

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill.
Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), read a first time.
2. Public Education Endowment Act Amendment Bill.
Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 7th April, at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 25th March, 1970

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

SUNDAY TRADING IN LIQUOR*Referendum: Petition*

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

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

We, the undersigned members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church of Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the subject of the proposed alteration of the law on Sunday trading in liquor.

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

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

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 180 signatures.

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

LOWERING OF DRINKING AGE AND SUNDAY TRADING*Referendum: Petition*

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

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

We, the undersigned, being citizens of Kalgoorlie, Boulder and Kambalda, Western Australia, do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will consider the holding of a Referendum on the subject of:

1. Lowering of the legal drinking age from 21 to 18 years.
2. That hotel trading hours on Sunday should be doubled in country areas and changed to allow trading in the metropolitan area at specified hours.

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

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

The petition has been signed by me, and it carries 337 signatures.

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

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE*Tabling of Report*

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) [4.34 p.m.]: I have for tabling the report of the Standing Orders Committee recommending certain amendments to Standing Orders. The Standing Orders Committee has considered one or two matters raised in the House, and one or two other matters that have become necessary because of alterations to the Constitution Act. Accordingly, I table the report.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [4.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the report be printed and its consideration be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

QUESTIONS (44): ON NOTICE

1.

POLICE***Vandalism***

Mr. CASH, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) In view of the increasing incidence of vandalism and damage to public property and the desecration of churches and war memorials, will he give further consideration to a re-examination of the laws relating to such offences to see if heavier penalties are warranted?
- (2) Whether it is considered that changes in the financial penalties are warranted or not, will he give further consideration to the introduction of additional "work" penalties appropriate to the nature of the particular act of vandalism committed?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) These matters are under review as a result of recommendations made by a special research committee set up to investigate all aspects of vandalism.

2.

VERMIN TAX***Revenue***

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the vermin tax review been completed?
- (2) Can he give the House any further information on this question?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Various proposals with regard to possible changes in the vermin tax system are being prepared for submission to the Government.

3. **TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITY*****Rockingham-Kwinana Area***

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

Relating to my question of the 19th instant which referred to the establishment of facilities for technical education in the Rockingham-Kwinana region—

- (1) How many classes are required now at the Fremantle Technical College for students from the Rockingham-Kwinana area?
- (2) How many students from the Rockingham-Kwinana area attend technical schools and colleges?

- (3) What number of students are considered sufficient to justify the establishment of a technical institution in the Rockingham-Kwinana area?

Mr LEWIS replied:

- (1) Six classes are required specially for the heavy industry in Kwinana.
- (2) This information is not kept as a departmental statistic. (It should be noted that many students who work in the Kwinana area live in other districts and find it more convenient to attend technical classes in those districts.)
- (3) Students enrol in various courses and study at different rates. Therefore, technical institutions are established on student hours of study and not on student numbers.

Departmental regulation 207 provides for the establishment of—

- (a) technical colleges;
- (b) two grades of technical schools;
- (c) six grades of technical education centres.

Currently there is a class IV technical centre conducted at the Medina High School and the regulations provide for reclassification as the student study hours increase.

4.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT***Mining: Rating***

Mr. BURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

What is the system to be adopted by local authorities when rating—

- (a) gold mining leases;
- (b) mineral leases;
- (c) mineral claims;
- (d) temporary reserves?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (a) to (d) The system of rating by Municipal Councils is to levy a rate on either annual or unimproved value of land in accordance with the limits subscribed in section 548 of the Local Government Act. Temporary reserves are not rateable.

The basis of valuation of gold mining leases and mineral leases are:—

Annual value as per subscribed in section 533(4) (e) of the Local Government

Act. Unimproved value as prescribed in section 533(3) (e).

Mineral claims: Annual value as prescribed in section 533 (4) (e). Unimproved value as prescribed in section 533 (3) (g).

5. SURFBOARDS

Safety Measures

Mr. BURKE, to the Premier:

Further to my question of the 19th March regarding the design of surfboards, would he advise the date on which the special sub-committee's report was received?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

19th January, 1970.

6. WATER SUPPLIES

Desalination Plant

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware of the portable desalination plant that has been produced by Water Desalination Plant Pty. Ltd. of Panorama, South Australia?
- (2) If so, does this type of plant offer bright prospects for use in Western Australia?
- (3) If "Yes" will he give an explanation of how and where it could be used?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) In answer to the three questions I advise that Water Desalination Plant Pty. Ltd. is a small firm which is developing a vapour compression unit. As I understand it, it is a well-known desalination process. Inquiries have so far revealed that the plant is still in the developmental stage.

7. SCAFFOLDING INSPECTORS

Vacancies

Mr. TOMS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) How many scaffolding inspectors have left the Department during the last 12 months?
- (2) What is the number of vacancies at the present time?
- (3) Is difficulty being experienced in obtaining such inspectors and, if so, what steps will be taken to rectify the position?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) Nil.
- (3) No.

8. HEALTH

Eating Houses: Inspections

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

In view of the public concern caused by the discovery of the body of a mouse in a prepared meal purchased on the 17th February last from a Perth restaurant which was found to have filthy walls, mice and cockroach infestation, rodent excreta, holes eaten into bags containing food, rusted tins of food, rotting food-stuffs, etc., will he cause to have inquiries made and advise—

- (a) the dates of previous inspections of these premises during the two years preceding the complaint;
- (b) what was the nature of these reports respectively;
- (c) at what intervals are inspections of eating houses usually carried out by the City of Perth;
- (d) does he propose any action to ensure a more rigid adherence to cleanliness and health requirements;
- (e) if so, what is the nature of the action?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) 1968 and 1969 one inspection every two or three weeks. Since December, 1969, approximately once a week.
- (b) Generally unsatisfactory as regards standards of hygiene.
- (c) Twice a month.
- (d) and (e) I understand that the City of Perth Health Department is now enforcing requirements more strictly and giving less time for improvements to be carried out.

9. *This question was postponed.*

10. HOSPITALS

Northam Regional

Mr. McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When is it envisaged the Northam Regional Hospital will be completed?
- (2) What has caused the extended completion date, since February, 1970, was originally nominated?
- (3) Will the original tender price of \$3,772,107 have to be increased; if so, to what extent and why?
- (4) What provision is being made for long term patients when the regional hospital becomes operative?

- (5) Is it contemplated building nursing units as is being done at Albany and Bunbury?
- (6) If "Yes" how many and when?
- (7) If "No" why?
- (8) Where regional hospitals have been constructed have the local authorities been asked to contribute to equipment?
- (9) If so, would he supply details?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 1st September, 1970, but furnishing and equipping will take about eight weeks.
- (2) Labour shortages, both "on site" and in the manufacturers' factories.
- (3) Yes. The estimated cost is now \$4,023,989. This has resulted from "rise and fall" clause variations and sub-contract prices being above the provisional sums allowed for in the main contract.
- (4) Initially long term patients will be accommodated in the regional hospital and in some existing buildings to be retained temporarily for the purpose.
- (5), (6) and (7) It is intended to build a long term care unit when funds are available.
- (8) Yes.
- (9) The amounts provided locally were approximately—
 - (a) Albany—\$12,300.
 - (b) Bunbury—\$19,000.
 - (c) Geraldton—\$15,000.

11.

TRAFFIC

International Road Signs

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has consideration been given to the installation in this State of international road signs for the control or information of road users with a view to—
 - (a) a reduction in the road toll;
 - (b) catering for international travellers who bring their vehicles to this State;
 - (c) making it easier for Western Australians to adjust to overseas conditions when travelling abroad per vehicle?
- (2) If not, will such consideration be given?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes. However, in the interest of traffic safety and efficient traffic movement throughout Australia as a whole, uniform road signing practice as outlined in the Standards Association of Australia Road

Signs Code has been adopted by all States. Nevertheless, the Australian Committee on Road Devices has the existing code under review. The committee includes an Australian representative to recent United Nations conferences on road signs and signals, and in preparation of the new Australian manual due cognisance is being taken of the United Nations convention in order to ensure as far as practicable future uniformity of road signing practice at the international level.

- (2) Answered by (1).

12.

SEWERAGE

Mt. Hawthorn

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

When will the small area which is roughly described as being between Sasse Avenue and Jugan Crescent, Mt. Hawthorn, which is low lying and which is long established, be serviced by deep sewerage?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The Water Board is aware of the need to have this area sewered and has carried out some design work with this in view. Completion of design has been postponed until firm details of proposals for the extension of the Mitchell Freeway are available. These proposals and also redevelopment contemplated by the Perth City Council will affect the sewer design, so no firm date can be given for the commencement of the work.

13.

RAILWAYS

Employees: Retrospective Pay

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Railways:

What is the total sum which will be paid to the railway men for retrospective pay?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

It is anticipated that the total sum will approximate \$100,000.

14.

MARRIED PERSONS AND CHILDREN (SUMMARY RELIEF) ACT

Section 99 (1)

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

Further to his answer to my question without notice on the 10th September, 1969, what action has or will be taken in respect of

subsection (1) of section 99 of the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act and why?

Mr. COURT replied:

No action to amend the section is considered desirable. The court should have this power to be able to have all facts considered necessary to reach a decision in any matter before it.

15. *This question was postponed.*

16. TUART HILL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Hall-Gymnasium

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Education:

When is it expected that a hall-gymnasium will be built at Tuart Hill Senior High School?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

A definite date has not been determined as it has been necessary to give other major works a higher priority.

17. NATIVES

Quairading Incident: Police Action

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Has he read page 23 of the *Independent* of the 22nd instant wherein reference is made to two incidents which allegedly occurred at Quairading earlier this month and which involved action by police against natives?
- (2) In view of the serious nature of the allegations will he give details of the circumstances or cause enquiries to be made in order to check the veracity of the reports and if necessary take appropriate action?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. Inquiries are currently being made.

18. POLICE

Natives: Quairading Incident

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has he read page 23 of the *Independent* of the 22nd instant wherein reference is made to two incidents which allegedly occurred at Quairading earlier this month and which involved action by police against natives?
- (2) Will he give an explanation of the circumstances in view of the serious implications of the reports?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes, the publication has been noted.
- (2) The matter is currently under investigation by the District Police Inspector at Narrogin following reports submitted by the officer-in-charge of Quairading Police Station.

19. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Balingup and Donnybrook Shires: Amalgamation

Mr. H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) It is correct that the amalgamation of the Balingup and Donnybrook Shires will now take place on the 26th March, 1970, instead of the 30th June, 1970, as initially proposed?
- (2) Has the amalgamation been approved by Executive Council?
- (3) On what day did Executive Council give this approval?
- (4) Was notice of the intention to bring about the amalgamation on the 26th March, 1970, communicated in writing to the shires concerned, and upon what date?
- (5) Was any reply received from the two shires involved?
- (6) What reasons are given for the early amalgamation?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The 18th March, 1970.
- (4) No. Councils were advised in writing on the 6th August, 1969, of the decision to unite the two districts and the date of amalgamation was suggested as the 1st July, 1970. Councils were subsequently advised by telephone in March, 1970, of the variations and requested to inform the Local Government Department if any difficulties would be created by the decision.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) The reason for uniting two districts on the 26th March, 1970, was to enable the new Council to be elected at the annual election on the 4th Saturday in May, and thus obviate the holding of two separate additional elections for members who would hold office for a brief period only. This procedure has been applied to the uniting of the districts of the Shire of Swan-Guildford and the Town of Midland, and also to that of the districts of the shires of Greenbushes and Bridgetown.

20. **GRAZING LAND***Drought-affected Stock: Northcliffe Area*

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

- (1) What is the total area of Crown land in the Northcliffe area which has been made available for the agistment of sheep from drought areas?
- (2) To what companies or persons has such land been leased for the purpose stated above, and what is the area involved in each instance?
- (3) What charge or fee has been levied by the Lands Department in each case?
- (4) What is the total number of sheep which are grazing or have been grazed upon these lands?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Approximately 40,000 acres on the area known as the Fingerup Plains. Vacant Crown land only is involved, and State forests were excluded.
- (2) No leases have been granted. The right to graze stock, on a non-exclusive basis, was granted to Benbullen Graziers and Producers Pty. Ltd.
- (3) As grazing rights were granted on an emergency basis, as a measure of drought relief, and after consultation with the local authority, no charges or fees have been levied at Northcliffe, or any other area.
- (4) This information is not available. Grazing rights were granted on condition that the land was not over-grazed, as the natural carrying capacity is low.

I might add that when the drought hit us last year, to enable stock to be preserved approval was given where possible, subject to investigation by the local authorities concerned, when it was found that Crown land was available for stock coming from drought areas. This is an instance where stock have been preserved and this happened in a number of cases, after consultation with the local authorities concerned.

21. **DAIRY REHABILITATION SCHEME***Eligibility*

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

- (1) When is it expected that the dairy rehabilitation scheme as outlined by the Minister for Primary Industry and accepted by this State will become operative?

- (2) Will he indicate the conditions necessary for an individual to establish eligibility for participation in the scheme?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) On the 10th March, 1970, I telegraphed the Minister for Primary Industry seeking his co-operation in finalising the proposed Agreement between the Commonwealth and the Western Australian Governments for implementation of the Dairy Farm Reconstruction Scheme.

The Minister for Primary Industry has acknowledged my request and I am presently awaiting further details from him.

- (2) The conditions laid down under the Scheme will be announced when the agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments is finally executed.

22. **GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS***Rent Paid to Private Landlords*

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Premier:

What price per square foot per annum is the Government paying for accommodation in each of the following Perth buildings—

- (a) Claver House;
- (b) Vapech House;
- (c) Willmar House;
- (d) 190 Hay Street (Jaxon Building)?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (a) Claver House. Rental \$2.65 per square foot per annum including air conditioning but does not include rates or cleaning.
- (b) Vapech House. Rental \$2.85 per square foot per annum including air conditioning but does not include rates or cleaning.
- (c) Willmar House. Rental \$3.00 per square foot per annum, including air conditioning and rates, but does not include cleaning.
- (d) 190 Hay Street, (Jaxon Building). Ground floor \$2.75 per square foot per annum. 1st floor \$2.50 per square foot per annum. Other areas \$2.40 per square foot per annum.
Rentals include air conditioning and rates but do not include cleaning.

23. RAILWAYS

South-West: Operational Losses

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Railways:

What action is contemplated to reduce the operational losses incurred during 1968-69 on all sections of the south-west railways?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

Major proposals in this direction include replacement of steam locomotives by diesel traction, upgrading of the permanent way to permit heavier axle-loading and introduction of cyclic permanent way maintenance to reduce gang strengths.

24. RAILWAYS

Marshalling Yard: Picton

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is a marshalling yard to be established in the Picton area to serve the new harbour or will it be served from the present marshalling yards in Bunbury?
- (2) What tonnage of fertiliser has been hauled ex Picton Works to Bunbury for marshalling purposes for the years 1968-69, 1967-68, 1966-67?
- (3) What amount of freight has been charged for such haulage and is freight charged from Bunbury to Picton on fertiliser hauled to Bunbury for marshalling purposes?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Intentions are that in the planning of the railway to serve the new harbour, long term provision will be made for a future yard at Picton.
Until such time as this phase is implemented, existing facilities at Bunbury will continue to be used.
- (2) This information may not be available in full but will be provided.
- (3) There is no freight charge raised for the haulage of fertiliser between Picton and Bunbury for marshalling purposes as the movement is performed for the Railways Department's convenience.

25. ROAD TRANSPORT

Ilmenite

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the tonnage of ilmenite hauled by the government operated road trucks for the years 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69?

- (2) What is the haulage rate charged per ton for ilmenite transported by the W.A.G.R. road trucks?
- (3) What amount of Road Maintenance Tax has been paid on government owned trucks engaged in ilmenite haulage for the years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (1) | Tons |
| | 1966-67—180,915 |
| | 1967-68—172,711 |
| | 1968-69—224,174 |
| (2) | The W.A.G.R. is attracting this business under normal commercial competitive practices. Rates are on a contractual basis which are confidential to the parties concerned. |
| (3) | \$ |
| | 1966-67—43,498. |
| | 1967-68—42,397. |
| | 1968-69—47,343. |

26. MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Administration of Various Acts

Mr. JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Which Minister is responsible under the Mining Act to renew temporary mining reserves and to state the conditions under which they may be renewed?
- (2) Which Minister is responsible for administering the Harbours and Rivers, Regulation of Anchorage Act, which controls the rules and regulations applying to the harbours of the State?
- (3) Who is the Minister who has the authority under the Land Act to approve the amalgamation of vast pastoral areas and their transfer to company ownership?
- (4) Which Minister is in charge of the public relations and publicity for the Government and does he approve the mass of Press and radio statements made on behalf of the Government and relating to the administrations above referred to?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Minister for Mines.
- (2) Minister for Works.
- (3) Minister for Lands.
- (4) In general terms individual Ministers exercise authority over Press statements emanating from their own departments and in connection with matters for which they have special responsibility. No Minister is specifically in charge of public relations but matters of Government policy in this field are broadly my responsibility.

27. POLLUTION

Kwinana Freeway Foreshore

Mr. DAVIES, to the Minister for Works:

Can any action be taken to eliminate or minimise the unpleasant smell which has been emanating for a considerable period from the Swan River in the region of the Kwinana Freeway foreshore, near the South Terrace turnoff?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The area of the river in this vicinity is very shallow and includes what is known as "Reed Island".

Whilst it is not a gazetted bird sanctuary, the Fisheries and Fauna Department consider this and Pelican Point to be very important areas, particularly as they are used by a large number of migratory birds. The department has asked that they should not be molested or the environment interfered with.

Being a shallow area and at low tide exposed, it is at times somewhat malodorous, but present thinking is that it should not be altered.

28. QUAIRADING AND BROOKTON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Prefabricated Classrooms: Fans

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Education:

As wall type fans are to be installed in demountable classrooms when may the same necessity be expected to be installed in the Bristol prefabricated classrooms at Quairading and Brookton Junior High Schools?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

This matter is presently under consideration.

29. HOUSING

Exmouth

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Now that the United States Navy is building 70 more houses in Exmouth with an anticipated additional 26, will his department be building any more—

- (a) project houses, and
(b) Commonwealth-State rental homes,

in Exmouth?

- (2) Has he read a statement by the Civil Commissioner at Exmouth, Col. J. P. K. Murdoch, in *The West Australian* on the 18th

March that the R.A.A.F. will have about 450 servicemen and their families in Exmouth by 1971?

- (3) If "Yes" can he advise the House if his Department will be required to provide houses for the married servicemen and, if so, how many?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) The State is awaiting a Commonwealth Government decision.
(b) Yes.
(2) No, but information as to R.A.A.F. plans and intentions is known to the commission.
(3) The extent and financing of housing for the airfield construction and subsequent operational phases are now being determined by the Commonwealth authorities.

30. SCHOOLS AT EXMOUTH

Extension

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he read a news item in *The West Australian* on the 18th March giving details of the immediate development of Exmouth wherein the Civil Commissioner, Col. J. P. K. Murdoch, said that the American Navy was building 70 homes for their personnel and expected that another 26 homes would follow and, in addition, it was expected that the R.A.A.F. would have 450 service personnel and their families in Exmouth by 1971?
(2) In view of this statement have any plans been made to extend the Exmouth Junior High School or build a new primary school and, if so, what are they?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) Additions consisting of four classrooms, science, home economics, and manual arts facilities are under construction. Ample accommodation will be available.

31. FERTILISERS

Nitrogenous: Prices

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Can he advise the House the price of the various types of nitrogenous fertilisers used for agriculture in—

- (a) Queensland;
(b) New South Wales;
(c) Victoria;
(d) South Australia?

Mr. NALDER replied:

This information is not readily available and will be supplied to the member when it has been collated.

32. FERTILISERS

Rail Freights from Other States

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Railways:

What is the rail freight per ton on fertilisers from—

- (a) Queensland;
- (b) New South Wales;
- (c) Victoria;
- (d) South Australia?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

In asking this question, I take it the member for Gascoyne wants the figures for rail freight on fertilisers in Western Australia to make a comparison with the rates in the four States he has mentioned, and I therefore supply the following information to him:—

At the average distance of haul in Western Australia (180 miles)—

- \$
per ton
- (a) 6.60
 - (b) 5.65
 - (c) 3.85
 - (d) 3.07

33. BUILDING BLOCKS

Shark Bay

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Lands:

Is it the intention of his Department to make any building blocks available in Shark Bay; if so, when and how many?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

Yes. Approximately 30 lots will be offered by public auction as soon as services have been arranged.

34. *This question was postponed.*

35. HOSPITALS

Bentley

Mr. MAY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that the Bentley Hospital is unable to provide accommodation for all patients requiring hospitalised attention?
- (2) Is he further aware that the maternity section of the hospital is unable to cope with current applications and, in particular, from local residents?

- (3) What further extensions are envisaged?
- (4) What is the anticipated date for commencement of the extension?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) and (4) Extra beds will be provided at Bentley Hospital when funds can be allocated for the purpose. The area's bed accommodation will be assisted when the proposed 32-bed maternity wing is built at Armadale-Kelmscott Hospital, tenders for which will be called shortly.

36.

RAILWAYS

Indian-Pacific Service

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Railways:

In connection with the Indian Pacific rail service will he advise—

- (1) What is the present period of waiting for berths (1st and 2nd classes) from Perth to the Eastern States?
- (2) Since inauguration, what were the weekly number of berths vacant (1st and 2nd classes) on the Indian Pacific for the Western Australian portion of the journey ex Perth?
- (3) Does South Australia hold priority seats on the Indian Pacific for passengers desirous of travelling from Adelaide to Sydney?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) First class accommodation is fully booked up to and including Thursday, the 18th June, 1970. Economy class is fully booked to and including Thursday, the 28th May, 1970.

		First Class	Economy Class
W.E.	5/3/70	1	4
	12/3/70	12	49
	19/3/70	15	37
	26/3/70	2	13

- (3) The South Australian Railways' allotment for passengers from Adelaide to Sydney is 12 first class and 28 economy class berths on each train but this distribution is currently under review.

37.

MANNING ROAD

Upgrading

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Will he refer to questions dated the 19th September, 1968, the 31st October, 1968, the 7th August,

1969 and letter dated the 9th December, 1969, concerning the upgrading of Manning Road, Manning?

- (2) Is he aware of the many accidents and near-miss accidents which are occurring frequently on this high density vehicular road?
- (3) In view of the funds set aside by the Main Roads Department to assist with the upgrading of this road can some positive move be made to expedite commencement of work?
- (4) Are any resumptions necessary before work can be commenced?
- (5) If so, to avoid further procrastination, would it be possible for work to commence on the eastern section of the road near Clontarf College?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The Main Roads Department is pressing on as quickly as possible with negotiations with the various local authorities in order that some work may be put in hand at an early date.
- (4) Subject to agreement with local authorities, work could be carried out on sections of Manning Road where no land resumption is involved.
- (5) Answered by (4).

38. MITCHELL FREEWAY *Resumptions and Plans*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

With reference to my question of the 18th instant regarding the proposed Mitchell Freeway—

- (1) Were members of the public informed by Town Planning that their homes would be demolished?
- (2) Were residents of the area shown a diagram at the Town Planning office showing line of freeway cutting through their properties?
- (3) If his department resumes properties in this area would it be prepared to reimburse owners for additions to the present structure?
- (4) Can he advise how it is possible to sell properties in question when potential purchasers are advised by Town Planning that their properties are totally affected by new route of freeway?

- (5) As stated in *The West Australian* of the 19th March, that ratepayers have been advised in the Mt. Henry area on what to do with their land or houses, will he agree to prepare a similar statement to residents in the Mt. Pleasant area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) No. However, a preliminary plan prepared by the Main Roads Department to show the carriageway concept has been used to illustrate the proposal when answering public enquiries. The public has been advised that the plan illustrates the principle only. As stated in my reply to question 34 (4) on the 18th March, no detailed plan can be made available at present.
- (3) As in the case of land, property is acquired at market value at the time of acquisition.
- (4) Properties that are reserved under the provisions of the Metropolitan Region Scheme may be sold with the compensation safeguards provided by the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act. Properties that may be required for road works cannot be defined until detailed plans are completed.
- (5) The newspaper report of the 19th March is a little misleading. The Mt. Henry ratepayers have not been advised regarding the future of their land or houses. The report was intended to indicate only that some preliminary information might be given to interested enquirers. Detailed preliminary plans will not be available until about the middle of 1971.

I wish to explain that the answers to questions (1) to (4) were obtained from the Town Planning Department. As to question (5) it is possible that the member for Canning has misinterpreted the newspaper report of the 19th March, and an extract from the relevant section of that report is given as follows:—

The department has done preliminary work on the Mt. Henry proposal, enough to inform ratepayers of what to do with their land and houses.

39.

POLICE

Dress of Defendants

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Did he read *The Independent* dated the 22nd February, 1970, re a man being present in court without any pants?

- (2) Will he ensure that this situation is not repeated?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.

40. WESTERN ALUMINIUM N.L.

Waste Disposal

Mr. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) With regard to waste disposal from Western Aluminium N.L., Kwinana, is the Department of Industrial Development at present considering the feasibility of increasing the storage capacity of the Spectacle Swamps area Mandogalup?
- (2) As this disposal site is close to land designated urban and part of the Orelia townsite is he in a position at this stage to give guarantees—
 - (a) that any changes in the storage capacity of the swamp will not require it to extend over the present alignment of Thomas Road; and
 - (b) will not intrude into or be adjacent to land at present gazetted as urban?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) An adequate area of residue disposal is a prerequisite for the operation of Western Aluminium's alumina refinery at Kwinana. The swamp area at Mandogalup is one of the areas which has been set aside for this purpose. Plans for its utilisation have not yet been finalised.
- (2) Until final plans are drawn up and approved I am not in a position to be specific but full regard will be had for all factors during the current studies.

41. STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Lots in Naval Base Area

Mr. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) As a consequence of the sale by the owners of lots 271 and 272 Burlington Steet, Naval Base, to Messrs. H.A.M., N.V. will the S.E.C. continue its efforts to purchase adjacent property and also properties to the south in Macedonia Street?
- (2) If not, does it intend to make available for purchase lots in this area which it has latterly acquired?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The commission will continue its efforts to acquire lots 273 to 276 inclusive in Burlington Street and lots 263 to 267 inclusive on north side of Macedonia Street.
- (2) See (1).

42. BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT *Amendment*

Mr. HARMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) In view of the significant rise in the cost of building will he amend section 4 of the Builders' Registration Act to allow an unregistered builder to obtain a building permit in excess of \$2,400?
 - (2) If so, when?
- Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
- (1) and (2) This matter will receive consideration when the Act is next amended.

43. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES *Generation and Sale of Units*

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What were the—
 - (a) total number of units of electricity generated by the S.E.C. during the years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69;
 - (b) total number of units sold annually by the metropolitan system for the years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69;
 - (c) number of units of electricity sold annually by the S.E.C. outside the metropolitan area for the same three years?
- (2) What was the average price charged annually per unit for these three years—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) outside the metropolitan area?
- (3) What price per unit is necessary to operate a uniform tariff schedule to all the commission's consumers and produce a similar revenue as that achieved annually for the years previously mentioned?
- (4) What were the total annual receipts from the sale of electricity for the last three years from—
 - (a) metropolitan area;
 - (b) outside the metropolitan area?

Mr. NALDER replied:

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
(1) (a)	1,344,397,100	1,672,961,070	1,901,937,570
(b)	1,058,923,416	1,165,851,021	1,337,702,770
(c)	209,641,319	240,922,585	279,381,267

- | | | | |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| (2) (a) | 2.147c | 2.147c | 2.116c |
| (b) | 2.351c | 2.395c | 2.437c |
- (3) Large electricity supply authorities divide consumers into different classes depending upon the nature of their demand for electricity, so that each class makes a fitting contribution to the cost of making a supply available. Hence a uniform tariff for all consumers is not practicable and the question is beyond solution.
- | | | | |
|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| (4) (a) | \$22,737,860 | \$25,031,732 | \$23,306,897 |
| (b) | \$4,929,040 | \$5,769,220 | \$6,807,919 |

44. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Uniform Power Rate

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Has he seen the reported statements by the Leader of the Opposition contained in *The South Western Times* of Thursday, the 12th March, 1970, concerning uniform power rate, which read—
- (a) "That Electricity Minister Nalder had said it would cost \$2,000,000 to introduce a uniform rate";
- (b) "He had no hesitation in saying that it would cost no more than \$500,000 and it could be done"?
- (2) Is the first quoted statement correct?
- (3) What substance is there in fact in the Leader of the Opposition's statement; i.e., cost of no more than \$500,000?
- (4) What is the approximate cost of—
- (a) introducing a uniform rate for domestic power;
- (b) introducing a uniform rate for all power using the metropolitan rate as the base?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No, not until it was brought to my attention by the honourable member.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The statement is incorrect.
- (4) (a) and (b) The answer will be made available to the honourable member as soon as the information is obtained.

PERTH MINT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.7 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I want to correct an answer I gave to an interjection during the course of my reply to the second reading debate yesterday evening. Whilst I was speaking there was an interjection from a member who asked whether dispensation orders would be gazetted. I said that they would be; but, of course, that is not so. I began to alter my speech when I received the report of it last night.

There is no intention for these dispensations to be gazetted, but there is the intention, of course, to gazette the areas that will be declared; that is, water control pollution areas or any modification of the areas or the by-laws, but not the dispensations. So I regret that information was conveyed to the House, and I want to correct it at this juncture.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

PUBLIC EDUCATION ENDOWMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Lewis (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Council.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

FISHERIES ACT

Disallowance of Regulation 3AA: Motion

MR. JONES (Collie) [5.9 p.m.]: I move—

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

I would like to refer the House to the debate which took place on this question in the first sitting of the present session of Parliament. Reference to page 2577 of *Hansard* of 1969-70 will disclose that following questions which were asked by a member in this House as to whether it was the intention of the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna to introduce new

regulations to control the fishing of marron and other types of fish, we were advised that it was the intention of the Minister to bring down certain new regulations. Following the speeches which flowed from this side of the House the Minister for Works, who represents the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna in this Chamber, indicated the feelings of the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna on this question. The debate on that matter was left at that point.

On page 2577 of *Hansard* of last year the questions and answers mentioned in the House on the 11th November, 1969, are clearly recorded. They show what the Government intended to do in respect of the proposed regulations. I spoke at great length on a number of regulations which the Minister reported were then under consideration. It is not my intention to refer to the questions which, I understand, were asked by the member for Belmont or to the replies given, because they are generally in conformity with the regulations that were subsequently gazetted on the 17th December, 1969. I do not think it will be contended that there is much difference between the substance of those regulations, and the questions and answers I have referred to. Perhaps the verbiage of the regulations has been altered a little, but their intention is the same and they do not differ very much from the information that was given to the House on the 11th November, 1969.

I would like to remind members that when speaking to matters which were raised in the debate on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) I strongly opposed a number of points. Reference to *Hansard* will show that, in particular, I was opposed to several to which I shall now refer. To list them: firstly I agreed that there was a need for conservation, especially in regard to marron, as did the member for Warren when he supported my remarks. I would request the Minister to advise from where the information was obtained, or who conducted the survey, to ascertain that the catch of marron should be restricted to 30 in number. Reference to *Hansard* will reveal that this question still remains unanswered. We were not told from where the figure was obtained: but the figure of 30 marron as the maximum permissible catch was put forward. I posed a question to the Minister when he was referring to this matter, but reference to *Hansard* will reveal that that question still remains unanswered.

In the debate on the 12th November, 1969, I referred to catches and to the permissible size of the catches. In mentioning the maximum permissible catch of 30 in the Manjimup-Pemberton area, and comparing it with the same maximum permissible catch in the Wellington Dam, I indicated that in my view the marron in

the Manjimup-Pemberton area were much larger than the species to be found in the Wellington Dam and Collie area.

In that debate I also opposed strongly the introduction of the inland amateur fishing license. It will be recalled that the answers given to the questions I have referred to indicated that it was the intention of the Government to amend the regulations to prescribe that an inland fishing license costing \$2 was necessary before anyone would be permitted to fish for marron, cobbler, and perch, which are found in the rivers in the southern portion of the State, and also for cherabin and other species which are found in the northern waters.

In concluding my speech on the 12th November, 1969, I strongly and violently opposed the requirement for school children and pensioners to obtain licenses before they could go fishing or could participate in this sport. I still hold those very strong views. I do not think it is necessary for children and pensioners to have to pay for these licenses. To say the least, the position of children in this regard is very clouded. This is shown in a letter which the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna wrote to the Bridgetown Shire, and this letter appeared in the local Press. I shall refer to that letter later. The position is very clouded, because the Minister is purported to have said that he was not worrying about the position of the children.

The position is not clarified in the regulations which indicate that if children fish without first obtaining an inland fisherman's license they are open to prosecution. It will therefore be appreciated why I have moved this motion.

I would like to refer to the remarks of the Minister for Works in replying to me when I raised this question last year, because I feel they are very important and have application to the content of the motion under discussion. I do not intend to refer to all the matters I raised at the time or to all the Minister said.

The Minister mentioned conservation, about which there is no argument, but the remarks contained in the paragraph to be found on page 2585 of *Hansard* No. 15, under date the 12th November, 1969, I feel are the most important made by the Minister. Therefore I think I should read that paragraph. It is as follows:—

At the same time, I understand there have been requests from many parts of the State for conservation measures to ensure the continuation of certain species of marron. There have been requests to not wait until they have just about been fished out. As the member for Warren pointed out, it is necessary that one should have more officers policing regulations and taking steps to conserve our natural fauna. I agree with that

statement. It is all very well to have regulations, but what is the use of them if they are not policed properly? As I said, the regulations are not yet drafted and members will, in due course, have an opportunity to determine their effectiveness.

It will be appreciated we did not have the opportunity to indicate our views very strongly on that occasion when we were discussing the questions and answers involved. However, now that the regulations have been gazetted we are able to express our views concerning them. The following is to be found on page 4110 of the *Government Gazette* dated the 17th December, 1969:—

FISHERIES ACT, 1905-1969.

Department of Fisheries
and Fauna,
Perth, 9th December, 1969.

HIS Excellency the Governor in Executive Council acting pursuant to the provisions of the Fisheries Act, 1905-1969, has been pleased to make the regulations set forth in the schedule hereunder, to take effect on and after the 1st day of July, 1970.

B. K. BOWEN,
Director of Fisheries.

Schedule. Regulations.

Principal
regulations.

1. In these regulations the Fisheries Act Regulations published in the *Government Gazette* on the 6th May, 1938, and reprinted as amended pursuant to the Reprinting of Regulations Act, 1954, and published as so reprinted in the *Government Gazette* on the 30th May, 1967, are referred to as the principal regulations.

Reg. 3AA
added.

2. The principal regulations are amended by adding after regulation 3A a heading and regulations as follows:—

Inland Fishing License.

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

(2) The fee payable for and on the issue of an inland fisherman's license shall be two dollars.

(3) Every inland fisherman's license issued in pursuance of this regulation is subject to the following conditions:—

- (a) That no brown trout, rainbow trout, redbfin perch, freshwater cobbler or barramundi shall be caught by any means other than a single rod, reel and line, or by a single line, held in the hand.
- (b) That no more than six drop nets, or one pole snare or one hand scoop net shall be used in the taking of marron or cherabin.
- (c) That not more than ten trout shall be taken in any one day.
- (d) That not more than thirty marron shall be taken in any one day.
- (e) That fish caught by a person licensed in accordance with this regulation shall not be sold, consigned or offered or exposed for sale.

I will not weary the House by reading the remainder which merely indicates the schedule to which reference has been made and covers the different species of fish concerned.

Members will realise that the regulations now gazetted are not very different in context from those foreshadowed in this House last year. The point I wish to make—and I do hope that Country Party members will adopt a sensible attitude on this matter—is that inland people do not have the opportunity to enjoy hobbies to the same extent as city people, and yet they will now be forced, if this regulation is not disallowed, to apply for a license to catch perch and cobbler whereas at present there is no restriction. I can understand the Minister's concern regarding conservation, but why has he included redbfin perch and cobbler when there is no prohibition at all on the number of perch or cobbler which can be caught? There is a limit with regard to marron, the maximum catch allowed being 30.

I put it to the House: Why should it be necessary for inland people to obtain a license before they can catch redbfin perch or cobbler? Actually, some people say that these fish are a menace so far as other fish and marron are concerned. I do not know the attitude of the member for Warren, but in my electorate many old pensioners pass their idle moments by catching perch and cobbler. If no conservation problem exists in regard to

these species, why is it necessary for those people to obtain a license? I can see no reason for it.

When speaking last year in this House on this matter the Minister made it quite clear that the Government is concerned about conservation, but there was no mention of cobbler or redfin perch. Consequently, if the Government is not worried about the size of the catches of these types of fish, because their numbers are not diminishing, why is it necessary for school children and pensioners—these are the two groups about whom I am most concerned—to obtain an inland fisherman's license before they can fish for redfin perch or cobbler?

Another point is very often a whole family will go out for the day on a fishing trip. A man might take his wife and children marroning, but under these new regulations every member of a family must obtain a license. I ask members: Is there any need for the Government to go this far?

Mr. Lapham: Have you got a license?

Mr. JONES: I have not, because the regulations are not as yet in force. If they were, I would naturally have obtained one. However the regulations in question do not come into force until the 1st July this year.

The point I was about to make concerns the school children and pensioners, and this is the part of the whole situation which I deplore. In my view the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has clouded the issue and made the situation even worse. Actually, I do not think he knows his own intentions. I will back this statement up by a quotation from an article published in March in a Bridgetown paper. The article quoted a letter written by the Minister to the Bridgetown Shire Council, and portion of the letter which, I repeat, was written by the Minister, reads as follows:—

With regard to your concern for boys in your district, I cannot imagine any circumstances which would lead to a prosecution action being taken. I will not read the whole quotation, but other references deal with a letter the shire wrote to the Minister regarding his intention to amend the regulations.

My contention is that the position is not clear. In one instance the regulations stipulate that it is necessary for any person who desires to catch marron to first of all obtain a license, and school children are included. Yet the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has written to the Bridgetown Shire Council stating that as far as children are concerned he does not think that action would be taken against them. If this is the case, why do we not clarify the situation? Why do we not specifically exclude school children from the provisions in the regulations? The Minister has

stated that as far as he is personally concerned children will not come under this provision so why do we not clearly define the situation in the regulations?

I would say to the Minister handling the matter in this House that the situation is very confusing, to say the least. If the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna holds the opinion as expressed in the paper to which I have just referred why does he not define the situation clearly and indicate that certain people, and especially school children and pensioners, are exempt from the provisions of the regulations?

A moment ago I referred to pensioners and I have a very strong feeling for them. A big majority of the population in my community comprises pensioners. Why should they be charged a fee of \$2. If they want to catch a perch—in the main they do not go marron fishing—why should they be charged a fee of \$2, especially if there is no question of conservation involved?

I believe that the solution to the problem concerning conservation is an easy one. It has been revealed in the Press from time to time that people have been convicted for catching undersized marron and I feel that such convictions will act as a deterrent to others who might otherwise be inclined to catch very small fish, or those not in line with the provisions of the regulations.

I appeal to the Minister to have another look at these regulations and at least exclude school children and pensioners. Personally I do not see any necessity for anyone to obtain an inland fisherman's license. If a person desires to catch perch or cobbler, which are the only two types of fish in our local rivers, he must pay \$2. However, what about pensioners in seaport towns? They do not have to pay \$2 in order to catch herring or whiting, so why should people in inland towns be compelled to pay \$2 in order to have the privilege of catching a few perch or cobbler?

I feel very strongly about this and I hope that members of the Country Party will support me in my views on this issue. If this license is to apply to pensioners in the inland towns, then it should apply equally to pensioners in the seaport towns. However, I do not believe there is any need for an amateur license at all, particularly in the case of pensioners. Surely in the last few years of their lives they should be able to enjoy themselves by throwing out a line and catching perch or any fish; and I think the Minister could well have another look at this situation.

In my view there are too many licenses. A supplement in the *Daily News* on Wednesday, the 18th March, revealed the situation very clearly. As I understand it, an amateur fisherman fishing for crayfish must apply for a \$2 license. If the same fisherman desires to indulge in net

fishing he must apply for another \$2 license. If the same person desires to fish for trout, redfin perch, marron, barramundi, cobbler, or cherabin, he must pay another \$2 for an amateur fisherman's license. This means that that fisherman must obtain four licenses in order to fish for all those different species. I want to know why four licenses are necessary. Why could not one cover the lot? Surely it is not unreasonable to suggest that if a man likes this type of sport he should be able to fish for any species he likes; but under the existing regulations he is required to obtain four amateur fisherman's licenses before he can fish for the different species to which I have just referred.

I realise the situation may vary somewhat in different areas and perhaps the Pemberton area is harder to police than Wellington Dam. In the Manjimup-Pemberton area, people generally fish in the rivers and, of course, it is very difficult to police marron fishing in the rivers due to the vast distances involved. Perhaps the situation is easier in Collie where there are fewer accessible fishing spots. Certainly the honorary wardens in Collie do not have much trouble in policing the Act in this respect.

Whilst there may be difficulties, I feel the problem can be solved. I think the solution lies in the appointment of more honorary wardens. If more people are caught taking undersized marron this will be a greater deterrent to the fishermen who catch marron.

As a matter of fact, the question of conservation in the Collie district has solved itself, as the Minister for Works well knows, because the Wellington Dam is now at its lowest ebb for many years, due to the drain on the water resources by the drought areas of the State. It is impossible now to fish for marron in the dam due to the amount of silt. One sinks to one's waist or, at least, to one's knees.

Doubtless the department is worried about conservation and, to a degree, I share concern on this question.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course there are other rivers and streams apart from the dam to which the honourable member refers.

Mr. JONES: There are marron in the rivers, but there are not many. I say this from my own knowledge, because I go fishing quite often, and also from the knowledge of those to whom I have spoken in the town. In the main, children and some of the older folk may fish in the rivers, but those who enjoy marron fishing prefer to go to the weir where the fishing is more enjoyable. At the weir it is possible to place baits in the water and the walking is quite good whereas it is very difficult at the river, because of the branches and scrub through which it is necessary to

move in and out. Consequently, fishing at the river is not as enjoyable as fishing at the weir.

As far as I know, Collie is the biggest dam in Western Australia in which marron can be caught. The majority of people in Collie like to go there because of the conditions and for the outing; it is more pleasant to take one's family there than to fish from the banks of the river.

I think I have indicated my position quite clearly. I shall reiterate my main points for the benefit of the Minister. Firstly, I do not see the need for the introduction of an inland fishing license for amateur fishermen. I truly do not see that the introduction of such a license can assist conservation in the district I represent. Secondly, pensioners and children should not be required to obtain such a license. If the Government has any consideration whatsoever for pensioners and the vast number of school children in Western Australia, it will amend this regulation. Further, the Government might also give some consideration to the matter of one license for a family instead of everyone having to obtain a license before being able to enjoy marron fishing.

I trust members of this Chamber will realise why I have moved the motion and I sincerely hope the Minister will give some consideration to the points I have raised.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.35 p.m.]: I support the action of the member for Collie who has moved for the disallowance of new regulation 3AA made under the Fisheries Act. I would like to clarify my attitude and indicate my reasons for offering him my support.

The grounds of disagreement, as I see them, stem from several causes, but basically they emerge from the license requirement which is laid down. In the first instance, I cannot see any necessity for the inclusion of redfin perch and cobbler in the regulation, as shown in the schedule. For example, perch are particularly voracious eaters and, as a consequence, they take a disproportionate amount of the available food from our streams which, in any event, are not regarded as being very conducive to water life. Consequently, they make it very difficult for other species to survive.

Furthermore, perch are prolific breeders and tend to over-breed in a very short period. Consequently, the run of fish becomes considerably smaller—dwarfed, as it were. This is the general experience of people who have introduced them into dams throughout the south-west areas and it is a hypothesis which is fairly well proven. So far as fresh water cobbler are concerned, very few fishermen show a great interest in this kind of fish. The inclusion of these two species of fish only occludes the regulations, as they exist at the moment.

The requirements of the license have been worded rather badly, to say the least. I do not intend to read through all the requirements, but regulation 3AA (i) refers to a person who catches or attempts to catch certain fish which are listed in the schedule at the bottom. This suggests that every single person who participates in the sport of fishing for one of these water creatures is necessarily involved with a license.

I realise it is not possible to license fishing in the same way as radio and television, where the receiver set or unit is the object of the license and the medium by which the levy is made. However, it is possible for the Government to consider a family license, which would include the school children mentioned by the member for Collie who, quite rightly I feel, takes umbrage at the fact that the license is applicable to them at the moment. I suggest the Minister should give strong consideration to that point when re-examining the regulations.

When pensioners, as a class in the community, are considered, it seems rather severe to involve them, too, in a license. I am sure that only very few pensioners would participate in marron fishing and this fact, to my mind, is the major consideration.

The need to conserve marron has become increasingly obvious and I acclaim any action on the part of the Government to further this motive. This is something in which I have been interested for many years and, indeed, the reaction to this subject is most revealing. Ten years ago the question was one of polite interest, but now every single marron fisherman is aware of what is taking place in the streams of the lower south-west. Stocks of marron are diminishing at an ever-increasing rate and I do not suppose it would be an exaggeration to say that a stranger who goes to any major town in the south-west would have very little chance of catching a haul of reasonably-sized marron.

I have previously indicated in some detail the reason for this decline. I will content myself with indicating, in summary form, that the major causes are, firstly, increased accessibility to marron-stocked waters. This is because of the tracks that the Forests Department have necessarily put in in the course of forest management and also because of the greater number of boats being used on the rivers. There are therefore very few parts of the south-west rivers which are inviolate from marron fishing enthusiasts.

The second point made was the increased number of fishermen. I think an increasing proportion of these would be New Australians. They see that we have a delicacy which is unique in the world and they are prepared to go to far greater

lengths to catch marron than are the indigenous Australians. In the past, the attitude of fishermen towards conservation has been, "All right, let us conserve them, but for ourselves." Of late, however, an increasing number of thinking fishermen have seen that the end is rapidly approaching.

Conservation means and requires two things. Firstly, it requires regulations, which must be policed. Secondly, it means research which will enable sound regulations to be framed, recognising that control and research are the two essentials upon which we must rely for any hope of conservation of these creatures. This would probably apply in a general sense, too. This brings us to the principle which is involved and the amount of the license fee.

Control and research involve a certain cost. The Minister who introduced the proposals into the House said during the debate last year that the Government expected that a substantial amount of revenue would come from license sources. I am at variance with him on this point and on the amount of the fee that is contemplated. As marron stocks are declining at the rate I have suggested, I agree it could be argued that the cost of trying to combat this should be borne to some extent by the fishermen themselves. It becomes a matter of degree, and in my opinion \$2 is an excessive amount; half of that would be somewhere nearer to the figure.

We must have regard for the fact that there are quite a number of people who go out only once or twice during the season. Tourists passing through the area are more likely to take kindly to a fee of \$1 than to twice that amount, as is at present proposed. The issue of licenses by the Tourist Bureau, which I understand has been contemplated, will make it much easier for tourists. Every tourist bureau to which I have spoken has expressed willingness to co-operate in this manner, but I think there is less chance of people accepting a fee of \$2.

It is most desirable to have acceptance of this principle of licenses and ultimately the co-operation of all those who participate in fishing. The necessity to take out a license will make people realise the responsibility that they have in the matter of conservation. It may be a vain hope but I think that at least it should be tried. It is an approach to education, which implies the goodwill, awareness, understanding, and co-operation of the public at large. This is something that is not achieved overnight but if any policy is to be ultimately successful this is where its strength will stem from. The license does have the advantage of allowing fishermen to participate in a conservation measure, but the greater the amount of the license the less chance there is of acceptance of it.

I do not find a great deal of fault with the other provisions of the regulations. They indicate the numbers permissible for catching and the methods of catching. The question of size was previously established in other regulations. To my mind, these are acceptable, but I think that the policing of these regulations is of considerable importance. It is better not to have a regulation at all than to have one that is not policed and which is simply flouted. It becomes an object for contempt and this contempt spreads into other areas. The policing of regulations is, I think, a basic principle of law and regulation-making.

The difficulties in enforcing these regulations cannot be exaggerated or over-estimated. The rivers of the south-west extend over many hundreds of miles. There are even more hundreds of miles of roads and tracks by which access is gained. The practical difficulties confronting the fisheries inspectors cannot be minimised and I doubt whether they would have a great deal of success in apprehending offenders if they did not receive the co-operation and guidance of local residents, on whom they would have to depend to a large extent. However, the deterrent effect of the presence of inspectors, even though few prosecutions are made, would at least serve to bring about a greater degree of conservation than we have at the moment.

The member for Collie indicated that to some extent the conditions in the two areas are different. The main fishing area in his district is a large body of water and I understand that the conditions are different from those which apply in the rivers further south. However, insufficient research has been done in both areas and it will be some years before the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, through its research officers, can give any valid guidance or reasoning which could be made the basis of solid and lasting regulations. I feel that separate treatment for the two areas could be considered, although this might make conservation too fragmented. However, it is something that should be considered in the interests of the constituents of Collie.

It is on the note of a general license, which has already been suggested, that I would like to terminate my remarks. There are four separate licenses required by the general fishermen and the enthusiasts seek a variety of creatures. It could be preferable to have a single license for the four situations and I hope that the Minister will consider this.

I would like to support the motion moved by the member for Collie to disallow the regulation as it stands at the present time.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works).

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEES

Establishment: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 10th September, on the following motion by Mr. Bickerton:—

That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken to set up:—

- (a) A Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee; and
- (b) A Joint Parliamentary Standing Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.51 p.m.]: This motion is one of the leftovers from the earlier part of this session. It was moved by the member for Pilbara, who has shown a keen interest in obtaining a favourable opinion from this House towards the setting up of standing committees under a number of headings. On the last occasion he spoke at great length and gave details of what had taken place in other States. However, in the main, the public works committee of South Australia was the subject of his discussion.

The member for Pilbara originally set out to press for the setting up of three committees—a public accounts committee, a public works committee, and a subordinate legislation committee. After considering the case he put forward and listening to a number of people who felt that some action should be taken, the Government decided it would proceed to set up a public accounts committee, even though this has not been done by every other State in Australia.

It is interesting to note that no standard in regard to any of these committees has been established in Australia. There are differences of opinions between the States as to what is a valuable committee, or otherwise. However, we have decided to proceed with the setting up of a public accounts committee. We propose to set it up as a standing committee, and not by way of legislation. This method is in line with those of the other States. It is planned to finalise whatever machinery arrangements are necessary so that the standing committee, along with other standing committees, may be established at the beginning of the next session of Parliament. The details and the terms of reference of the committee will be announced when they have been finalised and accepted by the Government. However, I would stress that

the Government has made a definite decision that we will have a public accounts committee operating in the Legislative Assembly, as a standing committee of the Assembly, during the next session.

I think it is interesting to note that Victoria and Tasmania have public accounts committees. The state of New South Wales also has one, but it has very limited powers of inquiry and, in my opinion, compared with the committees in Victoria and Tasmania, is not very effective. So in Australia we have the Commonwealth, Victoria, and Tasmania with effective public accounts committees, and this State will now be added to the list.

The subject of the current motion of the member for Pilbara is the setting up of a public works committee and a committee on subordinate legislation. I have previously expressed my opinion that no strong argument has been advanced in favour of committees on subordinate legislation and public works. In any case, I prefer to gain experience of how the public accounts committee will work in this State. There is no very strong argument in favour of setting up all three committees, having regard to the fact that throughout the history of Western Australia we have never had committees of this kind. I realise the motion states "That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken to set up" the two committees.

From my inquiries around Australia regarding public works committees, I find that there is no such committee in Queensland or Tasmania, and we make the third State without one. On the other hand, there seem to be three States which do have those committees, so there is no unanimity of approach towards this matter amongst the States.

Mr. Bickerton: Governments do not believe they are necessary.

Sir DAVID BRAND: That is true; the honourable member made that point in his speech when he said that Governments are not in favour of these committees. Well, I think there have to be arguments for and against. I do not believe we should set up standing committees merely in order to have them or because of whatever might be claimed for them.

Mr. Bickerton: Governments are not against committees; they are against standing committees of Parliament.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I do not think that is correct. I believe that if one wants standing committees, then one must have a strong argument in favour of them. If there is no strong argument in favour of them, then I do not see any reason why action should be taken when there is doubt of the value of such committees; and I have some doubt about the value of them.

Mr. Bickerton: Everyone has his own opinion of what is a strong argument.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Yes; the honourable member has his and I have mine.

Mr. Bickerton: Yes; and I am listening to yours.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The member for Pilbara pointed out in this House that great power was centred in the Executive. This is something which we read about in the Press, and also in the Press in England; that is, that criticism was being directed at the Executives in democratic Governments because they were taking a great deal of power unto themselves. I think all Governments naturally take advantage of all the sources of information available to them before they make decisions. Governments are also subject, in the main, to the decisions of their own parties.

The member for Pilbara emphasised that we are living in an era of political parties, and we accept that the political party system is here and that it will remain. The party room gives members of Parliament—in any case those who support the Government of the day—the opportunity to express their opinion and to have their say.

If party members refuse to support the action of the Government, then quite obviously such action cannot proceed. There is a host of ways in which the Executive, at least, confers with members of Parliament. I really cannot see that it is necessary right now to set up all these standing committees; in fact, I suppose if it is necessary to set up a public works standing committee or a subordinate legislation standing committee, then it is equally important to have an education committee, and so on. From what I can gather from the remarks made by the member for Pilbara, this is the reason we want to set up the committee.

Mr. Bickerton: That is not quite right.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Yes, it is. It is important to point out that committees composed of private members could be set up to inquire into the activities of every portfolio, more or less, that exists.

Mr. Bickerton: You have those, but they are departmental and are responsible only to the Minister controlling the department.

Sir DAVID BRAND: There are those committees that inquire into public works.

Mr. Bickerton: What I want are committees that are responsible to Parliament.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Already we have internal committees, research officers, and engineers all of whom advise the Government on matters of public works, and I think a standing committee on public works in a matter of the State where the accounts are not so large, and where they are really few, is not necessary. Perhaps as we grow it could be claimed there is a

case to put forward, but it must be recognised that in other States where motions similar to that of the member for Pilbara have been moved the decisions of the Government have to run the gauntlet of Parliament itself and such committees could delay important decisions, and delay the commencement of public works.

It is understandable that the Commonwealth Government has a Public Works Committee, because it has public works all over Australia and it is extremely important for this committee to travel around the various States to listen to the evidence of the local people, if the people in the individual States could be called local people.

Mr. Bickerton: We have local people.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Those people have a point of view which would not be heard in Canberra until the Public Works Committee gave them an opportunity to make their point and hear their case. So in my opinion there is not a strong case to say that we should establish a parliamentary public works standing committee.

So far as setting up a joint parliamentary standing committee on subordinate legislation is concerned, I cannot be moved on this one. All the argument submitted in favour of the establishment of such a committee could not convince me it is not possible for every member in this House to examine every regulation that is introduced here.

Mr. Bickerton: How many did you examine when you were a private member?

Sir DAVID BRAND: I examined a few, and they can be examined if any honourable member so wishes.

Mr. Jamieson: This is it; once it becomes law a member cannot do much about it.

Sir DAVID BRAND: There is a set period within which a private member can voice his objection, and the regulations are not so numerous that they cannot be examined by any honourable member. For example, the member for Collie has picked up a regulation which, currently, he desires to see disallowed. It does seem unnecessary to set up a committee and then to appoint an executive officer who enters this House and decides whether a regulation is favourable or otherwise and then reports to his committee, and the committee then examines the regulation. To me this is quite unnecessary.

Surely, as private members, it is our responsibility to examine regulations as they are introduced, bearing in mind that many of them are just machinery regulations which would call for hardly any examination at all.

Mr. Bickerton: Many of them would be *ultra vires* the Act under which they are framed.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The position in Australia is that only three States have such a committee operating.

Mr. Bickerton: Do they consider that an advantage?

Sir DAVID BRAND: I would think so, because they moved to set them up; that is, in those States where such committees are in operation.

Mr. Bickerton: I thought we were the State on the move, so why should we not have such a committee?

Sir DAVID BRAND: Maybe it is a good thing that we do not have one, and still be on the move. After all is said and done, it is only a matter of opinion. The Government has examined this matter, and I strongly believe it is not necessary to set up a committee on subordinate legislation if we are really to examine, within the period set down, the regulations that are to become law.

So I regret we have to reject the suggestion made in the motion which has been moved by the member for Pilbara. In any case I do not think the time has come when it is necessary for us to have such a committee, and I find this is the unanimous opinion of those to whom I have spoken in the various States on the question of standing committees. I have talked to the Premiers and Ministers of other States and there are conflicting opinions as to the value of standing committees, or perhaps the need of them. It is very easy to set up committees to clutter up the situation.

Mr. Bickerton: You have thousands of committees now, so do not talk about cluttering up the situation!

Sir DAVID BRAND: That is right. This is another sort of committee that would be appointed with legal blessing and with the chance of someone being paid to act upon it. Once again, I say that this is a question we should examine and not just act to set up a committee merely for the purpose of having one.

Mr. Bickerton: Your Government has set up more committees than any other Government in the past.

Sir DAVID BRAND: No, I do not think that is so. I do not think we have set up any more committees than the previous Government.

Mr. Bickerton: I will do some research on that.

Sir DAVID BRAND: Please do so, and the honourable member will find that the Government has set up committees for a special purpose, for some specific task, and there are not many of them. Accordingly, I oppose the motion that, in

the opinion of this House we should establish a public works standing committee and a standing committee on subordinate legislation.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [6.7 p.m.]: In the few minutes available before the tea suspension I would like to support my colleague, the member for Pilbara, in what I consider to be a very desirable purpose. I was pleased to hear the Premier say that he has limited intentions in some other respects, but in regard to the public works committee he referred to the fact that there was no such committee appointed in Queensland or in Tasmania. I do know, however, that there is such a committee in Victoria.

Sir David Brand: I said that.

Mr. FLETCHER: The other day I had the experience of seeing my cousin off—he is a member of the Victorian Parliament and a member of the committee to which I have referred—on one of our State ships leaving for the north.

Sir David Brand: Is that a strong argument for the appointment of such a committee in this State?

Mr. FLETCHER: I would point out that my cousin was not going up north by the State ships on a pleasure trip; his purpose was to witness some of the activity which it was felt might be of advantage to his State. As a result I support the member for Pilbara and feel that we should do precisely the same thing here: we should appoint an all-party committee from both sides of the House and permit such a committee to visit Victoria. If a committee from Victoria can visit this State to see how things are progressing, there is no reason why we should not go over there, or possibly to Canberra, or anywhere else in Australia.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And have some other nice little trips!

Mr. FLETCHER: The purpose of the Victorian committee was to learn what it could from events in this State. The Premier might be flattered from drawing the inference that such a committee could learn anything from this State. I do feel, however, that we can certainly learn from what is happening in other States and, accordingly, I support the motion to bring about that very desirable state of affairs.

During my trip overseas I saw things in Canada which I had certainly not seen anywhere in Australia. It could do nothing but good if such committees were formed, because their members would be enabled to travel to other parts of the world and return with information which might be of advantage to this State. Even if the members of such committees did not go overseas, they would certainly learn something which would be of mutual advantage to both sides of the House if they travelled to the various parts of the State or perhaps went interstate.

If this were done we would not witness so many dog fights in this Chamber, as members from both sides of the House would have the advantage of a unified approach which could, perhaps, result in something to the State's benefit. It would certainly do away with a great deal of the rancour and argument which takes place at the moment.

Sir David Brand: Members of Parliament can still go to Victoria.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have only a very limited time available to me before the tea suspension and I promise not to continue my speech after the suspension. I would point out, however, that committees of this nature have been appointed in Canberra.

Sir David Brand: That is a different kettle of fish!

Mr. FLETCHER: Other States not mentioned by the Premier have also appointed public works committees and joint standing committees on subordinate legislation. As the Premier has said, we hold our party meetings in our respective party rooms and while there may be some leakage, I certainly am not aware of any. The point is that these meetings are held in secret and members know nothing of what has gone on until the matter is brought to the House.

The Premier suggested that we should emulate the example set by the member for Collie and study all the papers laid on the Table of the House. I would point out, however, that there have been occasions when Ministers have mumbled something about papers being tabled, but I certainly have had no idea as to what those papers might be. I admit that we have files showing certain papers that are tabled, but quite often these have ambiguous titles and give members no indication of their contents. Apart from this, if we were to study all the papers on the Table of the House our constituents would certainly receive very little attention.

Sir David Brand: What is to stop a party or a combined party from doing this?

Mr. Bickerton: What stops yours?

Sir David Brand: Nothing at all.

Mr. Bickerton: We want a committee responsible to this House not to a party.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would like to know who has the floor at the moment! I feel we should not confine our activities to this State alone, because I am sure we can learn from what is happening in the Eastern States and in other parts of the Commonwealth. We could view both Federal projects and State projects to the best advantage of the State.

I have much pleasure in supporting the motion set out by the member for Pilbara. These parliamentary committees would be very desirable and I feel that in the opinion of this House they should be implemented.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [6.13 p.m.]: I would like to support the Premier in this matter, because I think that in all the circumstances his approach is eminently fair. There could possibly be some advantages in the establishment of a public works committee, but in my opinion the disadvantages would possibly outweigh the advantages.

There are occasions when members would like certain works to be accomplished within a particular period, and if such works were likely to be held up by being referred down the line to a committee we would certainly not gain very much by the appointment of such a committee. This would merely constitute a duplication of work. Members have their own way of examining these matters without finding it necessary to seek advice from committees.

In the case of subordinate legislation, I cannot for the life of me see why members cannot examine any subordinate legislation that might be laid on the Table of the House. It is not necessary for them to look through all the papers laid on the table. They know what is likely to interest them and they need only examine the files which concern them. Members of this House, or the parties in this House, could, if they desired, appoint their own committees to examine subordinate legislation, and this would not take a great deal of time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. W. A. MANNING: Before the tea suspension I was supporting the remarks which the Premier had made in speaking to the motion, and I said that some of the committees which had been proposed were unnecessary and that there could, perhaps, be no end to the establishment of committees.

I do believe that some committees are highly important and very valuable. I refer particularly to the Committee of Public Accounts established by the Commonwealth Government, and I have the support of the Country Party in saying this. I have had the opportunity to study what this committee has done, and I have attended inquiries instituted by it, both in Canberra and in this State.

Perhaps it is not fully understood by members that a public accounts committee just does not conduct a *post mortem* into accounts which have already been dealt with by the Auditor-General. It delves deeply into the financial situation underneath, and into methods and reasons. In this respect it does impinge to an extent on the activities of departments in other spheres. So, when we speak of the establishment of a public works committee there is always the finance which underlies aspects of public works; and some of these aspects can be dealt with by a public accounts committee.

So, of all the committees that have been suggested in this House I believe that the public accounts committee is the most embracing and the most important, because it is of very great value in looking into the activities of departments, in giving advice, and where necessary in making criticism. I do think the Premier has made a wise decision in proposing as his first choice of committees a public accounts committee. I hope that when the Premier establishes this committee he will enable some assistance to be provided for it, because if the committee is to operate to the fullest possible extent and to prove to be of some value it will certainly need assistance when it seeks to inquire deeply into the activities, into the reasons for them, etc., of Government departments. I hope the Premier will find some way to deal with this situation; if he does it will improve the work of the committee very considerably.

Mr. Bickerton: But you have nothing against the other two committees?

MR. W. A. MANNING: At the present time I cannot see any value in their establishment. I think the appointment of a public works committee could delay many of the jobs which are undertaken urgently. I am not convinced of the need to appoint a public works committee at this stage, and I do not know how good it would be.

In regard to the standing committee on subordinate legislation, I cannot see any value in establishing it.

Mr. Bickerton: What made you change your mind in the last couple of years?

MR. W. A. MANNING: I have not changed my mind. I have always been very convinced of the value of a public accounts committee, and this is the committee which underlies the whole structure.

Mr. Bickerton: How will you bring about its establishment?

MR. W. A. MANNING: The Premier says that he intends to form a public accounts committee in a simple form, to start off with. I am happy that a start will be made. After a start is made there will be a realisation of the value of this committee and how it covers the activities of the various departments which are concerned. I have very much pleasure in supporting the Premier's opposition to the motion, including his opposition to the setting up of the two committees mentioned therein. I cannot at this stage support the motion.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [7.36 p.m.]: I wonder whether the Premier consulted the Minister for Industrial Development before he suggested the setting up of a public accounts committee, because if ever anything gave the Minister for Industrial Development a heart attack it was the

action of the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee. That happened when it brought down a wrong set of figures, and this resulted in a considerable amount of work and much action on the part of the Department of Industrial Development to straighten out the error that had been made. I do not think the Minister for Industrial Development has received an apology from that committee.

Mr. Davies: The chairman of that committee met his Waterloo on that occasion.

Mr. JAMIESON: He did, but that did not improve the health of the Minister for Industrial Development. As a matter of fact that incident caused him to do a great deal of extra work. If the committees such as this one are to work efficiently, they cannot make big mistakes like that. The Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee made a terrible mistake by transposing a set of figures, so that they showed what had been spent as what had not been spent, and *vice versa*. This caused the department a great deal of extra work to resolve the situation that arose. However, that is water under the bridge.

In regard to the committee proposed by the Premier, I say that any committee which watches the privy purse is desirable. With this very point the member for Narrogin agreed in 1967. He had seen the Commonwealth committee in operation in the Federal sphere, and generally he supported the establishment of some committees.

Mr. Speaker, before you draw my attention to the fact that I am departing from the motion, seeing that other members have debated the point which I have just made—I seem to have got away with the few comments I have made—I had better return to what is before us; that is, the setting up of a parliamentary public works standing committee and a joint parliamentary standing committee on subordinate legislation.

In my view one of the most important committees to be established is a parliamentary public works committee. Such a committee appears to be very active in Victoria and South Australia. Indeed, the members of the committees in those two States to whom I have spoken have indicated that they have been the means of saving the Government a considerable amount of finance. They did this in many ways. They called architects and other people before them to examine the proposals being inquired into. Bearing in mind that the Public Works Department has the responsibility of carrying out the construction and supervising the work for other Government departments, up to the stage where the buildings are handed over, and as it is obvious that the Minister for Works cannot give the required attention to cross every "t" and dot every "i"

to ensure that the Government is getting value for the money expended, a public works committee is necessary.

At times when this State was short of funds for education, I did raise the issue in this House that we could afford the cantilever type of construction. If we had a public works committee it could inquire from the architects why such a type of construction was proposed when money was available, and when more effective classroom accommodation and other types of accommodation could be built.

This is the type of work the public works committee would undertake. I understand that in South Australia with regard to one hospital project alone the recommendations of the committee represented a saving of \$1,000,000 to the Treasury. Such a committee here could advise similarly, probably with results which would be just as good.

We all know that architects are far too prone to get carried away. A group of them are responsible for Government jobs for which they receive a Government commission. Consequently they expand themselves no end. The department naturally accepts the advice of the architects and thus makes a recommendation to the Minister. We all know that the Minister's time is limited. He has not the physical ability to examine every single project because he is an administrator in his own right and has many projects in which he is involved. That is why I say that such projects, if submitted to a committee, would receive a very studied examination.

Unless the present Premier or some future Premier or administrator reverts to a system of parliamentary committees to assist in the government of the State, parliamentary behaviour as we have known it in the past will cease to exist. The present Government back-benchers have been in such a position long enough to know that they are, in effect, only ciphers. The Opposition members have a little more scope because they are able to criticise and they have more license on various issues, as the Premier must realise when the Leader of the Opposition takes license on items at times.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Too much sometimes.

Mr. JAMIESON: Nevertheless this is our way of doing something. I have been in this Parliament long enough to have been a back-bencher for a time and to realise that while we may dislike certain things and feel it would be advisable if they were not proceeded with, we do not, for diplomatic reason, proceed to discuss them in Parliament.

It is true we have our party rooms, but then again many aspects of legislation and other matters which are not administrative never come up for discussion in the party room. Actually, it would be impossible for

this to occur. We would never get anywhere if we tried to do this. Consequently, our only alternative is to second our responsibility as a Parliament to certain committees to examine, with legal backing, the situations which deserve examination and then submit recommendations.

These committees work fairly effectively in democracies. It is pretty obvious from the experience not only of the committees in other Australian Parliaments but also the committee system which works in the United States of America in the State Parliaments and in the Federal Parliament, that they are all very effective. As a matter of fact in America, under the State systems, everything is done by committees. No Minister introduces a piece of legislation. It is introduced by the committee responsible for the particular matter, after it has examined the question fully. The draftsman, of course, is involved, but then the committee responsible studies the situation and recommends whether or not the legislation should be adopted. This is the ultimate in committee management.

I do not know whether I go along with that idea entirely because we could get back to the stage where the member for Pilbara often states that a camel is a horse designed by a committee.

Members have various ideas. For instance, someone might ask why it is necessary to have a public accounts committee when we have an Auditor-General who reports directly to Parliament. No doubt if a public accounts committee were appointed it would be examining many items normally examined by the Auditor-General, thus duplicating the work. However, this is the committee the Premier fancies.

On the other hand, we have no-one in the public works line or subordinate legislation line who can act as a guide or as a person who can report direct to Parliament the observations of individual people who might be informed on a certain subject and believe that certain proposals should not be carried out.

In order to give members of Parliament a real say and a real responsibility in the running of the State of Western Australia it is desirable that a series of committees be instituted. The Premier referred to the payment of members of such committees. Well, I do not know about this. People worry about paying members of this committee and that committee, or another committee. However, once a person is on a committee, whether in an honorary capacity or a paid capacity, he should apply himself, and I think most people do this. I take as much interest in and feel just as responsible with regard to the organisations in which I am involved in an honorary capacity as I take with regard to those for which I am paid. I do not think this aspect should be taken into consideration.

However, if a member is working for the State on one of these committees, he should not be out of pocket to any greater extent than any other member of Parliament, and consequently, in that respect I believe there is justification for making some recompense to those who have to spend a considerable time on activities on behalf of Parliament. Indeed, this has been the established practice for many years. As members are well aware, if a Select Committee is appointed and it is necessary for the members of that committee to travel around the country to take evidence and thus live away from home, provision is made for paying for such travelling and accommodation.

I fully realise that such a system could get completely out of hand. I think this has occurred in Victoria. Every now and then when it is decided that a new bridge is required over the Yarra River, a parliamentary committee is sent over here to study the projects at Kununurra. Of course, this type of situation is ridiculous and probably the Premier is frightened that this type of thing might well come into the picture and this would be a worry. However, if the terms of reference of these committees were laid down clearly and concisely, this situation could not arise.

On the other hand, if some contemplated hydro-electric scheme had to be examined and reported on by a public works committee, I could see nothing wrong with the members of that committee visiting similar projects in the Snowy River area or in Tasmania. However, for members of a committee to go on a sort of safari on some abstract study, in my opinion would be wrong. I have seen such safaris go through here fairly often. Many go on our State ships and have a good holiday, and all that sort of thing, but such visits do not achieve very much. That is one of the faults which could be found with a public works committee.

Of course, a public accounts committee could not be involved in such visits, because all its activity would be centred in the city. On the other hand, I realise that members of such a committee would of necessity spend a considerable amount of time on the work of the committee and should possibly receive some consideration for what is in addition to their ordinary work as lay members of Parliament.

As members know, if a member of Parliament happens to be the loafing type and works one hour a week, he gets paid the same amount as a member who might be over-diligent and works 50, 80, or many more hours a week. That is one of the drawbacks of the system under which we work. As a consequence, if a member is employed on duties in addition to those normally involving a member of Parliament—that is, if he serves on one of these committees—some assistance should be forthcoming.

Let us consider the subordinate legislation committee. I would say this is a very necessary committee. The Premier seems to think it should be one of the last to be appointed. On the Table of this House we have some of the papers and some of the regulations which are tabled each year according to the Acts under which they are made and required to be tabled. They can be objected to within the first 14 sitting days after they have been tabled.

It would be physically impossible for members to cull through the various departmental regulations which are laid on the Table of the House. All I can manage to examine are, perhaps, the local government regulations which affect my particular area. Occasionally, I look at the regulations which affect racing and trotting clubs, but usually it is too late for me to do anything about them. Some of the regulations which are tabled and not objected to are fantastic. Some of the regulations take away quite a lot of the freedom of the individual, and I feel this was never intended. However, the regulations are made and they are never reported. We do not have time to examine those things.

Most of us have more to do than to worry about the activities of racing and trotting clubs, and this also applies to many other activities. Some of the by-laws of local governing bodies, where they break away from the recommended model by-laws, are pretty harsh. For instance, for a long time we have had no compunction in not allowing the president of a shire to sack, or to suspend, a senior officer before calling a meeting of the council. However, we find that some local authorities have even put through regulations to allow one man to take action before he calls a special meeting of the council. Of course, the person who has been dismissed in those circumstances has to fight a rearguard action instead of being in a position to explain himself before the suspension took place.

Such regulations have gone through, but it has been too late for me to be able to take any action. Nobody else seems to have been interested. However, those regulations and by-laws should have been reported to the Parliament. If a local authority adopts certain model by-laws we are not interested, but anything which is away from the norm should be fully explained to Parliament in a report by a committee on subordinate legislation.

If that were the case, the people of the State would be better looked after, and members would be more satisfied that they were achieving the object for which they were sent to this Parliament.

A day consists of only 24 hours and it is a battle to get through our first-class mail without having to delve into our second-class mail. If we then try to examine regulations and tabled reports, we are really struggling to do anything

further. It must be out of the question for anybody in the Ministry to do anything other than look after his own department.

Sir David Brand: Would you not be relying on the opinion of one man, who would be the executive officer, to decide which regulations were acceptable?

Mr. JAMIESON: That is not my understanding of how the committee would work. The executive officer would merely compile the report subject to the committee. No doubt the committee would make its own arrangements so that one member would look at all regulations tabled by certain Ministers, and another would look after those regulations tabled by another Minister.

When anything out of the norm was noticed it would be noted for the next meeting of the committee. The matter would then be discussed by the committee and if, because of its peculiar nature, the committee thought it should be reported to the Parliament, it would be reported. The secretary of the committee would compile such a report and, no doubt, the chairman of the committee would sign the report before it was laid on the Table of the House as an effective report of the subordinate legislation committee.

In my opinion it would be as simple as that. Of course, regulations would be required to ensure that the committee carried out its job. Committees are only as good as they are made to be. In my opinion, and because of what I have read about such committees in various Parliaments throughout the world, it seems a vital and necessary part of any democratic Government to have a committee to examine subordinate legislation. Otherwise, there is a tendency for Parliaments to get to the stage of the Government and the Opposition not being particularly interested in what is going on, because one side cannot investigate deeply enough, and the other side has all the knowledge of the situation anyway. With that information the Government is able to close down on the Opposition.

This is the situation which develops when there is not an investigating authority. We do not want the situation of a one party Parliament, as has been the development in many South African States. Those States do not want an Opposition or, at least, not a recognised Opposition. The only opposition comes from within the party.

As representatives of the people, we must insist on some changes taking place. The change suggested by the member for Pilbara and that suggested by the Premier are the least that should be introduced. Other committees might need to be appointed. Statutory requirements would have to be dealt with to make the committees function properly. If that were done,

I am sure we would get a better working Parliament that would give more satisfaction to the people we represent.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [7.57 p.m.]: A similar motion to the one we are now debating came before this Parliament in 1967. I think the sentiments behind the motion on that occasion were the same as those on this occasion; that is, we want to restore to Parliament some of the power it should have and, perhaps, relieve the Executive of some of the work it does at the present time.

On the occasion in 1967 when a similar motion was debated, the Premier moved an amendment to the effect that there should be a ministerial inquiry into the position which existed in the other States.

A further amendment was moved by the member for Belmont—as he is now—to the effect that the inquiry should be completed before the next Parliamentary session. There was to be an election in the meantime. That amendment was accepted by the Premier and agreed to by the House.

It would appear that the Premier set himself up as a one man *ad hoc* committee to make inquiries into the position in other States. With his many other duties, it is understandable that he would not have had much opportunity to carry out investigations and to make a report. The report which he presented to this House tonight was, to say the least, disappointing. Whether the Premier was a committee of one, and whether the report was a majority report or a minority report, I do not know. The report certainly did not give us very much information.

The Premier said he had made inquiries from other Ministers as he travelled. He said that some of the committees seemed to work, some members liked them, some Ministers liked them, and some Premiers liked them. However, some did not like them, so one could adopt any line one wished. The line the Premier wished to adopt on this occasion was that there was no need for a committee on subordinate legislation; there was no need for a committee on public works; but there was need for a public accounts committee.

That is understandable, because I understand the Country Party policy supports the appointment of a public accounts committee. So the Premier, on this occasion, is bowing to the Country Party—his co-partners in Government. He certainly got away from the motion, because there is no mention of a public accounts committee in the motion. As I have said, the attitude adopted by the Government is disappointing. For the Premier to suggest that the Government has not set up a record number of committees during its term of office is, I think, not paying due regard to all the important legislation which has come before the House since 1959.

Mr. Bovell: At least the Government has had a record term of office.

Sir David Brand: And performance!

Mr. DAVIES: The Opposition does not deny that the Government has had a record term of office. Members on this side of the House would say, however, that the Government has made some record mistakes. However, we are not debating that point at the moment; we debate those issues at election time.

As far back as 1965, I made some research into the number of committees which had been set up through legislative action in this House. I am not referring to the number of committees which have been appointed from time to time for particular purposes, although, in this regard, the Government has also set up a record number. In this respect, I refer particularly to committees set up on education and I must confess that, on occasions, I have been somewhat confused as to the areas of jurisdiction of the various committees.

I shall refer to some of the permanent committees or boards set up by legislative action which my 1965 research revealed. Since then, of course, there has been a further stream of similar boards and committees. At that time there was a board set up under the Mental Health Act, the Water Supply Board, and the Parole Board. A number of boards and committees were set up under the Factories and Shops Act, one of which may, in fact, have arrived at a rather disastrous decision. Boards have been set up in connection with the control of taxis and of chiropractors, and there is a Government Employees' Housing Board. There are boards set up under the National Trust, boards to look after chemists, and a board concerned with the fluoridation of public water supplies. A couple of boards have been set up under transport legislation and, although one man was appointed to do an almighty job in that direction, applications have now been called for another man to supervise him. Last but not least, a board was set up to deal with the artificial breeding of cattle.

As I have said, that was the position in 1965, and the number of committees and boards at that time indicates that the attitude of the Government towards setting up such committees and boards depends on the particular position in hand. On this occasion it does not suit the Government to set up the boards suggested in this motion.

Sir David Brand: The setting up of committees by a Government is nothing new. Your own Government was always setting them up. The record will show this.

Mr. Bickerton: We thought a couple more would not matter.

Mr. DAVIES : I challenge the Premier on that point. I agree that any Government must set up committees.

Sir David Brand: Yes.

Mr. DAVIES: However, the present Government says that it does not believe in Government control but is a free enterprise Government. For the Government to say this and then set up the boards I have mentioned is, I think, begging the truth, because the actions of the Government do not fit its words. This applies at election time, in particular.

Sir David Brand: Yes, they do.

Mr. DAVIES: This shows that, irrespective of the colour of the Government in the House, the same kind of legislation is put forward. There might be a different emphasis on different aspects of government by the different parties, but the fact remains that the Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government will set up—and indeed has set up—more boards than were ever set up under a Labor Government.

Sir David Brand: If the record were looked into, you would be proved to the contrary. We have set up fewer committees.

Mr. DAVIES: If it were possible to have a wager, I would accept a small bet. However, this is not possible because you, Sir, would not tolerate the placing of any bets, particularly outside the jurisdiction of the T.A.B.

Sir David Brand: Save your money.

Mr. DAVIES: I shall certainly do some research on the subject to see what I can establish. The fact remains that the promised ministerial inquiry into the establishment of parliamentary committees is disappointing. I suppose one could say that the House has been held in contempt, because the Government did not comply with the amendment carried by the House; namely, that the inquiry should be finalised by 1968.

I know that the member for Pilbara—whom I shall be calling my “colleague” if I am not careful, through the influence of members opposite—has asked a number of questions on many occasions, but the Government did not take any action and, once again, he had to move a motion in 1969 along the same lines as the one he moved in 1967. It is apparent that there has been a great deal of reluctance on the part of the Government and on the part of Ministers who were going to conduct the inquiry to make a genuine attempt to see what the position was in other States, and to assess whether any good could come from the introduction of parliamentary committees in Western Australia.

Two factors would inhibit the Government in its attitude towards parliamentary committees. Firstly, members of the

Government would not want too many people inquiring into their activities. Secondly, if the committees were to operate successfully, it would be necessary to plan ahead to make certain that the plans allowed the committees time to make the necessary inquiries which would prevent undue delays in implementation. One thing which we certainly know about this Government is that it does not plan ahead; it simply cuts its cloth to the needs of the day.

Sir David Brand: It plans further ahead than any other Government has done; in fact, so far ahead the honourable member would be lost.

Mr. DAVIES: Only a week ago the Opposition pointed out the lack of planning in regard to housing and education. Unquestionably the need to plan ahead would inhibit the Government. The Government does not appear to have examined the probable good which would come from the establishment of these committees. The member for Belmont has already indicated that there has been a considerable saving of money alone in other States where committees are established. Surely this should appeal to the Treasurer. The savings of money have come about through the expertise brought to bear through examination of public works by parliamentary committees. For this reason alone the public works committee should be welcomed by the Government.

I believe committees are necessary to maintain the position of Parliament. Increasingly, members find that there is no hint of what is to come before Parliament until measures are actually introduced into the House. I was not a member of Parliament at the time my party was in Government and, because of this, I have no experience of how Governments treat their own parties in the caucus room. I have heard some grumbings, however, around the corridor from some back-bench supporters of the present Government to the effect that they do not know what is coming before the House until, perhaps, the day it is introduced or until they read about it in the newspapers.

I understand the present Government held a party meeting quite recently, but this was the first held since before Christmas. Nevertheless there were announcements in the Press in connection with the Government's plans and the legislation to be brought forward. Certainly we have, perhaps, been able to forecast some of the announcements made in the Press. If my understanding is correct and the Government had not, up to the time Parliament resumed, held a party meeting since before Christmas, surely back-bench members are sadly lacking in knowledge and information and, certainly, they cannot have much appreciation of what their Government is doing.

This points to the fact, of course, of Government by the Executive. We find this is increasingly so all the time. This is not happening only in Western Australia, but is happening on a grand scale in the Federal House. I do not think I need remind members of what has been happening in Canberra, but it is necessary for me to point out that the Prime Minister has made certain concessions in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Dunn: What has this to do with a public works committee?

Mr. DAVIES: The member for Darling Range does not read his paper; because, if he did, he would be able to forecast what I am about to say. Some of the concessions made by the Prime Minister involve the setting up of committees and the giving of more work to back-bench supporters of the Government. The Prime Minister intends to give them a greater say in what is happening and to let them know beforehand what the Government has in mind.

Recently there was an announcement—and I think this was published in the Press a few days ago—that a recommendation had been made in the Senate to set up seven specialised committees. This proposition was accepted by both Government and Opposition members in the Senate. One might use the argument that there are more members in the Senate than there are in this House, but there are not that many more. The Senate has 60 members, and we have 51, so I am sure we could effectively set up from amongst our members standing committees along the lines proposed in the Senate.

I do not propose that all those committees should be set up here, but I do believe we should start off with the standing committees on public works and subordinate legislation, as has been proposed. The committees proposed by the Senate are for the following purposes:—

Statutory corporations, such as T.A.A. and Ansett Airlines.

External affairs and defence.

Transport and communications.

Trade, industry, and labour.

Legal, constitutional, and home affairs.

Health, welfare, education, and science.

National finance and development.

It is not proposed that the committees should examine every piece of legislation that comes before the Senate, but only those which are referred to them by decision of the Senate itself. I would be quite prepared to have parliamentary committees in the State operating in a similar manner.

However, the powers of this Parliament are continually being whittled away or passed into the hands of the Executive, and this causes me some concern. I think the public would like to know just what good

is Parliament. This question is often raised, and we often try to justify our existence. I must confess that I am finding it increasingly difficult to do so. Certainly, I can speak on measures which come before the House, but if the Government has made up its mind then my words do not carry much weight.

If we established parliamentary standing committees we would be able to make a more thorough investigation into matters coming before this House; we would be more thoroughly informed; and I believe we would be more effective as members of Parliament.

I will not delay the vote much longer, but I do think that the time is fast approaching when we must return to Parliament some of its supposed powers which, as I have said, have been whittled away and have ceased to exist over the years. Perhaps those powers have been whittled away from us unconsciously, without our realising what was happening. However, there is ample evidence to show that this has been done, and there is ample need for us to do something about it. The only way to do that is to set up committees of this nature. In this way we would not only be able to assist the Government in what it is doing, but we would also be able to bring some expert knowledge to bear.

The Premier has said that the Government departments are there to watch the position, but I have found, unfortunately, some evidence of nepotism in some departments. I have found that we, as members of Parliament, are getting increasingly scant regard from some Government departments. I cannot help but feel that the service for which the Civil Service has been noted and applauded over the years is not up to the standard that it was formerly when I first became a member of this House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I would like you to give instances. I think you should.

Mr. DAVIES: For a start, I would bring to attention replies to correspondence, more particularly with regard to the Education Department. I have spoken about this before and mentioned instances of replies being delayed over a long period and, indeed, where the department says it has lost the mail and would I send it a copy.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I can think of a number of courtesies which are extended to you as quickly as possible when you ask for them.

Mr. DAVIES: I think the Minister is too thin skinned on this issue.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No, I just want you to be specific.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not saying that the officers of every department are paying less attention to their work; I am saying that I think the general attitude is not as good as it was. This is happening not only in the State Civil Service; it is happening in

regard to the Railways Department and also the Commonwealth Public Service—for example, the Post Office.

The **SPEAKER**: I have been very tolerant, but the member for Victoria Park is getting well away from the subject.

Mr. **DAVIES**: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was answering the interjection of the Minister. However, I will stick to the motion before the Chair. I do not wish to make any wild statements, but I feel this is the attitude which exists at the moment, and concern has been expressed to me by other members.

I think there is ample need for these standing committees and I am sorry that after two years the Premier is only able to give us such a sketchy outline of what he believes the position to be in other States. I am sorry that if we could not have a full ministerial inquiry into this matter, then we could not have had at least a committee of senior public servants set up to bring down a written report which could have been tabled in this House. However, after two years we have only a few formal remarks, and the same attitude expressed now as was expressed on a former occasion.

We certainly will be pleased to have a public accounts committee, but I do not think that this alone will be the answer to our problems. I think this is only a sop to the junior partner in the coalition and to the Parliament as a whole. I hope that much experience will be gained from the proposed committee, and that its establishment will not be delayed overlong. I hope, too, that we will see the advantages accruing from such a committee and that before long we will have a change of Government and the new Government will set up more parliamentary committees.

Sir David Brand: Hooray! Utopia at last!

Mr. **BICKERTON** (Pilbara) [8.18 p.m.]: I wish to reply to the debate on the motion standing in my name on the notice paper. It is quite a simple motion calling upon the Government to set up two parliamentary standing committees; namely, a public works committee and a subordinate legislation committee. I will not repeat what I said when introducing this motion and state the advantages of these committees. That is not necessary, because it is recorded in *Hansard* and the Premier obviously had plenty of time to study the arguments put forward concerning the necessity for these committees.

Sir David Brand: I read your speech more thoroughly than I have read many others.

Mr. **BICKERTON**: I am pleased to hear the Premier read my speech and I hope he reads many more of them and that he derives—either directly or indirectly—some benefit as a result of that exercise.

Sir David Brand: Yes, I am sure I will.

Mr. **BICKERTON**: However, I am sorry that the Premier obviously did not derive the benefit that would normally accrue to a person who looked into these matters from a broadminded point of view and was not concerned so much about whether or not he was in Government.

Sir David Brand: That was not so.

Mr. **BICKERTON**: To my way of thinking these committees are essential if Parliament is to maintain in any shape or form some rights for the private member of Parliament. We all know that in present-day politics the rights of the private member—what we normally refer to, perhaps, as the back-bench member—are being gradually whittled away to the stage where he is becoming somewhat of a stooge if he is on the Government side; and it does not always apply that he is not a stooge when he is on the Opposition side.

As I said when I introduced the motion, this is mainly because we live with a party system of politics and I cannot come up with a suggestion for any better system. So it remains with us. However, when it is with us, as it is at present, we have to admit quite readily that the opportunities of a private member to exercise some control over the actions of Parliament are becoming fewer and fewer as the years go by. I know that those who sit behind the Government—I had that privilege on one occasion—become frustrated, just as the Opposition becomes frustrated by what we call Executive control.

Executive control is taking a greater and more important part in governing the State and the private member is having less say in regard to what goes on in government. It is true that the party room, more or less, represents a safety valve where private members can express themselves. On the other hand, at times one wonders how much of a safety valve it is, particularly in the case of parties that select their Ministers by a system under which the leader is first elected and he, in turn, selects his ministerial material. That system may have its advantages, but on the other hand it could have its disadvantages in that the safety valve of the party room could make a member who, perhaps, had his sights on ministerial rank be a little loth to criticise his party leader if he thought such criticism may jeopardise his opportunity for promotion.

In replying to my motion on the appointment of these committees, the Premier dealt at some length with the fact that the Government was elected to govern and there was no need for such committees to be appointed. It was at this point that I made the interjection that this is not so. Governments seem to be all in favour of committees being appointed provided they relieve the Government of some

responsibility of making a decision that may not please the public. How often do we see all Ministers, at some time or another, being placed in the position of having to make a decision on some matter of great public interest? The first news we hear of it is that a board is set up to bring down a recommendation to the Government. To my way of thinking this is to enable the Minister to avoid his responsibility.

However, the difference between the appointment of that committee and a parliamentary standing committee is that the Minister invariably selects who will be on a departmental committee, its report is delivered to the Minister himself, and if he does not wish to make a decision in line with the recommendation of that committee, naturally, there is nothing to force him to do so.

Governments do not like parliamentary standing committees, because a public works standing committee, or a standing committee on subordinate legislation, as mentioned in the motion, is not responsible to the Minister of the department into which it is inquiring, but is responsible to Parliament and in due course it reports to Parliament. Therefore, such a committee is entirely different from one set up by an individual Minister or a head of a department to inquire into some matter, and, after conducting its inquiries, merely reports back to the Minister himself.

When introducing my motion I went into some detail to explain that a public works committee has been proved to be quite successful in South Australia; that it is of extreme value not only to the Government, but also to Parliament and, more particularly, to the taxpayers of that State. The member for Narrogin, whilst he was speaking, referred to delays that may take place if a public works standing committee were inquiring into a major public work before it was passed by Parliament. However, it is known that under the South Australian legislation a limit is placed on the cost of the public work before it is referred to the public works standing committee. I think the limit is in the vicinity of \$1,000,000.

The public works standing committee, in view of the fact that it is dealing with public works all the time, would become competent and experienced on the question of values and costs, tender prices, and the like, and therefore, with an amount of approximately \$1,000,000, surely it would be worth while if there were some delay whilst the work was thoroughly investigated by such a competent committee. Further, the delay incurred would be so slight that one could hardly submit it as a reason for not voting for the establishment of a standing committee of this nature.

In dealing with a standing committee on subordinate legislation, if I had a choice I am not sure that I would not

consider such a committee more important than a public works standing committee; that is, if we had no alternative to starting with only one. It is true, as the Premier told us, that by-laws and regulations that are framed under our various Statutes are tabled in Parliament. We have a set procedure under which we can object to any regulation after it is tabled. We express this objection by moving that the regulation be disallowed. The Premier has said that any member of Parliament has access to these regulations and it is his responsibility to peruse them. The members of a standing committee on subordinate legislation would become experts after a while, and it would be their responsibility to investigate these regulations immediately they are brought to Parliament. I would point out that under the South Australian legislation a copy of the regulation or by-law is forwarded to the standing committee on subordinate legislation at the same time as it is tabled, so there is no chance of the committee ever overlooking a by-law or regulation.

As I have said, the regulations, when framed, are sent to the committee which studies them and it brings down a recommendation to the House of Parliament. Therefore, what in the name of creation is wrong with that system? If it is maintained that Governments have in positions of power efficient officers who are responsible for drafting regulations and by-laws, why should any Government worry about having a committee appointed to examine the regulations and to inform members of Parliament that it considers the regulations are *ultra vires* the Act, or that perhaps they could have some harmful effect which the normal member of Parliament may not detect in his perusal of the regulations in ordinary circumstances?

I agree with the member for Victoria Park that in this instance it would seem that the Premier has made a sort of hand-out to the members of the Country Party lest they break the bonds of friendship. As a sort of consolation prize the Premier has suggested that at some time or another—I do not know when, but he said during the next session of Parliament—he will appoint a committee to investigate public accounts. However, the Premier will excuse me, I know, if I am suspicious of this statement, because when I introduced my original motion over two years ago he told me that immediately after the first sitting of the new Parliament a report on the matter would be brought down.

I doubt whether we would have heard any more about it at all had I not moved another motion such as the one that is on the notice paper now. In fact, the Government did nothing about a report to this House, even though the members of this Parliament carried a motion, amended by the Premier to suit himself, to the

effect that a ministerial inquiry would be held and a report would be made to Parliament. As a result of that we got nothing until this motion came along.

I know there are members of the Country Party who are extremely keen about the public accounts committee. Indeed, the member for Narrogin, in his remarks when the original motion was introduced, was much more keen about this committee than about the others, although, if I remember rightly, at the time he did not oppose the other two committees. On this occasion he went along with the Premier and opposed the other two, accepting the public accounts committee. I can only assume that this was handed out by the Government as some sort of a consolation prize to the Country Party.

I have no objection whatever to the public accounts committee. Because this motion is so restrictive, I know it is very difficult to start discussing public accounts committees. However, as the Premier in his reply to my motion has thrown it into the ring, I might make reference to it in passing. I have no objection to this committee; I welcome it; I think it is a start, a good start; but why should the Premier oppose the motion which is on the notice paper? Perhaps he is not ready to set up these committees. But that is no reason for opposing the motion.

The motion is quite clear. It says that in the opinion of this House such-and-such should be done. We know that a motion like this one is only a recommendation to the Government; it is not an instruction. If the Premier had been more genuine in this matter, the public accounts committee could quite easily have been added to the other two committees that are already mentioned in the motion. They may not be set up tomorrow or the next day, but if these committees become part of our parliamentary system they will enable the members who may not have the opportunity to do so through other channels, to bring before Parliament certain aspects of the normal running of the State.

Another way in which these standing committees are of value is that they serve the ordinary member of Parliament. If he requires advice on subordinate legislation or on some public work, the committees would have the files and the information which he requires. If one goes to the Public Works Department seeking information, it is true that one could possibly get it; but if it is something that may be embarrassing to the Government it is also possible that one will not get it; and much more than possible. Whilst departments do supply us with most of the information we require, we have to remember that they do have a loyalty to the Government which the people have elected; that primarily they are responsible to the Government, not to the member of Parliament at all; whereas the committee would be responsible to the Parliament.

In my view, we will never get away from Government by the Executive. I do not believe that the private member of Parliament will ever be able to exercise the rights that the people who elect him believe he does exercise until such time as he has an avenue such as a standing committee of Parliament through which he can go. This has been proven in many other Parliaments, including the House of Commons, on which practically the whole of our traditions, Standing Orders, etc., are supposed to be based. I believe that we will get these committees in time. It is only a matter of who keeps putting up the motion for long enough, how many members get offended for long enough and do not get satisfaction for long enough. Then we will reach a stage where the private members of the House will not only vote for a motion but will demand that it be introduced.

I know that any Government that is in power will probably oppose these committees because Governments hate them; they do not like them at all. Premiers do not like them; Ministers do not like them. I was rather amazed when the Premier said he had discussed this with other Premiers and other Ministers. He might as well discuss it with the Minister for Works and ask the Minister whether he wants a public works committee. Of course the Minister for Works does not want it. Why would he want it? He is getting along very nicely, thank you, the way he is; but he is not getting along very nicely, thank you, as far as I am concerned. This is the point in having standing committees. I would suggest that the next time the Premier makes an investigation he should leave Governments out of his inquiries; he should leave Ministers right out; and he should go to the private members on both sides of the House and ask them what they think of standing committees. I am inclined to think that he would get a decision different from the one arrived at after such a hasty investigation prior to this motion.

I wake up reasonably quickly—I do not say that I am quick on the draw; I am not the sheriff type. I have gathered the impression that the chances of this motion surviving are rather slim—put it that way. Of course, we do not know until the vote is taken, and stranger things have happened at times, but that is the impression I have. However, in the future, when those private members who vote against it are discussing whether they have any rights, or whether Ministers are overbearing, or whether Governments are overbearing, or whether Government departments are far too close with the information that they require and they do not receive sufficient co-operation from the various organisations, let them remember that they voted against a great opportunity to do something about it. I recommend the motion to the House.

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

Ayes—18

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moir
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Graham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Harman	Mr. Toms
Mr. Jones	Mr. Davies

(Teller)

Noes—25

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

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hall	Mr. Craig
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Dunn

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

PLASTERERS' REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [8.43 p.m.]: This Bill, which was introduced by the member for Belmont, has been presented to us with a view to registering certain workers in the plastering industry, thus enabling them to come under registration legislation.

The member for Belmont was quite correct in stating in his second reading speech that approaches had been made to the Government to introduce legislation to provide for the registration of plasterers and, of course, for the consequent setting up of a plasterers' registration board.

The honourable member was also correct in saying that the Government had decided not to introduce such legislation. However, what the member for Belmont did not state were the reasons for the Government's decision and, as I proceed with my speech, I will endeavour to illustrate these reasons in my comments on his speech and on the Bill that he has introduced.

I consider that the proposed legislation to register plasterers is undesirable for a number of reasons. In the first place, registration is not necessary, in my view, nor is it necessary in the public interest. Secondly, it is believed that the principles in the Bill are restrictive—as they must be in registration legislation—and generally they are unaligned with the principles of

enterprise which motivate the Government and also, I believe, the majority of people.

Apart from this the Bill is an escalation of restrictions, and it proposes wider and tighter control than exists in the painters' registration legislation on which it appears to be based. The fact that the painters' registration legislation has been placed on the Statute book is a continuous source of surprise to me, and I feel sure it could only have been placed there because of the winning ways of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Graham: I do not know what you mean by that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition did, however, have to accept a number of amendments to his Bill. Nevertheless, it is now on the Statute book.

Mr. Court: He is saying that you are jolly lucky to have got it through.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In connection with the registration legislation to which I have referred, I think we were impressed by the honourable member's sincerity and by the fact that he had not been able to get a private member's Bill through. Apart from this, the legislation seemed rather innocuous, anyway.

Mr. Graham: You are doing a good job.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In addition to all I have said, it is believed that there should not be any registration or licensing of workers unless the work concerned can involve a danger to the public or to public health, such as occurs in building construction, in electrical work, or in the plumbing trade.

The Builders' Registration Act covers all building operations in the metropolitan area except low-cost renovations and additions in privately owned homes. This Act provides a sufficient coverage for the plastering trade.

A further reason why this legislation is undesirable is that although the extension to State-wide coverage, as is proposed for the plasterers' registration board, explains the higher costs contained in the Bill, it could tend to retard development—although I do not say it would necessarily do so—of remote areas and also possibly increase the cost of development.

It should also be understood that the Bill before us covers only solid plasterers. As members know there are two forms of plastering—one is solid plastering and the other is fibrous plastering. The member for Belmont ensures that his Bill covers only solid plastering. I do not say I would support the member if fibrous plastering were included.

The Bill, however, does tend to fragment plastering. I know the two forms of plastering are not alike, but they are sufficiently alike to make one wonder why we

should have legislation to cover one section of the plastering industry—that of solid plastering—while fibrous plastering should not be covered at all. This appears to be a weakness. If it is good enough for one form of plastering to be covered by legislation, it should be good enough for the other.

Mr. Jamieson: The other is not a full trade; it is only a partially skilled occupation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This might be so, but it does not cover the whole situation by any means. It covers only one facet of the plastering industry, that of solid plastering. In any case, there are certain questions that immediately arise from the introduction of this Bill, and they occur basically from its being too restrictive.

The Bill has been presented as a protection for the public. Indeed, this is the reason we all give when we introduce registration legislation. Whether or not this is so—and I do not believe it is so in this case—it would at the same time tend to create a closed shop for this particular facet of the plastering industry.

The general character of the Bill goes considerably further as a control measure than does the Painters' Registration Act, upon which this one seems to depend, in part, for its justification; and in some instances it appears to go much further than does the Builders' Registration Act.

For example, those two Acts are limited in their effect to the metropolitan area, but the present Bill proposes State-wide coverage, which would in all probability create some problems for remote areas. In addition, it seems to me that we need freedoms more than ever before in the development of the vast and distant areas of this State. We do not need unnecessary restrictions.

I would like to point out at this juncture, in comparing legislation of this type, that it is even open to doubt whether the Builders' Registration Act, or the Painters' Registration Act, is operating to the satisfaction of everyone. In fact, in 1959, the then Leader of the Opposition in another place, during a debate on a Bill to amend the Builders' Registration Act, recommended that it should be abolished. To illustrate I quote from page 2240 of the 1959 *Hansard* which contains the comments of the then Leader of the Opposition (The Hon. H. C. Strickland), as follows:—

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: In my personal opinion it should be repealed. After 20 years of operation I cannot see how the Act has brought about an improvement in the quality of the buildings in and around Perth, as compared with the buildings in other capital cities and in country

towns in Australia. There is no difference in the standard of the structures in the metropolitan area, from the standard of the buildings in Northam, Geraldton or Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you not think the public will be deprived of a lot of protection?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I have explained my reasons. I do not think the Act offers any protection to the public. I believe it loads the cost of buildings for home-buyers, and it increases the cost of homes. It pushes up the cost of buildings; and consequently rentals increase, and the basic wage rises.

Mr. Graham: Do you agree with those sentiments?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am not saying that I agree completely with what The Hon. H. C. Strickland had to say, but I introduced his remarks by saying there was considerable doubt as to the value of pieces of registration legislation that have long been on our Statute book.

Mr. Brady: Do you know why the Builders' Registration Bill was introduced originally?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have already given some idea of why registration legislation is introduced.

Mr. Brady: It was introduced to protect the public.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have said that once or twice already in my speech. Some basic questions that arise from this Bill are as follows:—

- (1) What will registration and a registration board do that, firstly, is to the advantage of the public, secondly, is towards the betterment of the building industry's operations and, thirdly, will give the plasterer himself assistance without which he is suffering injustice?
- (2) What is analogous between the reasons nearly nine years ago for registration of painters, and 30 years ago for registration of builders, that makes it essential for plasterers to follow suit now?

As I said before, only one facet of the plastering industry is to be covered. It could well be that subsequently someone will introduce a Bill to provide for the registration of fibrous plasterers. I ask: How far beyond that will this trend go?

Mr. Jamieson: I take it that you are quite happy with the registration of plumbers.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have already said that plumbers and electricians are, very properly and rightly, licensed,

because their operations bear upon public safety. The third basic question that arises from the Bill is—

- (3) Is the proposal primarily in the public interest or in the industry's interest?

In regard to the first question, it is very doubtful how the public interest would be served by the proposed system. There is no evidence of registration boards being established for plasterers or painters in other States, or even for builders except in South Australia. I would like members to note that in 1961 when the then member for East Perth, who is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, introduced the Painters' Registration Bill, he said that Queensland intended legislation and—to quote his words—"was waiting for Western Australia's lead." But we find years later that Queensland has not acted.

As far as Western Australia is concerned, the presentation of this Bill depends heavily on the fact that builders, painters, and certain other building industry tradesmen have registration or licensing in some form. There has been no objective attempt to prove a need for the registration of plasterers with a convincing, logical account of what are the real problems which confront the public and the industry to a degree which makes registration necessary and essential; nor have widespread examples been given to show how severely the public is suffering from the absence of such legislation. It is true to say that one or two isolated instances, such as those that have been given, are not sufficient evidence; nor is it sufficient to say that plasterers should be registered simply because others are.

I would say there could be grave doubts that the public is suffering because of the absence of this type of legislation in a segment of the plastering industry. Whether or not that is so, it would seem that the legislation is designed, either intentionally or unintentionally, more for the protection of the industry itself, by recreating it as a difficult trade in which to set up new businesses. It is not known to what extent that attitude prevails each time a form of registration legislation is brought forward.

I do not want anybody to misunderstand what I have said. This is the background that is present, and I think it right for me to express it. As in other forms of registration, it is noteworthy that all the present operators would be granted registration whether or not they are dependable, or whether they are good or bad operators.

Mr. Graham: That is the usual grandfather clause.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes. In regard to the second basic question that arises from the Bill as to what is analogous between the reasons for other building industry registration boards and this proposal, the answer seems to me to be "very little." The Builders' Registration Act

under which the various operations of building in the metropolitan area are controlled plays a certain role. It has carried out its purpose to a reasonable extent, and it covers also to an extent—but not fully, as the honourable member would wish—those forms of the building industry which are not covered by legislation.

Even with that legislation there is a franchise of a kind up to the amount of \$2,400, so that any work up to that value can be done without the builder having to be registered. I forget what the amount is in respect of the Painters' Registration Act. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition originally proposed that the franchise be £5, where no registered painter was required to do the work. Subsequently he accepted an amendment for the value of the franchise to be increased to £20 or £25.

In the light of this, it is illogical that work under this Bill only up to \$100 in value should be excluded from registration, and I ask members to have a look at this Bill and consider the penalty for work worth more than \$100. In legislation of this kind, penalty provisions must be included and the penalty provision the honourable member has included in this Bill is as follows:—

Penalty: For a first offence not exceeding two hundred dollars; for a second or subsequent offence not less than four hundred dollars or more than six hundred dollars.

This penalty is for a man doing some plastering work worth more than \$100.

Mr. Graham: I am sure the member for Belmont would look sympathetically at amendments proposed by the Minister.

Mr. Jamieson: This has always been the case. There must be some basis.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am one who hopes the Bill will not reach the Committee stage, as probably the honourable member appreciates.

Mr. Graham: You disappoint me.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Members can see from the type of penalty involved how harsh its application could be. Surely members of this House would find this penalty distasteful in the extreme, and I believe it is very questionable whether the climate of industry needs the presence of this registration today.

Mr. Graham: It reminds me of the penalties imposed for those who grow potatoes without a license.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The third question follows on the foregoing and asks in whose interest is the Bill. If it were primarily in the public interest, the industry would have been doing shoddy work and there would have been a public outcry. Perhaps scandals would have been involved and pressure for control would have come from injured persons; but this,

generally, has not been the case except in certain isolated instances, and one or two have been deliberately channelled through to me.

It seems then that the principal benefits will apply to those who find themselves registered in a closed shop situation. There could therefore be the danger of the system eventually becoming disadvantageous to the public instead of protecting the public. A trend in higher charges could possibly follow the seal of registration and the establishment of a board could become more of a protective bulwark for the registered than for the public.

Mr. Graham: Like the Architects Act Amendment Bill you introduced?

Mr. Brady: And the Nurses Registration Act Amendment Bill introduced a few months before that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am rather pleased that interjections of this nature are made because they tend to make one think about registration legislation as a whole and how far we should go with it. Many of us in this Chamber do have some doubts about the further extension of this type of legislation and I think we will have to examine any such legislation soundly and solidly.

Mr. Brady: All after the horse has got out!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Do not let any more horses get out.

Mr. Jamieson: Why do you think the Builders' Registration Board wants this?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will come to that in a moment. The remarks of that board were very guarded and qualified.

Mr. Jamieson: Oh no, they weren't. The members of that board are quite prepared to be on this board.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let us get on with the subject a little further. The member for Belmont, at one stage of his speech, said—

Of all the artisans employed in the building trades the plasterers are about the only ones who are not covered by some form of registration. I think he was drawing a long bow there. In actual fact registration or licensing within the building industry seems to be confined to builders, painters, plumbers, and electricians.

Mr. Jamieson: What other contractors or subcontractors are there?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: What about carpenters?

Mr. Jamieson: They are part of the building industry.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: What about bricklayers?

Mr. Jamieson: They are part of the industry.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: So are plasterers.

Mr. Jamieson: No, they are not. That is where you are wrong.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Plastering is part of the building industry. Fragmented reasons can apply to these others, but as I mentioned earlier let us have regard for the further proliferation of this type of legislation and let this House guard against it.

Mr. Graham: Let us judge every case on its merits.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I believe in that. I said we must guard the situation very carefully and watch very closely before we pass any more legislation.

The registration of plumbers by the State water supply and sewerage authorities is essential because of the health hazards involved, and the registration of electricians is essential for safety reasons. There is no registration of bricklayers, carpenters, or joiners, or the members of any other trade, of which there are hosts; and pressure could come for those trades to be registered—and they are skilled trades, and shoddy work could be done by those tradesmen thus disadvantaging the public. Do we want registration legislation introduced with the penalty of the kind contained in this Bill, under which work worth more than \$100 carries a penalty of \$200?

Mr. Graham: That is a maximum.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: For a subsequent offence the penalty is a minimum of \$400 and a maximum of \$600.

Mr. Jamieson: You do not give them a second break, you know, if they commit a crime.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would hate to think the philosophy just expressed by the honourable member is his true philosophy; I am sure it is not. More and more in this life we give people a second break, so I do not think he really meant what he said.

Mr. Jamieson: We don't in financial matters. The situation is different in other activities—far different.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We give prisoners a second and third break, as we do others who offend society. I am sure the honourable member did not mean his remarks to be taken generally. Another quote I wish to make from the honourable member's speech is as follows:—

The Master Builders' Association of Western Australia has expressed the desirability of such registration and will give its full support to achieve this end.

That is what the honourable member said and we must have regard for it. In the first place members must realise that builders come under a similar type of legislation, so their views are not completely unbiased. Also I think if the honourable member were to take this statement further with the Master Builders' Association

he would find the association had qualified any statements it may have made with comment to the effect that it doubted whether the Master Plasterers' Association had acted for, or had the support of, the majority of the master plasterers; and, further, that the support of the Master Builders' Association for the Bill would be dependent on the Master Plasterers' Association producing evidence to support it. My understanding is that no such real evidence has been produced. Another quote from the honourable member's speech is as follows:—

It might be of interest for members to know that there are approximately 60 members of the Master Plasterers' Association of Western Australia. There are said to be approximately 150 free-lance contractors who operate in some small way.

I think this supports the contention that the Master Plasterers' Association does not necessarily act for, nor has it necessarily the support of, the majority of master plasterers.

Mr. Jamieson: Do you mean master plasterers, or plasterers? Only master plasterers are members of the association. The others are not master plasterers, but are just jobbing plasterers.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is the definition, and by becoming a member of the Master Plasterers' Association one becomes known as a master plasterer.

Mr. Jamieson: The same as one becomes a master plumber or a master builder.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: As can readily be expected so far from my remarks, I do not support the Bill, and I trust the House will oppose it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Toms.

TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th October.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [9.11 p.m.]: When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition introduced this Bill on the 8th October, 1969, he explained to the House some of the problems being experienced by members of Parliament in respect of the witnessing of land transfers. He explained, quite factually, that members of Parliament generally—and himself in particular—were being deluged with applications from people who wanted to be made commissioners for declarations so as to witness signatures on land transfer documents.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also explained that in the legislation as it then existed—section 145 of the parent Act—there was a list of people who were qualified, within the limits

of Western Australia, to witness documents. He proposed that this list be extended, not in a general way, but in a specific way so that those directly connected with land transfers, in the form of land agents and the like, could become qualified witnesses.

The main argument advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was that those people were under some supervision through their own Statute and, therefore, would be competent to witness documents—largely because of the supervision exercised over them. Because of their own particular legislation they were responsible people.

In 1969 the State Government brought down a Bill to amend the same section of the Act and, ironically enough, those amendments went much further than that proposed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with his specific and restrictive amendment.

So, in the meantime, the Act has been amended virtually to provide for any adult person, who is not a party to the transaction, to witness the transfer document. The reasons for that particular amendment are well known to the House and I need not enlarge on them. Suffice to say they were adopted by the Parliament and for that reason the commendable effort of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was made redundant. I suppose he can bask in the glory of the fact that the greater includes the lesser and, therefore, I think he would be the first to admit it would be rather impracticable to indulge in the amendment which he proposes.

For that reason I propose to oppose the Bill, not because of the principle involved, but because of the changed set of circumstances. I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will accept my opposition in that spirit.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.14 p.m.]: But for one reason I would have asked that the Order of the Day be discharged from the notice paper when it was called. However, it is my intention to do that in a moment. I want once again to emphasise the situation which confronts a private member.

It was early in the session that I gave notice of the Bill, and I moved the first reading on the 17th September. I gave the Bill its second reading exercise on the 8th October last, five and a half months ago, and it has taken up to now—getting towards the end of March—for me to learn the attitude of the Government.

It is true that the Government, after I had introduced my Bill, introduced legislation which achieved what I wanted. Indeed, as pointed out by the Minister that Government legislation has gone somewhat further. Therefore, the purpose to relieve not only myself, but other members of

Parliament, of this spate of requests to be appointed commissioners for declarations in order to witness transfer of land documents, has now been met. As has already been pointed out, any adult in Western Australia, virtually, has the power to witness those papers.

Having done that, and having also overheard what was confided to you, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Mitchell), before I resume my seat might I ask whether at this stage I am in order in seeking leave to have the Order of the Day discharged from the notice paper, or must I suffer the ignominy of witnessing my Bill, with my personal blessing, defeated on the voices in this House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mitchell): I am afraid that the Bill, having been dealt with before the House, and having been debated, must go to the vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: I find myself in the position of being a part—or a partner—to the execution of my own good intentions.

Question put and negatived.

Bill defeated.

KEWDALE LANDS DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Recommittal

Bill recommitted, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), for the further consideration of clause 12.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 12: Amendment to section 8—

Mr. COURT: I hope that before I have concluded my remarks the member for Belmont will be available. Through no fault of his he happens to be out of the Chamber at the moment. I did not think we would get to this item on the notice paper so quickly, and I have asked somebody to let the member for Belmont know because he handled this Bill during the second reading stage and the Committee stage. It would be unfair if he were not here to discuss this particular matter.

Mr. Brady: The member for Belmont is attending a Labour Caucus meeting.

Mr. COURT: If, after I have explained the reason for the recommittal of the Bill, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—who is in charge of the Opposition benches at the moment—would prefer the matter to be reported on, I would gladly do that, because it is not my intention to put it through without the Opposition having an opportunity to study it.

I discussed this matter with the member for Belmont and explained it to him. Perhaps I should now explain it to the Committee. When the Bill was before Parliament, during the second reading stage, I indicated that the land which was acquired by the authority would continue to have the dedication which exists under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act.

In other words, once the land was acquired under that Act, on its way to the authority, it would have endorsed on it through the dedication—because of the Statute—the fact that it could not be sold, leased, or mortgaged, without the prior approval of the Minister.

There is a very good reason for this; because if land is acquired from people at a lower price than its commercial value later on, the people concerned would not like to feel that the land was traded in by the new owner. This would be even more severe if it was a case of straight-out resumption. Personally, if I had land resumed under those circumstances and then found that the new owner was free to trade to the full, I would be extremely angry if the new owner sold it at a handsome profit within a short or even a long term.

Therefore, it was intended that the dedication from the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act would remain on the title so that the land could not be sold, leased, or mortgaged without prior ministerial approval. When I had this point checked the other day, following a query raised by the member for Belmont in connection with the operations of the existing Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, the legal people advised me that my intentions would not be achieved.

Because I had given an assurance to the Parliament that the dedication would remain, I felt it my duty to get an amendment drafted to remove any doubt and to ensure that the restriction would prevail. Members will have seen the amendment on the notice paper which is aimed at achieving the purpose I have mentioned. There is a slight difference from the original form of dedication, but I believe the slight difference is, in fact, an advantage and it will allow a degree of common sense when the property has been developed according to the intentions of the authority; in other words, when the person concerned has met in good faith all the conditions that were imposed.

By way of explanation I should point out that the representatives of the authority as well as legal people considered that the amendment I now propose is going too far for what would, in fact, be required in practice. With some justification they say that the authority would impose conditions when it sold land and it would be entitled to say to the new owner, with full force and effect, that the land had to be

developed and used in a certain way. However, I still believe that Parliament would prefer to have the endorsement in the form of the actual dedication which would then read that a person could not—

- (a) sell, exchange, transfer, assign or encumber with any mortgage or other security or sublet or otherwise part with the possession of such land or his lease thereof to any other person; or
- (b) use such land for any purpose other than for the purpose for which he obtained it from the Development Authority,

without the prior consent in writing of the Minister.

The penalty proposed is \$1,000. Let me make it clear that this amount is a penalty for virtually going across the dedication and it certainly does not mean that a person could avoid the dedication by paying a penalty of \$1,000. After all, it would be something of a farce if the value of a property had increased by several thousand dollars and the dedication could be avoided merely through the payment of a penalty of \$1,000. As I say, it is a penalty for breaching the dedication and, in addition, the person concerned would not be able to give effect to the transaction he entered into. The amendment then provides—

- (5) Where the Minister is of opinion that a person has to such a degree developed or used the land for the purpose for which it was obtained by him as to warrant the person being exempt from the provisions of subsection (4) of this section, the Minister may by writing under his hand, grant exemption to that person from those provisions and thereupon they cease to apply to the person and the land.

The last provision has been suggested as a practical one by the representatives of the authority and I personally go along with it.

Previously I had explained in the absence of the member for Belmont, who was unavoidably out of the Chamber at the time, that I did not wish to proceed with the amendment until he had had ample time to study it. Doubtless he will be able to indicate to the Committee whether he is happy to deal with it tonight or wishes progress to be reported. I move an amendment—

Page 6—Insert after paragraph (c) the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (d):—

- (d) by adding after subsection (3) subsections as follows—

(4) A person who has purchased or leased from the Development Authority any land referred to in Part IV, V or VI that has been acquired

by the Development Authority or any land that the Development Authority has acquired under subsection (1a) of this section shall not—

- (a) sell, exchange, transfer, assign or encumber with any mortgage or other security or sublet or otherwise part with the possession of such land or his lease thereof to any other person; or
- (b) use such land for any purpose other than for the purpose for which he obtained it from the Development Authority.

without the prior consent in writing of the Minister.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

(5) Where the Minister is of opinion that a person has to such a degree developed or used the land for the purpose for which it was obtained by him as to warrant the person being exempt from the provisions of subsection (4) of this section, the Minister may by writing under his hand, grant exemption to that person from those provisions and thereupon they cease to apply to the person and the land.

Mr. JAMIESON: I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment, because it will tidy up the legislation. As the Minister has indicated, at the present moment there is some doubt that a person could engage in some form of property transaction. This is not the spirit of the legislation and the doubt will be removed by the passing of the amendment. We would not want the Industrial Lands Development Authority to find itself in the position where it sold land to a person who saw the opportunity to hold the land for a year or so and sell it at an enhanced price. If this were done, the Government would be involved in some form of speculation and, after all, the present legislation aims at overcoming excessive speculation in industrial land. To that end we must ensure that all avenues

Restrictions
against
dealings
in land
acquired
under this
section.

of speculation are reasonably tightly tied. In this way, the Parliament will not be accused of allowing people to speculate in land acquired for industrial purposes.

The fact that the Minister may exempt a person from the provision at a later stage is desirable. In these changing days an industry which is necessary when it is established may have been set up on a small acreage but, at a later date, it may be found that it is no longer required because of some other system which has been evolved with different techniques. Surely the person concerned must be able to sell the land and receive some equity for the site. This will be done only after a close examination to establish that the industry was intended to be set up in all good faith but that it was no longer required economically because of the effluxion of time. Under these circumstances the persons concerned who had acquired the land should receive from the Minister an exemption from the requirement that they are not able to sell it outside of the purpose for which it was acquired.

I see no other problems associated with the amendment. As I have said, it tidies up the legislation and, when it is incorporated in the reprinted Act, it will clearly indicate to any persons who examine the Statute exactly where they stand. In this way there will be no excuse for anyone to say that he was not aware of the extent of this provision or the intention of the Parliament when it passed the measure. I support the proposed amendment, because it clarifies the situation.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with an amendment.

House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 26th March, 1970

The SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

AFTERNOON TEA SUSPENSION

THE SPEAKER: I would like to make a short announcement concerning afternoon tea today. I understand it is the Premier's desire to adjourn the House somewhere around 4 p.m. If that eventuality is likely we will not rise for afternoon tea at 3.45 p.m., and we will sit for another 15 minutes. In any event I will watch the proceedings and let members know later on whether we will rise at 3.45 p.m.

QUESTIONS (46): ON NOTICE

1. COCKBURN SOUND

Causeway: Point Peron-Garden Island

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What criteria are being used to determine the causeway design which is to cross the south passage between Cockburn Sound and the Indian Ocean?
- (2) Who will make the final decisions on the plans, the State or Commonwealth Government?
- (3) In regard to environmental factors (currents, winds, beaches, etc.) what consideration will be given to these aspects when designing and building the causeway from Point Peron to Garden Island?
- (4) How far have the State and Commonwealth Governments progressed towards establishing the causeway?
- (5) If there are estimated times for commencement and completion of the causeway what are they?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of constructing the causeway?
- (7) Will it be necessary for the Government to acquire any freehold or leasehold land on Point Peron reserve prior to completion of causeway towards providing access to this project?
- (8) Could an indication be given as to the future of Garden Island?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) To meet the requirements of the Department of the Navy and to conform in basic design to Fremantle Port Authority development plans.
- (2) The Commonwealth Government on the basis of criteria as set out in (1).
- (3) Design will be based on existing research into all environmental factors.
- (4) Research is currently progressing.
- (5) Not known.
- (6) Not known.
- (7) Depends on final agreed alignment.
- (8) The island is the property of the Commonwealth.

2.

EDUCATION

Eden Park Primary School

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

Relating to Eden Park Primary School, Westfield, Kelmscott—

- (1) When are the permanent buildings expected to commence and be ready for occupancy by students?