

not exceed the period specified opposite to that subject in the following schedule:—

Under "Clauses in the Bills" it is set out that a Member may speak for two periods of 10 minutes after the first occasion of 15 minutes. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken three times on this particular subject and I cannot allow any further discussion.

Mr. TONKIN: That Standing Order limits my discussion to three occasions?

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Mr. TONKIN: I bow to your ruling.

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not think it is an unreasonable request by the Leader of the Opposition to have such matters tabled. Surely Parliament, having approved the original agreement, is entitled to know what is going on in subsequent amendments. Surely, from time to time, the Government in its own interest, should table such amendments so that everyone will know exactly what the situation is with the company at any specific time.

If the Government is not prepared to do this it would look as though it had something to hide. I would suggest that the Minister is being completely unreasonable in denying this to Parliament. As the Minister said, Governments come and Governments go, and surely it is to the interest of the Opposition to know when any amendments have been made to agreements agreed to by Parliament. This information could be tabled. I do not say that it should be debated any further, but at least it would be made public, as is the original agreement. Surely this will not frighten away any of the companies referred to by the Minister by having the agreements publicised. If this were the case they would not want the original agreements made public. I do not see that the request is unreasonable.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Mining Act Amendment Bill, 1969.
2. Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment Bill.
3. Mines and Machinery Inspection Act Repeal Bill.

Bills received from the Council; and, on motions by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

House adjourned at 9.47 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 16th April, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (4): ON NOTICE

GUN LICENSES

Investigation

1. The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Justice:

Will the Minister investigate the situation regarding gun licenses, with a view to recalling licenses from holders who own a gun purely for amusement, and thus lessen the terrific amount of vandalism caused by itinerant shooters on weekends and holidays?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Firearm licenses are not issued to persons purely for amusement. Each applicant is required to satisfy the police as to his reason for requiring the license. What would be regarded as satisfactory reasons are: Sporting activities, destruction of vermin on farming or pastoral properties, professional kangaroo shooting, and membership of pistol, gun, or rifle clubs.

DUST NUISANCE

Redress to Householders

2. The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Mines:

What redress has a house owner whose house is situated on a freehold block, when a mining company creates a great dust nuisance during operations?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The application of the common law.

KIMBERLEY RESEARCH STATION

Establishment and Cost

3. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) In what year was the idea for the establishment of the Kimberley Research Station referred to the Rural Reconstruction Commission?

(2) Who were the members of the Commonwealth Rural Reconstruction Commission from 1943 to 1945?

- (3) Which Government of Western Australia made the negotiations with the Commonwealth Government to establish, on a joint responsibility basis, the Kimberley Research Station?
- (4) In what year was the Kimberley Research Station established, and who was the Premier of Western Australia, and the Minister for Lands, Western Australia, respectively?
- (5) What is the annual cost to the State of conducting the Kimberley Research Station?
- (6) Is it not a fact that the Kimberley Research Station has made, and is still making, a very important contribution to the potential development of northern Australia by agriculture and better animal husbandry?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The first reference of the idea for a research station to the Rural Reconstruction Commission cannot be traced, but the first reference in the Rural Reconstruction Commission report was in 1945, when initiation of investigations into the potential for irrigated agriculture in northern Australia was recommended.
- (2) The Commonwealth Rural Reconstruction Commission was appointed by the then Minister of State for Post-War Reconstruction (The Hon. J. B. Chifley), in February, 1943.

The members were—

The Hon. Frank Joseph Scott Wise—Chairman.

Mr. James Francis Murphy.

Professor Samuel McMahon Wadham.

Mr. Cecil Ralph Lambert.

- (3) Following preliminary discussion between Dr. Richardson, Chief Executive Officer of C.S.I.R.O., and the former Under Secretary of Agriculture (Mr. G. K. Baron-Hay), the then Prime Minister (The Hon. J. B. Chifley) under date the 2nd August, 1946, set out the proposed responsibilities of both the Commonwealth and State Governments to share the capital and operating costs, and this was accepted by the then Premier (The Hon. F. J. S. Wise) under date the 14th August, 1946.
- (4) Preliminary work commenced in 1945 and the original quarters were completed in early 1946. The Premier was The Hon. J. C. Willcock and the Minister for Lands was The Hon. F. J. S. Wise.

- (5) In 1967-68 the cost to Western Australia was \$144,673 for capital and operating expenses plus \$20,132 for salaries. For the five years commencing 1968-69 it has been agreed that the annual contribution to capital and operating costs will be \$186,000 plus salaries of State officers.

- (6) Yes.

MINING

Compensation to Pastoralists

4. The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister consider the re-establishment of a three-man tribunal to determine adequate compensation for pastoralists who have had their properties rendered unusable through extensive activities of mining companies, particularly where it is obvious that extensive mining operations are to be conducted in the particular area?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

I am not aware of the existence of any three-man tribunal being appointed to determine compensation.

Any claim for compensation for improvements on pastoral land resumed is subject to the provisions of the Land Act, having in mind the provisions of section 28 of the Mining Act.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning), and read a first time.

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION: SECOND PERIOD

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.44 p.m.]: I move—

That during the remainder of this second period of the current session, so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in any one sitting, and all messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith.

In moving this motion, I would briefly say that it is contemplated the present session will be completed by the 2nd May, which is a Friday. In asking members to agree to the motion I would point out that it is a customary one in order to facilitate the business of the House.

I would like to assure members that, provided the motion is agreed to, it will, of course, be used with discretion. I certainly have no reason to hasten unduly the business of the House, but there are times when the suspension of Standing Orders acts conveniently in respect of the passage of legislation through this place, particularly when it comes to the exchange of messages with another place. A similar motion is being moved in another place today, and this will assist in the exchange of messages between the two Houses.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.46 p.m.]: In seconding the motion, I accept the assurance of the Leader of the House that it will be used as more of a machinery matter to facilitate and expedite the business coming before us, especially the more routine matters which we can speed up. I give the Minister my assurance that we on this side of the House will endeavour to see that the business on the notice paper is completed—having full regard to the time that might be taken to study some Bills—on the date that he envisages the session will end.

I do not anticipate that anything we ask for within reason in regard to time to consider particular Bills will not be granted. I give the Minister an assurance that we on this side of the House will deal with anything that is reasonable as expeditiously as possible.

Question put and passed.

NEW BUSINESS: TIME LIMIT

Suspension of Standing Order No. 62

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That Standing Order No. 62 (Limit of time for commencing new business) be suspended during the remainder of this second period of the current session.

Mr. President, as you are aware, Standing Order 62 is the one which places a limitation on the time for the commencement of new business. The passing of this motion by the House certainly will not cause Ministers to want to sit after 11 o'clock at night. On the contrary, I am one of those who believe that we can proceed with the business of the day until a reasonable hour in the night and then adjourn to enable us to come back feeling fresh the next day.

Once again, at times it is a matter of convenience to introduce new business after 11 o'clock, for reasons similar to those I gave when moving the previous motion.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.48 p.m.]: Mr. President, I have only one thing to say: Not only do three Ministers dislike sitting after 11 o'clock at night, but also 27 other members.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Innkeepers Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and transmitted to the Assembly.

2. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill, 1969.

3. Brands Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

4. Reserves Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

5. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

PROPERTY LAW BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1969

Recommittal

Bill recommitted, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), for the further consideration of clause 1.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

Page 1, line 11—Delete the figures "1969" and substitute the figures "1967".

The reason for the recommittal is that a Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill was introduced in the previous period of the session. The draftsman thought that Bill had gone through, but it had not. It contained the figures "1967." The Bill, however, was removed from the notice paper in another place and we were informed of this fact.

I now want to ensure that the figures in this Bill read 1967 and not 1969. The legislation that was removed from the

notice paper was that referring to the spouse *versus* spouse provision to which members in this Chamber took exception. With the removal of that legislation the situation will remain as it is now.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Further Report

Bill again reported, with a further amendment, and the report adopted.

STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1969

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 15th April.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.56 p.m.]: Basically this Bill contains only one alteration to the State Housing Act. It puts the General Manager of the State Housing Commission onto the commission as an identity in his own right as general manager rather than as a member of the Public Service, which is the situation which obtains at the moment.

It is also proposed to take from the Housing Commission staff a senior executive officer who will substitute for Mr. MacKenzie on such occasions when he cannot be present at meetings of the commission. At any meeting of the State Housing Commission I think it is essential that the general manager or his representative should at all times be present, because each in his own right would be the only person competent to deal with the day-to-day situations and problems of the commission.

The other people appointed to the commission are there on a very different basis from that which applies to the general manager. He is the chief executive officer of the commission in relation to all its activities and the Bill would therefore ensure a continuity of thought or suggestion on every occasion the commission met. In the interests of the commission I feel it is essential that this Bill be approved.

It is true that senior officers such as Mr. MacKenzie have great calls made upon their time, because of the particular field of knowledge they possess, and though surprising, it is nevertheless easily imagined, that he might not be able to attend all the meetings of the commission. The next best thing to having this outstanding officer available is to have someone who is very close to him in the succession present at meetings of the commission during his absence.

To make this instrument active, and to correct the difference in the law as we have it at the moment, it becomes necessary to give the Minister power to nominate a deputy. This will be done with the passing of the Bill.

I foresee it is likely the deputy will not always be the same person over a period of time. Therefore the Minister would change the identity of the person he nominates as a deputy. I think basically the role is not a new one. It is the sort of thing one gets with companies where directors substitute for other directors. The whole basis is the continuity of the development of ideas; the continuity of what is developing and, most important, the presentation of day-to-day problems to the commission—problems that emanate from the hubbub of the State Housing Commission's activities.

So in essence the Bill provides that the general manager is specifically nominated to the commission in his own right as general manager, and his deputy is appointed by the Minister from time to time. I think this legislation will be effective and will produce better results. When the general manager is absent there will still be a continuity of thought, because the ideas on the day-to-day activities will be submitted by the deputy to this authority which has to make the final decision.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

EXOTIC STOCK DISEASES (ERADICATION FUND) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd April.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.4 p.m.]: This Bill is a conservation fund measure based a little differently from those which have been and still are in operation in this State. It proposes to enlarge the area or the breadth of the compensation field; and it is very interesting to note that it has been discussed at the Agricultural Council meetings and agreement has been reached between the States and the Commonwealth in connection with the fund.

I was asked in the corridor today, "What is the Agricultural Council?" The Agricultural Council is a body initiated by the late Sir Earle Page, when Minister for Commerce, in the very early 1930s. It is composed of the Ministers for Agriculture for all States, together with the Minister for Commerce of the Commonwealth, or the Minister for Trade of the Commonwealth. This body has, through the

years, made some most momentous decisions affecting the policies of States and the introduction of legislation in both the State and Commonwealth spheres.

Therefore it is very interesting to note—I do not know from which State the proposal emanated—this important change in attitude which has come through the Agricultural Council. Although there are no fundamental changes or departures in this Bill from existing legislation, I am interested to see that the Commonwealth now agrees to make a contribution to these funds. As far as I know it has not been disclosed—the Minister may be able to help me in this regard—to what extent the Commonwealth intends to contribute. I have seen no mention anywhere of that. I think Parliament, in the passing of a Bill of this kind, is entitled to know, because there is no secret about it. The Bill has been developed in conference in Canberra where agreement has been reached in so far as the States and the Commonwealth Constitutions have a like purpose. I am wondering whether the Minister could help us in that connection.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I will do my best.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is interesting to note, too, that this Bill in that context is confined to exotic diseases—not to diseases of this country, but diseases introduced. I suppose that is the sphere where the Commonwealth felt there was a distinct responsibility because of certain quarantine and other laws affecting the Commonwealth. The mention of blue-tongue, a disease rife in South Africa, is also very interesting because the incidence of blue-tongue is preventing Australia from obtaining the nucleus of herds of some of those wonderful crosses of the Brahmin and Herefords; crosses evolved by that wonderful geneticist, Dr. Bonsma.

When the Commonwealth Government was offered some stock from the doctor's experimental areas north of Pretoria, there was no possibility of being assured that all quarantine measures taken would be successful, and it certainly would have been a dire tragedy for the sheep population of Australia if blue-tongue was ever introduced to this country.

At the moment there is no compensation fund applying to sheep. Therefore this legislation in that particular, too, is very important for us to consider. However, at this stage I think we must regard ourselves as being very fortunate that no such diseases as foot-and-mouth, blue-tongue, or others have entered Australia, particularly when we think of the countries in which planes touch down and the fact that those planes are here within 24 hours with very little check as to where passengers have been walking in those countries.

As we have heard from Mr. McNeill on more than one occasion, if foot-and-mouth disease came to Australia, no matter where the incidence occurred, it would very quickly threaten the entire stock population of Australia.

I think this sort of legislation is of more than passing interest. The first Bill introduced into the Parliament of Western Australia to provide for compensation for the destruction of diseased animals was defeated, and it was not until a dire tragedy occurred in this State in the form of a swine fever epidemic in 1942 that people not only wanted such legislation, but clamoured for it. This resulted in the introduction of a Bill in 1942. At that period we had killed 8,000 pigs in Western Australia to prevent the pig population being decimated. I think it can be said that this epidemic was brought about by the relaxation of regulations.

It is only incidental that I had the worry of that outbreak; and it was enough to keep one awake when one thought that every day 1,000 pigs were being slaughtered and burnt in this State. The outbreak occurred very close to the metropolitan area where there were large concentrations of Americans in camps and those people were not required to pass many of their food-stuffs through quarantine. Unboiled scraps were fed to pigs which were in close proximity to a camp. One grower found an unusual sickness in his pigs and he sold 1,000 of them through the Midland yards. They were turned into bacon, and scraps and rind of the bacon were thrown into other unboiled swill and the State was very quickly affected.

If members are interested in that very serious but historic matter they will find on page 1756 of the 1942 *Hansard* that a document from the Director-General of Health was read to this Parliament. He said—

... the quarantine regulations governing the importation of meat, produce and vegetables from the United States of America have been lifted temporarily so as to enable such foodstuffs to be imported into Western Australia for the sole use of the United States Forces.

This State paid a very heavy price for that Commonwealth relaxation. Most of it occurred simply because our own laws relating to unboiled swill being fed to pigs were not completely altered. I give that illustration to show how—I repeat—we are on the edge of a volcano in regard to animal health. Therefore the greatest precautions possible must be taken. That is the first responsibility; and the second is the method of combating such a scourge if it occurs.

I was interested in a question, notice of which was given this afternoon. I do not know what the Minister may say in reply,

and I would not anticipate it, but I have a note here I wanted to use. I firmly hold the view there should be no ceiling to the amount of money kept in such funds as insurance to cope with such difficulties when they occur. I support this Bill. It combines many of the provisions in existing laws and is very important in regard to stock of all kinds in the State of Western Australia.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [5.14 p.m.]: I rise to ask a few questions arising out of the remarks of the honourable member who has just spoken. He mentioned that this Bill has been brought forward as a result of a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council. Some time ago I asked questions about this body and I was not very happy with the answers I received.

Each year this council meets in rotation in the various States. The meeting this year was held in Hobart. I take it that the agenda is prepared by the Departments of Agriculture in the different States, and that matters of interest vital to primary production throughout Australia are discussed.

I asked some questions in this regard but I could get no answers regarding what matters were discussed or what decisions were arrived at. I can quite understand why matters of a confidential nature should not be disclosed, but I feel there must have been a number of matters from which eventually we may get legislation similar to that now before us.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This could have been initiated in Western Australia.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: It may have been. Yet we can find out nothing about these matters. Where conferences are held and representatives from each of the States are pooling their ideas I think the country should get the benefit, and that was the purpose of my question—to see if I could find out what matters had been discussed and what decisions, if any, could be disclosed; because these are all points of interest and, arising out of the information we are all better equipped to make our contribution to the affairs of State.

As Mr. Wise mentioned, I have heard Mr. McNeill, Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Wise, too, refer to the grave danger there would be to this country if another exotic disease were to be introduced. For instance, in Great Britain a few years ago there was an outbreak of an exotic disease and it cost the people involved hundreds of millions of pounds. What a tragedy it was. Therefore the setting up of a fund to cover an occasion such as the disaster I mentioned, is most desirable. I, too, support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. N. McNeill.

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd April.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.18 p.m.]: This Bill is distinctly complementary to the measure we have just discussed and it enables the compensation fund, after establishment, to be disbursed when compensation has to be paid for beasts destroyed in an endeavour to eradicate a disease.

However, there is something else in this Bill which is of interest. It provides—and this is quite a new departure, and a good one—for the recoupment of the cost of vaccination. That is most important.

I think it is a good step forward to have Bills of this kind introduced, and although one of them deals only with exotic diseases we also have enzootic diseases which are endemic, or belong to a locality at a given time. These local diseases are also being provided for so that the compensation fund may be extended to cover that aspect, and its use is certainly being expanded in an endeavour to keep control, where necessary, of all outbreaks of diseases. I support the measure.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. N. McNeill.

BANANA INDUSTRY COMPENSATION TRUST FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Banana Industry Compensation Trust Fund Act of 1961, which was given a life of seven years, and is due to expire on the 18th April, 1969, established a trust fund for the payment of compensation to banana growers in the event of loss caused by cyclones, storms or floods, or any natural cause, pest or disease. The fund is composed of contributions made on a basis of \$2 from the growers and \$1 from the Government. Its credit balance is at present \$88,751.

The Carnarvon Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association has requested further continuity in the life of the Act. The trust fund committee concurs with this view, and because of the undoubted value of the existing legislation as an influence in the stabilisation of banana growing in the Carnarvon district, the Government agrees that a continuation of the provisions of the Act for a further seven years is desirable, and this Bill makes provision accordingly.

There are, in addition, some other amendments requested by the association. A new definition of "case" is desirable

because bushel cases of various dimensions are now being used and have displaced the standard case previously favoured.

The present rate of contribution by growers to the fund is 20c in respect of every case of bananas sold. In view of the type of case now being used, and to be defined in the Act, it is proposed to amend this amount to 15c, a figure which is proportionate to the size of containers now in use.

Quite naturally, this amendment affects the compensation provisions, which, at present, are assessed on a basis of \$2 per case. This figure is to be reduced to \$1.50 per case, representing a reduction in proportion to the size of the container.

A further amendment concerning compensation will allow each patch or planting of bananas damaged on a property to be considered separately. It has been contended by growers that as separate plantings can be at different stages of growth, ranging from young to mature plants, this amendment is desirable, as, for instance, the more mature plants are more liable to damage. It has been the practice to assess the damage on each planting separately and then strike an average for the whole property, compensation being paid if the loss exceeds 20 per cent.

Assessment along these lines is considered by the growers to be unrealistic, particularly when a planting in production is damaged, and unproducing plantings remain unaffected. As a result, the assessment on the existing basis can result in little, if any, compensation being payable.

It is therefore intended to amend the Act to obviate the continuance of the system of compensation payment on an average loss and replace this by an assessment of separate plantings, as requested by the Carnarvon growers.

It is further proposed to increase the complement of the Banana Industry Compensation Committee from three to four members, in order to allow for two elected grower representatives. As a consequence, the committee on the passing of this measure would comprise an officer of the Department of Agriculture, who is chairman, an officer of the State Treasury, and two representatives elected by the growers. I presume they will elect one from each side of the river, because they seem to have two associations.

In commending this Bill to members, I would remark that the assistance under existing provisions has provided much needed financial security and enabled growers to withstand the shock of two cyclones during the life of the legislation. It is considered that the amendments now proposed for the extension of this protection for the industry over a further period of seven years is well warranted, and the amendments, as affecting contributions

and compensation, to be soundly based on the practical application of the Act in the interests of the industry over the past seven years.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

TRADE DESCRIPTIONS AND FALSE ADVERTISEMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members will be interested to know that legislative amendments along the same lines as those contained in this measure have been, or are being introduced into every State Parliament by Ministers in charge of textile labelling. This is as a result of an agreement reached at a conference held in Queensland last year.

The amendment now proposed was requested by the Australian Agricultural Council and was supported strongly by the Australian Wool Board. Its purpose is to enable the Australian Wool Industry to participate fully in and benefit substantially from a world-wide promotion of the sale of wool being undertaken by the International Wool Secretariat under what is known as the Wool Mark Programme.

The amendment has been designed to permit the use of the description "pure wool" or "all wool" for textiles containing not less than 80 per cent. sheep's wool and not more than 5 per cent. fibres other than speciality animal fibres; namely mohair, cashmere, alpaca, llama, vicuna, and camelhair. A textile product may not currently be described as "pure wool" if it contains less than 95 per cent. sheep or lamb's wool. This requirement puts Australia at a disadvantage in the international wool sales promotion scheme.

It is a fact that most major wool producing countries permit the description "wool" to be applied to textile products resulting from a blending of sheep's wool and the speciality animal fibres which I have just mentioned.

The exceptions have been Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Mexico, and Belgium. We are advised that legislation of a similar nature to that proposed in this Bill is to be introduced in New Zealand and South Africa and, further, that Mexico and Belgium have the matter in hand also.

Acceptance of the proposal contained in this Bill will mean that the wool brand mark, as well as the description "pure wool" or, alternatively, "all wool" may be used on textiles containing not less than

80 per cent. sheep or lamb's wool and where, at least, three-quarters of the balance—or 15 per cent. of the total weight—comprises speciality animal fibres previously mentioned. As a result, Australian wool products will then suffer no such disadvantage in competition with textile products produced in other countries and labelled "wool."

I should mention that considerable research has been undertaken to ascertain whether the proposed increase in the percentage of fibre, other than sheep or lamb's wool, would produce a textile, the characteristics of which would differ materially from fabrics which, up to this point, have qualified to be described as "pure wool."

Associations of dry cleaners have advised that no real problems would be created in relation to dry cleaning, provided the animal fibres in question possessed similar characteristics to what would be conventionally regarded as wool, and this is the case in regard to the fibres mentioned.

Research conducted by the Australian Wool Board to ascertain whether the inclusion of any or all of the specified animal fibres in a blended wool fabric would produce an allergic reaction to the wearer, has indicated that there is no cause for alarm in this regard. This opinion has been supported by an independent check carried out by the Queensland Department of Health.

I am advised that no objections to the proposals now being made have been registered by any organisation approached and these included, apart from those already mentioned, chambers of manufactures and the Textile Council of Australia. This latter council, incidentally, proposed the use of the alternative description "all wool."

The other amendment in the Bill is of a slightly different nature and its purpose is simply to include carpets under the definition of textiles in the parent Act.

The increasing use of synthetics or man-made fibres, either wholly or in blends with wool and/or other animal fibres in carpet manufacture has reached such proportions that these goods should be required to carry a trade description similar to that required in regard to textiles generally.

A further amendment will facilitate the inclusion of other materials as textiles by regulation rather than necessitate bringing the Act to Parliament for amendment as has now been required to include carpets under the definition of textiles.

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

PROPERTY LAW BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Justice) [5.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Before the motion is put, Mr. President, I would like the opportunity to say that I have made some inquiries in relation to clause 122 of the Bill which was debated last night. Mr. Willesee inquired, as a matter of interest, whether the airspace above a building would be limited by the insertion of the new subclause (7) into clause 122.

I am advised that clause 122 of the Bill empowers the court to deal with applications by either party affected by building encroachments over block boundaries. The clause covers all likely contingencies as regards surface encroachments, such as intention, gross neglect, etc., and whether it is just and equitable in the circumstances that relief by way of compensation should be granted or an easement accorded in favour of the encroaching owner.

The clause, as provided, is not specific, however, as regards other types of encroachments, such as subterranean or overhanging buildings in airspace. While the building might not encroach at its foundations, it might encroach at a higher level. Two buildings might start on the same parallel and not be completely vertical with the result that one may encroach upon the other at a higher level, perhaps with a top storey or canopy flying over the vertical projection of the boundary of the building block.

The purpose, therefore, of the new subclause (7) being added to clause 122 is purely to enable the court to deal with such projections in airspace which encroach over the building line of the building block; or, alternatively, to deal with underground encroachment in a similar manner as the clause, as drafted, permits the court to deal equitably in the matter of orders covering surface encroachments.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.33 p.m.]: It was quite interesting to hear the Minister's reply to the query I raised. I was somewhat concerned over what would be considered the ultimate area of airspace in matters of this nature. However, it is obviously a domestic matter between the parties.

I was also conscious of the fact that air could have a variation in value. For instance, if it is mixed with fumes from hops it becomes very expensive!

I do not think it will be possible for people in the future to take members of Parliament to task for what they do with

regard to legislation if ever the current measure is referred to. When the Minister introduced the Bill he referred to it as "lawyer's law," and every amendment has been presented by the hierarchy of law in Western Australia. If this legislation does not have a smooth passage before judges, I give up!

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I will bet that it does not.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 16th April, 1969

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

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Rejection: Petition

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed to The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled. It reads—

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia, hereby humbly petition the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia to do all within their power to reject the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, 1968.

The main grounds of our objection are that your petitioners are deeply concerned that any direct intervention to take away the life of a baby in its mother's womb is a violation of the right to life.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is only requisite upon you at the moment to tell us shortly what is in the petition. If the honourable member wants the petition read, he must have a motion carried by the House to that effect. Just tell us what it is about, how many signatories there are, and who is the organisation that presents it.

Mr. HARMAN: The objective is to petition the members of the Assembly to do all within their power to reject the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, 1968. The petition is signed by 29,028 petitioners, and I certify that the petition conforms to the rules of the House. I move—

That the petition be received.

Question put and passed.

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

The petition was tabled.

QUESTIONS (53): ON NOTICE

WOOL EXPORTERS ROYAL COMMISSION

Report

1. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

- (1) Have the findings of the Royal Commission into Wool Exporters been completed?
- (2) If so, when is it contemplated that the report will be made available to members of this House?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) No. It is anticipated, however, that the report will be completed by the end of this month. Consideration can then be given to meeting the honourable member's request.

WHEAT TRANSPORT

Receipts

2. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Would he please advise the House of the income received for each of the months from November, 1968, to March, 1969, by the Railways Department for the transport of wheat by rail?
- (2) Could he supply the figures of similar months for the preceding three years?
- (3) What percentage of the total income of the railways has wheat been responsible for over each of the last three years?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2)

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
	\$	\$	\$	\$
November	84,938	184,458	357,467	266,856
December	959,440	1,060,741	1,214,876	725,345
January	1,462,908	1,388,210	1,277,666	886,984
February	1,257,811	903,319	1,121,876	422,307
March	1,115,863	1,053,505	849,098	*280,000

* Approximate. Final figures not yet available.

- (3) 23.20%, 25.37%, 22.82%.

The percentage of the total income for 1968-69 is not yet available as the financial year has not been completed. It must be remembered that there is a terrific amount of wheat in the country areas at the moment and this, again will reflect on the railway revenue for the current year.

CANNINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

Upgrading

3. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Education:

When will the Cannington High School be upgraded to a fourth and fifth year high school?