked me whether there was any truth in the statement that had appeared in the Press to the effect that the Government intended to meter and rate those people who had their own water supply, and I said, "Certainly not; the Government has never even considered it." That newspaper ran a story more or less along the lines of what had been said. Being a matter of topical interest, *The West Australian* wanted to follow that story up, naturally enough, with another article in its publication, but, when approached, I refused to make any comment.

Some time later in the day, the night editor had one of his reporters telephone me, who said at the request of the night editor, "If you did not make this statement you should say immediately that you did not make it, because our newspaper will be flooded with letters to the editor complaining about this issue. In fact, already we have received many complaints." In the circumstances, and on his insistence, I said, "Very well, you can very quickly deny that I have—or the Government has

—any intention of putting this into effect. The statement that appeared in the Press was as a result of a complete misunderstanding of a conversation that occurred between myself and a reporter." Indeed, members will probably have noted that in the next issue of *The Sunday Times*—

Mr. Graham: *The Sunday Times* or the *Sunday Independent*?

Mr. JAMIESON: No, *The Sunday Times*. That newspaper did publish a retraction of the story after my complaint, but unfortunately the basic damage had been done. I merely wish to point out how such things can get completely out of hand. I do not wish to disparage any newspaper in its publication of news, but at that time of the year water conservation was a prime objective and the top story of that day was one that appeared to have come from the General Manager of the Metropolitan Water Board, but, in fact, he did not make the statement that was published. The article that appeared on the Sunday dealt with the aspect that the Metropolitan Water Board was considering imposing restrictions on the use of water between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. This is how the story appeared in the Press.

Of course, the true story of this report was that Mr. Hewitt, the General Manager of the Metropolitan Water Board, who had been prevailed upon by a reporter who had contacted him to obtain the up-to-date figure of the consumption of water on the Saturday in view of the heat that was being experienced at that time, gave the reporter the telephone number of a somewhat junior engineer whose duty it was to record all this detailed information daily. During the course of his conversation with this engineer, the reporter said, "Will this mean water restrictions?" and the engineer replied, "That is up to the Metropolitan Water Board; it will make its determination on Monday. That has nothing to do with me." The reporter went on to question this engineer by asking, "If there were restrictions imposed, when would they be imposed?" and the engineer said, naturally enough, that they would be imposed in the heat of the day when water would probably be effectively used to a lesser extent; that is, between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m.

The story in the newspaper was to the effect that the Metropolitan Water Board intended to impose restrictions between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m., but nothing was further from the truth, because the board knew nothing about it. The true story of the conversation between the reporter and the engineer was not published. As a result of this, any statement I now hand to this newspaper is restricted to that which has my signature attached so that I may be safeguarded against any future misinterpretation that might occur, and the newspaper might also thus be protected.

I felt that I owed it to the House to make this explanation, because I was aware that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had made a statement to the Press and that it was ready for publication the next day. He had also made a recorded statement to a television station which was to be announced, but when I made my retraction, neither the Press nor the television station took any action to publish the statement by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. His statement was very critical, and I will say that he was entitled to be critical if his facts concerning my statement had been correct.

Mr. Court: It was a reasonable statement.

Mr. JAMIESON: It was a reasonable statement in view of the way the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had accepted the story, but it would not have been a reasonable statement had he known the full facts, following *The West Australian* having sorted them out.

Mr. Nalder: You did not have any intention of metering private water supplies?

Mr. JAMIESON: No, I never did have. This clarifies the situation. I can imagine what the position would have been in Kalamunda had this been true. The member for Darling Range would have been running round in little circles crying, "We have him now! We have him now!" I can just imagine the performance that would have been going on. However, it was not to be, because the true situation was revealed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Development and Decentralisation) [3.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is the reintroduction of a Bill that was introduced last session, but which was not proceeded with because of the unfortunate circumstances of which all members of this House are aware.

The Bill that has now been circulated among members is to protect the "Made in Western Australia" symbol from unlawful use.

A wide-ranging campaign to foster the use of locally manufactured products on the home market has been conducted since February, 1970. During the preliminary investigation prior to mounting the campaign a survey was conducted to study existing attitudes and preferences among Western Australian consumers.

Results of this survey indicated that, generally speaking, people were prepared to purchase locally manufactured goods but there was a low consumer awareness of what were local brands.

The housewives just did not appreciate which companies whose names were printed on packages were carrying on business within the State. Therefore, it was obvious that the first thing that had to be done was to develop a symbol which would give quick and positive identification and then to publicise this symbol widely so that people would recognise that goods branded with it were locally manufactured. I think most members would agree that the symbol that was developed gives a good visual impact and that more and more manufacturers are using it. I have no doubt in my mind that it is of positive value in promoting sales.

Therefore, I believe the time has come when we should protect the symbol from unlawful use by unqualified manufacturers, such as those who are carrying out only a token manufacturing operation within this State or even carrying out no manufacturing operations within Western Australia. Initially, when the problem of protection was examined, it was thought that it may be possible to obtain the necessary protection under the Trade Marks Act, a Commonwealth Statute. However, investigation proved that this would be costly and cumbersome and it was decided not to proceed with this method of protection. The alternative is the Bill before members which I will now explain. It is concise and to the point.

Clause 2 repeals the Western Australian (Sales Promotion Labels) Act of 1957. On the advice of the Parliamentary Counsel it was decided it was preferable to repeal this Act rather than attempt to amend it to provide the protection necessary.

Clauses 3 and 4 are machinery ones and require no explanation.

Clause 5 grants authority to use the prescribed symbol. It will be noted that any person who sells a product which is substantially manufactured or prepared within the State is authorised to affix the symbol.

Clause 6 provides for a \$50 penalty for the unlawful use of the symbol for a first offence, \$150 for a second offence, and \$400 for a third or subsequent offence.

Clauses 7 to 11 provide for the appointment of inspectors and prescribe their powers.

Clause 12 ensures that any information which is obtained relating to a manufacturing process or the operating of any equipment or plant cannot be divulged except with the consent of the person who owns the process or in accordance with the provisions of the Act which are set out in the clause.

Clause 13 makes directors, managers, and secretaries of bodies corporate also liable where the body corporate is guilty of an offence if the offence was done with the knowledge of the director or officers of the body corporate.

The final clause authorises the making of regulations to give effect to the objects of the Act.

Before concluding my remarks at this stage I would like to pass on to members some information in regard to our campaign which I believe would be of interest.

A recent survey indicated that recognition of the symbol had risen to 82 per cent. of adult shoppers compared with 68 per cent. recognition by people in the same category 12 months ago.

There are also two case histories which have been disclosed as a result of inquiries. The first of these concerned a supplier who found a new market manufacturing locally for a large international company. The local supplier could not offer any advantages over the imported goods except that his were made in Western Australia. He obtained the contract and proclaims that his success was due to the local products campaign.

The second case which stands out was that of a manufacturer of a food product who had tried in previous years to increase sales by advertising during the traditionally slack months without any real success. Today he is using the "Made in W.A." symbol on his packaging and his sales have improved enormously. This manufacturer attributes his increased sales to the support given to the campaign by consumers.

I am convinced that the "Made in W.A." symbol makes a significant contribution to our campaign to increase the volume and diversity of locally-produced goods by positively identifying them to the purchaser who is already conditioned to support local industry.

This manufacturer attributes his increased sales to the support given to the campaign by consumers.

I am convinced that the "Made in W.A." symbol brings results in increased sales and that our campaign must go on so that we can bring back to a reasonable figure our adverse trade balance with our sister States.

Finally, I want to say that it would be tragic, indeed, and virtually it would be a case of false pretences and would have a most damaging effect, if it became the practice—either rare or common—for manufacturers of goods falsely to apply the label which is so well identified when, in fact, the goods were not appropriate to the insignia being placed upon them.

Mr. Court: Have any amendments been incorporated in this legislation, or is it a facsimile of the previous Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is almost identical. I think the only alteration would be in respect of penalties.

I commend the Bill to members and trust it will have a safe passage through the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Town Planning) [3.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to effect four amendments to the Town Planning and Development Act relating to town planning schemes and subdivisional procedures.

Under existing legislation, an approved town planning scheme remains effective as long as the local council wishes. If a council does not wish to take further action, or if it finds it inconvenient to do so, the scheme may remain unaltered.

Any changes or variations in a scheme therefore rest on the initiative of the council. Many amendments are frequently made to schemes without the local council necessarily considering the full impact of the amendments on the district. Furthermore, in times of rapid progress and development it is desirable that schemes should be reviewed at intervals to meet changed circumstances and to allow ratepayers to voice their opinions about the needs of the district, and their objections.

Clause 2 of the Bill accordingly adds a new section 7AA to provide that a town planning scheme containing land-use or zoning provisions shall be reviewed where requested by the Minister or in any event within five years of its approval or within such longer period as the Minister may agree.

This clause also makes provision for the review to be carried out under the same procedure followed when a scheme is first prepared; that is to say, it provides advertising periods, and an opportunity for people to object to any of the conditions or proposals contained in the scheme.

Clause 3 (a) is to amend section 20 and concerns the situation that can arise when lots are amalgamated. People seeking to subdivide lots are required to obtain the approval of the Town Planning Board, but the amalgamation of lots does not require such approval. This may create problems. For example, a proposal to amalgamate two lots either side of a common boundary between two local authorities may result in subsequent administrative difficulties for the councils concerned. Similarly, where a servicing authority has a service land adjoining a boundary, the amalgamation

of lots may eliminate the boundary and deprive the servicing authority of the opportunity to request an easement or of rerouting the service. This amendment proposes that contemplated amalgamations of lots shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planning Board.

Clause 3 (b) contains the third amendment and this relates to public open space contributions by subdividers. The Act provides that where the local authority and the Town Planning Board approve, a subdivider may pay a cash equivalent representing the value of his open space contribution—usually 10 per cent.—in lieu of contributing the land. The initiative for making this alternative arrangement rests with the subdivider.

There are many occasions when a cash contribution would enable a local authority to acquire a large area of open space in a particular neighbourhood instead of having a poorly located reserve. A further consideration is that subdividers of small areas—usually less than 2½ 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. This amendment to section 20 will enable the board to require a payment in lieu of a land contribution.

Clause 4, the final amendment, being to section 28A, removes an anomaly that has become apparent in cases where a subdivider pays a proportion of road costs. A person who subdivides the land that abuts a road constructed by an adjoining—and earlier—subdivider is required to pay half the cost of the land and constructed road to the local authority which in turn pays the money into a trust fund. It is then open to the subdivider who originally constructed the road, or the owner of any lot in the original subdivision, to demand his proportion of the amount paid into the trust fund.

However, such payment is made only on the written demand of that owner. As the Act does not require the local authority to notify the owner that such money is being held in the fund, many owners may not be aware of their entitlement. Clause 4 of the Bill therefore amends the section to make it mandatory on the local council to pay the person entitled to the payment as soon as practicable.

Mr. Court: Are these amendments based on requests from local authorities or do they result from the department's own experience?

Mr. GRAHAM: It could be a combination of both, but all of them are proposals that have been promoted by the Town Planning Department.

Mr. Court: I refer particularly to clause 2 which proposes to insert a new section 7AA.

Mr. GRAHAM: Clause 2 would be a requirement of the department. I think it is generally known that zoning amendments can be initiated only by a local authority; the Town Planning Department, the Town Planning Board, and the Minister are unable to do so. Of course, the Minister has power of veto; that is to say he can approve the proposal or disagree with it. It could be that a town planning scheme could go on for year after year, be hopelessly old-fashioned, and nothing is done about it. What is sought is that periodically—and I want to say I am not hidebound by any particular period—there shall be a stocktaking—in other words, a review—of the entire area by the local authority which may very well decide that there should be no changes whatsoever. However, at least it will be obliged to resubmit its scheme. If the local authority requires any changes, as indicated earlier, these will be advertised in the ordinary way and will allow a waiting period to enable interested organisations, people, and ratepayers generally to voice their objections to the local authority. The latter then makes its comments on the objections which subsequently are vetted by the Town Planning Board and, finally, are submitted to the Minister with the board's views and recommendations. The idea is that, as town planning procedures are more rigid today than they were a generation ago, there should be an opportunity—indeed, an obligation—for periodic revision.

Mr. Court: The Minister can initiate it as well, I assume?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister can require the local authority to undertake a revision. The local authority could submit a plan in its entirety without any modification if that were the position, but it will give an opportunity for a complete review. From time to time very many amendments are made and these can tend to be done in isolation. Therefore, the purpose is merely to ensure that there shall be an overall review of the complete situation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Message: Appropriations*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

## QUESTIONS (38): ON NOTICE

### 1. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

#### *Mt Magnet*

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Is he aware of the very serious situation that is apparent in the town of Mt. Magnet the existence of which depends almost entirely on the continuing operation of the Hill 50 gold mine?

- (2) Does he realise—
  - (a) that some businesses in that town are for sale at "give away" prices;
  - (b) that the morale of the workers in Mt. Magnet is at a low ebb because of the realisation that the mine operations are steadily losing money?
- (3) Can anything be done to alleviate this very depressing situation in this very important regional centre?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware that the gold mining industry has economic problems because increasing costs of production cannot be passed on. This situation is not new, and undoubtedly it has affected the development and general economic well-being of Mt. Magnet for some time.
- (3) As indicated in His Excellency's address when opening Parliament, the State Government has forcibly represented the plight of gold mining centres—and, here, I acknowledge the co-operation of Opposition parties—including Mt. Magnet, to the Commonwealth Government, seeking further and more realistic assistance to the industry. The State Government awaits the response of the Federal Government to its most recent representations made in Canberra on the 15th February last by the Acting Treasurer and the Acting Under Treasurer.

2.

#### CATTLE

##### *Rail and Road Transport from Meekatharra*

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would he give details of—
  - (a) the numbers of cattle railed from the railhead at Meekatharra from 1966 to 1971?
  - (b) the numbers of cattle transported by road from 1966 to 1971?
- (2) What is the anticipated build-up of cattle that will need either rail or road transport over the next three years, five years, seven years, using this route regardless of their origin?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) Year Ended  
30th June
 

1966	....	12,369
1967	....	8,276
1968	....	4,469
1969	....	9,429
1970	....	4,489
1971	....	9,928

(b) This is not known.

- (2) It is difficult to forecast over such an extended period.

In the short term, tentative orders have been lodged with the Railways over the next six months for wagons for approximately 5,000 cattle in addition to the normal annual average of approximately 6,500.

Long term prospects are considered to be reasonably good as cattle from the Kimberleys appear to be passing over this route in increasing numbers to satisfy a growing demand in the south.

#### 3. PINJARRA HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Extensions*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the current planning for additions and extensions to the Pinjarra High School?
- (2) Will the extensions include an adequate staff room, staff toilets and a sick bay for students?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) It is proposed to convert and upgrade the administrative area.
- (2) The honourable member will be pleased to know the answer is "Yes."

#### 4. YALGORUP NATIONAL PARK

##### *Area and Use*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What is the area of the Yalgorup National Park?
- (2) What is the area of—
  - (a) Lake Preston;
  - (b) Lake Clifton?
- (3) Are both these lakes incorporated within Yalgorup park?
- (4) What restrictions does the National Parks Board place on the use of the park by the public?
- (5) Has the board any special planning for the park?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 22,291 acres.
- (2) (a) 8,122 acres.  
(b) 4,378 acres.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Restrictions placed on this park are no different than those placed on all areas vested in the National Parks Board of W.A. These restrictions are governed by the by-laws gazetted under the Parks and Reserves Act of 1895-1968.
- (5) The board's policy is to prepare utilisation plans for all national parks. As yet a detailed plan has not been prepared for Yalgorup National Park.

## 5. HOUSING

*Total Expenditure 1970 to 1972*

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

- (1) What was the total expenditure on housing by the State in 1970-71?
- (2) What is the anticipated total expenditure on housing by the State in 1971-72?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Total expenditure in housing by the State in 1970-71 is as follows:—

	\$
State Housing .....	29,594,312
Commonwealth-State .....	38,555,119
War Service .....	5,098,878
Government Employees Housing Authority .....	3,206,943
Other departments .....	3,821,275
	<u>\$80,276,517</u>

Capital expenditure included in the above is as follows:—

	\$
State Housing .....	36,213,374
Commonwealth-State .....	
War Service .....	4,675,000
Government Employees Housing Authority .....	2,103,854
Other departments .....	3,821,265
	<u>\$46,813,493</u>

- (2) Anticipated total expenditure for 1971-72 has been assessed as follows. Figures in brackets indicate the anticipated capital expenditure included in the total:—

	\$	\$
State Housing .....	50,000,000	(28,850,000)
Commonwealth-State .....		
War Service .....	4,614,000	(4,580,000)
Government Employees Housing Authority .....	3,592,000	(2,500,000)
Other Departments .....	3,500,000	(3,500,000)
	<u>61,706,000</u>	<u>(39,430,000)</u>

## 6. HOUSING

*Interest Rate: Reduction*

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Rural and Industries Bank advised housing loan borrowers of a reduction in interest rate?
- (2) If so, what reduction was announced and from what date will it be effective?
- (3) What reduction in housing loan interest rates has been adopted by permanent building societies as a result of the recent reduction in the long term bond rate?

- (4) From what date is the reduction in (3) effective?
- (5) Will the Rural and Industries Bank permit a reduction in instalments or will the repayment period be reduced as a result of the reduced interest rate?
- (6) What now is the current interest rate and repayment period for a loan from—
  - (a) the Rural and Industries Bank; and
  - (b) permanent building societies generally?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) Yes, where applicable.
- (2) Up to  $\frac{3}{4}$ % from 1st January, 1972.
- (3) I understand that the recent reduction of  $\frac{1}{4}$ % in the permanent Building Societies' lending rate was undertaken after consideration of investment rates offered in the money market generally, with the reduction in the long term bond rate being only one of the factors.
- (4) 1st March, 1972.
- (5) Automatic reduction of instalments is not intended but customers' wishes will be paramount.
- (6) (a) Current rates on loans—
  - Up to \$8,000—6.5% applying to 76% of loans.
  - \$8,001 to \$10,000—7.0% applying to 9% of loans.
  - \$10,001 upwards—7.50% applying to 15% of loans.
 Repayment periods range up to 30 years according to individual circumstances and take into account the borrower's circumstances, type of building, locality, etc.
- (b) The general interest rate is  $7\frac{3}{4}$ % to 8% and the general maximum term is 25 to 30 years.

## 7.

## LUPINS

*Demand and Price*

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has there been an increased demand for lupins from overseas buyers?
- (2) If so, are these demands for specific varieties and grades?
- (3) What are the prevailing prices for various varieties and grades f.o.b. at all Western Australian ports?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) There has been no demand from overseas buyers for lupins as a feed grain from Australia in the past. It is hoped that an export market can be developed.
- (3) There is no ruling export price. Lupins are sold to local feedmillers at variable rates up to about \$54 per ton. There have been enquiries at \$56.00 per ton c.i.f. Japan.

8.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Cabinet Sub-committee*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is there a sub-committee appointed by Cabinet to give special attention to unemployment in Western Australia or a part of it?
- (2) If so, what members comprise the committee?
- (3) If not, when was the committee disbanded?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) to (3) Representatives of State departments concerned and the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service have conferred as required to draw up proposals for the allocation of Commonwealth grants for the relief of unemployment in non-metropolitan areas.

In the case of the Albany district, a Cabinet Sub-Committee was appointed consisting of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, the Treasurer and Minister for Tourism, and the Minister for Works.

In the case of Collie, a Cabinet Sub-Committee was appointed consisting of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, the Treasurer, the Minister for Works, and the Minister for Mines.

9.

## ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT DISTRICT MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

### *Swimming Pool*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that the ladies auxiliary and staff of the Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital and the local community have over the past three years saved sufficient money to build a swimming pool in the hospital grounds for use by the patients and staff?

- (2) Is it a fact that he congratulated the organisers of this project when he opened the new maternity wing last year?
- (3) Is it a fact that he wished this swimming pool venture success on the occasion of his visit?
- (4) Has the Medical Department now refused to allow the pool to be built in the hospital grounds?
- (5) What is the area of the hospital site?
- (6) Is it a fact that the morale of the staff and patients would be encouraged by this amenity?
- (7) Which other hospital establishments have swimming pools within their grounds?
- (8) If the answer to (4) is "Yes" will he give the full reasons for refusing this amenity?
- (9) Will he now reconsider the present decision and allow this swimming pool to be built in the hospital grounds?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) I am aware that approximately \$3,200 was raised for staff use.
- (2) I certainly congratulated the auxiliary on their fine work for and interest in the hospital.
- (3) I did then and do now approve of amenities for staff.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Approximately 33 acres.
- (6) This is a matter of opinion.
- (7) Royal Perth Hospital and Carnarvon Hospital (nurses quarters).
- (8) A copy of my reply to Dr. Wearing Smith dated 10th December, 1971, and of a letter dated 16th March, 1972, to Mr. A. L. Dawkins following his personal representations are presented for tabling.
- (9) Not unless further material evidence can be provided.

*The letters were tabled.*

10.

## STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

### *Vessels: Acquisitions and Sales*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Which ships comprised the State Shipping Service fleet as at 3rd March, 1971?
- (2) Which ships were in the State Shipping Service fleet as at 1st April, 1959?
- (3) When was the decision made to acquire M.V. "Kangaroo"?
- (4) Which ships were in the fleet 3rd March, 1971 and not at 1st April, 1959 and when and why was each one acquired?

- (5) Which ships have been sold since 3rd March, 1971 and when was the decision made to negotiate disposal at an appropriate time?
- (6) (a) When were negotiations for the two unit load ships commenced;
- (b) what was the source of finance for these two vessels?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) M.V. "Kangaroo".  
M.V. "Koolama".  
M.V. "Koojarra".  
M.V. "Kabbarli".  
M.V. "Dongara".  
S.S. "Dulverton".  
S.S. "Delamere".  
S.S. "Yarrunga" (Temporary Charter).
- (2) M.V. "Koolama".  
M.V. "Koojarra".  
M.V. "Kabbarli".  
S.S. "Dorrigo".  
S.S. "Dulverton".  
S.S. "Delamere".
- (3) 25th February, 1959.
- (4) M.V. "Kangaroo" — November, 1962.  
To cater adequately for the ever increasing passenger requirements in the north west and provide additional space for increasing tonnages of cargo required at a time of expansion in the north west ports and Darwin.  
M.V. "Dongara"—On Charter from 1-3-1965 and purchased on 15-9-1966.  
Required for increasing cargoes due to northern development.
- (5) S.S. "Dulverton".  
M.V. "Kabbarli".  
S.S. "Delamere".  
M.V. "Koojarra".  
M.V. "Koojarra"—Ministerial approval 11-11-1970.  
S.S. "Dulverton", M.V. "Kabbarli", S.S. "Delamere"—Ministerial approval 10-6-1971.
- (6) (a) 4th March, 1971.  
(b) State Shipping Service No. 2 bank account, including depreciation fund, private borrowing and sale of vessels.

# 11. METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING AUTHORITY

## Membership and Reappointments

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (a) Who are the present members of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority;
- (b) when do their current appointments expire;
- (c) which ones are to be reappointed;

- (d) where reappointments are not contemplated, who are the proposed replacement members together with their qualifications for appointment;
- (e) where reappointments are not proposed, what are the reasons for not reappointing such persons?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (a) Mr. M. E. Hamer, Chairman.  
Mr. J. E. Lloyd, Town Planning Commissioner.  
Mr. D. H. Aitken, Commissioner of Main Roads.  
Mr. R. M. Hillman, Chief Engineer, Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board.  
Mr. J. E. Knox, Director General of Transport.  
Mr. J. F. Morgan, Surveyor General.  
Sir Thomas Wardle, The Lord Mayor of Perth.  
Councillor J. J. Sowden, representative Group "A" District Planning Committee.  
Councillor J. W. Armstrong, representative Group "B" District Planning Committee.  
Councillor A. A. Mills, representative Group "C" District Planning Committee.  
Councillor W. P. Calnon, representative Group "D" District Planning Committee.  
Mr. W. L. Hughes, businessmen's representative.
- (b) 7th April, 1972.
- (c) to (e) Other than for the position of chairman, and the Director General of Transport for whom specific provision is made in the Act, appointments are currently in course of preparation for submission to Executive Council, for which reason it would be improper to supply particulars at present.

*Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.07 p.m.*

# 12. POULTRY FARMING

## Hen Licenses: Increased Quotas

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With reference to the licensing of hens, how many farmers with a base year number of less than 4,000 hens received an increased quota?
- (2) How many farmers with a base year number of less than 4,000 hens received additional allocations of—
  - (a) more than 500 hens;
  - (b) more than 1,000 hens;
  - (c) more than 2,000 hens;
  - (d) more than 3,000 hens?

- (3) What was the total increase allocated to farmers who in their base year had less than 4,000 hens?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 94.  
(2) (a) 60.  
(b) 15.  
(c) 11.  
(d) 8.  
(3) 126,609.

13. **WESTERN AUSTRALIAN  
EGG MARKETING BOARD**

*Building Reserve Levy*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) On what date was the building reserve levy first introduced by the Western Australian Egg Marketing Board?  
(2) What is the total amount collected since the inception of the levy?  
(3) What major developments has the board undertaken with the moneys so raised?  
(4) What is the present amount held in the reserve?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 1st July, 1947.  
(2) To 3rd July, 1971—\$459,117.78.  
(3) The board's preliminary accounts for the year ended 3rd July, 1971, disclosed the following—

	\$
Plant and machinery at cost	429,226
Land, buildings at cost	976,237

The above costs include all country depots situated at Narrogin, Bunbury, Geraldton, Northam, Albany, Kalgoorlie and also include the Palmyra premises and its modern machinery and equipment.

- (4) As at 3rd July, 1971—Nil, and all moneys collected have been expended in the purchase of land, buildings, plant and machinery—in fact, expenditure has by far exceeded moneys collected as disclosed by the cost values of assets disclosed in the board's preliminary accounts for 1970-71 as indicated in the answer to (3) above.

14. **STATE FINANCE**

*Additional Commonwealth Grants for Works and Housing*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Of the total amount of \$2,990,000 for the supplementary works and housing programme as reported in *The West Australian* of 22nd

March, were there any additional allocations to local authorities as listed in his reply to question 38 of 16th March, and, if so, what were the extra amounts and how many extra men were engaged?

- (2) Which additional local authorities have been assisted, by what amounts, and what was the number of men engaged?  
(3) What amount above the original allocation has been made to Government departments, which are they, what is the number of men to be engaged, and the general detail of the work to be carried out in both metropolitan and country areas?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) No. The information supplied in the reply to (38) of 16th March related to the allocation of Commonwealth grants for the relief of unemployment in non-metropolitan areas. My recent announcement, as reported in *The West Australian* of 22nd March, referred to expenditure approved under the supplementary works and housing programme agreed to at the February Premier's Conference and Loan Council Meeting.

- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

15.

**NATIONAL PARKS**

*Admission Fees*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) At which national parks in this State are admission fees charged?  
(2) What is the amount of the fee at the respective parks?  
(3) (a) What was the total amount collected; and  
(b) what was the estimated cost of collection in each of the last three financial years at the respective parks?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yanchep, John Forrest, Serpentine, Walyunga.  
(2) 20 cents per vehicle in each instance.  
(3) (a) and (b)—

			Collection	Cost of Collection
			\$	\$
Yanchep	1969	....	13,070	932
	1970	....	14,421	984
	1971	....	15,200	1,036
John Forrest	1969	....	4,868	932
	1970	....	5,041	984
	1971	....	5,532	1,036
Serpentine	1969	....	1,528	364
	1970	....	1,898	470
	1971	....	2,305	529
Walyunga	1971	....	4,014	1,036
	(initial year)	....		

# 16. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## *New Building at Moora*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

When will the new building for the Department of Agriculture be provided at Moora?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

As soon as loan funds can be provided.

# 17. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

## *Additions: Cost*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Was a decision made in the past 12 months to make additions to Royal Perth Hospital?
- (2) What was the estimated cost of these additions?
- (3) How much has already been allocated to this project?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) A decision was made to proceed with planning a diagnostic block.
- (2) No firm estimate can be given until planning is complete. The architect's preliminary estimate was \$9,000,000.
- (3) Nil.

# 18. ROCKINGHAM-KWINANA HOSPITAL

## *Plans and Specifications*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What has caused the repudiation by the Government of the Brand Government's intention of having tenders called for the construction of the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital in April or May this year?
- (2) As the plans and specifications are well overdue even on this Government's advised dates, when will they now be completed?
- (3) What is holding up the completion of the plans and specifications?
- (4) When is it now expected to call tenders for building of this hospital?
- (5) When is the estimated date for this hospital to be ready for patients?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (5) The position is no different to what would have obtained had there been no change of Government.

Mr. Rushton: That is total rubbish!  
The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: The honourable member has played politics with this subject over a long period and he is not facing the truth of it.

Planning has proceeded and is proceeding as quickly as practicable but a final sketch plan has not yet been approved. Working drawings and specifications cannot be commenced until a final sketch plan is approved.

In the light of experience, no firm dates can be given, nor will they be given.

Mr. Court: The Minister for Health is in bad health at the moment.

# 19. HOSPITAL PROJECTS

## *Priority and Cost*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

Will he list the priority of significant hospital projects including the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital and including the estimated cost of each project?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

No. I am reluctant to detail priorities because these have to be determined not only by need but also in the light of available funds. I would point out that it has been necessary to change priorities detailed in answer to the Member's question of 26th August, 1971.

The 1972-73 loan allocation will not be known for some months.

# 20. KINDERGARTEN ASSOCIATION

## *Government Contribution*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the Government's present contribution to the kindergarten association?
- (2) Is the Government giving consideration to increasing the amount?
- (3) If so, can he give any details?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) \$492,946 has been paid to date this year.
- (2) and (3) No recent request has been made by the association to the Government for a review of the formula under which the grant is determined, but, in the event of such an approach being made, it will be given careful consideration.

# 21. CRABS

## *Research and Conservation*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) What research has been done on crabs in Western Australia?

- (2) Because of the very large number of crabs being taken almost every year from the Peel Inlet does he consider that conservation methods should be introduced?

(3) If so, can he give any details?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) A doctoral study by T. D. Meagher, primarily in Leschenault Inlet, but also in Mandurah Estuary and the Swan River.
- (b) Data is currently being gathered in a trawl sampling programme being undertaken by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna in Cockburn Sound.
- (2) (a) It is thought that the number of crabs taken in one year does not have a close relationship with the number available in later years. The restrictions which make it unlawful to take crabs under 5 inches or females in spawn or during their spawning period, together with limitation on nets are believed to be adequate.
- (b) The recent research in the United States shows that a diminution of crabs in Chesapeake Bay was due to the destruction of shallow muddy banks which previously supported populations of juveniles.
- (3) Conservation committees concerned with the main crabbing areas—Leschenault Inlet, Peel Inlet and the Harvey Estuary—and the Swan River Conservation Board each includes a representative of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna amongst its members. Preservation of adequate habitat, including extensive shallow muddy bank areas, appears to be an essential factor in the conservation of these crab fisheries.

## 22. MANDURAH-ROCKINGHAM ROAD

### *Roadworks*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the present nature and cost of work being done on the Mandurah-Rockingham road?
- (2) Because of the increasing volume of traffic on this road what plans has the Commissioner for improving this highway?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Reconstruction of a 1 mile section between 17.9 and 18.9 mile at an estimated cost of \$39,000.

- (2) Investigations are being carried out to determine the feasibility of duplicating sections of the road to provide passing opportunities.

## 23. POLICE SUMMONSES

### *Delivery at Places of Employment*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Are police officers delivering summonses instructed and/or allowed to deliver them to recipients at their places of work?
- (2) Is he aware that such procedure often endangers safety conditions in factories when one man is called away from a machine where his presence is necessary?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "Yes" are employers compelled to allow employees time off for delivery purposes even though this might stop the work of other employees?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) There are no specific instructions issued as to where police are to serve summonses.

Where difficulty is experienced in serving a summons at the person's last known place of abode or where requested by the person to whom the summons is addressed, it may be served at his place of work or any other place the person may be located.

- (2) If arrangements are made for a man to be called away from his work it is normally for the purpose of saving embarrassment. If the member is aware of a specific complaint in this regard, it should be brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Police.
- (3) No.

## 24. YUNDURUP CANALS SCHEME

### *Dredging*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) By whom is the dredging which has been started at the Peel Inlet by the Yundurup canal developers supervised to make sure that it is executed according to the plans which were tabled in this House and which are part of the dredging contract?
- (2) Will the sand heaps which at present are thrown in the estuary forming small islands at places not indicated on the plan remain there or will the contractors be compelled to remove them and leave the original sand level under the water in the estuary?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) The Harbours and Rivers Branch of the Public Works Department is the Government body controlling dredging and related operations.
- (2) Under the conditions applying to these operations the spoil may be deposited either onto the project itself or into a spoil area on the south side of the channel. Other areas of the estuary will remain as they are.

## 25. SUPERPHOSPHATE

### *Works in Eastern Wheatbelt*

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

As the study of Davey Ashmore Consultants reveals a reasonable case for an inland super works in the eastern wheatbelt, what proposals are envisaged to implement the proposals of the report?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The study referred to comprises the first part of a two-phase study on the prospects for an inland superphosphate plant.

The report is currently being examined by departmental officers. When this examination has been completed, a decision will be made on the need for completion of phase two, which will cover in greater detail the economics of inland works.

It should be understood that the Government commissioned the report at the request of regional bodies, and if the conclusions to be drawn from the report indicate a viable operation, formation of an operating company and initiation of construction of the plant would be outside the Government's jurisdiction, although the Government would offer advice and act in a co-ordinating role, if required.

## 26. MOTOR VEHICLES

### *Thefts*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many motor vehicles were stolen in the metropolitan area for the years 1962-63, to 1970-71, and for the period 1st July, 1971, to 18th March, 1972?
- (2) How many motor vehicles were stolen in the country for the same period?
- (3) How many motor vehicles stolen in the metropolitan area for the same period were—
  - (a) damaged;

(b) completely destroyed by fire or wrecked?

(c) not recovered?

- (4) How many motor vehicles stolen in the country for the same period were—

(a) damaged;

(b) completely destroyed by fire or wrecked;

(c) not recovered?

- (5) What are the numbers of offenders arrested and charged for the same period—

(a) under 17 years of age;

(b) over 17 and under 30 years of age;

(c) over 30 and under 45 years of age;

(d) over 45 years of age?

- (6) For the same period, how many offenders have been—

(a) fined;

(b) gaoled;

(c) both fined and gaoled?

- (7) During the same period, have any offenders been ordered by the courts to—

(a) pay for damage to motor vehicles in full;

(b) pay for part of the damage?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 1962-63 .... not available  
 1963-64 .... 1,034  
 1964-65 .... 991  
 1965-66 .... 1,376  
 1966-67 .... 1,543  
 1967-68 .... 1,960  
 1968-69 .... 2,034  
 1969-70 .... 2,251  
 1970-71 .... 3,202  
 1/7/1971-29/2/1972—2,502

- (2) Included in (1).

- (3) (a) Not known.

(b) Not known.

(c) 1962-63 .... not available

1963-64 .... 92

1964-65 .... 70

1965-66 .... 44

1966-67 .... 28

1967-68 .... 72

1968-69 .... 58

1969-70 .... 77

1970-71 .... 62

1/7/1971-29/2/1972—166

- (4) Included in (3).

- (5) Statistics are not kept under the age groupings requested but are as follows—

	Under 17	Over 17 and under 18	Over 18 and under 21	21 and over
1962-63 ....	Not available.			
1963-64 ....	397	107	94	182
1964-65 ....	485	49	117	156
1965-66 ....	695	200	213	343
1966-67 ....	859	103	194	148
1967-68 ....	375	78	263	217
1968-69 ....	757	82	81	210
1969-70 ....	736	144	115	254
1970-71 ....	1,291	224	201	245
1/7/1971- 29/2/1972	643	189	185	252

- (6) Information not available.  
(7) Information not available.

## 27. POULTRY FARMING

### *Hen Licenses: South-West*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many applications for a license to produce eggs were received from the—  
(a) Augusta-Margaret River shire;  
(b) Busselton shire, areas?  
(2) Were any licenses granted, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) 3.  
(b) 2.  
(2) A. M. and C. E. Wills, Box 115, Yongarilup via Busselton. W. S. Kemp, Ludlow. W. H. Benbow, Karridale. R. E. Clews of Cowaramup. Margaret River Junior High School, Margaret River.  
The addresses given are postal addresses. It cannot be determined on which side of the shire boundaries properties of producers are situated.

28. *This question was postponed for one week.*

29. *This question was postponed.*

## 30. EDUCATION

### *Class Sizes*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many State primary school classes exceeded 40 in number at 1st March, 1972?  
(2) Does the Government consider classes of this size acceptable, and conducive to providing the desired standard of education?  
(3) If not, will he state when we can expect a reduction in class numbers?

- (4) What does he consider the maximum number of pupils which should comprise a primary school class, and the maximum number of students who constitute a secondary school class?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) This information is not available as returns from schools have not yet been analysed.  
(2) No.  
(3) The department has for many years followed a policy of progressively reducing class sizes and this policy will continue.  
(4) The objectives in the W.A. survey of needs are 35 for primary, 30 for lower secondary, and 20 for upper secondary classes.

## 31. TRANSPORT

### *Hovercraft*

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many "hovercraft" vehicles or vessels exist in this State at present which could come within the ambit of the proposed legislation to regulate the use of same?  
(2) Is—  
(a) importation; or  
(b) construction,  
of this type of transport contemplated in this State?  
(3) If so, by whom—private enterprise or Government?  
(4) Are such craft intended for ferry purposes on a fare paying passenger basis?  
(5) If so, on what routes?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Nil.  
(2) (a) and (b) The Director-General of Transport has had discussions with manufacturers of hovercraft outside the State and potential manufacturers within the State but at this point in time, to the best of our knowledge, there are no known plans to import or manufacture hovercraft—but the ability to do so probably exists.  
(3) Private enterprise.  
(4) They are widely used overseas for this purpose and some discussions have been held with potential operators but none of the proposals has ever been taken beyond a feasibility stage. The Director-General of Transport recently queried all likely Government Departments who had possible application for the use of hovercraft to see if they had any intention of employing them. The general answer was "No, not at this time".

- (5) Routes that have been discussed are as follows—  
 (a) Perth to Rottnest;  
 (b) the Swan River for urban purposes,  
 but the technical feasibility of either of these routes has never been probed in depth.

### 32. FISHING AND HUNTING LICENSES

#### *Part-time Staff*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Has he acted or does he intend to act upon the suggestion made during the budget debate last year, of employing part-time office staff in major centres to issue various fishing and hunting licenses, thus allowing the inspectors greater time to carry out their duties?
- (2) What arrangements are being made for this year; in what months will part-time staff be employed, and in what number at each centre?
- (3) If this suggestion is not to be carried out, what are the reasons?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The main period for the issuing of licenses is between early December and mid-March each year. Finance will be sought to employ additional staff for future licensing periods in the major centres.
- (3) See answers (1) and (2).

### 33. HOUSING

#### *Bunbury*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What number of State Housing Commission houses, units, etc., have been constructed in Bunbury during this year?
- (2) How many further units, houses, etc., are to be constructed this year?
- (3) How many units, houses, etc., are vacant at present time?
- (4) What areas of land does the Commission hold in Bunbury, and what is the general location and area in each case?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) 103 units have been completed, to date, in this financial year.  
 Looking through this part of the question, if the reply I have just given does not give him the information he seeks I suggest that he see me later. Maybe it has been misunderstood.

- (2) A further four units for larger families are programmed to commence this financial year.
- (3) 99 units are vacant at present, of which 22 are in process of handing over following completion.
- (4) For the future growth of Bunbury and its environs, the commission has acquired 2,873 acres, of which approximately 415 acres has been subsequently zoned industrial. Of the residential land, 120 acres is being planned for development when required.

### 34. TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

#### *Hobby and Night Classes*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What increase or decrease has there been in the amount of money available to technical schools and centres for the hobby and night classes during 1972?
- (2) In either case, what is the extent in each centre?
- (3) What does this variation mean in numbers enrolled for these classes in 1972 compared with 1970 and 1971?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The amount of money made available for all part-time teaching, including hobby-type classes, was increased by \$815,000 for the period 1st January-30th June, 1972.  
 This includes day and evening part-time classes.
- (2) The increase in each school or centre varies from \$5 to \$600 per week depending on the size of the school or centre and the respective enrolments in classes.
- (3) No comparison can be made since the enrolment statistics for 1972 are incomplete.

### 35. ART GALLERY

#### *Replacement of Building*

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) Is it not a fact that the Western Australian Art Gallery has a permanent collection which has grown greatly in size and prestige and also that the Aboriginal collection has become one of major importance?
- (2) Is it not a fact that the present exhibition, storage and working space available to the gallery is entirely inadequate to do justice to the collections and that the gallery's role of fostering the visual arts in this State is thus sadly impaired?

- (3) Does the Government intend to proceed with the building of a modern art gallery with adequate exhibition storage and working space in general conformity with the cultural planning of the Brand Government as evidenced in the modern museum?
- (4) If so, when and where?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) Is the Government completely satisfied that all necessary moves have been made to protect the concept of a plaza in Forrest Place with a vista through to the cultural centre?
- (7) If not, will he ensure that the necessary action is taken?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.
- (4) The Art Gallery site is at present occupied by the existing Police Courts and a start cannot be made until this site is vacated. The exact date of this has not yet been finalised.
- (5) Answered by (3) and (4).
- (6) and (7) The Government is fully conscious of the need to maintain vistas from Forrest Place to the cultural centre across a landscaped central railway area. The Principal Architect, who is also Chairman of the Cultural Centre Planning Committee, has had informal discussions with Commonwealth officials.

36. *This question was postponed.*

37. **STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENTS) ACT**

*Ear Tags and Marks*

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of an article dealing with the Stock (Brands and Movements) Act which appears in the Journal of Agriculture, November, 1971?
- (2) Is this article correct where it states that the ear tag shall be placed in the same ear as the ear mark?
- (3) Is he aware that the current practice is to place the ear tag in the opposite ear to the ear mark and that possibly 75% of sheep are now marked in this manner?
- (4) Does he agree that to alter this situation would result in utter confusion?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

The Stock (Brands and Movements) Act has not yet been proclaimed nor have proposed regulations under this Act been gazetted.

An amendment to the relevant regulation has already been prepared and will require the registered ear tag, if used, to be placed in the ear opposite to that carrying the ear marks.

- (3) and (4) The requirements of the proposed regulations will comply with current practice.

38.

**BUILDING SOCIETIES**

*Commonwealth Funds: Use*

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

- (1) Does not the policy of directing that 50% of home builders account funds allocated to building societies be used to buy State Housing Commission houses mean in effect that only 15% of funds made available by the Commonwealth may be used to purchase homes which are the personal choice of borrowers?
- (2) If not, what effect does this policy have?
- (3) Does not the current financial arrangement with the Commonwealth require that 30% of funds be channelled to building societies in order to qualify for the non-repayable cash grants available under these arrangements?
- (4) If so, does the State expect to receive all such grants available; if not, what is the position?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) and (2) As outlined in an answer to the Member on 21st September, 1971, there are now no Commonwealth capital funds made available for housing. The new arrangements provide for housing assistance grants which are to be used to reduce the purchase instalments or rentals of persons eligible for welfare housing. The definition of welfare housing is left to the States and in Western Australia it is taken as housing for persons and families of low and moderate income.

The current arrangements also provide, as previously explained, for the 30% requirement to be applied to the whole allocation of State loan fund made to the housing authority for welfare housing. This means, of course, that funds are diverted away from Housing Commission programmes and into building societies.

The policy requiring 50% of home builders account funds to be used for financing Commission applicants purchasing Commission built properties has been introduced in order to maintain at a fairly constant level the number of eligible applicants who can be assisted from State funds and have the benefit of reduced instalments through the housing assistance grant. This arrangement will ordinarily have no effect on the number of people who will be able to purchase homes of their personal choice and financed by building societies.

- (3) The current arrangements require at least 30% of funds allocated from State loan borrowings to the housing authority for welfare housing should be placed in a Home Builders Account to be used in making advances to building societies and other approved institutions. A similar proportion of the Housing Assistance Grant must also be placed in the Home Builders Account. In special circumstances the Commonwealth Minister may approve a lesser allocation and this has been done for Western Australia for 1971-72 only.
- (4) The State expects to receive all the housing assistance grant for which it is eligible in 1971-72. The arrangements for the Home Builders Account have received approval of the Commonwealth Minister.

## QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. PRICE CONTROL

#### *Press Report of Minister's Comment*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Prices Control:

In the absence of the Minister for Prices Control, I would ask him, through the Acting Premier, the following question:—

- (1) Is he correctly reported in today's issue of *The West Australian* to the effect that—
  - (a) Proposed price control legislation could control only the prices of W.A. items and services; and
  - (b) Only the Commonwealth can carry out really wide-reaching price control?
- (2) If so, what are the grounds on which he makes these claims?
- (3) What is the constitutional position of the Commonwealth in respect of price control in

times other than wartime controls—especially in view of the fate of the Referendum to try to give the Commonwealth this power in peacetime?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. Taylor) replied:

The Minister for Prices Control wishes me to express his regrets that he is not present. He has a commitment at ambassadorial level, and he has asked me to reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the following terms:—

- (1) to (3) The article referred to is apparently part of a phone conversation requested by a reporter and covering a number of aspects with regard to the Government's proposed excessive prices legislation. The words appearing in quotation marks in the article may, or may not, have been those used, but could be reasonably accurate if the word "can" becomes "could." The broad tenor of my remarks in 1(a) and 1(b) is generally correct, though from question (3) one interprets that the honourable member would have preferred additional qualification referring to the doubts inherent in the Federal Constitution for the Commonwealth forthwith to implement some form of price control. However, the statements in 1(a) and 1(b) remain substantially correct from the point of view of the State's legislation. I am informed that as question (3) calls for an opinion on a point of law, it is not admissible (ref. *May's Parliamentary Practice*, Ed. 18, folio 327) but I believe I may have covered the points to which the honourable member wished to draw attention.

### 2. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

#### *School of Veterinary Science*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Did he see an article in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* headed "Loss of proposed vet school feared"?
- (2) Did he see where Dr. G. M. Robertson said that if the opening of the school was delayed because of financial difficulties, the school could go to an Eastern States university?

- (3) In the statement made by the Minister appearing in this article he said that there was no serious threat that the school of veterinary science would be transferred to another State. What are the grounds on which that statement was made?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) I did read the article.  
 (2) Yes.  
 (3) It was an opinion on my part that if the opening of the veterinary school was deferred in 1975 I did not fear that we in Western Australia would lose the school.

The basis upon which I formed this opinion was that I had the opportunity to be present at the Premiers' Conference on the 14th February, where I heard at first-hand the pleas put forward by each State Premier indicating the dire needs of the other States for capital funds which were very scarce. I had no reason to doubt the genuineness of the pleas put forward.

Subsequently, I cannot imagine any State Premier waiting in the sidelines to grab the veterinary school. I might mention also that I am somewhat fortified in my opinion as a result of a discussion I had the following day with Professor Karmel of the Australian University in Canberra. I will not mention the subject we discussed, but I still share the view there is no great fear. I can understand the concern, the distress, and the anxiety felt by people associated with the veterinary school.

Mr. Court: The Minister created the anxiety.

### 3. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

#### *School of Veterinary Science*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How can he reconcile his reply given to question 6 without notice on Tuesday, the 21st March, 1972, with the view he expressed in his letter dated the 23rd February, 1972, to the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, especially with the passage where he states that unless the Commonwealth bears the full cost the State Government would postpone the project—that is, the Murdoch University and veterinary school—to the triennium of 1976-78?
- (2) Will he state definitely that the veterinary school will be built within the framework of the Murdoch University and it will be open

for teaching at the latest in 1975, considering that the Commonwealth's finance will be available to the normal extent as promised previously and negotiated by the Brand Government?

- (3) Has he received the Commonwealth Minister's reply to his letter of the 23rd February, 1972, which reply confirms the availability of finance according to the usual formulae and expresses concern about his proposition of delay?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the member for Floreat for sufficient notice of his question, the answer to which is as follows:—

- (1) There is no inconsistency. The Government's problem in relation to the veterinary school and other tertiary education developments proposed for the 1973-75 triennium is clearly set out in my reply to question 6 of Wednesday, the 22nd March. The member for Floreat has misquoted my letter to the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science in which I stated that in view of the very heavy demands for expenditure on tertiary education in the 1973-75 triennium, the Government had "no alternative than to consider—the emphasis is on the word 'consider'—the postponement of work on the veterinary school." Before coming to a decision on this matter I sought the views of the Commonwealth Government which, knowing this State's very difficult capital funds position, may well have rated the veterinary school sufficiently high priority on the national scene as to be prepared to provide additional assistance to enable it to commence on the date planned. Apparently this is not the case.
- (2) I am not as yet aware of what the Commonwealth commitment for the Murdoch University will be in relation to the 1973-75 triennium. This information has not been made available to the Government.
- (3) I have not received so much as an acknowledgment from Mr. Fraser and am therefore unable to state whether or not he confirms the availability of finance from the Commonwealth.

I am somewhat disturbed at the framework of the question which suggests that the questioner is aware of the contents of the letter whereas I have not had the courtesy of a reply.

Mr. COURT: Does the Minister not read the papers?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: If the member for Floreat is aware of the contents of Mr. Fraser's reply to me I should be grateful if he would convey them to me.

I wrote the letter to the Federal Minister and I did not expect to find the reply to a parliamentary question in the form of a Dorothy Dix question and answer.

#### 4. WHEAT QUOTAS

##### *Alterations*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he discussed any alterations to wheat quotas with any members of the wheat section of the Farmers' Union since the Farmers' Union executive had an opportunity to discuss the independent committee's report?
- (2) If so, can he inform the House of any decisions made?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the Leader of the Country Party for notice of the question. The reply is as follows:—

- (1) and (2) Discussions have been held with the wheat executive of the Farmers' Union. Additional information was sought from the wheat executive and is currently being considered. A further meeting will shortly be held with the executive and as soon as possible thereafter a decision will be made.

#### 5. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

##### *Vessels: Acquisitions and Sales*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

With respect to question 20 on today's notice paper, would the Minister be good enough to confer with his colleague in another place concerning the answer he gave to part (6) (a)? The reply gave the date as the 4th March, 1971, whereas, if my memory serves me aright, the negotiations for the unit-load ships commenced approximately October-November, 1970, following about 12 months' search to find suitable vessels.

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I will confer with my colleague on this matter.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

##### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from an earlier stage of the sitting, on the following motion by Mr. Brown:—

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

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

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [4.41 p.m.]: The first matter I wish to refer to in this debate on the Address-in-Reply is the discomfort experienced by many members by having to wear coats, and the prospect of air-conditioning this Chamber.

I would point out that this whole affair has been blown up out of all proportion. First of all, I would like to discuss the basic reason for our feeling rather warm. For two years I have been advocating that there is no reason at all for this Parliament even to be sitting at this time of the year.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAYFER: The opinion has been expressed recently that it could cost upwards of \$1,000,000 to air-condition this building completely. I base my figures on the dust-extraction unit used by the bulk handling installation at Fremantle. The unit cost \$1,000,000 and it extracts the dust from the installation. For that reason I think it would cost about \$1,000,000 to extract the dust which is sometimes prevalent in this Chamber.

Mr. Jamieson: Have they got a second-hand unit available?

Mr. GAYFER: Nevertheless, I do consider that portions of this buildings, where the staff are employed, should be air-conditioned. However, as far as this Chamber is concerned it would be a complete and utter waste of time to air-condition it. The original quote was approximately \$400,000 to air-condition the offices. We do not know what it would have cost to air-condition the Chamber and this matter has only been raised since we have been sitting during this summer session.

I will now point out to members the circumstances which caused us to have a summer session. First of all, the then Opposition and the Press—and the letters written to the Press by the public as a result of

publicity—brought pressure to bear on the Premier of the day to introduce two sittings of Parliament. Also, at that time, the mining industry was booming and expanding.

Mr. Jamieson: We are all in agreement.

Mr. GAYFER: All right, we now have two sittings. However, what is the situation now? This morning there were three Ministers in the front bench, and there are three Ministers present now. During this morning two other members sat in the front bench in an effort to fill it. There were six members on the back benches this morning, and there are six members present now. I do not object to the fact that Ministers and members have work to do outside the Chamber, and I will come back to this point in a short time.

I will now refer to the two years prior to the time we commenced having two sittings in each session. During 1966 we sat for 16 weeks and one day, and we introduced 110 Bills. In 1967 we sat for 16 weeks and one day, and we introduced 82 Bills. In 1968-69 we had two sittings and we were in session for 19 weeks and one day, and introduced 118 Bills. In 1969-70—and extending—we sat for 22 weeks, almost half the year, and we introduced 105 Bills. That was nearly as many as we introduced during the 16-week session when we had only one sitting.

I am of the opinion that we have given this method a fair go and for the benefit of the State we should wipe it out, get rid of it, and return to the system which applied previously. In various countries throughout the world through which I have travelled, Parliaments deal with an equivalent number of Bills—and from memory I can quote Winnipeg—in a period of five to seven weeks. Those Parliaments have subordinate legislation committees, but the legislation is dealt with within the period I have mentioned.

In my opinion all we have achieved is a heck of a lot of talking and a sheer waste of time. Somebody will come up with the answer that members are going home earlier at night. What members are going to which homes? One result of the two sittings is that country members are dragged down here away from their homes to be shackled up in dwellings not fitting to their situations. I say “dwellings” because they stay in the type of accommodation they can afford to pay for, and believe me some of the members of this Chamber, because of the high cost of accommodation, do have to put up with circumstances not fitting to their situations.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear! Hear!

Mr. GAYFER: The position now is that members have to put up with these conditions twice a year. And for what? For no appreciable gain at all in the way of

legislation. None, except to please the whim of the public, the newspapers, and the then Opposition.

Mr. Jamieson: The public has to be considered.

Mr. GAYFER: What does the public get with three Ministers sitting on the front bench? This is just a facade to hide a set of dirty underclothes.

Mr. Jamieson: It is not stopping the honourable member from saying what he thinks.

Mr. GAYFER: I am quite convinced that it is necessary for Ministers to go abroad, and I am also convinced—as we from the agricultural areas have been for the last two years—that Ministers should not be wasting their time sitting in Parliament for such a long period of time. Those Ministers should be travelling overseas selling Western Australia, just the same as we get out and sell our wheat and other products.

It is unfortunate that the Premier, and the Minister for Mines, have to be away from the State at this time, but they had to go away in order to protect Western Australia. However, this farcical arrangement whereby we are tied down to the benches—and that is all it is because we are not gaining anything—is a lot of rot.

There is talk about spending \$1,000,000 in the provision of air-conditioning to please, again, the community. We see our Clerks done up in tails and white ties. They are beautifully attired, but for no reason at all. You sir, have discarded your wig but I like to see you wearing it. The two Clerks sitting in front of you, Mr. Speaker, often have perspiration pouring off their faces because they have to wear their wigs which I should imagine are quite prickly and uncomfortable.

I am very definite in my attitude on this matter. Our country electorates are expanding and becoming larger and larger. It will soon be virtually impossible for some members to meet all their electors, because of the size of the electorates.

What chance has a country member of rendering a service to his people? He has none at all because he is being taken out of his electorate for twice the time he was being taken out of it previously. Believe me, it is not sitting in this place that wins elections and votes; it is getting out among the people, listening to them, and looking after them.

Mr. McPharlin: Hear! Hear!

Mr. I. W. Manning: The honourable member who agitated for this is sitting in a sauna bath in Japan.

Mr. GAYFER: I am convinced we must be big enough to own up to this stupidity. That is all it is—arrant stupidity. If we were handling more legislation, it would

be O.K. What is it to me and my colleagues to knock off at 10 o'clock, half an hour earlier, or even before midnight, to go home to what? A motel; a flat somewhere or other. When we look at the other side of the House, we find one member has a home in Fremantle and another member shares a dwelling. This is the way of it. I know what the member for Geraldton has had to put up with where he has lived over the years.

It is absolutely ridiculous, farcical, and stupid to spend all this money just to convince the populace that we are working here. What work are we doing? The Address-in-Reply nearly folded up on the second night because there were not enough speakers on the Government side. So we decided there would be one speaker from each party and then it could fold up. The Government could go down to the Governor and say, "Here is the Address-in-Reply. We are very sorry but they were not very enthusiastic about it. They had only one speaker from each party." I am telling secrets out of school now but it does not matter because we have nearly all spoken.

It is so stupid to think we have to come here and sweat this out with coats on, and so on, just to please a few people who reckon we are working only if the House is sitting. Every member of Parliament gets this when he is in his electorate. People come up and say, "You will be back to work next week. The holiday is finished." However, there is more work out in the electorate than there is when the House is sitting.

I would like to deal with another problem experienced by country members. I happen to be a Whip—and I might add, looking at the benches on the other side, I would hate to call a division right now because, while I have one member away, there are many Government members who are away. The member for Wellington has them all covered—nine or 10 of them. Nevertheless, while we are stuck down here in the city because of this farcical business, at any time he likes a city member can get a pair for an hour and go out in his electorate to look in at a P. & C. meeting and say, "I am sorry, the House is sitting and I cannot stay."

Mr. Jamieson: He has to do that while he sits in Parliament, too. You get a spell away from your electorate.

Mr. GAYFER: How many times do we have to refuse to go to meetings? The Minister does not have an idea what he is talking about.

Mr. Jamieson: You are the only one who has any ideas.

Mr. GAYFER: The Minister supported the idea of a summer session. It is tying him down and he does not like it any more than anyone else.

Mr. Jamieson: I do not mind it at all.

Mr. GAYFER: It was said we would be working shorter hours. If anyone cares to check up on the hours he will find they are not much shorter. The Government is not introducing any more Bills and we are working longer hours during the week. All the Government is doing is holding people here unnecessarily by continuing with this farce. Air-conditioning this place would be a sheer waste of money.

Mr. Bickerton: Have you air-conditioning in your car?

Mr. GAYFER: Has the Minister?

Mr. Bickerton: Yes.

Mr. Jamieson: Have you ever been refused a pair?

Mr. GAYFER: I will say one more thing before I close. In my opinion, there is much less efficiency in this House through sitting in two sessions under the conditions we are experiencing. I fervently believe we should not be sitting now. This matter should be reviewed.

Mr. Bickerton: If we were not sitting, you would be running around your electorate and working hard.

Mr. GAYFER: That is possibly one of the motives in making us sit during this summer session.

Mr. W. G. Young: You would have an air-conditioned car.

Mr. Bickerton: And a pure wool coat.

Mr. Graham: Does not the honourable member think it is wrong that for six or seven months every year Parliament should not be sitting?

Mr. GAYFER: May I interject?

Mr. Graham: I think you want to go farming instead of doing your legislative job.

Mr. Jamieson: That is about what it is.

Mr. Graham: He is throwing brickbats around. I think he ought to examine himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Avon will continue.

Mr. GAYFER: Six weeks ago I rang the interjecting Minister's office and asked that he receive a deputation from the Bruce Rock Shire Council to discuss a matter concerning decentralisation. The secretary said he would confer with the Minister. I would have liked him to receive the deputation this week. When I rang back, the secretary said to me, "The Minister is frightfully busy. He has had two visits to the north-west. He has been in the Eastern States. His desk is full of files he has to get off before the session starts. Then he has to get ready to go to Indonesia." That is exactly what he said. I did not want to bring this matter up but the Minister became nasty.

I do not mind the Minister doing all those things but he cannot do service to the office he is occupying at the moment by being unnecessarily tied to the seat in which he is now sitting. He should be available to receive deputations when they are requested. That is just as important to Bruce Rock. I think the Minister should be out enticing industries to this State and getting around the country in this period—with me, in my car, if he likes—in order to see the necessity for doing what I advocate.

Mr. Graham: Do you think it is right that for a period of seven or eight months in every year Parliament should not be meeting? That was the position previously. It is too long.

Mr. GAYFER: As I said before, I have investigated this matter in other countries. It seems to work satisfactorily there and, funnily enough, it seemed to work in this place for 60 years.

Mr. Jamieson: Not exactly. Look back at the records.

Mr. GAYFER: I would like to move to another subject in order to stop the interjections.

The SPEAKER: You might get fewer interjections.

Mr. GAYFER: I recently noticed in the Press and heard over the radio an announcement that the Fitzroy area had had five inches of rain in six days. I was speaking to a couple of members who came down from that area and they said it was rather wet. On the 1st March a cloud went over Cunderdin, where it dropped three inches of rain. It came over Bruce Rock and settled in over Corrigin at 5.30 p.m. There was considerable thunder and lightning. It dropped 375 points of rain in 35 minutes, and in two hours it dropped six inches of rain on the town of Corrigin. I have positive proof from one of the members who happened to be caught in that flood that cars were washed off the road, secondhand machines were swept off lots, cars were dented as they were swept along the main street and hit telephone poles. Empty drums were swept from miles away. The two ambulances in the town were completely flooded out. Fences were torn down and there was a vast amount of debris for miles around.

The shopkeepers and residents unfortunately took the brunt of it and water swirled through the town counter high. In fact it did irreparable damage not only to the shops, their stock, and account books but everything one could name, such as carpets, bedding, and other household goods behind the shops. Telephone lines were down and there was almost sheer chaos. Farmers who were not affected came into town—100 of them—and for three days they conducted a working bee

with front-end loaders, tanks, power pumps and everything else to help the people sort the matter out. The police took control of organising it and did a wonderful job. Civil Defence came in and did everything possible to help. I flew over the area damaged which extended from 20 miles to the east of Corrigin to five miles to the west in a strip three miles wide. This means that 75 square miles were affected. Five days later people were still bewildered and wondering what had hit them. If members could have seen the devastation there they would readily appreciate why many doubted whether there was any future for them. Others thought straightout that they were finished. The psychological effect of something like this is tremendous.

The people started to ring their insurance companies. At this stage I was called in and asked to look at some of the policies to see whether or not people were insured.

Mr. Bertram: I am rather disappointed.

Mr. GAYFER: When the people rang their insurance companies they said that a storm had hit the town. They were asked: "Did a storm hit the town or was it a flood?" I ask: "What kind of a question is this?" For two hours the heavens broke loose; if that is not a storm I do not know what is.

The people advised the insurance companies that they had comprehensive policies. Some of the companies said, "You may think you have, but you should read the fine print."

Mr. Bertram: Comprehensive in its exclusion.

Mr. GAYFER: That is about right.

Mr. Bertram: There is nothing new about that.

Mr. GAYFER: I realise the member for Mt. Hawthorn has spoken once in the debate, but perhaps some opportunity will soon come for him to speak again. I ask him to give me a chance to make my point. It appears that water which comes through one's front door cannot be attributed to storm or tempest. Water must smash a window, break down a door, or take a sheet of iron from the roof before it can be attributed to storm or tempest. In other words, the insurance companies are completely exonerated.

Two days later 16 shopkeepers called a meeting because they had all found out that there was very little chance of claiming under insurance. The stupid part is that it is only two years since the earthquake problems. At the time people went to their insurance companies and said, "This time make sure the policy is comprehensive." For a total of 16 people, 13 different insurance companies were involved. I was amazed.

Mr. Hartrey: Did any get paid?

Mr. GAYFER: I do not know. I have here a typical letter which has been sent to a New Australian who had just paid for his home, furnished it, and finished painting it. His home is right alongside the spot where the member for Roe's car was washed away.

The letter I shall read is from an insurance company whose name I will not mention because, if any insurance company out of the goodness of its heart decides to come in to help, I feel sure a meeting will be called tomorrow in the Terrace and a question to this effect will be asked: "Why did you help? It should be all-in- or all-out." The letter reads—

Dear Sir,

We have been advised by the Corrigin Shire Clerk that your property has been damaged following the heavy rain on the 1st. March, 1972. It is not clear at this stage whether or not you would be entitled to claim under your Policy in respect of the damage as there are no provisions for rainwater damage unless associated with storm and/or tempest. Heavy rain does not necessarily constitute a storm.

To enable us to give the matter every consideration will you please write and outline the circumstances surrounding your loss . . .

This letter was written to a New Australian, as I have said. What kind of mumbo-jumbo is this?

Mr. McPharlin: It was probably written by a legal practitioner.

Mr. GAYFER: I will pass it over to the other side shortly to obtain a legal view.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It would be a hard-hearted legal practitioner and not a Labor man.

Mr. GAYFER: It is only a week ago that I was told by some that their insurance companies are looking at the matter because they have been clients for so long. Others said that they had been given an emphatic "No." The people came up with the stock answer that was given to so many insurance companies at Meckering and York after the earthquake; namely, "If you will not look after my business I will leave your company and go to another." The companies laugh at this suggestion. What happens? One man takes his business from one insurance company and goes to one around the corner. There is merely a changeover of clients. It is not possible to use the principle of "might is right" or to bluff. The only thing we can hope for is that some insurance companies, out of the goodness of their hearts, will do something.

For the interest of members I have brought in a few of my insurance policies. After the earthquake at Meckering I thought I was properly covered for everything. If members look at my policies they

will see innumerable bits of paper which have been stuck on to a "comprehensive" policy to make it comprehensive. I truly thought I was covered. However, one clause reads—

Storm or tempest, but excluding destruction or damage by water or rain to the interior of any building unless caused by water entering such building through an opening in the wall or the roof made by the storm.

I have had it again! The result is we take all the insurance papers back and have them endorsed again. We are told now that we will have to pay more heavily because the area is flood prone. I might add that the storm knocked over fences that have stood since 1907, but we are now flood prone!

Mr. Jamieson: Do you have an insurance against drought?

Mr. GAYFER: If it were not so serious it would almost be humorous. All told \$35,000 has been lost because people honestly thought they were covered for all emergencies.

I plead with the public and ask everybody, whether in the metropolitan area or in country towns: For God's sake, get out your insurance policies and read them. Of course, people will not understand them, but they should take them to lawyers.

Mr. McPharlin: They will not understand them then.

Mr. GAYFER: If lawyers can make sense out of a policy such as this, I am a Dutchman.

Furthermore, I castigate companies which send out ill-trained salesmen with the one intention of writing an insurance policy. The only way they can better a previous quote is to delete some clause—and this is done under the guise of the policy still being comprehensive. In fact, the person who swallows the story is left with a worthless piece of paper, as so many of us have found out.

I heard the Young Liberals discussing a motion at a meeting three weeks ago. I thought it was ridiculous and a lot of rot—

Mr. Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAYFER: —because they were talking about training insurance salesmen and agents. I thought that if this was all they could do at a political meeting they were wasting their time. However, they were on the right track. There should be a law to license these people and we should bring one in. It is a problem, and a great one.

Despite all the interjections and the humour apparent here today, I hope members never suffer a Meckering earthquake or a Corrigin flood. It certainly wipes the grin off a man's face when he loses everything in two hours.

Mr. T. D. Evans: If the member for Avon would pause a moment I might make a comment which will please him. I have tried twice already to tell him this. It is a principle of insurance—unfortunately it only applies one way—that the insurance policy is one of good faith. I intend to introduce legislation at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the principle of good faith works to the benefit of both parties. I look forward to the support of the member for Avon.

Mr. GAYFER: I hope the legislation will be back-dated six months.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I feel I can count on the vote of the member for Avon.

Mr. GAYFER: Before I leave this subject I would like to congratulate the Civil Defence & Emergency Services and the Police Force for the wonderful job they did. The A.B.C. and the Press reporters were there but they were not welcome. There were already too many people in the area and this is probably why the stories of the floods were not complete. It was a bad business and I should know; I have a property in the middle of it.

Mr. W. G. Young: I endorse those remarks.

Mr. GAYFER: Whilst the members of the Civil Defence & Emergency Services are busy mopping up, I believe other officers attached to the organisation should be provided to advise on such things as insurance policies. If men are not available from this organisation, it would be in the interests of public relations for a Government department to send two officers to these areas.

This Government and previous Governments have been afraid to provide men in this capacity because people may think the Government is willing to help. I know Government policy is not to help except in national disaster. However, if officers were available people in trouble would have a shoulder to cry on. Many of the people lost their policies in the flood. If members realise that tip trucks and front-end loaders were shovelling debris out for five days, they will appreciate the need for some assistance in this way. I believe the member for Boulder-Dundas wants to say something.

Mr. Hartrey: Perhaps the Consumer Protection Authority could make this its business.

Mr. GAYFER: I am afraid that if I say too much on this scheme the "knock knock" will apply and policyholders will get nothing.

The other day the Acting Premier tabled a neat little document in this House. It is called, "The Development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana." I was interested enough to peruse this document with the member for Dale. However, in

the middle of it I found something I did not like particularly. I refer to proposed arrangements in respect of the outloading facilities at Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. This passage reads as follows:—

In so far as jetty construction in the south is concerned, Co-operative Bulk Handling is at present negotiating with the Fremantle Port Authority with a view to the construction of shipping facilities by 1975, subject to the availability of funds. Accordingly the possibility suggests itself of conjoining the Pacminex shipping requirements with those of C.B.H. . . .

I hear no sound. Do members know how compatible alumina is with wheat or oil seeds?

Mr. W. G. Young: Or any grain.

Mr. GAYFER: The member for Roe is quite correct—or any grain. One of the recommendations in the document reads as follows:—

The Fremantle Port Authority and the W.A.G.R. review the possibility of combining the proposed Pacminex Alumina shipping requirements with those of Co-operative Bulk Handling with the prime object of encouraging development of the proposed port operation area from the south.

Let us regress a little. People who were aware of the planning that was taking place expected that Pacminex would load at the CSBP jetty to the north. Arrangements are made with Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to construct a jetty in the south. What is the result?

It is set out carefully in the report that the alumina dust is a fine dust. It is a white powder which floats in the air and permeates everywhere. Because of this the jetty was to be constructed away from the housing area, and this is appreciated. It has been decided to dump it just over the fence which has been put around Co-operative Bulk Handling's 55 acres. A conveyor is to be installed down the side of the Co-operative Bulk Handling allotment and hung on the other side of the proposed jetty.

Co-operative Bulk Handling's idea is to build a conveyor big enough to take 5,000 tons of wheat an hour. It will be the largest international integrated terminal in the world. No doubt it will be eclipsed eventually but it is certainly a big project. It needs to be on its own and not contaminated by infringements.

Perhaps the alumina can be covered as it is going out parallel to the wheat on the small jetty. However, members who have seen a ship loading with alumina at the end of a T-piece of a jetty would have some idea of the result if another ship were loading say, oil seed. This is a sticky substance that will attract and hold any dust close to it. Blankets of alumina dust swirl around as alumina hits the hold of a

ship. Members will appreciate the chaos which will be caused if Co-operative Bulk Handling wishes to utilise fully its out-loading terminal.

It is apparent that either Co-operative Bulk Handling or Pacminex would have to close down its concurrent outloading operations. Certainly the covers could not be taken off the Co-operative Bulk Handling ship whilst alumina was being loaded alongside. We could not do otherwise because the international codex scale adopted by all countries in the world lays down a standard for all types of insecticides and other impurities which may be found in grain. This is not just a matter of putting wheat, oats, barley, linseed, lupins, and rapeseed into a terminal. This will be a terminal to be proud of throughout Australia. It will have grassed areas and a fine appearance, but we must remember that grain from here must be sold overseas. We will never sell while fine alumina dust can permeate and mix with the grain.

I believe after this Government took office a stage was reached where this aspect of planning was no longer discussed with Co-operative Bulk Handling people.

We have had this trouble in Geraldton with iron-ore. Co-operative Bulk Handling painted a terminal building at Geraldton white. It looked beautiful but two months later it was covered with red iron ore dust. This proves how incompatible mineral dust is with grain, but some of it is much worse than others. It would be foolish to put such a substance on a conveyor hanging on the other side of a jetty where gain is being outloaded.

I will admit that in Esperance a conveyor belt is used to load wheat and salt; but then salt is compatible with wheat. However, this proposal is absolutely wrong. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider the matter before he goes any further with it. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the involvement of C.B.H. is great indeed and it will be terrific in the future. But the nigger in the woodpile could be the occurrence of the very circumstance that is proposed. Immediately our overseas buyers would shrug and say, "Look at where they are loading alumina; right next door to the grain."

We cannot object to the dump being established alongside the C.B.H. facilities. That is fair enough because the prevailing wind does not blow towards the C.B.H. installation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr. GAYFER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the five minutes left to me I would like to ask the Minister for Works to consider the immediate establishment of a committee to set in operation the next seven-year programme of the country comprehensive water supply scheme. I know the department is considering the

proposals, and I know the Minister has received countless deputations on this very point—as a matter of fact I have yet to write to him regarding a further three deputations.

Mr. Jamieson: I will make it an open house, I think.

Mr. GAYFER: At present a large area is not yet covered by the comprehensive scheme. We feel that the area I am pointing out on the maps I am holding up, which is right in the centre of the original comprehensive scheme, should be completed, especially as it is the oldest part. We have every reason to ask for the completion of the scheme in this area, especially when we consider that people seem to have forgotten about the Jerramungup drought and other droughts, generally. But drought has never left the huge area to which I am pointing. I am referring to the area surrounded by the towns of York, Beverley, Brookton, Corrigin—to the west—and Quairading.

The people in that area have been carting water for almost three years now. They have carted water through the winters. Without wasting the 2½ minutes left to me now I would like to say that the proof of my remarks is in the figures of the water which is being carted—and in some cases the distance is 25 miles—from the stand-pipes of the public water supply.

Finally, I would like to say it would appear that my days as the member for Avon are numbered. But, for heavens sake, I have always been honest with every member of Parliament; and if Ministers or members come into my area without telling me—I cannot stop them, I know that—and without being decent or nice about it they will receive no co-operation from me! Let us all get along like buddies for another two years, which is all that is left to me in my electorate. I am sorry to be losing it, but I do not want to be undermined and I do not want to leave this House in the wrong fashion after having received an 80 per cent. poll. I like to think that I have done my best to look after my district, and I do not want my position to be usurped by members or Ministers.

Mr. Bickerton: What did you say was the percentage of your poll?

Mr. GAYFER: Eighty per cent. I support the motion.

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [5.20 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to speak on the Address-in-Reply. Having listened to the speeches of those who have preceded me in this debate, I would like first of all to offer my support to the remarks of the member for Avon, particularly in regard to the times of sitting of this House. I agree with him in this because one of the points I have noticed as a country member is—as the member for Avon said—that most of a member's work

is done in the electorate he represents, and not in this House. I realise that certain matters must be attended to within the Parliament, and I have no objection to sitting late into the night should it be necessary; but I think the time we are forced to stay in Perth should be reduced.

While listening to members speaking during this debate it became obvious to me that members on the other side of the House paid tribute to the achievements of the Government during its 12 months in office. From where I sit I would have thought that some things are best left unsaid, particularly with regard to the record of the Government's achievements. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is quite a record.

First of all, let us consider the Government's record with regard to unemployment. Unemployment levels in Australia are at an all-time high, and Western Australia is heading the field for the first time in 12 years. It was rather hollow praise for the member for Northam to speak about unemployment in this State being no problem at all. I ask members to realise that we have an unemployment problem in spite of the very big hand-outs the Commonwealth has been feeding to this State for the very purpose of providing employment.

I would like to refer also to the Government's record in respect of mineral development. For 12 years we saw the State-on-the-move progressing more and more. It is all very well for the Minister for Works to laugh.

Mr. Jamieson: It was even profitable to have a dairy farm during part of that time.

Mr. BLAIKIE: I will have a little to say on dairying, so I hope the Minister does not leave early.

Mr. Jamieson: I will not be leaving.

Mr. BLAIKIE: We had a State-on-the-move; but what have we seen during the last 12 months? We had an agreement for the establishment of a refinery in the Bunbury area, and I can vaguely remember the phraseology that was used some time ago in this regard. We also had the proposal for the Pinjarra refinery and, of course, the Pacminex proposal. Where are all of those today?

I can go even further. We have seen the stop-go and stop-stop policy of the Government in respect of the State Shipping Service. On three occasions the Government gave a final notice that the service to Darwin was to be discontinued. The Government gave notice to all concerned that as from the end of August the service would cease. Then there was a reprieve until the end of December, and a further reprieve until the end of March. However, I do not believe the Government can take any kudos or say that it was responsible for the service finally being

continued, in spite of what the Premier might have said. I do not believe the Government used its initiative to seek funds from the Commonwealth. Of course, members on the other side are silent about this.

Then again, \$500,000 was allocated by the Government to provide free travel for metropolitan pensioners; but what about country pensioners? Are they to get nothing? Then we can go on to electricity charges. This was a tremendous issue at the time of the last elections when country people were told that uniform electricity charges would apply in this State.

This was good news which was well and truly believed. However, they were told that the higher rate they were paying, as compared to the lower rate paid by a metropolitan consumer was to be equalised; in other words, that the rate paid by the metropolitan consumer was to be lifted to meet the rate the country consumers were paying. They expected the reverse to be the case. I could go on to mention the road maintenance tax, but I will refrain from doing so on this occasion.

However, there is one item that has been brought to my notice and which I must mention because during this last week, it has shown its teeth and its prominence. I refer to the big teeth of the Environmental Protection Authority. I wonder how the Government views this authority now? Perhaps we can expect some of the teeth of this authority to be pulled in the next session. Therefore, there is a certain amount of confusion at the moment. I have listened to speakers on the Government side of the House praising the work the Government has done during its first 12 months in office, but I believe that if criticism is warranted it is only just and fair that it should be put forward and it is the duty of those members in opposition to ensure that the facts are put straight.

I now wish to mention a matter that is closer to home. In our area we are facing a problem which, although minor in size, is increasing in stature. I refer to the stinger. This is a jellyfish with feeler-like attachments that causes a degree of unpleasantness to anyone who comes in contact with it whilst swimming. I understand this jellyfish was reported at Busselton some time ago, but it is now progressively moving up the coast and starting to inundate other areas. I would appreciate it if the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna could inform us whether his department has had any opportunity to carry out an investigation into the habits of these creatures because I feel they can destroy some of our best tourist resorts. Whilst these jellyfish were contained in an isolated area they did not gain much prominence, but these stingers are now moving up the coast and being found in many other coastal areas where previously they were unknown.

I also wish to take this opportunity to refer to the rock lobster industry and how it concerns my electorate in particular. There are fishermen licensed in the area at Augusta, Margaret River, and Quindalup. They are now faced with a problem which has been created because of the standard of efficiency that has been attained by those engaged in the rock lobster industry in this State. Licenses were granted to these fishermen to operate in those areas as far north as the 33rd parallel. When one considers that these licenses were granted in the early 1960s, because of the number of boats operating at that time fishermen generally fished those areas they could satisfactorily service, but with the passing of the years the position has changed greatly. I am referring to the tremendous developments that have taken place in an industry which I regard as being most efficient. We must also take into account that the boats have become larger, faster, and can operate over a wider field, and the problem has now arisen that fishermen in Fremantle-based boats have now the opportunity to fish in the Cape Leeuwin and Cape Naturaliste areas. This has become a major problem, because the local fishermen in those parts cannot fish any further north than the 33rd parallel.

It is also important to mention that the type of rock lobster that is caught is the one that is known as the southern cray (*Jasus Hollandiae*). This is crayfish which, by its nature, congregates in isolated grounds, but once these grounds have been fished out this type of crayfish may not be seen again for some period of time which could be five years, and therefore the fishermen must find other areas in which to fish. There are four or five Fremantle-based boats laying upwards of 600 or 700 pots and fishing out many areas and this certainly presents a serious problem. I think it could be overcome by granting the holders of licenses in the south-west areas I have mentioned an extension to allow them to fish in other areas further north. I believe that this is a matter that should be reviewed, because I understand that the Fisheries Department realises the importance of the problem as it presents itself at the moment.

Whilst on the subject of rock lobsters there is another matter I wish to raise. I believe that in the area about which I have been speaking it will be necessary for greater protection to be given to the rock lobster as a result of the activities of spear-fishermen. In the area to which I have been referring, pots are being ravaged by spear-fishermen, but what is more serious is that when crays are being taken in this manner how can a spear-fisherman tell whether it is a spawning crayfish until after it has been speared? This is an industry which, to Western Australia, is worth \$17,000,000 on the export market. When one takes into account in what high regard the beef industry is held, I consider that the crayfishing industry, in compari-

son, certainly warrants some protection. I therefore hope the Minister will look into the question of the taking of crayfish by spear-fishermen, particularly when they use the hooker and air cylinder, because such equipment allows spear-fishermen to remain under water for a greater period of time.

Regulations are already gazetted which can be policed, but I ask members to keep in mind that this is 1972 and the use of high-speed fibreglass boats is quite prevalent. There is a multitude of road systems in these particular areas of which I speak, and a multitude of people who visit these fishing grounds in the summertime, but it is only a few persons who are creating these problems, because of their greediness in taking more crayfish than that to which they are justly entitled. I therefore ask the Minister to give consideration to this problem.

I wish to refer to another matter which concerns fishermen. I believe that in the south-west region of the State there is a need for the establishment of a fishmeal plant. I have had discussions with local fishermen and others involved in the fishing industry in this State and from the information I have been able to glean, whilst it has not yet been documented because no research has ever been undertaken on the subject, there does seem to be tremendous resources of the pelagic-type fish in this particular area.

I would now like to refer to the possible establishment of a fishmeal industry in the south-west of Western Australia. When we take the location of Western Australia, and particularly the western seaboard, into consideration we find that in the southern hemisphere the western seabords of South Africa and South America are served by a cold ocean current from the Antarctic Ocean. This current carries a vast amount of vegetable matter on which pelagic fish feed. It is significant that South America, in particular Peru, and south-west Africa are the worlds leading centres in pelagic fishing. It is also necessary to bear in mind that Peru and South Africa are situated basically in the same latitudinal position as the south-west corner of Western Australia.

Fishmeal has come into focus tremendously since 1948, and as agriculture continues to progress at the rate it must progress in order to survive, we realise that forced feeding and other methods of advanced animal husbandry will be used increasingly. In this field fishmeal comes into its own, because it has the highest protein content of any protein foodstuffs that are available in soya bean, meatmeal, etc.

The countries which are producing fishmeal include Peru, South Africa, and Chile. In 1948 there was no production of fishmeal in Peru, but in 1967, which was almost 20 years later, the production rose

to 816,000 tons. In South Africa the production in 1948 was eight tons, but in 1967 it was 190,000 tons. In Chile the production in 1948 was 1,000 tons, but in 1967 it rose to 164,000 tons. In Australia there was no production of fishmeal in 1948, but in 1967 there was a production of 1,000 metric tons, and basically the production in Australia has remained the same since 1967.

It is quite significant that countries which are similarly situated, as is the southern part of Western Australia, have shown tremendous progress in this direction. From what I have been able to find out from the industry within Western Australia, it is believed that similar supplies of fish do exist in the areas I have mentioned. It is all very well to speak of production. We may be able to produce an article, but how do we sell it?

The Australian consumption of fishmeal in the year 1957-58 was assessed at 1,000 metric tons, and in the year 1971 it had risen to approximately 36,000 tons. We should bear in mind that of this quantity of 36,000 tons consumed in Australia only 1,000 tons was produced locally. In concluding on this subject I would request the Government to undertake a survey to see whether it is feasible to commence an industry of this magnitude in the south-west corner of the State; or if it is unable to carry out the survey whether it would give adequate protection to private enterprise to do so. If the Government is not prepared to carry out a survey and private industry is, then I believe the Government ought to give protection to the industry by way of a tenure over production sites so that no other operator can operate a processing plant within a period of, say, 10 to 15 years after the commencement of production—that is, provided the industry proves to be feasible.

It is rather disappointing that the Minister for Agriculture is not in the House this evening, because I now intend to speak on the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme. However, other members of the Government are present, and I daresay they will inform the Minister for Agriculture of what I have to say, and in due course he will be able to answer any criticisms.

To refresh the minds of members, under this scheme the Commonwealth Government provided \$4,500,000 to the State on the basis that 50 per cent. of the money would be in the form of a grant and the other 50 per cent. would be repaid by the State to the Commonwealth. This was to assist dairy farms which were classified under the terms of the agreement as marginal dairy farms. Of course, for many years the dairying industry has been clamouring for such assistance.

When the Bill was introduced in the Federal Parliament it was accepted at that point of time that two States would re-

ceive the major benefit from the assistance that was offered, these States being Queensland and Western Australia. I believe that figures tell a story, and maybe some people say every picture tells a story. In this case the figures I am about to quote will tell the story of what has happened under this scheme.

To the 31st January, 1971, some 289 farms in Queensland had been purchased by the responsible authority, and these cost \$7,500,000. In New South Wales 20 farms were purchased at a cost of \$500,000. In Victoria 11 farms were purchased at a cost of \$200,000. It is quite interesting to note the figure for Victoria, because I have always presumed that the dairying industry in Victoria does not have any problems. In South Australia five farms were purchased for a total cost of \$100,000. In Tasmania seven farms were purchased for \$100,000. In Western Australia, where a major problem was said to exist, a total of 30 farms were purchased for \$700,000.

This brings me to the next point I wish to make. When we take into account the 289 transactions that were carried out in Queensland, and compare that figure with the 30 transactions that were carried out in Western Australia under this scheme—and both States are supposed to have a major problem—something seems to have gone wrong in Western Australia.

The response from Western Australia has been, to say the least, most disappointing. To substantiate this statement, I would like members to realise what has occurred since the inception of the scheme in September, 1970. For the first 12 months 89 persons applied to sell their properties under the scheme. In the seven months following that only nine persons applied; and I am rather disappointed the Minister is not here because these figures are quite alarming. Only \$700,000 has been spent in near enough to 18 months, and if the scheme continues to operate in this way, we will be lucky to spend \$1,000,000 out of the \$4,500,000 allocated.

The reason for the downturn in response is that those involved, although they started off with great expectations, have lost confidence in the scheme because of a lack of co-operation by the administering authority. I include the Minister in that criticism. Because of the lack of co-operation farmers are not prepared to offer their farms for sale even though the scheme could assist them.

The following is a report of a meeting of the dairy section of the Farmers' Union held in Manjimup on the 15th February:—

#### Dairy Reconstruction Scheme

#### CHANCE OF ENDING LACK OF CONFIDENCE

The failure of the Marginal Dairy Farm Reconstruction Scheme to win the confidence of dairymen in Western

Australia could perhaps be reversed now, Farmers' Union dairy section president, Mr. T. R. Noakes, told its annual conference last week.

That the scheme, launched with so much expectation, had not been accepted by dairymen, was borne out by the record—only 31 had taken part in the scheme.

But there was now hope that the confidence of farmers could be rekindled.

This is pretty good stuff, but we will see why it was to be rekindled. Where was our State Minister? The article continues—

Mr. Noakes said that he had taken advantage of a visit to Canberra this month to meet the Minister for Shipping and Transport, Mr. Nixon, a senior Cabinet Minister, and to call at the Department of Primary Industry.

He had spent a morning at the department to find out how the Commonwealth Government had interpreted its agreement with Western Australia on the reconstruction scheme, because the Commonwealth's agreement with each State differed.

The information he gathered has now convinced him that the Dairy Section's original interpretation of how the scheme should function had been correct.

This finding would now strengthen their hand in fresh negotiations with the State Government on the scheme.

Mr. Noakes added that the statements made by the Minister for Agriculture and the Administration on the scheme had been conflicting.

That reference is to our Minister for Agriculture. To continue—

The dairymen had last year sought representation on the policy committee for the scheme from the former Premier, Sir David Brand.

Sir David had indicated that this was not possible but representation would be given on the advisory committee that would liaise between the farmers and the Administration.

Mr. Bickerton: What was the date of that?

Mr. BLAIKIE: It was at the dairy section conference at Manjimup on the 15th February, 1972. Would the Minister like a copy?

Mr. Bickerton: No. I was just wondering what the date was. Was everything happy prior to the time the present Minister took over?

Mr. BLAIKIE: I am very pleased the Minister for Housing is taking such an interest in agriculture because the industries in the area I represent have been

sadly neglected by the present Minister. I am appreciative that the Minister for Housing is taking an interest.

Mr. Bickerton: I was trying to find out what happened previously. Were no complaints made then?

Mr. BLAIKIE: I have already given that information. I am sorry the Minister was not listening.

Mr. Bickerton: I listened to every word.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Included in the first 12 months after the inception of the scheme was the last six months of the Brand Government's regime and the results were extremely satisfying as the figures available show.

Mr. Bickerton: Were they?

Mr. BLAIKIE: Yes.

Mr. Bickerton: Why then were they complaining all the time to the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association?

Sir David Brand: Don't let him use your time.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The Minister for Housing has no idea of the subject. To continue, Sir David Brand agreed that a farmer would be included on the liaison committee. This assurance was subsequently endorsed by Mr. H. D. Evans when the Labor Government came into being.

Mr. Bickerton: Came into what?

Mr. BLAIKIE: However, the advisory committee has never met!

Mr. Nalder: Sounds like bulldust!

Mr. BLAIKIE: That is right. The problems of the farmers must be taken up directly with the Minister, and this is woe to the farmers because they get very short shrift and their individual problems are not recognised.

Mr. Bickerton: They have never had it so good in their lives as they have under the present Minister.

Mr. BLAIKIE: I will continue.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Leader of the Country Party should beware of using that word because of what occurred to Dr. Germaine Greer when she used another eight-letter word in New Zealand recently!

Mr. BLAIKIE: If I could interject at this stage—

The SPEAKER: The member for Vasse!

Mr. Bickerton: I thought you had a very good run in view of what you have said.

Mr. BLAIKIE: A scheme was developed for the benefit of those marginal dairy farmers in this State, but it has been completely bogged down by administration. However, I do not blame the administrators of the scheme. I blame the Minister for not taking heed of those people who time after time sought this liaison.

I would like to assist the House further in this matter by clarifying the point concerning how the people have lost confidence. In order to do this it is as well for members to know how the scheme operates in other States.

Mr. Bickerton: I would like you to clarify it.

Mr. BLAIKIE: In Queensland, New South Wales, Tasmania, and South Australia, the scheme is designed in such a way that any person wishing to buy a farm, first chooses a property to his liking, settles on a price, and then approaches the authority. The first criterion to be considered is whether the applicant qualifies; the second criterion is his ability to repay the loan.

Mr. Bickerton: This is for dairy farms only.

Mr. BLAIKIE: In Victoria the scheme operates somewhat differently. Farmers offer their properties for sale, and these are processed. If the farmer qualifies for assistance under the terms of the agreement his property is advertised for sale.

Mr. Bickerton: That is socialism.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The Minister has not heard about the Western Australian scheme yet which, at the outset, operated fairly satisfactorily. However, the final results have been shocking.

If a farmer in Western Australia wishes to buy a property he makes application to the authority. If a person desires to sell his property, he does likewise and then has his property valued, which in some instances has been much higher than current market prices. The authority then classifies the applicant—buyer or seller—to ascertain whether or not he qualifies for assistance under the scheme. If he does, then his case is considered on its merits. This applies to all applicants.

To explain the situation a step further, farmer A might wish to sell his dairy farm in, say, Busselton, and 10 or 15 farmers in the locality—they could be anything from five to 15 miles away—would be considered.

If any other neighbours have not made application the authority then seeks them out and classifies them to see whether or not they also qualify. But this operation can take months and is not satisfactory to either seller or buyer. This, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the frustration which is experienced. The Minister for Housing mentioned socialism, and to me this is rank socialism.

Sir David Brand: That is the policy of the Government.

Mr. Bickerton: Farmers like to socialise their losses and capitalise their gains!

Mr. BLAIKIE: I have outlined a situation which has developed in this State. It is a good scheme which could be frittered away.

Mr. Bickerton: I cannot understand how this has all happened in the last 12 months.

Mr. Rushton: It is easy to understand.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The scheme has been in operation for 18 months anyway, and only in the last 12 months has the present Government loused it up. The Government has not taken the opportunity to find out what the problems of the people involved in the industry are.

Mr. Bickerton: Why did the farmers put us in Government?

Mr. BLAIKIE: My concern is that we have a scheme to which ample Commonwealth funds have been allocated. However, the policies of the Government are preventing the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme from operating in the best interests of the industry in this State. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

*House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 28th March, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS: (5) ON NOTICE.

#### 1. BURSWOOD BRIDGE

##### *Commencement and Resumptions*

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) When is it planned that construction of Burswood Bridge will be started, and what is the estimated completion date?
- (2) How many, and what resumptions of private properties are involved in the construction of the bridge and its approaches?

The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. W. F. Willesee) replied:

- (1) Subject to the provision of adequate funds in the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act due in 1974, it is hoped that construction of the bridge will commence in 1974 and be completed within three years.
- (2) Until detailed design of the approach roads is completed the exact number of properties affected cannot be defined. However, it would appear that approximately 85 private properties will be affected, either wholly or in part. Of these 11 have already been acquired.