Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 3rd April, 1969

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. A. Manning) took the Chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Postponement

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Owing to the impossibility of having questions answered at this time of the day, they will be dealt with at a convenient time later in the sitting, possibly after lunch.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning leave of absence for eight weeks granted to Mr. Mitchell (Stirling) on the ground of urgent public business.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Agent General Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Nalder (Deputy Premier), and read a first time.

2. Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and read a first time.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. State Housing Act Amendment Bill, 1969.
   Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. O'Neil (Minister for Housing), and transmitted to the Council.

2. Poisons Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and returned to the Council with amendments.

BANANA INDUSTRY COMPENSATION TRUST FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 1st April. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Williams) in the Chair; Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 4 had been agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 9 put and passed.

New clause 7—

Mr. NORTON: I move—

Page 4—Insert after clause 6 the following new clause to stand as clause 7:—

> 7. Section twenty-six of the principal Act is amended by deleting subsection (2) and inserting in lieu the following subsections—
>
> (2) The Committee shall within two days after the making of an assessment and determination pursuant to subsection (1) of this section give or cause to be given written notification thereof to the grower.
>
> (3) A grower who is dissatisfied with any assessment and determination may within three days after receipt by him of the notification thereof appeal in writing against such assessment and determination to the Minister, and the Minister shall thereupon appoint some competent and impartial person (other than a person previously nominated and appointed by him under subsection (1) of this section for the purpose of making the assessment and determination being appealed against) to assess and determine the extent of the destruction.
>
> (4) The determination of the person appointed by the Minister under subsection (3) of this section is final and conclusive.

This amendment seeks to amend section 26 which deals with the extent of losses to be assessed after a cyclone, or any damage suffered by planters, as set out in the Bill.

Under this section the Minister has power to appoint two assessors, one from the Department of Agriculture and one who is elected by the growers. It is also provided that in the event of any disagreement between the two assessors the Minister may appoint a referee assessor and, as the Act now stands, his decision shall be final. However, under section 17 (1) of the Cattle Industry Compensation Act an appeal is allowed against an assessment if a producer considers he has not been fairly treated. Here again the Minister may appoint an umpire assessor whose decision shall be final. A similar provision is contained in section 14 (g)

of the Bee Industry Compensation Act and in the Pig Industry Compensation Act.

The amendment contains three proposed new subsections. It seeks to delete subsection (2) as this will be necessary if the first two proposed subsections are agreed to. Proposed new subsection (2) is probably the most important, and to understand the reason for this amendment one must realise that when any banana plants are destroyed by a cyclone it is necessary to have the area cleaned up as quickly as possible.

Therefore the assessment has to be made, and the assessors have to do a very complicated task in as short a time as possible. The trouble with such assessments is that at the time the total destruction caused by the wind is not apparent to the growers or to the assessors. The damage is very apparent where a banana palm is blown over or broken off, but standing palms can be damaged very extensively although the damage may not become evident until three or six months later. Any delay in notifying the producer of the percentage of damage caused is detrimental to him; it enables him to ponder over the damage, and as he cleans up he generally sees more damage than was assessed. If this goes on before the assessment is delivered to him, the grower will imagine the damage to be greater than that assessed. This has happened on a number of occasions.

Where a grower receives his assessment, and is then able to see his neighbour's property and compare it with his own, he will be able to realise that he has been assessed on the same basis as his neighbour. However, as time goes on he imagines more damage and greater losses, and this causes some dissension in the assessment of such damage or losses.

With the assessor delivering to the grower within two days of the making of an assessment and determination a *pro forma* setting out the percentage of damage, the grower would be given a chance to lodge an appeal if the second part of my amendment were agreed to. It would be fair to the assessors and to the growers for such notice to be delivered.

This would not place a great burden on the assessors, because they would have available printed or roneod forms on which it would only be necessary to insert the name of the owner of the plantation and the assessed percentage of damage. This form could be delivered the next day or by mail to the grower, whichever method was more convenient. Such a procedure would do away with much of the heartburning which exists, brought about by the multiplicity of damage which manifests itself as time goes on.

The assessors have done a wonderful job, and, as the Minister said, there has not been any request for an umpire to come in. That speaks very well for them. The same two assessors have been employed on each of the two occasions when a cyclone has caused havoc in the district.

The next part of my amendment will give the grower a right of appeal if he is dissatisfied; and this appeal must be lodged within three days after receipt by him of the notification. The Minister may appoint a further valuator, and his determination shall be final. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr. NALDER: I have examined the clauses in the Bill and the provisions in the Act. I have endeavoured to get in touch with some of the growers, because it has been difficult to find the reasons for requesting the amendment put forward by the member for Gascoyne. I must say there is very little support for the amendment. The honourable member has not indicated where this request came from—whether he originated it with the idea of trying to improve the position, or whether it has come from the growers or the organisation.

In my opinion what the member for Gascoyne suggests will only duplicate a situation which is already covered by the Act. If a good reason had been put forward as a result of the experience of storm damage to the plantations, then there would be some merit in the amendment; but the honourable member has indicated that up to this point of time no difficulty has been experienced with the Act and that since it came into operation there has not been the need to call in an arbitrator.

The two parties involved in this—the representative of the growers and the representative of the department, who is appointed by the director—have been able to negotiate successfully the necessary arrangements. It has not been necessary to call in an arbitrator in order to overcome a disagreement. If the Act has worked so successfully, there is no need to make some amendment which will definitely be cumbersome, and which will delay the decision as mentioned by the member for Gascoyne. He suggests that within 48 hours after the making of an assessment or determination the grower shall be notified. Section 26 provides—

> (1) Where a grower is entitled to compensation pursuant to section twenty-five of this Act, the extent of the destruction of the bananas being produced by him shall be assessed and determined by agreement between a person representing the growers nominated for the purpose by a majority of the growers, and an officer of the Department appointed for that purpose by the Director.

If the two parties cannot agree on the amount of damage then—

> . . . some competent and impartial person nominated and appointed for the purpose by the Minister shall assess and determine the extent of the destruction.

Subsection (2) of that section states—

> (2) The determination of the person nominated and appointed by the Minister is final and conclusive.

The member for Gascoyne seeks to amend this section by providing that if agreement cannot be reached after the two parties have assessed the damage, the Minister shall appoint an impartial person to act as an arbitrator.

The Minister has already looked for an impartial person, one who would have business acumen and sound judgment. Surely to goodness this should be sufficient; but it is not, according to the member for Gascoyne. He wants the Minister, after he has already appointed an assessor and the growers have disagreed, to appoint another person. In all probability the growers would not be satisfied with someone from this State and we would have to bring in someone from another State to assess the assessor's decision. I think this is a cumbersome way of dealing with the matter. As I have already said, we have never yet had to call in an arbitrator. Therefore I do not believe the amendment is necessary.

With regard to the two days allowed in the first part of the amendment, I say that this would be impossible. Let me explain what happens. When damage has been experienced and the request made for compensation, two people must be appointed, one by the growers and one by the department. In most cases the latter would be a person from Perth, nominated by the director. The two appointed must go to the area, make an assessment, and then return to Perth where a decision is made on the actual amount which is to be paid. Imagine the situation if all this was required to be done within 48 hours. What would the situation be if the airports and roads were closed? It would be impossible. Therefore I say the provisions should be left as they are.

Everything is done as expeditiously as possible and no time is lost. If this amendment were passed, the situation would become more cumbersome and more time consuming. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister asked me whether I had received any requests for this amendment. I have here a letter addressed to the Minister, dated the 30th November, 1968. It is from the Market Gardeners' Association in Carnarvon, and reads as follows:—

> Hon. C. Nalder, M.L.A.
> Minister for Agriculture,
> Parliament House,
> Perth. W.A.
> Dear Sir,
>
> Ref. Banana Industry Compensation Trust Fund.
>
> In view of the early termination of this Act, April 1969, my Committee requests that favourable consideration be given to further continuation of the Act, subject to the following amendments:
>
> Section 27 (3) Amounts of Compensation Payable.
>
> My Committee suggests that the present amendment to be rescinded and the original motion to be restored. "Where a grower is entitled to compensation under this Act in respect of any partial loss suffered by him, twenty per centum of that loss as assessed pursuant to Section 26 of this Act shall be borne by the grower, and the grower shall not be entitled to claim or be paid any compensation in respect of that portion of loss so borne by him."
>
> Original motion as stated above.
>
> Section 26. Extent of Loss to be Assessed.
>
> It is suggested that a new clause be added making it mandatory that the grower should be advised of assessment within a reasonable time, say 48 hours of determined loss. The suggested clause would afford the grower reasonable time and right of appeal where he considers the assessors assessment of loss to be understated. An opportunity should be given to an independent assessor to be appointed, reviewing the disputed assessment.
>
> My Committee requests that favourable consideration be given to inclusion of the foregoing amendments and the continuation of the Act.
>
> I await with interest your deliberation and reply.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> G. E. BARDWELL, Manager.

That is the request I received. It is a copy of a letter to the Minister and is the one I said he had not referred to in his second reading speech.

The Minister particularly dealt with the right of appeal by a grower. I think everyone should have the right to appeal. I am mainly interested in proposed new subsection (2). I think the Minister has possibly become a little confused concerning my intention, which is that the assessors should give the percentage of damage,

not the final assessment. I know that cannot be done, because the Act stipulates that if the compensation liable to be paid is greater than the amount in the fund, then the fund shall be distributed *pro rata* according to the assessments.

I know very well that the distribution of the compensation cannot be made until all of the assessments have gone to the committee in Perth and been processed. That takes anything up to two or three months. I feel it is only right and proper that in the meantime a grower should have some knowledge of his percentage loss; and this is what I am trying to provide. The total damage is not always apparent at first. The destruction of a plantation can be as high as 100 per cent., as was the case following the blow in 1961.

In that blow all the plants were broken off approximately 2ft. to 2 ft. 6 in. above the ground and not one was left standing. In an average blow, the destruction fluctuates and is caused mostly by whirlwinds within the cyclone. A constant wind is not as great a menace to the bananas as a whirlwind. If plantations are examined after a cyclone it will be seen that a strip has been blown down completely through the centre or along one side. One can never forecast where the whirlwind is going to hit. When this happens the plants are left lying in every direction, perhaps in a circle. Nothing at all was left standing in the 1961 blow, but that was exceptional.

It is where the damage comes in patches because of a constant wind or a whirlwind within the cyclone, that disputes over damage could arise. To my mind it is right that the grower should be given his percentage of loss as soon as possible. If this is done he will have some idea of what he can expect, although he will not know the actual amount until it is assessed by the committee. If this were done he would seem to have more protection.

I would be quite prepared to forgo the second part of the amendment in order to press the first part, because I consider it is the most worth while.

I referred to a letter in which the organisation asked for an amendment to section 27. The Minister has brought down an amendment to that section and I consider that the amendment will overcome the difficulty which existed previously.

I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to the notification of the assessment—perhaps it would be better to call it a percentage assessment—within 24 or 48 hours, or within a reasonable period so that the planter would know just where he was going.

Mr. NALDER: I wish to inform the Committee and also the member for Gascoyne that I replied to both organisations and indicated to them the Government's intention with reference to the amendments to be brought down.

Mr. Norton: I did not say that the Minister did not reply.

Mr. NALDER: I simply wish to make it clear that both organisations were informed of the proposals in the legislation. I have not actually received any official replies to those letters. However, when the amendments proposed by the member for Gascoyne were submitted I requested the officers of the department to try to contact the organisations there. Because of the short space of time, it was quite difficult to get in touch with them. However, one of the organisations, the Carnarvon Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, indicated that it was satisfied with the present legislation, and did not request any further amendments to those outlined in the letter which I sent. Those amendments have been included in the Bill.

Surely we can agree, without the necessity to legislate, on the points raised by the honourable member. I am sure that the two people who are appointed to assess damage in this situation will make the information available to the grower at the earliest possible moment.

I would go so far as to say that this will be a requirement. I am sure it has been done that way in the past, but I will emphasise the situation. If we were to stipulate a period of 48 hours, or some other time, how impossible it would be if a number of the circumstances which I have suggested did, in fact, arise.

Mr. Norton: But it does not involve roads or aircraft.

Mr. NALDER: It involves getting the information to the person and that could be an impossibility within the suggested time. Of course it might be possible that the information could be made available in less time. However, I will emphasise the fact—and I will see that a note is placed on the file to this effect—that the information is to be made available with the greatest possible speed. However, I do foresee difficulties if we include that stipulation in the legislation. I ask the Committee not to agree to the suggested new clause. The amendments proposed by the Government have proved satisfactory and in my opinion the suggested amendment is unnecessary.

New clause put and negatived.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

TRADE DESCRIPTIONS AND FALSE ADVERTISEMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 27th March.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [11.35 a.m.]: The Bill is something of a disappointment and something of a paradox. It also has the effect of legalising what is a misnomer.

I have said that it is a disappointment, because when I heard the Bill title as the Minister gave notice of the legislation to be introduced, I expected that, at long last, we were going to do something about the forms of advertising and trade descriptions which are generally rampant in the community. Unfortunately the legislation only proposes one or two minor amendments to the Act.

I have said it is a paradox because, in order to assist the international promotion of wool, we are to agree to less wool being included in garments which are to be labelled "all wool" or "pure wool."

I have said that we are legalising a misnomer because, in effect, we are going to label a garment "all wool" or "pure wool" when it will have 80 per cent. wool, 15 per cent. specialty fibre and 5 per cent. other fibre. If anyone takes the literal interpretation of "pure wool," he will see that the end garment will be some 20 per cent. short of the proper definition.

Mr. O'Neil: It is 5 per cent. short at the moment.

Mr. DAVIES: I was coming to that point. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a member representing a country electorate, you are probably aware that a woollen garment can be labelled "pure wool" if it consists of 95 per cent. pure wool and 5 per cent. other fibre. I think that provision comes in under section 4A of the Act. I suppose the other fibre refers to cotton, tyings, bands, and the like. Under the proposed amendments, the 95 per cent. will be reduced to 80 per cent. of pure wool, by the inclusion of 15 per cent. of what is called specialty fibre, which includes mohair, cashmere, alpaca, llama, vicuna, and camel hair. I am sure the countries which produce these fibres will be delighted with the move, because it will assist their trade in specialty fibres.

I do not know how the farmers feel about it. When referring to the member for Avon I never know which syllable to stress in his electorate, but perhaps an accentuated first syllable is more properly associated with a cosmetic product. In any event, I can see him sitting there, and I am sure he is going to make a contribution to the debate.

Mr. Gayfer: The honourable member is not trying to egg me on, is he?

Mr. DAVIES: I do not know how the farmers feel about the suggestion. To my mind, it is rather curious that the Minister said that the interested parties had been consulted. He referred to the Chamber of Manufacturers, the Textile Council of Australia, the Australian Wool Board, and the dry cleaners. All these organisations get a mention, but the producer of the wool did not get a mention at all.

Mr. Gayfer: Do you know the composition of the Australian Wool Board?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes.

Mr. Gayfer: There is farmer representation on the Australian Wool Board.

Mr. DAVIES: I am delighted to hear that. The other day I heard further concern expressed about the promotion of wool. In fact, all told, I have heard a great deal of concern expressed in this respect. I recall reading a number of articles which indicated that there had been a considerable amount of trouble with the top administration of the Wool Board.

I believe that a woman who had been appointed the top promoter, but who is no longer with the Wool Board, was the ground for the concern which was felt amongst growers generally. Naturally, any Australian would like to see wool promoted successfully. We all realise the tremendous effect which the price of wool and woollen garments has on the economy.

It will mean, of course, that when our wool is sold overseas, it will be possible to have it manufactured into garments which contain 80 per cent. wool and 15 per cent. specialty fibre and, when the garments come back to Australia, they will be labelled "pure wool." We will be able to do the same thing and export our garments overseas. I think it is pertinent to remark that in my travels I have found that Australian-manufactured woollen goods are very highly respected. In fact I have been able to do a trade with some of my clothes during my travels. I have swapped jumpers and cardigans.

Mr. Gayfer: Swapped or lost?

Mr. DAVIES: Swapped them, given them away, and they have even been pinched from me. I always felt somewhat proud that anyone would bother to pinch any of my clothes until I realised that they were stolen, not because they were my clothes but because they were made from Australian wool and were of a high standard. As a matter of fact, at the present time a request has been made to me by a friend in America to obtain a certain style of pullover and send it to him. This person was recently in Australia and impressed upon me time and time again that there is nothing better than an Australian-manufactured woollen garment.

There is nothing to stop manufacturers continuing to make a garment with a 95 per cent. woollen content, but I should imagine that the specialty fibres are cheaper than wool and, consequently, manufacturers will tend to incorporate more of the specialty fibres into a garment.

Mr. O'Neil: They are not; they are very expensive fibres.

Mr. DAVIES: That is heartening to know. If they are not cheaper, probably manufacturers will continue to use more wool, and I think that is a very good thing indeed.

If we are to allow into Australia garments which are manufactured overseas in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, I wonder whether this will mean a very substantial reduction in the number of garments which are manufactured in Australia. The Minister may be able to tell me whether any research in this direction has been undertaken.

As I have said, we are legalising a misnomer. We will be giving the legal label of pure wool to something which contains only 80 per cent. pure wool. I am not very happy about this kind of thing. I appreciate the Minister's remarks when he said that Western Australia is one of the last States in Australia to comply with the international standard. I would much rather see an attempt made to upgrade the overseas standard to the Australian standard. Perhaps the member for Avon, when he stands up, will be able to tell me whether such an attempt has been made. However, possibly the reason is that the Government felt that Western Australia was one of the last of the Australian States to comply with the international standard and that we simply had to join with those who were promoting the wool overseas.

I do not think there is very much more I can say on this matter. I am a little disappointed, but I appreciate the Government is in the position where it cannot do anything else. I am sure the people who know about these things have properly assessed the position and the ultimate overall benefit. I hope it will be to the good of the wool industry of Australia, with regard to both the manufacturing of garments and the growing of wool.

The Minister mentioned one or two other minor amendments, one being to incorporate carpets in the definition of textiles. I think this is a good thing. However, I am not so happy about the third proposal: to allow other textiles to be added to the definition by way of regulation. I have constantly opposed the rights of civil servants to do things by regulation.

Looking back over the years, I find that there have been very few amendments made to this section of the Act. Therefore, I believe it is not unreasonable to ask that each request come to Parliament. True, the regulations would be tabled in this House, but the Minister, and every member of this Chamber, knows that many regulations go through without being looked at.

I feel that we should not let go the power we have to amend the Act. We are handing some of it over to civil servants—to Government departments—and I am very much opposed to this. I can appreciate that for the most part the people concerned are well motivated. However, I do not think that in a matter like this —where in the past it has been proved that amendments have been made with very little inconvenience to the Parliament —we should surrender the right we have at the present time and delegate it to a Government department. With those few comments, and with the reservations I have made, I support the Bill.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [11.47 a.m.]: I wish to make a few comments on the measure before the House, which I consider is of great importance not only to this State, but also to the Commonwealth in general. I fully sympathise with the previous speaker who has just outlined his views, and who doubted that the farmers would wholeheartedly support such a Bill. However, I can assure the member for Victoria Park that the Australian Wool Board and the International Wool Secretariat have both given their support. The Farmers' Union and, I think, the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association have supported this move, and I think those bodies are fairly representative of the farmers and pastoralists of Australia.

Of course, this measure seeks to amend trade practices by permitting the use of the description "pure wool" or "all wool," for textiles containing not less than 80 per cent. sheep's wool, and not more than 5 per cent. fibres other than specialty animal fibres; namely, mohair, cashmere, alpaca, llama, vicuna, and camel hair. These, in fact, can be termed wool.

The Minister has explained that the Bill will possibly be one of the last to come before the different State Parliaments, and it is more or less complementary to Commonwealth legislation supporting this move.

Wool producers pay annually the sum of 2 per cent. of the value of their product for the purposes of promotion and research, and that sum is matched dollar for dollar by the Commonwealth Government to the extent of $14,000,000. Last year, something like $8,000,000 was matched by the Commonwealth Government on this principle, and those are the moneys which form the basis for the international promotion scheme.

The International Wool Secretariat, which is comprised, in the main, of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa is definitely adamant that greater emphasis shall be given to the promotion of wool throughout the world. At this stage, I might add that at the start of the promotion scheme a levy was made on the farmers, and there was a great deal of doubt amongst the farmers themselves as to whether the levy was serving any real purpose. Meeting after meeting was held condemning the idea of promotion and the fact that the money was being spent willy-nilly. Sir William

Gunn—or, Mr. William Gunn as he was then—actually conducted a campaign under some glorious name, but it did not have much effect on the industry; or so it seemed.

With regard to the 2 per cent. levy paid by each farmer or producer out of his wool returns, that amount represents about $3 per bale, and $2.10 of that sum goes straight into the promotion fund, and 90c goes into the research fund. So one can see that, although research is so vital to our industry, promotion is considered to be definitely the main core of the existence of our wool industry in the field of overseas competition.

The International Wool Secretariat produced the woolmark, or the original promotion woolmark, as its main weapon for the promotion of wool and for creating and maintaining a consumer demand. The secretariat has made significant advances ever since the woolmark became the symbol which is so widely publicised in all parts of the world. There are now actually 30 countries in the world which have licenses to manufacture wool products under the woolmark brand. At the present time woolmark labels are selling at the rate of 13,000,000 a month, and this figure is rising because the Eastern European countries are fast becoming aware of the value of the woolmark in signifying a true product.

There are also domestic licenses in those countries totalling some 9,640, and export licenses totalling 11,100 in order that they may export their finished products.

Last year the woolmark made its greatest stride ever when it became mandatory for the northern hemisphere woolmark to meet the new washable shrink-resistant specifications. This, as we all realise, is one of the greatest break-throughs our research has made in the field of producing a garment that can be placed in a washing machine—and a garment which is absolutely shrink-resistant.

Woolmark recognition was a problem that really worried me in my trips overseas, because in some countries I did not actually see any reference to, or indication of, the symbol—that well-known symbol each and every one of us here knows so well. Yet, I understand the strides that have been made in recognition of this symbol have gone beyond even the wildest hopes of the International Wool Secretariat and the Australian Wool Board. Woolmark recognition now averages 60 per cent. world wide. In other words, 60 per cent. of the population of the world know the symbol. The goal originally aimed at by the International Wool Secretariat was somewhere in the vicinity of 50 per cent., and already the recognition figure is way over that target, and it is anticipated that in the near future something like 70 per cent. of total world population will be aware of the wool product.

In nine of 14 countries that are far enough advanced in their education to conduct a survey of wool recognition, it has been proved that in advance of 70 per cent. of the population are aware of wool products in those countries. Consequently, the woolmark—and all the other terms which go with the promotion of wool—is being exploited increasingly as a hard-hitting protective measure against synthetic fibres; and this, of course is the main object.

In my opinion, the wool industry has shown a steady revival on a modest scale. In spite of the intense competition from synthetics, the opportunity for selling wool on the world market is increasing and expanding day by day. To this end, of course, we have the measure before the House today.

I noticed recently that Russia is importing from Japan 1,820 tons of pure wool yarn, and also 1,720 tons of acryl wool. This is an example of the results of the promotion of selling wool. However, the Soviets have in fact indicated that this year they will import more than 4,000 tons of wool from Japan, and they have said that this market will increase.

When one considers Australia has 166,000,000 sheep—I think that was the figure at the last sheep census—and the Russians, I think, have in the vicinity of 135,000,000 sheep, it is rather surprising that Russia would still want to buy on the overseas market; and, in the main, it is favouring Australian wool.

Russia is also exchanging information through the International Wool Secretariat about the products and processes with regard to the manufacturing of garments from wool. It is not the only country playing its part in scientific research. Brazil has just started on a promotion campaign. Admittedly Brazil only spent something like $12,000 last year, but at least it is a start. There is a growing recognition by the farmers in Brazil that the country needs world-wide promotion in order to sell its woollen goods.

Uruguay imposes a .3 per cent. tax on wool, which last year amounted to something in excess of $150,000. Chile, together with other countries, is following suit in recognising the need to bring the importance of wool before the attention of the public, and to tell the public exactly what a woollen garment is; and this in spite of synthetic production and promotion. Countries that have traditional animal fibres have been a little complacent with regard to using wool instead of their own mohair, or other product.

This cuts both ways. It means now that these countries will be pleased to add something of the renowned qualities of wool to their products. I think I am right in saying that these products of theirs are not always cheap by any means. I do not

think we will be lowering the standard of the product by incorporating the animal fibres from such countries.

The people in India want to use wool, but unfortunately, India being a poor country, they cannot afford it. If wool can be combined with some of their products, however, and be made available as a garment which can be more readily used by the people, I am sure more wool on the whole will be sold.

I have always thought that there should be a blending of wool with other products in order to satisfy the demands of people who cannot afford to buy the supreme quality product which looked like being turned out in the first instance and which is available to just a few. I am told, however, that generally throughout the world there is now a recognition of the qualities of wool and people realise that it will produce a far superior garment. As a matter of fact when one observes this feature of wool promotion overseas generally, and the lift that is being obtained from it, one feels the industry is gaining as a result.

It also makes one feel that possibly a similar type of promotion should be spread to the other fields of agricultural endeavour. I honestly believe that if the exporting countries—Russia, the United States, Canada, and the others which are exporting wheat at the present moment—adopted a world-wide promotion scheme similar to that which applies in the case of wool, we would have a lot less trouble in the sale of our wheat than we are experiencing at the present moment. I admit, however, that this is another subject altogether; but the very basis on which wool is promoted and the proven result of the woolmark exercise do, I think, indicate the necessity to investigate and possibly adopt a similar worldwide promotion scheme in connection with wheat.

This is not, of course, the first time I have mentioned this aspect. After I returned from my overseas study tour I made this point in 1967, but I was told at the time that I was speaking a little prematurely about the possible glut in wheat.

The only thing I want to say, however, on this motion is that Australia is absolutely dependent on the sale of her primary produce overseas.

Mr. Graham: Not absolutely dependent.

Mr. GAYFER: I say she is absolutely dependent on this. If the farmers go to the wall it will certainly be very difficult to replace their products by the iron ore being produced up north.

If members will consider our gross national product they will find that wool and wheat are by far the main products exported by Australia. I know it has been said that wool and wheat will soon take a back place so far as Western Australia is concerned, because iron ore will possibly eclipse them in value, particularly in their value to the State; but this has to be proven.

I do feel however that our great Australian primary industry is far from being at the cross-roads or the point of no return, in spite of the panic which some people are inclined to inject into the field of farming at the moment. We must go out and seek every available source we can in order to sell our products. I have always felt that one cannot enter this selling business half heartedly any more than one can be just a little bit pregnant. One must be either right in it, or right out. Farming is big business and we must use every available opportunity we can to sell our products overseas.

MR. HALL (Albany) [12.6 p.m.]: The Bill before us seeks to do two things. It seeks to add after the definition of "retailer" a definition to cover "specialty animal fibre." Without labouring that point, which has been adequately covered by the member for Avon, I would only say that the animal fibre is a natural circumstance or creation. Such fibre and its possible use is, however, comparable with that of wool in its correct atmosphere.

For a long time in Australia there has been waging what we call a textile war. The Australian Wool Board has been endeavouring to promote its campaign on the use of wool and, consequently, it has been reluctant to use the percentage of wool which might be used in the actual manufacture of woollen materials.

When we consider the construction of a yarn—it could be either wool or worsted—we find the present percentage is 95 per cent. wool. As a concession the Australian Wool Board has seen fit to accept the lesser proportion of 80 per cent. wool, rather than 95 per cent., thereby hoping to promote the sale of the product. It would seek to do this by the introduction of other fibres. The introduction of the other fibres referred to and, in many cases, synthetics, means that the cloth gains a character and a different denomination from wool which, of course, is the supreme fibre.

In the past, manufacturers have aimed at securing a ratio of 75 per cent. to 25 per cent.; and by conceding a loss of, say, 15 per cent. the Australian Wool Board has actually gained 5 per cent. The board has gained this 5 per cent. in the hope of introducing these other fibres and thus promoting, and stepping up, the sale of wool garments—garments which are all wool or a mixture.

I believe the object of the Australian Wool Board is to capture approximately 20 per cent. of the textile manufacture of Australia, which is almost double that of any other country in the world.

I do not wish in any way to belittle the point made by the member for Avon in relation to export, but this resolution of the board is designed to capture the Australian market to the extent of at least 20 per cent. This, however, has been hard to do because of Australia's immigration policy, and I would ask whether we are keeping pace with the sale of all wool products by this type of advertisement.

Due to advanced thinking and research into the matter we are able to secure the supreme fibre, the redeeming qualities of which are its washability and its elasticity. There is no disputing the fact that the wearing qualities of the natural fibre are excellent. I think the introduction of other fibres will definitely stimulate the manufacturing trade and also assist the Wool Board.

I would mention here that during the last 18 months there was a partial recession in the textile trade—and I refer now to the woollen and worsted trade rather than to synthetics. This was a result of the lack of presentation relating to the suitability of the garment in question when related to changing trends and patterns which develop in fashions from time to time.

The lifting of the hemline was a drastic move by our fashion designers in an endeavour to beautify the female of the species, but the effect it has had on the textile industry as a whole is absolutely calamitous.

I conferred with the Albany Woollen Mills on this matter because I had 30 years' experience in the trade. We always based our production of worsteds, certainly, on a percentage basis of 75-25. I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Albany Woollen Mills which reads—

> Thank you for sending us the draft of the Bill on wool content for comment.
>
> This is the standard alteration which is being made to the Commonwealth and State Acts and the Australian Wool Board has already examined it and altered provisions of the Wool Symbol agreement accordingly.

This brings me back to the point from which I started: that although the board has reduced its percentage from 95 to 80 it will, if it is successful in the promotion of its sales, have gained 5 per cent. in the manufacture of the worsted material. Apart from this, it will gain through the superior fibre of wool a far better character in the material produced.

It will be noticed that in the fashion trends today we have materials with glints and stripes; there are different types of synthetics and other natural fibres which make up a blend which is attractive to the consumer; and, after all is said and done, he is the person who really purchases the wool, thereby keeping the price of the commodity at a level which provides a profit for the producer. This aspect was mentioned by the member for Avon.

I have great pleasure in commending the Bill to the House, because it is a step in the right direction. It would appear that although this textile war has been waged between the manufacturers and the Australian Wool Board, some agreement has now been reached as a result of the 15 per cent. reduction which, as I have said, will mean a 5 per cent. gain to the Australian Wool Board; and it will also permit of this percentage being incorporated in the manufacture of woollen goods.

We have mostly spoken about the presentability and the wearability of the actual fibre in the worsted field, but on the woollen side of the trade a great deal of recovering takes place. In this recovering process one has to take the chaff from the grain, and at times one finds there is present a high percentage of cotton which could be detrimental and represent a loss without the introduction of further waste noil, which are taken from the combing section into the manufacture of the woollen goods.

I think the percentage agreed to will mean that manufacturers of woollen goods will have to introduce a higher percentage of wool into blankets, rugs, and so on, thereby increasing sales. I commend the Bill.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [12.16 p.m.]: If there was ever a move on the part of the Government to legalise false advertising, surely this must be it. With all due respect to the promotion programme for wool, with which I wholeheartedly go along, I cannot go along with pulling the fibre over the eyes of the people as is intended on this occasion.

The definition of "wool" in the parent Act needs some tidying up, because wool now is more widely defined than it is by this definition, which reads as follows:—

> "Wool" means the natural fibre from any variety of domestic sheep or lamb.

Now we are going to say to manufacturers that in the processing of woollen goods they can include the hair of llamas, camels, vicunas, and aplacas, and other fibres, and still use a label showing that the goods are made of pure wool. Surely it is not the prerogative of Parliament to sell the people down the drain by passing legislation that claims to protect them from false advertisements—and that is what this measure will do.

Most people in Australia regard pure wool as being wool taken from a sheep, and they would not think of it as being mohair, or the hair of the other animals I have mentioned. In regard to wool promotion, there would be no harm in branding a garment, "An Australian woollen garment," but to use the words "pure wool" under these circumstances is unadulterated false advertising.

The situation is very clear. If one wants pure water, one gets pure water, not water including 20 per cent. of something else. Likewise, if one wants pure milk, one does not expect it to contain 20 per cent. of something else.

Mr. O'Neil: What about 5 per cent. goat's milk and 95 per cent. cow's milk; is that pure milk?

Mr. JAMIESON: It could be if that were in accordance with the definition of "milk" as contained in the Act.

The meaning of wool does not stop at the natural fibres of sheep, as defined in the Act; and later on I will point out other matters about which the Act is not correct. A dictionary definition of the word "wool" is as follows—

> Kind of hair distinguished by fineness and wavy structure and scaly surface forming fleece of sheep, goat, alpaca, etc.

That definition is wide; but the Minister should not fiddle with the definition in the Act. I do not like it.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the most widely used media for advertising is television, and it is not an offence under the Act to advertise on television. The Act sets out the provisions under which advertising may be done in the case of a newspaper or a broadcasting station, but no mention is made of an advertisement in the case of a television station. There would be a large hole in the Act if an action were taken in regard to advertising on television, where video transmission takes place. The Act badly needs bringing up to date.

What wireless transmission is I do not know. When radio first came into being, it was something that did not require wires to be attached, and it became known as "wireless."

Mr. Gayfer: What is the definition of "wireless" in your book?

Mr. JAMIESON: I have not defined it, but radio waves would be the mode of transmission; and no doubt this would also cover a television receiver and a television station. However, the latter are not covered by the Act at present. The Act has been in existence since 1936, and no doubt it needs to be overhauled.

I cannot go along with playing around with one definition in the Act while there is another that is absolutely nonsensical. "Wool" means the natural fibre from any variety of domestic sheep or lamb. Surely we have to make that definition wider than it is if it is our wish to adulterate the woollen content of garments.

Surely there are plenty of ways to promote sales without amending the law dealing with advertising to allow a false description to be placed on a garment. That is the whole crux of the matter. I cannot go along with a proposal that will give people the impression they are paying for a garment that contains only sheep's wool when, in fact, that is not the position at all. Those people will think the garment is made of pure wool and, therefore, they will not receive the protection they should from the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act. They will not be able to rely upon the legislation to guide them in any way.

Mr. Bertram: It is straightout fraud.

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes, it is; yet it is to be contained in an Act of Parliament for the purpose of promotion! Promoters are able enough to promote wool in other ways without falsifying the labels on garments. It is ridiculous in the extreme, and cuts across the purpose for which the Act was originally designed. We are being asked to agree to a law to allow deviations from the truth.

Mr. Bickerton: It is very woolly legislation.

Mr. JAMIESON: To me it is quite unsatisfactory. We should have a look at the complete Act rather than play around with it on the basis of promoting wool, which I think can be well promoted by those who are charged with doing that job.

With all due respect to the critics of Sir William Gunn, I would point out that when he was charged with the responsibility of promotion he experienced many difficulties. I have mentioned in this House before that he experienced quite a lot of difficulty in Japan where there are 129 television stations, 22 of which transmit in full colour. That was the position years ago. After conducting an advertising campaign over those stations, one would be faced with a tremendous bill. However, in so far as they were able, the people responsible for promotion did a fair job.

If this legislation is not accepted, I do not think it will stop the promotion of wool. I think we owe it to the public to see that the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act is kept as pure as possible and not adulterated in any way, as is proposed in the case of woollen garments.

MR. BURT (Murchison-Eyre) [12.24 p.m.]: This Bill brings before us the fact that it has been found necessary to combine other fibres with pure wool partly, I think, to provide a fabric of better use to the public; certainly a fabric of more favourable quality. It will also help this industry to combat the serious competition it has suffered in the post-war period from man-made fibres. I think it is the duty of every Australian to do everything possible to keep wool before the world in general; to be always conscious of the fact, to use the well worn cliche, that Australia has ridden on the sheep's back for well

over 100 years; and to realise that the wool industry has been responsible for billions of dollars, mostly from exports, coming into this country. No doubt in the future wool will remain in that category.

The manufacturers of man-made fibres have had a great deal of success in recent years with the high scientific aids they have received. But even today, the best of the artificial products cannot compete with wool. I think most of us have had practical evidence of that fact in everyday life, despite all the competition from man-made fibres.

Every pound of wool—every hair—is always sold, although not always at a price which is profitable to the growers. However, there is never any wool left over as is the case with wheat; and wheat, unfortunately, has been in this position for some time. For that reason alone, it is the duty of every Australian to see that this great wool industry is not hampered in any way. Although the tide has turned in recent years, the tremendous wool promotion programme that has been carried out has not always been successful. However, it is now coming into its own.

In modern times, pure wool garments—I refer to 100 per cent. wool—have not been as successful as perhaps we would wish, despite the fact that a number of manufacturers say that shrinkage has been overcome.

I feel there is a great future for wool in combining it with synthetics to a very small degree, and with the animal fibres referred to as wool in the dictionary, as stated by the member for Belmont, because anything grown on the skin of an animal is, I think, correctly called "wool." Naturally, we in Australia think only of sheep's wool when we talk of wool.

For many years the wool industry would not have a bar of the word "synthetics" being mentioned. I will never forget the occasion in Kalgoorlie, seven or eight years ago, when the Premier opened the wool promotion campaign in that town. During his speech he stated he firmly believed that in the future wool would have to be combined with synthetic materials to a small degree. This statement by the Premier caused a tremendous furore throughout the industry in Western Australia, and all sorts of mutterings were heard after the Premier made his address. But how right he was! Now we find this legislation is before the House simply to bring us into line with other countries in agreeing to refer to textiles which contain only 80 per cent. of sheep's wool as a minimum, as being all wool.

When I was overseas two years ago I realised, as probably all of us do when we travel, that woollen garments are very seldom used, particularly in the United States of America.

With the central heating in homes, offices, and cars, most of the Americans, from what I could see, were clothed in pure synthetic garments. They used only a top coat of woollen material when they were forced to go outside to attend functions in the open air.

When I went to the United States I took a dozen woollen ties with me. I am wearing one at the moment which has the wool symbol on it and, incidentally, it was made in Japan from Australian wool. I handed the ties which I took with me to people I thought would appreciate them.

Mr. Lapham: How much wool is in them?

Mr. BURT: As far as I know, they are pure wool.

Mr. Lapham: Do you mean pure wool under the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act; 95 per cent. wool or 85 per cent. wool?

Mr. BURT: When I got to London the Agent-General advised me that he had difficulty in finding anything carrying the wool symbol in London shops. This was despite the fact that the wool symbol was displayed on a very big scale on a building in Piccadilly Circus. It was very difficult indeed to obtain pure wool garments in some of the leading stores in London. That surprised me, of course, because I think most of us in our younger days looked upon Yorkshire and Bradford as the centre of the woolmilling industry of the world.

I am glad to see that now more and more people, particularly those selling garments, are conscious of wool. Even so, I feel that those who handle the selling of woollen garments in stores could be made more aware of the importance of wool. My wife told me that only recently when she was buying blankets she was shown many types in very brilliant colours. However, when she asked if the blankets were wool the girl in the shop looked vacant and said that they were made from accrilon or some other type of synthetic. She experienced considerable trouble in finding pure wool blankets, and this in a Perth store. I trust that the wool promotion side of the industry will pay more attention to the important fact that the public, in many cases, is attracted by brilliant colours and the softer feeling qualities of the synthetic materials.

Unless the shop assistants draw attention to wool content in the material then the sale of this very important material will not be made. The use of animal fibre combined with wool produces a material which a number of us are now wearing in our suits. The legislation before the House is of a very worthy character and, provided the Act is not amended in the future to permit an even lesser quantity of wool to be used, it will continue to be a worthy measure. I support this Bill to the full.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Labour) [12.34 p.m.]: I want to thank members for their contributions, and I want to indicate that the purpose of the main amendment to the Bill is to ensure that Australian wool is not at a disadvantage in the world-wide promotion scheme when compared with wool products from other countries. The point raised by the member for Belmont indicates the trouble one can get into when one tries to do a good turn for a friend.

Mr. Jamieson: What about the friend?

Mr. O'NEIL: Textile labelling legislation is pretty well uniform right throughout the States of Australia and, in fact, the appropriate Commonwealth Act is the Act relating to customs and excise, which sets out the labelling requirements on imported products. As I said, these are fairly uniform.

The object of altering the definition of wool in this Act and promoting the use of the woolmark brand is that we can compete in the national scheme, and the suggestion was made by the Australian Agricultural Council. This council, as members will know, consists of the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Agriculture and Primary Industry. It is fully supported and sponsored by the Australian Wool Board and the International Wool Secretariat. The Ministers for Labour handle the legislation in the various States and they simply carry out the wishes of the bodies I have mentioned. The present wish is that Australian wool should be able to compete fairly on the international market.

I will concede to the member for Belmont that at conferences of Ministers concerned with labelling—I mention that specifically because not all Ministers for Labour are in charge of labelling—the morality of retaining the definition of wool was argued.

Mr. Bertram: With what result?

Mr. O'NEIL: The result is the Bill before us now. I would point out it was made clear to us that the specialty animal fibres which are now defined in the Act are, in fact, wool fibres.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what I told you.

Mr. O'NEIL: Yes. The addition of those animal fibres is confined by the legislation of every State. Another fibre cannot be added unless it comes under the classification of wool. It is true that in the minds of Australian consumers wool is sheep's wool or lamb's wool. However, that is not necessarily the case on the international scene. All the other fibres mentioned come from animals, and I checked the definitions in the dictionary and found they were all members of the sheep family—cousins, or remotely related—and, in any case, are ruminants. I was a bit doubtful about camels, but certainly the others belong to the sheep family.

Mr. Bovell: What about the bull?

Mr. O'NEIL: Well, we did have discussions about bull's wool and steel wool and things like that. A number of points were raised and the first one was that it was impossible, in any case, to have a textile material which is pure wool, pure cotton, or pure anything else. Of necessity it must contain some imperfections even if they are not blended into the material.

Secondly, the amendments made to this Act in 1953 permit 5 per cent. of matter other than wool in textiles. I have called for the debates covering those amendments but, unfortunately, they have not yet arrived. However, since 1953 it has been legal to brand a textile material "pure wool" if it contains up to not more than 5 per cent. by weight of any other material.

Mr. Jamieson: This would be so; you have to have buttons.

Mr. O'NEIL: No; this matter of buttons and lining is not what is concerned. It is the textile itself which carries the definition "pure wool" or "all wool" and the woolmark brand. It is the actual material in the natural state—the textile in the garment.

Mr. Jamieson: I am not so sure that the woolmark brand cannot refer to the little tag on the garment.

Mr. O'NEIL: It means that the main material from which the garment is made comes under the definition of pure wool. It does not refer to the lining or buttons or money in the pockets, or any like thing.

As I have said, we did argue the morality of altering the definition and, as a matter of fact, it was my suggestion that the definition should be altered in the Act, and I was outnumbered. However, the fact remains that by the addition of 15 per cent. by weight of specialty animal fibres we are not departing from the principle which has existed since 1953 when, in order that it might be labelled "pure wool," up to 95 per cent. of the material in the garment had to be wool. I think I mentioned that the alternative "all wool" is permitted to be used.

The addition of the specialty animal fibres, as far as I have been able to find out, does not in any way affect the essential characteristics of the textile. It improves the visual and tactile characteristics: its appearance and its feel. I think this is essential in order to promote the sale of wool for purposes other then men's suiting. We are aware that even evening dresses and light garments worn by females are now made from woollen materials. With the addition of some of these specialty animal fibres the appearance and other characteristics of the garments are improved. Reference has been made to surveys by dry cleaning associations and various departments to see that the essential wearing characteristics have not been impaired by the addition of the animal fibres.

Mr. Davies: I do not think I would like to wear a mohair singlet.

Mr. O'NEIL: In reply to the comment by the member for Belmont, that under this particular amendment we are not discussing the advertising of the product, but the labelling which may be applied—

Mr. Lapham: It is applied to the garment. Could we not say it is labelled in accordance with a particular Act? Then we would be defining it clearly.

Mr. O'NEIL: We have had this argument before, and if there is any further argument it ought to be taken up with the Australian Agricultural Council and the International Wool Secretariat.

Mr. Lapham: They are all palsy-walsy.

Mr. O'NEIL: I have already mentioned that this Act applies in every State and it carries out the desires and wishes of the bodies I have mentioned.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, but it is not all done in the same sort of Act in each State. This one ought to be brought up to date.

Mr. O'NEIL: We have had this argument at length and *ad nauseum*, but the result is the Bill before us at the moment.

I think there is only one other point which was raised by the member for Victoria Park. He referred to the provision that textiles other than those currently specified in the Act, may be classified as textiles by regulation for the purposes of labelling. This is simply to facilitate the labelling of any new forms of textiles which may be produced. This applies especially in these days of synthetic production.

One of the matters before the Minister in charge of labelling is the problem of flammable material. There is a very wide range of synthetic materials used, and I think they are listed in the Commonwealth excise legislation and number between 100 and 200 different types. We are trying to have this number reduced to a limited number of types, other than brand names, mainly for the purpose of being able to assess the flammability of the material. These materials should be labelled to indicate clearly the dry cleaning and washing characteristics. The dry cleaners' associations have been interested in this and insist that it is important that the materials be properly labelled in order that they may select the correct solvent to use without having the materials disappear altogether.

Those are the major problems, and I think the facility to further describe textiles by regulation will help us in the labelling of new and different textile materials. I know, too, and the member for Victoria Park may well have picked this up, that there is already in the Act a provision for textile products to be excluded by regulation.

However, I think he will appreciate the need for this. I do not think it is a regulation-making power which is designed in any way to usurp the authority of Parliament. It is simply designed to deal with the very rapid development in the production of new types of textiles upon which action might be required to be taken without any real need for the Parliament to deliberate the matter.

I thank members for their contributions to the debate, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

POISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

Sitting suspended from 12.48 to 2.15 p.m.

QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

SEWERAGE

Rockingham-Safety Bay

1. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

   (1) Has a firm decision been taken for the siting of sewerage treatment works to service Rockingham-Safety Bay?

   (2) If "Yes," what is the location and when will the work commence?

   (3) If "No," is it considered necessary, before the next phase of growth at Rockingham-Safety Bay, to have land serviced by deep sewerage?

   (4) When is it estimated deep sewerage will be provided to service the Rockingham-Safety Bay area?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) Point Peron. It is expected that the site will be used for a temporary scheme early in 1970. The permanent works are expected to be in operation in 1971.

   (3) Not applicable.

   (4) The treatment works will be available in 1971. Reticulation depends upon the provision of loan funds.

HOSPITAL

Rockingham

2. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

   Relating to the establishment of a major Government hospital at Rockingham—

(1) What is the location of the site on which the hospital is to be built?

(2) Has the planning for the site and building commenced?

(3) What work on the site and building is estimated for the year June, 1969, to June, 1970?

(4) When is it estimated the new Rockingham hospital will be available to receive patients?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) West of Lake Cooloongup (White Lake) and approximately six chains south of the proposed freeway and adjacent to No. 2 Development Rockingham—area approximately 45 acres.

(2) The Public Works Department was asked to plan on the 11th March, 1969, and an appropriate design will be available at the earliest practicable date.

(3) It is expected that approximately 15 months will be involved in planning, it being expected that building will commence in 1970-71.

(4) 1972.

3 and 4. *These questions were postponed.*

WATER SUPPLIES

Medina-Calista and Rockingham-Safety Bay

5. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Concerning the construction of the large capacity pipeline from Serpentine Dam to Rockingham—

(1) What daily supply will be available to—

(a) Medina-Calista;

(b) Rockingham-Safety Bay, from this source and other supplies?

(2) Is it intended to supply now, or in due course, from this source reservoirs for other communities?

(3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes," what reservoirs and where are they situated?

(4) When is it expected this additional water supply will be available to—

(a) Medina-Calista;

(b) Rockingham-Safety Bay?

(5) Could light industries built in Dixon Road, Rockingham receive, in due course, direct supply from this pipeline?

(6) What is the estimated cost of bringing this service to Rockingham?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Six million gallons per day for each area.

(2) Yes.

(3) Reservoirs will be constructed at Medina and Tamworth Hill.

(4) (a) and (b) The summer of 1969-70.

(5) No. Trunk mains are not tapped for this purpose. Dixon Road can be supplied from the present system, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements being made.

(6) $1,474,390 being the cost of 42-inch and 30-inch mains, now in course of construction.

IRON ORE COMPANIES

Council Rating: Investigating Committee

6. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

(1) Was a committee formed to investigate council rating of the various iron ore company holdings?

(2) If so, what are the names of the persons who comprised the committee?

(3) Has the committee completed its investigations; if so, will he give a report of its findings?

(4) If investigations are not completed, when can this be expected?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes. The Minister for Local Government agreed that a committee should be appointed, representing the Local Government Department, the Lands Department, the Mines Department, the Taxation Department, the Crown Law Department and the Department of Industrial Development, to report and advise on the rating of mineral leases and ancillary property and facilities and similar leases.

(2) Mr. R. C. Paust, Secretary for Local Government (Chairman). Mr. J. F. Morgan, Surveyor-General, Lands Department. Mr. B. M. Rogers, Assistant Under-secretary, Mines Department. Mr. C. L. Langoulant, Senior Legal Assistant, Crown Law Department. Mr. A. L. Allsop, Chief Valuer, Taxation Department. Mr. H. F. Brennand, Administrative Officer, Department of Industrial Development.

(3) No.

(4) It is hoped that a recommendation will be made in time to enable any necessary legislative amendments to be considered at the next session of Parliament.

HOUSING IN THE NORTH

Solar Air Conditioning

7. Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Has consideration ever been given to the use of solar air conditioning in commission homes north of the 26th parallel?

(2) Would he be prepared to authorise experimental trials with the Rockbed regenerative cooling unit which I understand is being successfully used in north Queensland?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) Initial reports of the Department of Mechanical Engineering of the University of Queensland have been studied. These indicate that the cost of an existing type solar air-conditioning unit could be of the order of 20 per cent. of the capital cost of the home. In the light of this adverse economic position, and the fact the unit is still more or less in the experimental stage, the commission is not contemplating the installation of such units in houses north of the 26th parallel.

(2) It is proposed to incorporate an experimental unit in a commission building proposal at Port Hedland to test effectiveness and capital and operating and maintenance costs. There is also a suggestion of such a unit not being satisfactory in areas of high humidity.

NATIVES

Business Enterprises: Financial Assistance

8. Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) How many separate applications have been received from aboriginal people for assistance in establishing enterprises from a capital fund set up by the Commonwealth Government for that purpose?

(2) What is the nature of the enterprises?

(3) How many applications have been—

(a) satisfied;

(b) rejected?

(4) How many officers are employed in carrying out feasibility studies on projects for which assistance is being sought?

(5) Is it anticipated that funds not spent in the current financial year and yet allocated for use in 1968-69 will be carried over for use in 1969-70?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) to (5) The Commonwealth Government administers the capital fund set up to assist in the development of viable economic enterprises and therefore the information sought is not available to the State. The applications do not necessarily have to come to the State.

RAILWAY MARSHALLING YARDS, ALBANY

Enlarging

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the increased grain haulage by rail into Albany, and bearing in mind the inadequacy of the marshalling yards, can he advise if a firm plan has been formulated to enlarge the yards?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

No plan has yet been formulated in this connection.

ALBANY RAILWAY STATION

Resiting

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Have plans been finalised for resiting the Albany railway station?

(2) If "No," what priority has the resiting in the overall State transport co-ordination plan?

(3) If "Yes," where would it be built and when would work commence?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No firm plans have been formulated by the W.A.G.R.

(2) Transportation planning under the State Transport Co-ordination Act does not embrace individual projects of this nature. It is concerned with the broader field of devising ways and means by which transportation tasks can be better carried out.

(3) Answered by (1).

HUMAN RIGHTS AND PSYCHIATRIC PRACTICES

Advertisement in "The West Australian"

11. Mr. CASH asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an advertisement in *The West Australian* of the 22nd February, 1969, referring to human rights

and psychiatric practices and requiring replies to the Secretary, W.A. Committee for Human Rights?

(2) Is he in a position to advise whether the insertion of this advertisement has breached the provisions of the Medical Act or any other Act of Parliament?

(3) As the United Nations Association (W.A. Division), the Chairman of its Human Rights Year Committee and its other officers know nothing of the advertisement or its purpose, is it possible that the advertisement was inserted by an organisation banned by an Act of this Parliament from practising in this State?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) to (3) Appropriate inquiry is being made and the honourable member will be advised as early as practicable.

POWER STATIONS

Coal Burning Units

12. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Electricity:

Will he examine the comparative economy of the recently constructed coal burning power station at Anglesea, Victoria, with a view to establishing a similar unit in this State?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The comparative economy of all types of plant will be examined before additional plant is added to the State Electricity Commission's system.

The plant at Anglesea has no special technical advantages.

RIVERTON DRIVE-IN THEATRE

Sewage Disposal

13. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

In view of the nature of the soil which surrounds the Riverton drive-in theatre, what method is being used for sewage disposal?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Septic tank and leach drains.

HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES

Resale

14. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many State Housing Commission purchase homes were sold by the purchasers in 1968?

(2) Is it intended a time restriction will be placed on the resale of these homes?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) This is not specifically known. There were 405 cases where purchasers liability to the commission was discharged.

There were 242 commission purchase homes transferred to other eligible applicants as a result of private negotiation.

(2) No.

POULTRY

Processing and Value

15. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many head of poultry—

(a) boilers;

(b) table birds.

were processed for the years 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68 respectively?

(2) What was the annual gross value for each year of (1) (a) and (b)?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Head of poultry (Western Australia)—

(a) Boilers (culled hens and roosters) processed in—

1965-66—346,000
1966-67—357,000
1967-68—362,000

(b) Table birds (broilers)—

1965-66—4,426,000
1966-67—6,332,000
1967-68—6,817,000

Ducks, drakes and turkeys—

1965-66—68,000
1966-67—77,000
1967-68—81,000

Source—Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics (Canberra).

(2) Annual gross value (Western Australia)—

Culled hens and roosters (boilers)—

	$
1965-66	283,419
1966-67	286,759
1967-68	244,900

Broilers (meat chickens)—

	$
1965-66	3,188,998
1966-67	4,340,341
1967-68	4,803,484

Ducks, drakes and turkeys—

	$
1965-66	172,993
1966-67	168,362
1967-68	202,123

Source—Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics (W.A. Office).

COMO HIGH SCHOOL

Upgrading

16. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When will the Como High School be upgraded to a three-year high school?

(2) Is it envisaged that the Como High School will ultimately be a five-year high school?

(3) If so, what is the anticipated date?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) No decision has yet been made.

(2) Yes.

(3) It is not possible to say at this stage.

SCHOOLS IN COCKBURN ELECTORATE

Additions

17. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Education:

What building additions are programmed or estimated to commence, or to be completed prior to the start of the 1970 school year, for the following schools—

(a) Primary Schools—
Annie Street,
Calista,
Orelia,
Medina,
Naval Base,
South Coogee,
Jandakot,
Coolbellup,
East Coolbellup,
South Coolbellup,
East Hamilton Hill,
Hamilton Hill,
Beaconsfield;

(b) Secondary Schools—
Kwinana High School?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Provided loan funds are available, the following additions are planned for the 1969-70 financial year:—

(a) Primary Schools—
Annie Street—Three classrooms plus administration.
Calista—Three classrooms.
Orelia—Nil.
Medina—Nil.
Naval Base—Nil.
South Coogee—One classroom plus toilets.
Jandakot—Two classroom.
Coolbellup—Nil.
East Coolbellup—Two classrooms.
South Coolbellup—Nil.
East Hamilton Hill—One classroom.
Hamilton Hill—Nil.
Beaconsfield—Nil.

(b) Secondary Schools—
Kwinana High School—
Two science laboratories.
Manual arts—six rooms.
One classroom.
Conversion of existing workshops to classrooms and home economics.

DUST NUISANCE

Kewdale

18. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Is he aware of the considerable dust nuisance being caused to the residents of Kewdale, particularly near Kew Street, by the Westply factory in Division Street, Welshpool?

(2) Has the clean air authority taken any action to minimise this nuisance?

(3) When can these residents expect to receive some relief from this dust menace?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) A dust nuisance exists in Kewdale, but there are a number of sources from which this can come and investigations are being made to determine which source is the major one.

(2) Action will be taken when the situation has been determined.

(3) See (2) above.

WARNBRO SOUND

Seafront: Use for Industrial Purposes

19. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Has any of the seafront area in Warnbro Sound been set aside for future industrial purposes?

(2) If so, would he lay on the Table of the House a plan showing the detail of this proposed industrial area?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

WEEBO TRIBAL GROUND

Investigation by Joint Parliamentary Committee

Mr. MAY asked the Premier:

In view of the apparent confusion and public concern which exists with regard to the Weebo tribal ground, will he give consideration to the appointment of a joint parliamentary committee to visit the area and report its findings to Parliament?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I have not been given any notice of this question, and I would like to give the matter some thought. My first reaction is that I do not think a joint parliamentary committee will find out anything more than we are able to do by simpler means. As I say, this is my first reaction, but I will give the matter some consideration.

LAKE LEFROY SALT INDUSTRY AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [2.29 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill now before members is to ratify an agreement dated the 25th March, 1969, between the State and Norseman Gold Mines No Liability for the production of salt at Lake Lefroy near Widgiemooltha for export.

Sumitomo Shoji Kaisha Ltd. of Japan will be associated with Norseman Gold Mines in the project. The Japanese company has undertaken to market a minimum quantity of 7,600,000 tons of salt over the next 15 years. The Japanese company will also contribute 48 per cent. of the required capital of between $6,400,000 and $7,000,000.

Salt will be harvested on the lake bed during the summer months when the waters of the lake have evaporated, and stockpiled. Throughout the year salt will be transported to Esperance by rail where it will be loaded into ships for export to Japan. To enable the tonnage required to meet export targets to be railed it will be necessary for a spur line to be constructed from the Coolgardie-Esperance railway line to the lake shore—a distance of approximately eight miles—to upgrade the existing railway line from Widgiemooltha to Esperance, and provide a connection to the land-backed berth.

Members who know the area will realise that rails were placed on the original wharf but there was no connection between the Coolgardie-Esperance railway terminal and the wharf, although land had been resumed in readiness for connecting the existing railway route to the land-backed berth where the rails have been installed. The company will be responsible for constructing the spur line and will make a contribution to the railway line upgrading and railway line extension connection to the wharf.

The agreement is conditional on the company satisfying the State that it has entered into satisfactory contracts for the sale of salt and that it has the necessary finance to complete the works. At the present time the company has a temporary reserve over the major portion of the lake surface, the temporary reserve being delineated on a plan which I will seek permission to table for the information of members. This plan is on a much larger scale than the one in the agreement, and it is easier for members to follow this plan than the small one in the agreement.

Under the agreement the company's rights of occupancy granted under the temporary reserve will cease once the production site lease of 3,000 acres—shown shaded green on the plan—has issued. The production site lease will be initially for a term of 21 years with rights of renewal for two further terms of 21 years—the lease rental payable being $25 per 100 acres per annum.

Members will no doubt query the reason for such a high rental when compared with the other salt agreements which provided for a rental of the production site of $4 per 100 acres per annum. The reason for the additional charge is that the salt occurs on Lake Lefroy as a natural substance and only requires harvesting. It is not necessary to have such a large area as those salt projects which rely on solar evaporation to obtain the salt production; nor the normal capital for works such as the earthworks involved in these projects.

It is estimated that 3,000 acres will be sufficient for the company's needs and that the winter flooding of the lake surface will replenish the salt reserves each year. However, to provide for unexpected contingencies, the agreement permits the company to relocate the production area provided there is land available. In the light of experience it may be desirable to change the 3,000 acres delineated on the plan. This will be permissible, provided that in the meantime the new area of the lake has not been allocated for any other purpose. In other words, if it is available the company can have it; and if it is not then the company cannot have it.

The company will install bulk loading facilities at the Esperance land-backed berth. These will be capable of loading at the rate of 1,000 tons of salt per hour and will be designed so that it will also be possible to load grain ships using the same equipment.

This, incidentally, will be of considerable indirect benefit to farmers as grain ships which at the present time take approximately one week to load will be cleared in 24 hours; at least it will be possible to clear them in 24 hours.

The agreement provides for the leasing to the company of a stockpile area adjacent to the land-backed berth. Members' attention is particularly directed to clause 10 of the agreement. It will be appreciated that Lake Lefroy is in the centre of the area in which there have been nickel finds.

As a result of these there has been considerable activity by mining companies in the immediate vicinity, and even portions of the lake bed itself have been pegged. The Western Mining Corporation also has a temporary reserve over a major portion of the lake bed. This is all covered by the agreement ratified by the State Parliament.

This possible conflict of interests has caused some concern, and clause 10 has been designed to protect the interests of Norseman Gold Mines No Liability, at the same time ensuring that the State does not deprive any legitimate holder of mining tenements from enjoying his reasonable rights.

From the point of view of Norseman Gold Mines No Liability the State accepted that it was necessary to ensure that the natural flow of water on Lake Lefroy was not unreasonably restricted. The natural migration of water from north to south annually is expected to obviate the possibility of the salt deposits at the southern end of the lake being exhausted over the years.

It is also important to the company that residues or tailings from mining operations do not contaminate the salt reserves, thereby making salt from this lake unacceptable to the Japanese buyers. There are references to this particular point in the agreement. The Government has found it necessary, for reasons which members will appreciate, to make it clear that the Government cannot accept any responsibility for damages that might occur.

It is very clearly set out in the agreement that the Government will use its best endeavours to so negotiate and arrange with the various mining companies that there is no contamination of the salt producing area, but because of the magnitude of the operations involved it would have been physically impossible and quite unrealistic for the Government to give a guarantee or to accept responsibility for damages. Therefore while the Government will use its best endeavours it will not be responsible for damages should there be contamination.

Those who know the area will realise there are already mining activities going on in the lake area. These activities have been very happily negotiated between all the parties concerned. This has resulted in the avoidance of contamination of the lake on the one hand, and also the avoidance of any unreasonable restriction to the flow of the water, which I understand is a natural flow from north to south.

The company is required to provide all the necessary locomotives and rolling stock. It is also obliged to supply the funds towards railway line upgrading, totalling $4,000,000 should new rails be used, and $3,400,000 should used rails be available to carry out the work. It was considered that there would be a possibility of obtaining secondhand rails from other lines.

Mr. Gayfer: Will Co-operative Bulk Handling be able to use the locomotives on that line?

Mr. COURT: That I do not know. I think this is a question of capacity. If the locomotives have any reserve capacity this will be used by the Western Australian Government Railways in the normal course, because these things become the property of the W.A.G.R.

Mr. Gayfer: It will use its own locomotives?

Mr. COURT: The company will supply the locomotives and the rolling stock, and these will be handed over to the W.A.G.R. for maintenance and operation. They will become part of the equipment of the W.A.G.R. If there is a surplus at any time the W.A.G.R. will get the benefit.

Mr. Gayfer: It will still be possible to cart wheat down that line?

Mr. COURT: The normal operations will continue. I thought the honourable member was concerned to know whether locomotives used for the salt company would be available. If there is any reserve capacity it will be used, because the locomotives become an integral part of the equipment of the W.A.G.R.

Mr. Tonkin: Is this the beginning of the takeover of railways by private enterprise?

Mr. COURT: I do not know what I have to do to get the message across to the Leader of the Opposition. I have just explained that all the assets of the company for the operation of the line will become an integral part of the W.A.G.R. system. This will become our property.

Mr. Tonkin: It will be run, subject to whose rules?

Mr. COURT: Perhaps I can explain it in another way. This is a W.A.G.R. line, but we have no money to upgrade it. The company will give us the money to do that, but the assets become our property. The company will provide the locomotives and rolling stock.

Mr. Tonkin: Who operates it?

Mr. COURT: The W.A.G.R. This is a W.A.G.R. system, and not a private railway.

A special freight rate has been granted to the company in recognition of the contribution made by it to the railway line upgrading. In working out the railway freight the W.A.G.R. has to satisfy the Treasury—and this is not an easy thing to do—that it will be a profitable operation after allowing for the normal methods of amortising, bearing in mind the company is providing the money, the locomotives, and the rolling stock.

For the first five years the freight rate will be $2.20 per ton rising to $2.25 per ton after five years. This latter rate is to apply until the end of the 10th year, or until 6,000,000 tons of salt have been transported—whichever shall first occur.

Then there is a formula for escalation, which takes over, having regard to the need of the railways to recover certain costs over a certain tonnage.

The wharfage charge payable is on a sliding scale commencing at 20c per ton on the first 100,000 tons reducing to 17.5c per ton on the second 100,000 tons in any one year, and 15c per ton on all tonnages over 200,000 in any year. The wharfage charge is to be adjusted proportionately with any increases or decrease in the wharfage charge on bulk products at Esperance. In other words, it is tied to the same variation as the official bulk products wharfage charge for Esperance.

It will be noted that if the company takes advantage of the additional berth at present being provided at Esperance, the wharfage charge will be renegotiated. In other words, if the Government provides a greater depth of water at the wharf and bigger ships can be used, there will be a renegotiated wharfage charge.

The reason for this is that a special wharfage charge has been set in recognition of the fact that salt is a low value product. However, if the company uses larger vessels, thereby obtaining a better freight rate, it is expected that the wharfage rates will be increased so that they are more in line with those applying to other materials handled in bulk.

The company will pay royalties identical with those payable by other salt producers. On the first 500,000 tons in any one year it will pay 5c per ton; on the second 500,000 tons in any one year, 6.25c per ton; and on all tonnages thereafter in excess of 1,000,000 tons in any one year, 7.5c per ton.

The agreement provides that in the future, should the price of salt increase, then rentals and royalties will also increase. The company has the responsibility to supply all housing required for employees. The other clauses in the agreement are the usual machinery clauses and do not require particular comment.

This agreement with Norseman Gold Mines No Liability is the fifth agreement negotiated by the State related to the export of salt. Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. has been exporting for three years, I think, in limited tonnages. Leslie Salt Co., which is located at Port Hedland, loaded its first ship on the 21st March, 1969. Texada Mines Pty. Limited loaded its first shipment of salt at its new port at Cape Cuvier on the 1st April, 1969. Dampier Salt Co. has commenced construction work on its area at Dampier. It is expected that this company will have salt available for export by the end of 1970.

It can be seen therefore that salt will become a major Western Australian industry. Exports from producing companies this year are expected to exceed 1,000,000 tons. Japanese requirements, excluding edible salt, for 1969, are expected to reach 5,500,000 tons. The demand for industrial salt is rising by approximately 10 per cent. per annum and I predict that by 1975 exports of salt from Western Australia could be in the vicinity of 4,000,000 tons, worth approximately $16,000,000.

Although the State has four previous agreements related to salt this one is of special significance as it does not rely on solar evaporation for the production of salt, or at least not in the normal way we expect in the case of Leslie Salt Co., Dampier Salt Co., and Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd.

It is also the only project which is not located on the north-west coast in the low rainfall belt. It is for this latter reason that I understand the Japanese salt buyers have been keen to see the project given the "all clear" by the State as they will be assured of a source of supply from Western Australia even though production from some of the other areas may be reduced through cyclonic rains diluting the brines.

As members will appreciate, the enemy of the producer of salt by the solar system is, of course, rain. It could be that after a period of unprecedented heavy rain in a cyclonic belt in the north there would be a comparatively low stockpile. It might appear to be uneconomic, by comparison, to take salt from Lake Lefroy to Esperance and incur the extra sea mileage to Japan, but the security factor is a consideration, for reasons I have stated, and will enable this project to add to the total salt industry of the State.

In addition to facilitating the loading of grains through the Port of Esperance, this project is likely to make possible the export of other minerals from the Esperance hinterland. The upgraded railway will facilitate the movement of minerals to Esperance whilst the shiploader will provide economical loading costs. A further advantage that this agreement brings is that it makes possible a new export through the Port of Esperance, which has rapidly been growing in importance.

I would like to pay a tribute to Norseman Gold Mines No Liability. This company, when it found itself getting to the end of its pyrites operation, had to look around for other activities. This it has done in a number of fields. In regard to this salt exercise, in spite of the best endeavours of the Government and of the company, we did not think we would make the economics work out, but because of the special features I have mentioned, and in view of this project being in a different climatic area from the other salt projects, it was possible to work out something mutually satisfactory to the buyers, the company, and the Government.

It will be necessary for my colleague, the Minister for Railways, to introduce a railway Bill, separate from this measure, because there are two features concerned. One is that there is to be a spur line which, although to be built by the company, will be a W.A.G.R. line to bring the Kalgoorlie-Esperance line out to the edge of the lake. I am not sure, but I think we still have to authorise the construction of the link at the Esperance end to the wharf. It may be that this was included in some previous legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask permission to table two copies of the plan to which I referred so that members may have access to them. I suggest that one copy go to whichever member takes the adjournment, and the other remain on the Table of the House.

Mr. Brady: Is there any estimate in millions of tons of the salt available in a year?

Mr. COURT: No estimate has been made, but it is calculated that from this 3,000 acres the company will be able to meet the initial contracts. For a favourable operation of a continuing industry the figure would be 750,000, which could be built up to 1,000,000 tons per year.

Mr. Jamieson: For how long?

Mr. COURT: Indefinitely, because as long as there is the flow from the north to the south, there is a replenishment of this area.

The plans were tabled.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Moir.

Message: Appropriations

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

THE WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE EXECUTOR AND AGENCY COMPANY LIMITED ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 27th March. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Williams) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 1 had been agreed to.

Clause 2: Interpretation—

Mr. COURT: We reported progress in order that I might seek confirmation of my views in connection with the points raised by the member for Mt. Hawthorn. It would perhaps have been better had I then suggested that we complete the Committee stage, because the matter in question is not one which is suitable for Committee discussion. Therefore, if it is satisfactory to you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and to the Committee, I feel we should conclude the Committee stage and then, during the third reading, deal with the points raised.

I have received advice from the Crown Law Department confirming my views on the matter but would like your guidance as to when we should discuss it.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Williams): I think the matter could well be discussed during the third reading.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Principal Act—

Mr. COURT: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 10—Delete the figure "1968" and substitute the figure "1969."

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

ALUMINA REFINERY (MITCHELL PLATEAU) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 27th March.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [2.54 p.m.]: Members will recall that this Bill is an agreement between the Western Australian Government and Amax Bauxite Corporation. As it is some days since the Bill was introduced it would perhaps be well if I refreshed the minds of members regarding the purpose of the agreement.

The main purpose is to provide for the mining of bauxite in the Mitchell Plateau area in the Kimberley and later on to produce alumina. It is also for the purpose of investigating the possibility of eventually establishing an aluminium processing plant at an estimated cost, according to the Minister of $100,000,000.

We have been told that to date the company has spent some $1,400,000 on preliminary testing and exploration. One would assume that if, in fact, that figure had been expended, the company would have a pretty fair idea whether this was a pretty good proposition for it. We assume that having gone this far, the company will, under some form of operation, proceed with this programme.

The agreement calls for the company to submit proposals to the Government by the 30th June of this year, with an extension until December, if necessary. By that date the company must submit proposals on the following:—

1. Port and port development to accommodate ships to 30,000 tons initially for loading bauxite and alumina, together with preliminary plans for expansion necessary to take 60,000-ton vessels.

2. Bauxite and alumina transport facilities.
3. Townsite facilities.
4. Regional facilities.
5. Alumina refinery.
6. Any other works required.
7. Marketing and financial arrangements.

The proposals to be submitted are to allow for refining facilities for alumina to the capacity of 200,000 tons by the end of the third year and some 600,000 tons by the end of the tenth year. The company is also permitted during this period, and thereafter, to ship or sell raw bauxite from these leases, and it is permitted to do that under the following scale:—

1. During the first three years from the commencement date a quantity not exceeding a total of 3,000,000 tons.
2. From years four to 10 inclusive, a quantity equal to 2½ tons for each ton of bauxite fed to the refinery.
3. Thereafter, in each year which the refinery operates at a rate which is not below 200,000 tons less than its rated capacity, a quantity equal to 2 tons of bauxite for each 1 ton fed to the refinery.

Also, to refresh the memories of members, I would quote the royalties which will be charged on this mineral. They will be as follows:—

1. On bauxite shipped—12½c per ton.
2. On bauxite used in the refinery —7½c per ton.
3. On special grade bauxite for refractory and special purposes shipped to points within the Commonwealth—25c per ton.
4. On special grade bauxite produced for refractory and special purposes shipped outside the Commonwealth—40c per ton.

These royalties, the agreement states, shall, after a period of 21 years, be reviewed by the Government every seven years. As near as I can gather, these royalties compare rather favourably with the royalties mentioned in other alumina agreements in other States. If anything, they are a little higher. However, I do not know, nor am I in a position to know, what disadvantages or advantages there may be in these other projects, which are operating mainly in the Queensland area; but, as I have said, to the best of my ability at any rate, they appear to be reasonable.

Also, rentals are involved in this matter for the area of land held by the company. The rental is referred to on page 25 of the agreement, and for clarification it may be as well if I read this very brief paragraph, as follows:—

(i) by way of rent for the mineral lease pay to the State annually in advance during the period expiring at the end of twenty-one (21) years from the commencement date a sum equal to five dollars ($5) per square mile of the area for the time being the subject of the mineral lease and thereafter the amount from time to time prescribed by the Mining Act but not exceeding ten dollars ($10) per square mile.

This does not appear to me to be a large amount of money when it is compared with what is involved in some of the other alumina agreements. I notice that an agreement covering a company in Queensland sets the rental figure at $4 per square mile for the first five years, at $8 per square mile for the next 10 years, and thereafter at $30 to $40 per square mile. Our rentals do not get above $10 per square mile.

In other words, this company, as the agreement will show, has during the preliminary stages an area of 1,500 square miles, and if it was to retain that area and to pay rental on it the State would receive $15,000 per year. If the company paid rent at the Queensland rate, the amount of money received would be four times that sum, or $60,000 per year. That seems to me to be a difference which rather warrants comment and perhaps the Minister when he reaches that point in his reply could tell us why there is a discrepancy between the two rentals.

The agreement provides for the company to undertake to investigate the feasibility of establishing a smelter within the State. There are provisions in the agreement to provide that if, after some 13 years, the Minister feels that what it is doing towards the establishment of this smelter is not, in his opinion, as good as could be, then he can make certain requests for the company to supply him with its ideas regarding the establishment of this smelter. There is also provision that if those ideas are not satisfactory to the Minister he can look around for some other organisation to establish a smelter.

There is also a provision to allow the present company plenty of opportunity either to show reason why a smelter is not economic, or why it will not put one in itself. The capacity of that smelter, if the project is proceeded with to the aluminium stage, is to be some 50,000 tons per year of aluminium product.

For clarification, I will repeat the figures used by the Minister when introducing the Bill. Apparently three tons of bauxite is capable, when manufactured or when refined, of producing one ton of alumina. I

realise that the Minister, in a communication, has pointed out to me that this depends on the grade of the bauxite, but we can say, roughly, that three tons of bauxite produce one ton of alumina. It is generally recognised that two tons of alumina will produce one ton of aluminium.

Under this agreement the State is called upon to provide 1,500 square miles of country for leases containing bauxite in that area, and extensive leases of land for townsites, port facilities, housing projects, etc., at a peppercorn rental. I can see that the area of land involved is possibly necessary in the early testing stages and one would hope that when the company has gone further with its testing it would relinquish much of this land, because 1,500 square miles is indeed a big hunk of territory, particularly when one adds to it all the land that is leased to the company at a peppercorn rental for the other facilities required before it can proceed to produce.

Parliament is also asked to waive many of its Acts of Parliament, as has been done in similar types of agreements which have gone through this House. Also, it is asked to generally provide assistance and co-operation—at least as far as I can see in the agreement—equivalent to that given to the iron ore companies.

The agreement contains many of the clauses that we have all become accustomed to in these ratifying agreements that have been passing through Parliament during the last few years. I say, "accustomed to" but I also say that many of us in this Chamber are certainly not happy with them. However, the provisions still occur within these agreements and the Opposition has, from time to time, pointed out the danger of waiving Acts of Parliament, particularly where there is no redress at any later stage through Parliament. However, the provisions continue to appear in the agreements and I suppose whilst they do, the Opposition will forever raise more objection to those provisions being there, and to their continuing to be there.

I wish to deal with a couple of these provisions specifically at a later stage, but I do feel that whilst we continue to waive certain Acts it will be very difficult to make agreements with any company in the future, regardless of what Government is in power, without including these special clauses. I can imagine companies saying to the Government that if it is good enough for Hamersley and the bauxite organisations, and so on, then they are not interested unless their agreements are on similar lines. Precedent has been adopted, and how we will revert, if ever, to Parliament operating the way it should in accordance with the Interpretation Act, I do not know.

The Minister referred to some unusual clauses and one concerned the establishment, or possible establishment, of a regional development authority. The Minister was very vague regarding the composition and operation of this body and he mainly covered it by saying that before this authority could go into operation a further Bill would be brought before this Parliament to enable members to understand the composition of the authority, etc., before its establishment was agreed to. Consequently, without having some details, it is difficult to discuss at any length this matter of the R.D.A., which is one of the unusual features of the Bill.

I wish to refer again briefly to the Queensland legislation. The only somewhat similar information I could obtain was in connection with one organisation set up under one agreement. For the benefit of the company, a separate local authority area was established, and the Governor-in-Council then was able, under the legislation, to appoint a town commission. The commission consisted of seven members. One was appointed by the Governor and he could also be removed by the Governor. Three were appointed by the company, who could similarly have their term of office terminated by the company. Three members were elected from within the special local authority area which was gazetted, and they were elected under the normal election procedures of the Queensland Local Government Act.

Therefore, it would seem that when the members in the Queensland Parliament were voting on this matter, at least they had a better idea of how it dovetailed into the actual agreement than we have in this case. I realise that the Parliament will have an opportunity to review this when the legislation to establish the organisation is before the House.

Nonetheless, the agreement, to some extent at any rate, does agree with the principle of a regional development authority. To my mind it would have been much easier for the members of this Parliament to appreciate just what they were doing if the Minister had supplied some more information on that matter. No doubt the matter has been discussed at length between the company and himself, and I am sure the Minister could have given us a little more detail than he has.

One clause in the agreement deals with restoration. This is one matter which we have not come up against to any extent in the other mineral agreements, because those agreements have been mainly concerned with iron ore. Members will appreciate that the mining of iron ore involves dealing with a huge body of ore which goes to considerable depth. Iron ore normally occurs in the type of country which one would hardly call good agricultural country or even good pastoral country. The amount of damage to pastures would be very slight indeed.

I would think the possibility of erosion in the areas where iron ore is mined would be practically nil, because of the type of country and the hardness of it. The operations are mainly open cut. However, bauxite is a different matter, because it is a mineral which forms more as a capping on other stone, rock, or mineral. Consequently, as members would know, it occurs generally in the Darling Range area and in other areas in a fairly thin layer. Perhaps in some cases it is only a few feet in depth but sometimes it is up to 15 feet in depth.

Therefore, it is necessary to work or mine a large area of country at, generally speaking, a very shallow depth to enable the necessary production to be obtained. Consequently, a large area will be excavated, dug up, or ripped up in obtaining and mining this mineral. One can understand that this could cause big erosion problems, because there may not necessarily be any hard rock at the finished depth; that is, it could still be soil which would erode easily. We should also bear in mind that when the top layer of dirt plus the mineral is removed, it will, even when it is replaced, be minus the heavy mineral which has been screened from it. Consequently it will be more prone to wind erosion and more likely to be blown or washed away than is normally the case where the material is *in situ*.

For the reasons I have mentioned, this is a very important clause and I do not know that it is particularly well covered in our agreement. For the benefit of members, I point out that the clause appears on page 28. I wonder how the local pastoralists and those dealing with land in that area will react to this from the point of view of erosion. I think it is as well to read the restoration clause. It says—

> (4) The Company will agree from time to time with the Minister for Mines as to the progressive restoration of the surface of the worked and mined areas and the regeneration of vegetation thereon at the cost of the Company, having regard to good mining and industrial practice, the remoteness of the area and its probable future use, the state of any area before being worked or mined, the cost to the Company, the risk of pollution or undue interference with any drainage system, the risk of erosion and the risk of injury to the public PROVIDED THAT if the Company and the Minister for Mines are unable to agree as to such restoration or regeneration from time to time the same shall be decided by a firm of consultants of international repute...

It goes on to refer to the method of arbitration. To my mind that is a fairly general clause. It is not specific enough in that it does not appear to provide sufficiently definite instructions to the company as to how it will go about the mining. It seems to leave out altogether the question of when the company will commence restoration. It certainly leaves a lot to the Minister.

We should bear in mind that the legislation we are dealing with now will not come back to this Chamber should any variations clause which exists in it be put into operation in connection with the restoration clause. Even though the restoration clause mentions some definite things which shall be made and done by the company, we must bear in mind that there is a variations clause which gives the Minister great power in the matter of variations. The variations clause would apply, of course, to the restoration clause.

To my mind the Queensland legislation, again, was much more thorough on this point. Whilst it was similar in some aspects, it was much more specific in the way it laid down what should be done. It was a definite guide to the Minister as to just what should be done and it gave the Minister much more power to carry out the work or to see that the company carried it out.

I will not read it all, because there is a great deal, but I would like, briefly, to give members some idea of the Queensland legislation. I am sure that those who live in the area and those who use the area for pastoral or agricultural pursuits will be greatly concerned over what is to become of the country when the company has removed from it the bauxite which it wants to remove. This, of course, is something which will take place progressively.

I wish to mention the name of the Queensland Act, which is the Alcan Queensland Pty. Ltd. Agreement Act of 1965. It is contained in volume 12 of the Queensland Statutes at page 378. It says—

> The Company in any operations for the mining of the designated minerals undertaken by it, which involve the removal of the surface, shall operate in accordance with good mining practice and shall, subsequent to such mining, take all steps necessary to restore and leave the surface of the mined areas (other than such parts as are required for use in storage of tailings, sludge and like substances) in a condition satisfactory to the Minister so that—
>
> (a) there shall be no abnormal batters or contours;
>
> (b) the surface soil existing prior to such mining is preserved and subsequently spread to maximum advantage over such mined areas;

I will interpolate at this point to say that that is a specific instruction which applies to most restoration projects; namely that

the topsoil must first be removed and stockpiled in some area, and when restoration takes place the topsoil must be replaced on top.

Whilst the Minister may say that the Minister in the agreement has the right to insist on this, I still prefer, wherever possible, to see the actual conditions written into the agreement so that the companies know where they stand in matters of this sort. We know that in many pastoral areas agriculture has been banned as a pursuit because of the possibility of erosion. Continuing—

> (c) there shall be a minimum of interference with the natural drainage system except and unless where it is found expedient to use any mined area for the storage of water;
>
> (d) the provisions of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) hereof are carried out progressively and in respect of mined parts not exceeding one square mile in area within two years of the cessation of mining on each mined part in order to allow of regeneration of vegetation;

There again we have a definite time within which this restoration must be done, and obviously that has been worked out so it would be done before any great damage in the area occurred. I continue to quote from this Queensland Statute—

> (e) there shall not arise any pollution of any drainage system which is dangerous or injurious to public health.
>
> The Company shall take competent advice as to what steps are possible to encourage and promote regeneration of vegetation and shall proceed to progressively promote such regeneration to the satisfaction of the Minister.

Then of course the final portion of the section permits the company, if the company is not satisfied with the decision made by the Minister, to have the matter referred to the tribunal which, in this particular agreement, is considerably different from the one with which we are dealing.

So on the question of restoration, I bring to the notice of the Minister the danger that could occur with this type of mining unless stringent conditions are included in the agreement relating to the restoration and regeneration of the area. In the Kimberleys we have had enough trouble to date, I submit, with erosion, and I hope that this mining operation will not, in any way, aggravate the problem of erosion in those parts.

I would like to return to some of the controversial issues that arise in these agreements from time to time. I know the Minister would be disappointed in me if I did not refer to them. He realises he has all the numbers on his side that are necessary, but I am, at the risk of offending the Minister, returning to my old hobby horse to remind him once again that he produced an agreement which overrides the Interpretation Act so far as by-laws are concerned.

Under the provisions of the Interpretation Act all by-laws framed under this agreement and the agreements which have been made in the past should be tabled in this Parliament and gazetted. This gives Parliament an opportunity to disallow any of the by-laws or regulations that have been framed under the agreements that already have been approved.

To date no by-laws have been gazetted or tabled in this House, but if ever they do come before this House, Parliament would then have an opportunity to move for the disallowance of any one of them. Indeed, I would go further and say that Parliament has not even had the pleasure, to date, of seeing any by-law that has been made under the agreements that have already been ratified. The Dampier agreement and the Tom Price agreement, or any of the others that have gone through, have not, as yet, produced any by-laws for tabling in this House so that members may have some idea of what form of government the companies are using to carry out their operations. This was the subject of some debate at the last sitting. We were told that the companies were simply operating under a clause in the agreement which enabled them, until such time as the by-laws were framed, to operate their own regulations.

I do not think this is a good thing. If the companies are to frame their own by-laws, such by-laws should be gazetted and tabled in this House so that any member may have the opportunity to move for their disallowance. The Minister does not go that far, but he agrees that they should be gazetted and tabled, because such provision is contained in the agreement. To date, however, that has not occurred, and it would be interesting to know how long this state of affairs will be allowed to continue.

Parliament has always enjoyed the right of being able to move for the disallowance of any by-laws or regulations that are tabled in this House. It is only just and fair that this should be done so that they can be publicised and everyone can be made aware of what has been done. It is essential that Parliament should have this right, because in this and other agreements there is the variations clause which enables the Minister to vary practically anything and everything contained in the agreement. If Parliament is to be responsible for ratifying the agreement, it is only right that Parliament should have the say as to whether the conditions laid down in the variations clause are just.

The reasons advanced by the Minister for taking the stand he does are that it is not always possible to obtain this sort of finance, or to get this type of project off the ground, or, to use his own words, to get it to the infrastructure stage, unless these conditions are contained in the legislation. Apparently all States do not think the same way, because I notice, on reading the Queensland agreement, to which I referred a little while ago, that such conditions cannot be considered as being in the Minister's mind or in the agreement he has before the House; and it is a very large and important agreement. It is similar to this agreement in many respects, and the conditions laid down are also very similar, but there is one very different feature, and that is that the Queensland Parliament has not been overridden so far as by-laws and regulations made by the company are concerned.

I think it is worth while briefly to look at the Queensland equivalent of our Interpretation Act and ascertain how it operates in relation to this agreement. This Statute, contained in No. 12 of the *Queensland Statutes*, is titled, "The Alcan Queensland Pty. Limited Agreement Act of 1965, No. 2." This is what it provides in regard to those little things that are decided between the Minister and the company—

> Proclamations and Orders in Council. (1) Any Proclamation or Order in Council provided for in this Act or in the Agreement may be made by the Governor in Council and, in addition, the Governor in Council may from time to time make all such Proclamations and Orders in Council not inconsistent with the Agreement as he shall think necessary or expedient to provide for, enable, and regulate the carrying out of the provisions of the Agreement or any of them.
>
> (2) Any such Proclamation or Order in Council may be revoked or altered by another Proclamation or Order in Council which is not inconsistent with the Agreement.
>
> (3) Every such Proclamation or Order in Council shall be published in the *Gazette* and such publication shall be conclusive evidence of the matters contained therein and shall be judicially noticed.
>
> (4) Every such Proclamation or Order in Council shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly within fourteen days after such publication if Parliament is sitting for the despatch of business; or, if not, then within fourteen days after Parliament next commences to so sit.
>
> If the Legislative Assembly passes a resolution disallowing any such Proclamation or Order in Council, of which resolution notice has been given at any time within fourteen sitting days of such House after such Proclamation or Order in Council has been laid before it, such Proclamation or Order in Council shall thereupon cease to have effect, but without prejudice to the validity of anything done in the meantime.

It then goes on to give the purposes of the term "sitting days." It is perfectly clear that nothing has been waived so far as the right of Parliament is concerned; it decides what shall happen to these by-laws and regulations, and the position there is arrived at by agreement with the company and then with the Governor in Council. There is also a variations clause just as we have in our agreement, but the difference here is pretty great. The variation of agreement clause, No. 4, on the same page states—

> The Agreement may be varied pursuant to agreement between the Minister for the time being administering this Act and the Company with the approval of the Governor in Council by Order in Council and no provision of the Agreement shall be varied nor the powers and rights of the Company under the Agreement be derogated from except in such manner.
>
> Any purported alteration of the Agreement not made and approved in such manner shall be void and of no legal effect whatsoever.
>
> Unless and until the Legislative Assembly, pursuant to subsection (4) of section five of this Act,—

That is the one I read concerning disallowing such regulations—

> —disallows by resolution an Order in Council approving a variation of the Agreement made in such manner, the provisions of the Agreement making such variation shall have the force of law as though such lastmentioned Agreement were an enactment of this Act.

In other words, even a variation of an agreement must come before Parliament and Parliament has the right to reject that variation. All the Opposition in this Parliament has asked for as a last resort is the right—and it asked for this right originally—to move in this House to disallow by-laws, regulations, and rules as made. It now finds itself in a position where it has even been denied seeing these by-laws, regulations, and rules, if in fact they exist, because, while under the agreement it calls for the tabling of these things, up to date I do not recall one having been tabled.

There are, however, matters on which no doubt the Minister and we of the Opposition will never see eye to eye, but I do not know how we will ever get the right of Parliament back into the Interpretation Act. I know there are certain regulations which must be used, but there

are companies which get on very well without them, and I do not see why Parliament should have to sacrifice one of its fundamental rights.

Mr. Court: You know the Queensland Government has invested in these project areas.

Mr. BICKERTON: I realise that the Queensland Government has invested in these areas, but when it comes to a clause like this, let us forget about houses and schools that are being built, and so on. Suppose it is a clause which is almost identical with the Queensland one, and which deals with actual mining, not houses and railways, and so on—and we can find such clauses in our agreement and the Queensland one—it then means that if there is a variation in the case of our agreement, Parliament will have no say as to whether the variation should be made or not. If the variation is made in the Queensland agreement in an identical clause, there is provision for Parliament to decide whether or not it wants that variation. To me that sounds fairly logical.

That is all I wish to say on the matter except that I wish the company success in its project. I am pleased that an industry is opening in this place, and if it is properly conducted I believe it could do much good for the area. On the other hand, if it is not, it could do a great deal of harm, not only now but for many years to come. We can only judge the position as we see it at present, and we can only point out those features we do not like in the agreement.

Finally, I would say that perhaps there are many things which are difficult to understand in the agreement, as I have already mentioned. In the case of some of these provisions, even if one secured the advice of half a dozen Philadelphia lawyers one would not really know what a clause actually meant.

I would liken the agreement to the bikini: what it reveals is interesting, and what it conceals is vital. This seems to be the case with a number of these agreements. I have nothing more to say on the matter of policy, but I would prefer Parliament to have more control in such matters.

MR. RIDGE (Kimberley) [3.38 p.m.]: I have a very limited knowledge of the mining industry but nevertheless I propose to give the legislation my strongest support. I do so because the Kimberley region urgently needs development, closer settlement, and investment—it needs investment of anything up to $300,000,000—and all this can be provided by a company of the stature of Amax. I am sure the company will make a great contribution towards achieving these very desirable standards.

The proposed development at Mitchell Plateau would be by far the biggest single enterprise ever undertaken in the Kimberley region, and I hope it is only the forerunner of other developmental projects of a similar nature.

The member for Pilbara said he was pleased to see that development is moving into this part of the country. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that almost every Western Australian will be pleased to see such a significant industry being established in this remote area—it is certainly remote. The nearest established settlement of any size is Kalumburu Mission, which is about 60 miles away in a direct line. Wyndham would, I think, be approximately 160 miles and Derby 200 miles from this area.

It can be seen, therefore, that any activity in the locality between these two main centres of Derby and Wyndham could eventually have a profound effect on the economics of the pastoral ventures which have been undertaken in the country but which, until a few years ago, were not considered to be worth any more than a row of beans.

Mr. Brady: Are there any roads to this area at present?

Mr. RIDGE: A road has been pushed through as far as Gibb River. This is of a fairly high standard. The Main Roads Department has surveyed a track further on towards Kalumburu. I do not know how far this will go, but the company has put in a developmental track from Gibb River to the bauxite site. At present only four-wheel drive vehicles are able to use it.

Perhaps the problems created by isolation were responsible for the school of thought that this district was not worth anything, but in recent years the introduction of tropical legumes, which grow in low rainfall areas, has put this country in fairly high demand by people wanting to follow pastoral pursuits. The productivity of the region has proved to be quite significant in some parts. This is very evident at Kalumburu where the priests and monks of the Benedictine Order are close to achieving economic self-sufficiency for a population of about 200.

If the Mitchell Plateau venture goes ahead—and it obviously will—then it will help the people in this region who are pioneering pastoral pursuits and perhaps following other activities; and this will hasten the development of roads. Of course, port facilities will have to be available to enable the people to obtain the urgent and necessary building materials and other commodities for their properties.

I was very pleased to hear the Minister say that the company is anxious to work with the Government in trying to establish other industries in the area. There are industries which can well be established on a commercial basis.

From a scenic point of view the country in this locality is nothing short of spectacular, and there is no doubt in my mind that one day the region will support a very large tourist industry; as the Minister said, commercial fishing is a distinct possibility. In fact, on the day I visited the site a little more than 12 months ago the company was providing fuel for the prawning boats which at that time were engaged in surveying the prawning potential in the Admiralty Gulf. The fuel had been brought down from Darwin in a company chartered barge, and I understand it was also available to the isolated pastoralists who had settled in the area.

Mr. Brady: How did you go there?

Mr. RIDGE: I visited the area by plane. Another matter I wish to touch on is the possibility of employing native labour on this project. It seems probable that as a result of the recent introduction of the pastoral industry award, a certain number of natives in the Kimberley region could be thrown out of work. Whether or not this will be the position we will not know until such time as the cattle industry gets back into swing after the wet season. Whether or not some of these people are thrown out of work, this project presents a wonderful opportunity to have some of these reliable young men trained in skills which will ensure them a place of importance in our society.

I appreciate that such a proposition would have to be negotiated with the corporation, but I know that a couple of young native men were employed during the early stages of prospecting. I understand they were highly regarded by their workmates. A reasonable amount of forethought would have to be given to the matter, because I can see the scheme failing if these young men are employed on a project and are virtually left to their own devices. They require expert tuition until such time as they become proficient in their work. That means the company will have to show a fair degree of tolerance for a while.

I think they will need supervision from a welfare officer until such time as they are successfully integrated into camp life. Under proper conditions I consider a proposal such as this contains a great deal of merit. I hope the Minister for Native Welfare will be able to explore the possibility of putting such a proposal into effect.

I have purposely refrained from making other than general references to the mining industry, because I know very little about it, but I think the Minister in introducing the second reading explained the project very extensively. When it comes to fruition I am sure every Western Australian will derive some benefit from it.

I would like to say something about an expression which was used by the Leader of the Opposition the other evening when he spoke about a company town. I almost got the impression that those were dirty words. In my opinion, any company which can provide enough work and sufficient facilities to establish a modern township in a previously unsettled area is deserving of high praise. I feel that the resources of the Amax Bauxite Corporation will eventually be responsible for the development of social and recreational facilities which will one day be the envy of every other town. It is with great pleasure that I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Deputy Premier) [3.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 15th April.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.47 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 15th April, 1969

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

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENTS

Approval of Governor

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [4.32 p.m.]: I have received the following letter from Government House—

I refer to your letter dated 3rd April and now return the amendments to the Standing Orders made by the Legislative Council duly signed by His Excellency the Governor.

(Signed) John F. P. Burt,
Lt. Colonel,
Official Secretary.

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

KALGOORLIE-PERTH PASSENGER SERVICE

Commencement

1. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister advise the date when the passenger train service will commence to operate between Kalgoorlie and Perth on the standard gauge?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

From current information available, and provided prompt approval is received from the Commonwealth Government for the acquisition of the rail cars late 1970.