

young people want to buy a block of land. When replying to me the Minister said he has no worries in that regard; he said it was the sign of an affluent society. The Minister said that in this House this year, implying that young people can pay the high prices.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That was last year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes; but I think the Minister will find he also said it this year. I think the members who will support me in this motion have feelings for the people. They are conscious of the injustices that have been done to people in all walks of life; not only those on the bottom rung of the social ladder, but also those who bought industrial land at Kwinana for the purpose of establishing small industrial plants. However, they have been denied that right. I am referring to men such as Rose who wanted to build factories on the land they had bought for that purpose and now they have to start again. They did not receive any compensation whatsoever from their previous resumptions.

We have the case of a lady in Hamilton Hill who has had property resumed on two occasions. Her new house was no sooner built than she was under threat of resumption. Members will see the mess we are in, and I think it is about time the people were given the right to air their grievances, and the right to be paid just compensation for the uncertainty and the worry they must experience.

If my fellow members have any compassion for the people who are suffering this inconvenience because of the activities of the Government, and if they feel that justice should be done, they will support the motion.

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

#### Ayes—8.

Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willsee
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. H. C. Strickland	Hon. J. Dolan

(Teller)

#### Noes—15

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Mr. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. J. Heitman
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	

(Teller)

#### Pairs

##### Ayes

Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. G. W. Berry
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. G. E. D. Brand

##### Noes

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 3rd September, 1968

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

### QUESTIONS (29): ON NOTICE

#### WHEAT PRODUCTS PRICES COMMITTEE

##### Reconstitution

1. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Will the Government give consideration to reconstituting the Wheat Products Prices Committee pursuant to section 6 (1) of the Wheat Products (Prices Fixation) Act, 1938-1964?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) and (2) There is considered to be no need at the present time to constitute the committee to which the question refers.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION

##### Industrial Deafness

2. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Labour:

Will the Government give consideration to having industrial deafness (due to gradual onset) declared as an item of the third schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912, as amended, pursuant to section 8 (10) of that Act?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The question of compensation for industrial deafness is among the submissions currently under consideration by the committee appointed to examine the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act.

#### QUARANTINE RESTRICTIONS

##### Kimberley Area

3. Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will his department's activities in relation to the vaccination of cattle in the pleuro-pneumonia endemic area eventually result in the abolition of quarantine restrictions on Kimberley cattle?

(2) If "Yes," can he predict when this will become effective?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Not before 1973.

**GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY***Widening of Northam-Wooroloo Section*

4. Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it planned to widen the Great Eastern Highway between Northam and Wooroloo?
- (2) If "Yes," when will a start be made?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The Great Eastern Highway from Wooroloo to Northam is sealed 22 feet wide. Investigations are being carried out for improvements to this section, including the possibility of alternative alignments. These investigations are still in the preliminary stages and no final plans have been developed yet.
- (2) Pending the completion of final plans it is not possible to say when these improvements will be put in hand.

**SEWERAGE***Northam*

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

Would he give consideration to having the deep sewerage system in Throssell Street, Northam, installed before June, 1969?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Funds are not available for extensions of the departmental mains in Throssell Street, Northam, this financial year; however, arrangements are in hand to commence the work in June, 1969.

**RAILWAY HOUSES***Departmental Policy*

6. Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has the department abandoned its policy of building railway houses at large railway country centres?
- (2) If "No," is it envisaged that further railway homes will be built in Northam this year?
- (3) Would the department consider applications by tenants of railway homes for a hot water system to be installed?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Northam is not included in the current programme.
- (3) Present policy is that further hot water systems will be provided only as new houses are constructed.

**IRON ORE***Transport to Wundowie*

7. Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) When is it anticipated iron ore from Koolyanobbing for Wundowie will be transported by the standard gauge railway?
- (2) How will this iron ore be transported from the Northam marshalling yards to Wundowie?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Transport of iron ore from Koolyanobbing to Wundowie on standard gauge is expected to commence in 1969.
- (2) It is proposed to take the ore on standard gauge freight trains to Northam in containers, which will be transhipped at that point onto narrow gauge railway wagons for transport to Wundowie.

**POINT INDICATORS***Standardisation*

8. Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it factual that the point indicators which have been placed at Gingin station as an added safety measure were removed from Meenaar siding?
- (2) Does the department intend to make this type of indicator standard throughout the railway system of the State?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This set of indicators was installed at Meenaar as a prototype. Although this equipment has proved satisfactory, a decision has yet to be made as to its general adoption.

**COAL***Use at Dampier*

9. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is coal being used at the agglomerate plant at Dampier?
- (2) If "Yes," from where is the coal being obtained?
- (3) What is the amount of coal already used at the plant?
- (4) What is the anticipated annual coal requirements in the future?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) to (4) Apparently the honourable member is not fully aware of the exact position at the Hamersley Iron project Dampier installation.

The current position is that the company is producing oxide pellets in accordance with the ratified agreement but approximately 11 years ahead of the original programme.

However, it has not commenced, nor is it yet committed, to produce metallised agglomerates.

The oxide pellets do not require coal for their production but metallised agglomerates which are at an advanced stage of negotiation with the State Government require coal.

No final decision has been made regarding the source of coal for the production of metallised agglomerates. The economics of Collie coal are considerably less attractive than coal from other sources. However, the company and the State Government are continuing their studies to try to find ways and means of reducing the gap between the estimated landed cost of Collie coal as compared with coal from Queensland.

At this stage it would be premature to forecast the amount of coal that will finally be needed but it could vary from approximately .5 to .8 tons per ton of metallised agglomerates produced. Much will depend on the nature and quality of the coal that is finally used.

10. *This question was postponed.*

### PRIMARY SCHOOLS

#### *Assistance*

11. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the additional assistance to Government primary schools as enumerated in the Government's last policy speech now available to parents and citizens' associations?
- (2) What assistance is available to parents and citizens' associations for old and new schools, including ground improvements?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. The additional assistance will be available as soon as the necessary amendments to regulations have been gazetted. In the meantime parents and citizens' associations are being advised of the new scale of subsidies.
- (2) At present, assistance is limited to schedule 6 of the Education regulations but this is in course of amendment and new regulations are expected to be gazetted shortly.

### ROLEYSTONE SCHOOL

#### *Building Programme*

12. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is there a building programme planned for Roleystone Primary School for 1968-69?

(2) If "Yes," what are the details?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. The accommodation requirements will be under review and a prefabricated building used if necessary.
- (2) See answer to (1).

### MARSHALLING YARDS

#### *West Kalgoorlie*

13. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

When is it expected that the proposed marshalling yards in West Kalgoorlie will be operating?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

The yard will be brought into operation in stages, and will be fully operative in approximately two years.

### SEWERAGE

#### *Canning Electorate*

14. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) What was the cost of installing the Westfield sewerage works at Armadale for the following sections—

- (a) extended aeration treatment plant;
- (b) sewerage main from townsite to plant;
- (c) sewerage main from plant to disposal site?

(2) What is the life expectancy of this type of treatment plant?

(3) How many of these types of plant are envisaged for the Canning area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) Excluding preparation of site and provision of access, water and power, the cost of installing the Westfield treatment works was approximately \$70,000.

1,500 persons will be served by the existing aeration tank but some of the facilities

have been provided for expansion to treat sewage from a population of 6,000.

	\$
(b) 9 in. and 12 in. diameter gravity sewers from railway to Forrest Road pumping station ....	57,700
Pumping station ....	35,700
7½ in. diameter 13,000 ft. steel rising main ....	64,000
	<hr/> \$157,400

(c) Disposal site is adjacent to treatment plant and main and distribution channels cost approximately \$3,000.

(2) With correct maintenance, the life expectancy of this type of treatment plant is that which can be expected from a permanent installation.

(3) Except for the proposed plant at the corner of Johnston and Nicol Roads, Lynwood, the Metropolitan Water Board has no present proposals for sewage treatment plants in the Canning Shire.

## MARSHALLING YARDS

### Albany

15. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Have any firm proposals been made and adopted for the broadening of the railway marshalling yards at Albany?

(2) If not, has the matter received any attention?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No.

(2) Proposals have been considered over several years but have not passed the discussion stage. The matter is still being investigated in conjunction with the Town Planning Department.

## SCHOOLS

### Naming Authority

16. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Will he advise—

(a) the authority concerned with the naming of new schools;

(b) the names of the persons and their respective vocations?

(2) What local organisations are consulted prior to the name being decided?

(3) Is consideration being given to naming the new high school in the Collier plantation the Como High School in conformity with the district in which it is being built?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) (a) The Minister for Education.

(b) Answered by (a).

(2) Schools are generally named according to postal address or the district served. However, if it is necessary to adopt another name the parents and citizens' association and the local authority are consulted.

(3) Yes.

17. *This question was postponed.*

## TEMPORARY RESERVES

### Applications by Goldsworthy and Nomads Pty. Ltd.

18. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) On what date in 1962 did Nomads Pty. Ltd. make applications for a temporary reserve in the vicinity of the reserves held by Goldsworthy?

(2) On what date did Goldsworthy make application for Temporary Reserve No. 2600H?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) The 31st July, 1962.

(2) By letter dated the 18th May, 1962, received on the 21st May, 1962.

On the 11th June the Minister agreed to grant the areas applied for, provided the applications were made in units of 50 square miles each.

Temporary Reserve 2600H was then applied for in accordance with the Minister's decision on the 18th July, 1962.

## TRAFFIC WARNING SIGNS

### Erection

19. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) In view of the great number of accidents at the corner of East Street and Terrace Road, East Guildford, has any consideration been given to erecting any special warning signs?

(2) In view of the 700 accidents at the Causeway rotary is any action being taken to erect special warning signs?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No. In 1967, 13 accidents were recorded at the intersection of East Street and Terrace Road.

This particular junction is rated in priority at 165 on the accident severity list of junctions and intersections in the metropolitan area. The great majority of the 13 accidents was not serious.

- (2) No. The number of accidents on the Causeway rotary is related to the very high vehicle volumes negotiating these facilities. Warning signs would have no significance in this situation.

### PARLIAMENT

#### March Sitzings

20. Mr. BRADY asked the Premier:

- (1) Is it intended to have an official opening for the March, 1969, sittings of Parliament?  
 (2) If "Yes," does he not consider this is an unnecessary expense?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) No.  
 (2) Answered by (1).

### TRAFFIC

#### Accidents

21. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Do all shire councils keep a record of the cause of vehicular accidents which occur within their respective areas?  
 (2) Can he advise the number and percentage of accidents attributable to mechanical defects for the year 1967-68 for those shires which do keep such records?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Where traffic control is exercised by municipal councils outside the metropolitan area, this information is supplied to the Government Statistician.  
 (2) The number of accidents attributed to vehicle defects for the year ended the 31st December, 1967—which are the latest available—were as follows:—

Non-casualty		Casualty		Total	
No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.
251	8	81	7	332	8
No. of persons killed		Per cent.	No. of persons injured		Per cent.
10		7	112		7

### KARDINYA ESTATE WATER SUPPLIES

#### Cost

22. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the cost of construction of the pipeline reticulating water to the Kardinya Estate, Melville?  
 (2) What was its length?  
 (3) How much of this amount was paid by the Bond Corporation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The cost of construction of the pipeline temporarily supplying water to the Kardinya Estate, Melville, was \$9,333.53.  
 (2) 3,662 feet.  
 (3) The Bond Corporation has paid \$80,000 for the supply of water to the Kardinya Estate, exclusive of reticulation costs, which the Bond Corporation pays on each subdivision. This amount was the full estimated cost of laying an 18-inch water main from the Coolbellup Reservoir to supply the estate.

However, as an interim measure so that construction of houses could commence during the winter of 1968, an 8-inch diameter main was laid from existing nearby reticulation to supply initial development. This main will later become part of the reticulation system.

The \$80,000 is being applied by the board as a contribution towards the greater cost of laying a 30-inch diameter main between the Serpentine system and the Coolbellup Reservoir, which will supply the estate *en route*.

#### Pipeline

23. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Was a pipeline, originally planned and constructed as an "inflow" feed main to the Coolbellup Reservoir, used instead as an "outflow" main as part of the water supply to the Kardinya Estate?  
 (2) If "Yes," what length of main originally constructed to provide head of water in the Coolbellup Reservoir has been used to facilitate reticulation of water to the area of the Kardinya Estate?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No.  
 (2) Answered by (1).

#### Effect on Coolbellup

24. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the connecting of the Kardinya Estate water reticulation main in any way slowed or reduced the building programme in eastern and southern Coolbellup?  
 (2) Has the connection of the Kardinya Estate water reticulation main in any way reduced water pressure in the Coolbellup area to the extent that it is not possible to construct homes on higher land in the area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Not so far as water supplies are concerned.
- (2) No.

## TROPIC OF CAPRICORN

### Official Parallel

25. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Lands:

Will he lay upon the Table of the House the papers from which he obtained the information contained in his replies to questions asked by me on the 29th August in relation to the adoption of a parallel of latitude to define the position of the Tropic of Capricorn?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The information referred to by the honourable member was supplied by the Surveyor-General from the minutes of a meeting of the National Mapping Council held in Brisbane in May, 1968, and from his own knowledge of the proceedings at this meeting, which he attended.

These papers, which are held by him personally, are submitted for tabling for one week.

Mr. Graham: We will fix Capricorn!  
*The minutes were tabled for one week.*

## BUILDING SOCIETIES

### Allocations

26. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

During each of the last three years respectively, what allocations have been made to building societies from the home builders' account under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The allocations made up from 30 per cent. of the funds available under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement plus the amount in the revolving funds, were—

	Building Societies	R. & I. Bank	Total
	\$	\$	\$
1966-67 ....	3,015,000	100,000	3,115,000
1967-68 ....	3,340,000	100,000	3,440,000
1968-69 ....	3,870,800	52,200	3,923,000

## COLLIER PINE PLANTATION

### Allocations

27. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Can he supply amended particulars to detail previously supplied regarding the future use of land now the Collier Pine Plantation?

- (2) Has all land in the area been allocated?
- (3) If not, what areas are still available for allocation?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) The plan of development has been completed and a copy of this plan is submitted for tabling.
- (2) and (3) Yes. All land is now allocated or reserved for the purpose as indicated on the plan.

*The plan was tabled for one week.*

## BULK MILK

### Price

28. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the price per gallon paid by milk companies to producers on the bulk milk scheme?
- (2) Is he aware of the prices paid in New South Wales and Victoria; if so, how do they compare with this State?
- (3) Does the board contemplate any action to assist bulk milk producers to obtain a higher price for bulk milk cartage?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The minimum prices payable to all licensed dairymen in the metropolitan dairy area and south-west coastal dairy area are as follows:—

At treatment plants outside the metropolitan area—  
40.618c per gallon.

At treatment plants in the metropolitan area—  
44.78c per gallon.

- (2) Yes. New South Wales—49.73c per gallon of 10½ lb. (at N.S.W. Fresh Food and Ice Ltd., Sydney). Victoria—40.56c per gallon. (At board's country agents less cartage from farm.)

*Note:* New South Wales allows 10½ lb. to one gallon of milk, whereas in Western Australia and Victoria 10.32 lbs. equals one gallon.

- (3) No. This is a matter for determination between producers and companies.

## KWINANA FREEWAY

### Canning Bridge Congestion

29. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the recent announcement concerning the delay in completing the Kwinana Freeway, will he give consideration to—

- (a) extending the existing freeway to cross Canning Highway at Canning Bridge to link up with Manning Road;

- (b) prohibiting left-hand turning north-east into Canning Highway at the Canning Bridge intersection;
- (c) prohibiting right-hand turning south into Leonora Street;
- (d) providing for one-way traffic north along Leonora Street south of Canning Highway?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) to (d) The most important feature of the present layout of the junction of Kwinana Freeway with Canning Highway is its capacity to handle a heavy right turning movement at the evening peak hour. Three traffic lanes, both on the Freeway and on Canning Bridge, are available to cope with this traffic movement. Any modification of the present junction could interfere with this heavy right turning movement and thereby reduce the efficiency of the junction. There is a relatively minor left turning movement.

As at many other situations in the metropolitan area, there is some congestion in Canning Highway east of the Freeway junction, largely caused by vehicles waiting to make a right-hand turn south into Leonora Street. While this congestion has not reached such proportions as to interfere with the efficiency of the Kwinana Freeway-Canning Highway junction, the Main Roads Department will nevertheless reinvestigate the suggestion to provide a one-way south link as an extension of the Freeway to connect with Manning Road. Should this be adopted it would be necessary to prevent any right-hand turn south from Canning Highway into the new road for traffic proceeding east. Unless this ban is applied, an extra phase would be required in the traffic lights, resulting in reduced efficiency, which could have a serious impact on the Kwinana Freeway traffic making the right-hand turn into Canning Highway. However, traffic which has been denied the right-hand turn would have to make a right-hand turn south from Canning Highway into Leonora Street. For this reason Leonora Street should not be converted to a one-way north, neither should there be a prohibition on a left-hand turn from the Kwinana Freeway into Canning Highway.

### QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

#### ILLICIT SALE OF LIQUOR

##### Convictions

1. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Police:  
For the last six years how many convictions have been registered for the illicit sale of liquor for each of the respective years?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

#### OFFENCES UNDER ILLICIT SALE OF LIQUOR ACT

	Year ended the 30th June					
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Selling liquor without a license .....	*	16	20	69	45	30
Unlawfully dealing in liquor .....	....	....	11	18	22	13
Being in possession of liquor for sale .....	....	18	3	....	1	1

\* These details are not readily available for the year ended the 30th June, 1963.

#### STATE SHIPS

##### *Sale: Approach by Thomas Nationwide Transport Limited*

2. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Transport:
  - (1) When, on Wednesday the 7th August, 1968, he replied to a question relating to a proposed sale of State Ships and said that "an organisation had made inquiries but no firm proposal had been made to the Government" was he referring to Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd.?
  - (2) On what basis had a director of Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. held talks with senior officials of the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission?
  - (3) How many separate talks were held and on what date?
  - (4) What qualifications had Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd., which was not engaged in the shipping business, which made its advice on shipping of value to the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission?
  - (5) On what date did Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. first indicate to the Government that it was interested in acquiring the ships of the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission?
  - (6) On what date was an intimation given to the company that the situation concerning the negotiations for the purchase of the State Ships had reached such a stage that the company was entitled to assume that the deal would go through and the company could proceed to raise the necessary finance?

- (7) On what date was a firm proposal made to the Government by Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. for the purchase of the State Ships?
- (8) Have the negotiations been on the basis of a cash transaction?
- (9) Has there been a final agreement as to terms and conditions?
- (10) If "Yes," will he give particulars?
- (11) If the Government intended to dispose of the State Ships why were not tenders called?

*Barge Carrying Vessels: Tabling of Papers*

- (12) Will he table the papers relating to the proposal to acquire barge carrying vessels for use by the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for notice of this question, the answers to which are as follows:—

(1) Yes.

(2) to (11). Thomas Nationwide Transport approached me in early June. They advised that they could be interested in purchase of the State Shipping Service and requested authority to have discussions with senior officers. This was given. A talk was held with the chairman prior to the 2nd July, 1968. Since then four talks were held—one on the 3rd July, one during the week ended 20th July, one on the 26th July, and one on the 7th and 8th August.

There has been no firm proposal made by the company and the Government has made no commitment to sell.

(12) Yes.

*The papers were tabled.*

### DRINKING

#### *Lowering of Minimum Age*

3. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

Is it the intention of the Government to reduce the age for drinking intoxicating liquors from 21 to 18 years?

Mr. BRAND replied:

As the honourable member would have seen in the Press, the matter is receiving some attention.

### DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Third Reading*

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

### HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Housing) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Housing Loan Guarantee Act is to facilitate home ownership for families of moderate means having limited funds available as a deposit on a home. To encourage investment in housing through building societies and other approved institutions, the State guarantees the repayment of advances made by an approved lending authority where these advances conform to specific terms and conditions as agreed to by the Minister for Housing.

In addition, building societies and other approved institutions are indemnified against default on the part of home purchasers provided home building loans conform to the specifications laid down in the Act. Currently these are as stated in section 7B of the Act. Simplified, loans may be amounts up to—

95 per cent. of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed \$6,000; or

90 per cent. of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed \$8,000; or

80 per cent. of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed \$10,000,

but in all cases the maximum loan must not exceed \$9,600.

These provisions were designed to permit of higher ratio loans for lower cost houses because it was felt that persons with more limited finance for a deposit would require greater assistance.

It has been found, however, that over the last 12 months 83 per cent. of homes financed from guaranteed funds cost between \$8,000 and \$10,000. These required at least a 20 per cent. deposit and, furthermore, no loans were arranged where the value of the house alone did not exceed \$6,000.

It has been decided to review these conditions to permit of higher ratio loans as a general rule. The Bill also recognises the differing levels of house costs in the metropolitan region, the north, and other country areas. It provides that—

- (1) In the metropolitan region loans may be made up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land provided that the value of the house alone does not exceed \$10,000 with a maximum loan of \$10,000.



(2) Outside the metropolitan region and south of the 26th parallel, loans may be made up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land provided that the value of the house alone does not exceed \$11,000, again with a maximum loan of \$10,000.

(3) North of the 26th parallel, loans may be made up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land provided that the value of the house alone does not exceed \$17,500 with a maximum loan of \$13,000.

Since the 1st July, 1959, advances totalling \$14,100,000 from approved lending authorities have been guaranteed by the State, and from these funds 2,079 families have been assisted in the purchase of their own homes.

This is but one more measure which it is felt will enable more homes to be built as part of the drive to overcome the State's present difficulties. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

## BILLS (2): MESSAGES

### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills:—

1. Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill.
2. State Trading Concerns Act Amendment Bill.

## ESPERANCE PORT AUTHORITY BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 22nd August.

**MR. MOIR** (Boulder-Dundas) (5 p.m.): This Bill is very similar to the one we dealt with last week; namely, the Geraldton Port Authority Bill. In the main I welcome this measure, because, as members are aware, for six years prior to the last election the Esperance area and its port formed a large part of my electorate. As a consequence I have a fair knowledge of the wishes of the people there. Since the redistribution of boundaries and the last election that area does not now form part of my electorate and a large part of it is in the electorate represented by the member for Roe. He will, of course, have on his shoulders all the Esperance troubles and burdens that used to be on mine.

Nevertheless I still have a keen interest in the Port of Esperance, because it serves the important mallee farming area in my electorate, which area sends a large quantity of grain to that port; and, further, the

port will be the outlet for the minerals that will be sent from the goldfields to be exported.

I do not propose to repeat the figures already quoted to the House by the Minister, because I think he covered the Bill fully by pointing out the tremendous growth of the port. Over the last few years it has grown remarkably, and at this stage I would point out that when the Act comes into operation and the port authority has control, it will be the third authority to have had control over the Port of Esperance. Surprisingly enough, in the first place, the Railways Department had control over the then jetty. The control was later transferred to the Harbour and Light Department, which still retains it.

During the years I represented the port area, the various Esperance bodies requested me to make representations for a port authority to be constituted. I made representations to the Minister at the time and also asked questions in the House, but I always met with a refusal. I can understand the reason for the refusal because, in my opinion, at that time the setting up of a port authority was premature. In fact, that is the only feature of which I am a little apprehensive at present; that is, the legislation could still be premature.

When constituted, the Esperance port authority will be confronted with some serious problems, as I think the Minister realises. However, after studying the Bill and reading the Minister's speech, my fears have been somewhat allayed. As the Minister knows, the siting of the new wharves and the building of the breakwater at Esperance have meant that the people of the district now have some pressing problems on their hands.

Evidently the breakwater has had some effect on the currents in the local waters and, as a consequence, the beaches which were probably some of the finest in Western Australia—and we have many of them—are now practically non-existent. In addition much damage has been done to the beach front, as the foreshore and the road running parallel to it have been swept away and the necessary repairs have proved to be quite costly. I do not know whether the port authority will be responsible for making such repairs in the future; because it is unthinkable that it should be the responsibility of the Esperance local authority.

I notice that the funds which will be required by the authority can be drawn from various sources: from revenue obtained through port charges; from borrowings; and from governmental revenue. I take it the Government will show this port authority a fair degree of generosity, bearing in mind the responsibilities it will have to face. In my opinion the Esperance Harbour will have a serious erosion problem in a few years, and I do not know whether it will be solved. It is rather sad

to see the heavy damage that has been done to the once beautiful beaches in the area.

I did mention that the Minister had quoted figures showing the increase in the shipping tonnage handled by the port, but I think I should quote some further figures to illustrate the phenomenal growth of this area. I doubt whether the substantial growth that has occurred can be equalled by any other place in Western Australia. The population of the shire, for instance, has increased tremendously. In 1961 the population was 2,285, but in 1966 it had grown to 4,867. The estimated population in the shire area for this year is 6,500; a remarkable increase, because it is just short of three times the figure for 1961.

In 1966 the ratable land value was \$3,500,000, but in 1968 it had grown to \$8,000,000; another phenomenal increase. Of course, the expansion of the district has not yet halted. The area is continuing to expand and I am certain it will do so for many years. Esperance, I feel sure, will be one of the foremost districts in Western Australia within a few years. I would also mention that in 1961 the number of town electricity consumers was 287, but this year it will be 1,000. That is an extremely large increase. These figures show quite convincingly that the growth of the area, and of the town itself, has been astounding.

I could continue to quote figures on the growth of Esperance, but I think most people would be aware that the vast expansion that has taken place there in the last few years will continue for some time in the future. This, of course, is dependent on the prices for most of the commodities grown in the district remaining somewhere near a payable level. At the moment the position does not look too bright for commodities such as wheat and wool, although wheat has not been affected to the same extent as wool.

At Esperance the people conduct experiments to ascertain if they can expand production by the growing of other grains and other commodities, and it appears that their efforts will meet with considerable success. Over the last few years linseed has been grown, and experiments have been conducted into the growing of different types of sorghum, which appear to have met with considerable success. The stage has been reached where Japanese representatives have inspected the Esperance area and are giving consideration to the expanded growth of sorghum. I believe those representatives have undertaken to buy large quantities of sorghum seed if it is produced in the Esperance area. So it would appear that this could be another crop to be grown successfully in the Esperance district.

For those engaged in the industry, clover seed produces a large income, which proves that Esperance is not only a wheatgrowing

area. A large amount of coarse grain is also produced in the district, the production of which is increasing all the time. In addition to the grain that is exported through the port, substantial quantities of minerals are handled.

For some years copper concentrates from Ravensthorpe have been shipped away for treatment through the Port of Esperance, and, further, sizeable quantities of nickel concentrates from Kambalda have been shipped through the port. Those concentrates may not increase, because it is known that the current proposal is to treat the Kambalda product at Kwinana, and, at some time in the future, it is further proposed to treat a large proportion of the nickel at smelting works which may be built on the goldfields. Recently a leading representative of the Western Mining Corporation stated that for some considerable time the company would be shipping concentrates through Esperance to fulfil the long term contracts it has for the production of nickel.

In addition to the Kambalda deposits, much progress seems to have been made in proving the large nickel finds at Scotia, north of Kalgoorlie. It appears a large mine will open there. Encouraging nickel finds have also been made south of Coolgardie, and further south in the Widgiemooltha area.

When these mines come into production, the destination of the production will be in the lap of the gods. I do not know whether it will be smelted locally or treated in the metropolitan area, or whether the concentrates will be shipped through the port of Esperance.

Salt is another product that could lead to an increase in the volume of shipping at Esperance. Japanese interests have been examining the Widgiemooltha lakes deposits which are embraced by the leases held by one of the mining companies. This company has plans to recover the salt, which, I believe, is of a very high grade. The salt which the Japanese interests are prepared to produce will certainly increase the work at the Port of Esperance.

Like the member for Geraldton I am a little concerned about the reply the Minister gave to that honourable member when he raised the question in regard to division 2 of the Bill which deals with officers and servants. This division is exactly the same for both the Port of Geraldton and the Port of Esperance. Clause 18 of division 2 reads as follows:—

(1) The Governor, on the nomination of the Port Authority may appoint a managing secretary berthing master (who shall be the person appointed as harbour master of the port), and wharf manager and on recommendation of the Port Authority may dismiss the managing secretary, berthing master or wharf manager.

(2) The Port Authority may appoint such other officers and servants as may be necessary for the administration of this Act and may dismiss any of those officers or servants.

It would seem that it might be possible to dismiss people who are carrying out the functions of the port very efficiently.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you mean in the Harbour and Light Department?

Mr. MOIR: I do not think the officers and servants concerned should be left in any doubt as to where they stand; their position should be secured for them for at least a certain period; they should not be left in a position where they can be got rid of if the authority does not happen to like them. I do not suggest for one moment that this would be done capriciously or irresponsibly, but in small towns all sorts of likes and dislikes are prevalent.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You do not know whether the department will do that at the moment.

Mr. MOIR: The department has always been reasonable and the people concerned have always been happy in the employ of the department; they feel sure that the department would not dismiss them if they were carrying out their duties as they should. The Minister said—

I have no doubt that if the staff continues to give good service there will be no changes; but I, as Minister, cannot promise that the port authority will make no changes at any time.

I feel a little more thought should be given to that aspect, because it appears rather unsatisfactory. I was very pleased indeed to hear the Minister say that none of the members of the authority will represent organisations. I think that is a very good step. I feel sure there will be no difficulty in securing efficient personnel, both in Esperance and Geraldton, who will be capable of looking after and conducting the business of the port.

By not appointing people who represent organisations we will be relieving them from pressures which could possibly be exercised locally as a result of their being nominees of those organisations. Accordingly I think the Minister's proposal is a very good one.

The Minister invited suggestions from the member representing the area—in this case the member for Roe—and this will give him an opportunity to look around and put forward names after he has spoken to the people concerned in Esperance. I have already suggested to the member for Roe the name of one man who, I feel, would fill the bill admirably.

My colleague, the member for Mt. Hawthorn, has certain amendments on the notice paper, but these are of a machinery

nature. He has discussed them with me and I think they are necessary, because they will, quite apart from filling a gap which is evident in the Bill at the moment, tidy up the measure and make its intent clearer.

With those reservations I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. YOUNG (Roe) [5.19 p.m.]: I rise to support this Bill to set up a port authority at Esperance. The member for Boulder-Dundas has some misgivings as to the timing in relation to the setting up of this authority; he felt it was premature. I do not share that view, because the Esperance plain is growing so rapidly, and the Port of Esperance is so busy, that it is very necessary to set up this authority. We will then know what is going on, and the authority and its activities will continue to grow with those of the port.

From the figures quoted by the member for Boulder-Dundas, the increase in the town population is certainly no less evident than the increase in the population of the hinterland. The growth in agriculture in this area has been fantastic. No area in Western Australia, or even in Australia, possibly, has experienced such a tremendous growth in agriculture as has the Esperance plain.

The Port of Esperance is now drawing grain from a district extending some 200 miles by road back to what is known as the Lakes district. This district is expanding more rapidly than any other grain-producing area in Western Australia, except, possibly, the Esperance plain. The Lakes district primarily produces coarse grains and wheat, whereas the Esperance plain has become known for its production of oil grains, such as linseed, etc., as well as coarse grains and wheat.

To give members an idea of the growth that has taken place in the area I would point out that the throughput of grain at the Port of Esperance in 1962 was 10,479 tons, or 391,216 bushels; whereas in 1967 it was 97,188 tons, or 3,628,352 bushels. Those increases in throughput cover a period of five years, and Co-operative Bulk Handling anticipates that possibly 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels of grain will go through the port at a future date.

It will be seen, therefore, how necessary it is to set up the port authority proposed in the Bill. To cater for the increased grain production, C.B.H. has agreed to install further storage for 4,000,000 bushels of grain immediately, and ultimately it expects to install storage for 6,400,000 bushels in the port area at Esperance.

The member for Boulder-Dundas referred briefly to the hazards which might have resulted from the building of the wharf, and said that this improvement

had brought with it increased problems of erosion of the waterfront at Esperance. This is certainly becoming a very serious problem, and twice this winter there has been erosion on the beachfront as a result of a swirl that was set up.

It will be necessary for the Government to take a very long and serious look at this matter with a view to trying to relieve the problem of erosion. If this is not done we will have the Port of Esperance and no town, because the erosion is eating into the built-up areas.

The worst of the erosion appears to be at the railway siding area, and as the people of Esperance are very pleased about the setting up of the new port authority they would like the railway line connected to the port before the siding disappears into the harbour.

I think it is a good idea to set up the port authority proposed in the Bill, because Esperance is some considerable distance from the metropolitan area. Accordingly it is indeed good to have the port controlled by men who know local conditions and who have lived in Esperance for a considerable time. It is a very wise step to put the control and the destiny of the port in their hands, because, being so far removed from Perth, there are occasions when it is difficult to have things done by the relevant authorities in Perth. This difficulty will be overcome by appointing to the authority men who know the difficulties associated with this area.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Works for asking me to look round and submit a panel of names of those who I think will be suitable to constitute the authority. I agree with the member for Boulder-Dundas that there are in this area men very capable of looking after its problems, and as long as we make the right choice in the first place the Esperance Port Authority will be assured of success.

One clause in the Bill which concerned the Esperance Shire Council to some extent is clause 24, which deals with the extensions of capital works to the port. The council was afraid the borrowing power of the port authority might be used, to the exclusion of other works, to develop a second berth. But, having contacted the department in the matter, and having studied the clause more carefully, the council is now quite happy that the prerogative for capital works will lie with the Public Works Department.

I support the second reading of the Bill.

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.29 p.m.]: I would like to make a brief reply to the two members who have spoken, and to thank them both for their contribution. The

member for Boulder-Dundas did say he appreciated the previous decision not to proceed with the constitution of a port authority for Esperance because he felt that at that time it was possibly premature.

The honourable member did not say so in so many words, but he wondered whether even now it might not be premature to set up this port authority. The Government trusts the constitution of the port authority is not premature, but that the time is well chosen. I am convinced a port authority at Esperance will do a great deal to assist the town and the hinterland; it will also help tremendously towards the better development of the region.

The honourable member also mentioned matters concerning beach erosion within the bay. There is little doubt that the erosion has been caused by the land-backed wharf; and, as is well known by the people in Esperance and by members themselves, a great deal of work has been carried out by the officers of the Public Works Department in an endeavour to discover the most effective way to control the erosion that is taking place.

Fears were expressed by the member for Boulder-Dundas that the appointment of a port authority might mean there would be a lessening of interest by the Public Works Department. However, this will not be so. The Public Works Department will continue to be closely interested in the matter of beach erosion within the harbour, and it will continue to pursue all matters possible to try to arrive at a favourable solution of the trouble.

I note that the member for Roe has no misgivings about the timing of this legislation. He has exhibited a great deal of faith in the future of the district and of the town. Indeed, the member for Boulder-Dundas has also reflected his faith in the future of this region. The member for Roe mentioned the selection of personnel for the port authority. I hope and trust that everyone who recommends a name or names to me will not expect that each recommendation will be accepted, and the person placed on the port authority. If this were done, I would be faced with a port authority of an unworkable size.

**Mr. Young:** There is no fear of that.

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** I appreciate that the honourable member knows a final selection must be made; but I shall be happy to have suggestions from him and from other sources so that wide consideration can be given and satisfactory personnel obtained for this important authority. I have pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 10 put and passed.

Clause 11: Disclosure of interests, etc., in contracts—

Mr. BERTRAM: I move an amendment—

Page 6, lines 3 to 6—Delete all words after the word "Authority" down to and including the word "persons".

This deletion will be made good later by the addition of a new subclause (4), as indicated on the notice paper. The object of the amendment is to follow up what was said recently during the Committee stage of the Geraldton Port Authority Bill. On that occasion I raised a similar point with the Minister and he indicated that he would give the matter consideration and possibly do something about it in another place. The fact that the clause in this Bill has not been altered indicates that nothing has been done or been contemplated in regard to the matter.

This is a most important clause, and it is one that appears in all types of legislation under which people are appointed to positions of authority, or executive office, on corporate bodies. Therefore one turns quickly to the Companies Act—an Act which is uniform throughout the Commonwealth—for guidance as to the best way in which to word the clause; and the wording in the Companies Act has not been used in this Bill.

Apart from the actual setting up of the authority, this is the most important clause in the Bill. Furthermore it is a punitive clause, because if it is not complied with a member of the authority will find himself in a position where he may be suspended from office under clause 12. Under the Companies Act a director who transgresses a similar provision may find himself subject to a penalty of \$1,000. Being a punitive clause, and being an important clause, it follows that the members' obligations under it should be spelt out very clearly so that he knows what he must do and so that the authority knows what it has to do.

With regard to subclause (1) of this clause, it seems to me that the draftsman has forgotten that the word "member" is defined in clause 5, and means a member of the port authority. However, it is quite obvious that where this word appears in lines 3 and 4 of the subclause there are different intentions to the meaning. It is correctly used in line 3, but in line 4 the word "shareholder" should be used. Subclause (1) also mentions the term "incorporated company" and that, too, is dealt with in my proposed new subclause (4), where instead of simply stating a certain

number of shareholders of an incorporated body, I have followed the wording used in the Companies Act. The number of shares held by shareholders is immaterial because they may have little bearing on the voting rights.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This amendment, with its consequential amendment, certainly does not clarify the situation. There is no need to amend the clause. The only point of any value made by the member for Mt. Hawthorn concerns his remarks about the description of the word, "member." There could be some confusion as to whether the word means a member of the authority or a member of a company. However, a close study indicates that it means a member of a company. The clause is similar to others written into legislation of this kind.

The number of members of the company is set at 25 to lessen the likelihood of the authority becoming, in effect, a one-man show, and I see no reason for any change. The situation would not be clarified at all. I do not think the member for Mt. Hawthorn has proved his point, and, therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. BERTRAM: My proposed amendment to subclause (2) is in no way affected by the amendment we have just dealt with. My proposal is to delete the subclause and to insert in its place a new subclause which spells out in clear terms what the position is. The existing subclause mentions a disclosure but does not say who shall record it, or in what record the disclosure shall be made.

It could conceivably be entered up in the petty cash book, or on the back of a stamp. The proper thing would be to set out—and this is once again following the Companies Act—who shall make the record and where the record shall be made. The Minister said, in regard to the Geraldton Port Authority Bill, that the entry must be made at the time. However, there is nothing in the subclause to that effect.

No time is set, but, surely, it must be done within a reasonable time. However, what is the position in practice? We find that somebody can make a disclosure, as set out in subclause (2) of clause 11, but that disclosure need not appear in any record.

A member of the authority could say he had made a disclosure, but that it was not his responsibility to record it anywhere. The same position would obtain under the Companies Act where a director made a disclosure. However, the drafters of that Act decided this was not fair and proper and that there should be a responsibility on the executive officer of the body concerned to record the fact of a disclosure.

My amendment aims to do precisely this. The Minister said earlier that this provision was included in other Acts of

this type, and no doubt he was referring to the Albany Port Authority Act, and other Acts concerning port authorities. The provision has worked in those cases, but I suggest that it has not been put to work, and when it is put to work it will not operate. It seems to me it is our responsibility not just to produce legislation which looks all right, but legislation which is, in fact, all right. Therefore, I move an amendment—

Page 6—Delete subclause (2) with a view to substituting the following:—

- (2) The Managing Secretary of the Port Authority shall record every disclosure under this section in the minutes of the meeting at which it was made.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think the honourable member is prodigal of his ability and his talents. He tends to try to accomplish changes in matters which require no change. I checked with Crown Law on this particular matter, and the officer to whom I spoke was unable to see where any improvement would be effected by the proposed amendment.

I think the amendment would spell the matter out more clearly, as the honourable member has said. The amendment mentions the word "minutes," whereas the word "record" is the term used in the Bill. Subclause (2) of clause 11 reads as follows:—

- (2) A disclosure under subsection (1) of this section shall be recorded in the records of the Port Authority.

Clause 17, with the side heading, "Records to be kept and annual report to be furnished," states that the port authority shall keep a record of its proceedings in such manner and form as the Minister approves. It so happens that minutes are kept of every meeting which is held by any of the port authorities which are functioning at the present time.

It is the most logical thing in the world that the managing secretary will keep a record of what is carried out at the meeting; certainly a record of anything of such a kind as this. Indeed, if he failed to do so he would be in the position of not carrying out his duty.

Mr. Lapham: What is the disadvantage?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think the honourable member brings out the point I am trying to make when he asks, "What is the difference?" I say there is very little difference, and I do not want to change it. It is quite obvious that it would be foolish to change one system which is working well, and use another system just because the new system spells it out better.

Mr. Lapham: It would bring about clarity.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: But there is no necessity whatever to bring about the change. I have agreed that the suggestion could work just as well as the present system is working, but there is no need to make a change, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: I think the Minister is missing the point. Surely the point made by the member for Mt. Hawthorn, on this occasion, is that if we can clearly indicate in legislation the responsibilities of certain persons, without unnecessary verbiage, then that should be done. It should not be necessary to rely on regulations to clarify a situation. The amendment would mean a simple and easy way of indicating who is responsible, and I cannot see anything wrong with that. The Minister for Railways appears to wonder why we want this particular verbiage. I say that all our legislation should be as clear as we can make it, and not be as clear as mud, requiring an interpretation by Crown Law at a later stage.

The Crown Law Department had numerous conferences in order to get some unification in the Companies Act throughout Australia. If Crown Law agrees with the verbiage in the Companies Act, associated with the requirements for this sort of disclosure, then surely it is right and proper to transfer such requirements into an Act such as this. The fact that the other similar Acts have this particular verbiage does not make it any more desirable, because at some time or other those Acts will have to be amended by Parliament. Because a particular line was taken some years ago, it does not mean to say it should be agreed to now. I suggest the Minister give this matter more thought.

The clarification of legislation which the public is required to obey as law should be of paramount importance to the Government of the day. I support the amendment.

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

#### Ayes—19

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moir
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Toms
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Graham	Mr. Davies
Mr. Hall	

(Teller)

#### Noes—22

Mr. Boveil	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Brand	Mr. Mengaros
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Henn	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Kltney	Mr. Young
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

## Pairs

## Ayes

Mr. May  
Mr. Norton  
Mr. Harman  
Mr. Sewell

## Noes

Mr. Williams  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Burt  
Mr. Ridge

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 12 to 18 put and passed.

Clause 19: Certain officers to give security—

Mr. HALL: I would like the Minister to explain this clause, if at all possible. To me it appears to be an iniquitous clause. Does it mean that the officer has to buy his employment by virtue of his financial capacity? If this is so, it brings about the position that a man with the necessary qualifications, but without finance, cannot be employed by the port authority.

As I read clause 19 of the Bill, the authority can insure itself against this security risk, and I think that is dangerous. If all the words in clause 19 down to the end of line 6 were deleted, the port authority would have sufficient financial protection against anything that might occur.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Firstly, I would say that this is certainly not an iniquitous clause. The member for Albany misreads the clause, if he thinks this is so. The position of trust which is referred to in this clause is one where a good deal of money is involved—public money—and anybody employed in such a position must have the confidence of the authority in order that a guarantee policy can be taken out.

In the past there have been officers employed by port authorities who have made defalcations and who have been accused of taking money. In an endeavour to avoid this sort of thing the clause has been included. It is essential for a person in a position of trust to have the confidence of both the port authority and the lending institution. In my view it is absolutely essential that this clause should remain in the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 20 to 33 put and passed.

Clause 34: Removal of wrecks—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I do not intend to move anything in regard to the clause but I wish to sound a note of warning. The clause deals with wrecks, obstructions, and damage within a port area. A famous decision was given by the House of Lords in the year 1895 regarding a ship which was sunk in a harbour. The owners of the ship collected insurance for it, and the insurance office had no rights of subrogation under the policy—that is, to assume the rights of salvage. The port authority called upon the owners to remove the wreckage as it was a hazard to shipping, but the owners immediately said,

"We have abandoned this"; and, of course, it had been abandoned. However, it is a tenet of English law that property just cannot exist *in vacuo*—someone must own it and therefore property cannot be abandoned.

To the surprise of the maritime world, and to the port authority in question, the House of Lords held that this particular ship had been abandoned in the circumstances; and, therefore, the port authority could not call upon anybody to move it, and the port authority had to have the work carried out at its own expense. The clause in the Bill is obviously designed to overcome the problem, and I would commend the draftsman for his knowledge of that very old case to which I have referred.

However, I would refer the Minister to paragraph (d) wherein it is provided that where a ship has been stranded or sunk the port authority may call upon the owner to remove it, but if the owner should fail to remove it within a stipulated time the port authority may remove the ship and sell the wreckage and from the proceeds it may reimburse itself for the expense involved. Then the port authority may refund any surplus to the owner; but where the proceeds of the sale are insufficient to pay the whole of the expenses of removal the port authority may recover the balance from the owners of the vessel.

In other words, as far as we have gone the clause sets out a course of action that can be followed by the authorities, but it appears to me that the wording of paragraph (d) in a serious way restricts the course of action that the authority can take. It says that if the owner has been responsible he can be sued; but if the owner is not responsible through his negligence, the port authority may sue some other person who is responsible.

This seems to be a serious restriction of the general law that exists in Western Australia today by virtue of a Statute called the Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasor's Contribution) Act of 1947. This Statute provides that if a plaintiff is not quite certain in his own mind just who is responsible for damage caused to him he may sue one, two, three, or more persons and allow the court to determine who is negligent. If more than one is negligent, the court then apportions the liability.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Don't you think that point is covered?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I do not think it is. I think this clause restricts the right of the port authority to sue. The clause says that the port authority shall sue the owner if it is certain the owner has been negligent.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Or another person.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Suppose the authority sued the owner believing that he had been negligent and then it was found that the port authority itself had contributed through negligence to the collision. I think the right of the authority to turn around and sue again is lacking in this clause. I do not intend to oppose it, but I would like the Minister to get his departmental officers to have another look at it before it is passed in another place.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am indebted to the honourable member for his clear description of the clause and of what it purports to do; but I was somewhat lost by what he was trying to say towards the end of his remarks. Paragraph (d) states that the port authority may recover the balance of the costs involved from the owner of the vessel, if the vessel was stranded or sunk through the fault of the owner, or from any other person who was negligent or by whose fault or negligence the vessel was stranded or sunk.

Subclause (2) goes on to state that the term "owner" includes not only the owner of the wreck at the time of the sinking, etc., but also any purchaser of the wreck. I fail to see how the clause is restrictive, but I will talk the matter over with the officer responsible in the Crown Law Department.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I do not intend to delay the Committee but if the Minister refers my comments to his officers I trust he will mention my belief that the paragraph limits the law in the Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasor's Contribution) Act of 1947, section 4 (1) and section 5 (1).

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I will send your comments on to the officer concerned.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Thank you.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 35 to 84 put and passed.

First and second schedules put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### **ARTIFICIAL BREEDING BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 22nd August.

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn) [6.12 p.m.]: As the Minister said when he introduced the Bill, it is a small one designed merely to change the financial year, and the year of operations of the board, to the 31st December in each year instead of the 30th June, as it is at present.

As the Minister also pointed out, the activities of the board are mainly seasonal and reach their peak during the months of June and July. Therefore it seems quite reasonable that the amendment should be agreed to. It is noted the board has recommended the change and it appears there will be safeguards in that reports will be submitted to cover the period of transition.

The activities of the board constitute one of those technological innovations of this century and they mean so much to the community of this State, particularly as we still rely so heavily on agriculture.

Artificial insemination was first brought to this State, as I understand it, in 1952 and it was the result of an overseas visit by an officer of the Department of Agriculture. I believe we must continue with the practice of sending departmental officers overseas in order that they may become acquainted with the latest techniques. The trip by this particular officer certainly produced something of value to the State.

The first experiments in artificial insemination in Western Australia began in 1955 at the Wokalup Research Station when a laboratory was set up and artificial insemination was commenced. I understand the first tests on the herds there were most successful; and, following those experiments, the practice spread throughout the dairying and butterfat areas of the State. I believe the most important change in technique was made with the introduction of liquid nitrogen as a refrigerant, because several important advances were made possible.

The use of a refrigerant meant that the semen could be brought from other States; it meant that it could be stored for long periods; it meant that it could be used in many parts of the State; and it meant an increase in the board's activities. Further it made it possible for the semen from a nominated bull to be used for a herd over a period.

I do not intend to speak for long on this measure, but I would like to commend the introduction of the amendment and I congratulate the board on its activities for three reasons: Firstly, because it is a board and as such it is a semi-governmental instrumentality. Because of this it renders a service to the community. It is interesting to note that while artificial insemination was pioneered by the Department of Agriculture, at one stage it was intended to allow private enterprise to take over the activities. However this was declined and a board was set up and this board has rendered a worth-while service. The activities of the board have been related primarily to the dairying areas and, as members on both sides of the House would know, this is an industry which can do with all the help we can



give it. That is the second reason why I think the activities of the board should be encouraged.

Thirdly I believe the board's activities should be encouraged because they will be beneficial in the future. So much land is now being opened up—marginal land—that difficulties are being experienced.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. TAYLOR: Before the tea suspension I was making the point that this particular technological innovation should have a lasting effect for the good of the State. Even though mining figures and industry generally are increasing, there is no doubt that we will remain an agricultural State, and that the backbone of the State for a long time will lie in agriculture. This will be particularly so as we move into new marginal lands with difficulties of climate, water, crops, and so on.

Accordingly I feel the board's activities will be invaluable, and there is no reason why the board should not be able to study and consider other types of animals for the purpose of breeding. The instance of the Santa Gertrudis cattle is one example of what can be done to assist the agricultural community of the State.

It may well be that in the future we will consider looking at other types of animals, such as goats, which can subsist in areas which at the moment are considered of little value. I can see nothing wrong with the Bill and accordingly I support the measure.

MR. KITNEY (Blackwood) [7.34 p.m.]: There is not very much I can add to the remarks of the member for Cockburn. The amendment contained in the Bill has been inserted at the request of the Artificial Breeding Board. This request has been made for two very good reasons.

As the Minister said, in the first place the activities of the board are mainly seasonal; they reach their peak in June, July, and August. I would like to quote a few figures to substantiate this statement. In July, 1966, 4,271 head of cattle were inseminated; in August, 2,412 head of cattle were inseminated; and in September, 1,340 were inseminated. These figures gradually declined to 759 in December, 1966. From January to April we find the figures are fairly static, averaging about 180 to 200 per week, and they increased in June, 1967, to 1,788.

The figures I have quoted are a very good reason for the proposed amendment. In July and August the staff is very busy, it has little time to attend to preparing the annual report and the financial returns. As a matter of fact I understand that at the end of August this year the staff was still busy trying to get out the annual returns; it was finding this difficult because it was overwhelmed with its normal seasonal business. I support the Bill.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Murray) [7.36 p.m.]: I also support the Bill, which gives effect to the suggestions made by the Artificial Breeding Board that it be allowed to present its annual report and financial statement after the 31st December, instead of at the end of June as is usually the case.

As members have already said, June is perhaps the busiest time of the year for the members of the board, because various artificial breeding centres in the butterfat and whole milk areas are working at their greatest pressure at that time. The people in the whole milk industry—particularly those from non-irrigation areas—find it necessary to mate more cows at that time of the year so that they will calve in the late summer months. It is then that they seek to increase their production.

As we all know, in the butterfat areas the people usually like their cows to come in early in the autumn so that they can take advantage of the full lactation period. The five members of the board are farmers and they, too, are busy at this time of the year.

The board, which took over its duties in March last year, has had a busy time during that period. Shortly after taking over, or at about that time, the members of the board visited the artificial breeding centres in the Eastern States to bring themselves up to date with the various procedures and technological aspects of artificial breeding. They visited the artificial breeding centre at Pamawn Park at Bacchus Marsh, which is well known throughout Australia.

Some years ago I had the opportunity and the pleasure to visit this centre. It impressed me with its size and scope and also with the excellence of the work carried out. Nevertheless, as one who has been well acquainted with the work at our centre at Wokalup, I was very pleased to appreciate that it was really outstanding; indeed, the conception rate on a percentage basis was higher at Wokalup than in other recognised centres of the Commonwealth.

This was due in no small measure to the excellent work done by the ex-Superintendent of Dairying (Maurice Cullity) who made a special study of this subject and who did a tremendous job for the dairying industry of Western Australia.

I am well aware that during his long service leave he visited Europe and studied the various techniques in the United Kingdom, and, accordingly he was able to pass this information on to Wokalup, with the result that the conception rate from the artificial breeding of cows in this State was stepped up. Those interested in artificial breeding and other spheres of dairying activity owe a great debt to the excellent work done by Maurice Cullity.

There is also another person who is on the board and who was associated with Mr. Cullity. He is a veterinary officer who was associated with the industry in the early stages, and he has continued to do excellent work. Those of us who know the work he has done are well satisfied and very pleased to have him as a member of the board.

I think the board is a very good one; it is made up of people with practical knowledge. The member for Cockburn mentioned that artificial breeding in this State started at Wokalup. This is not quite correct; because people in private enterprise imported semen prior to that date and they had some success with it. The chairman of the present board (Mr. Lefroy) was one of the pioneers in this respect, and it is pleasing to see him as chairman of the board.

I am looking forward to seeing the report of the board, as are most people associated with the industry. I am interested to see how the board has managed during the 12 months it has been in operation. I was rather surprised to find that the centre at Wokalup was discontinued soon after the board took over. Those of us who spoke on this matter two years ago were under the impression that it would be kept going for at least another two or three years.

Mr. Taylor: From where is it operating now?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: From the Eastern States. There is an office and distributing centre in this State. We were all surprised when Wokalup was discontinued so soon after the board took over. I have no doubt, however, that there are very good reasons for this, and that the matter was carefully studied before the step was taken.

Liquid nitrogen has been mentioned. This has been known to the artificial breeding industry for some time, and a few years ago semen was exported to Japan and many other centres in the Pacific from Pamawn Park and from Berry in New South Wales. Very good results were obtained from this semen.

Prior to the introduction of liquid nitrogen, crushed ice was used. This was not very satisfactory because it was necessary to maintain the semen capsules at a low temperature. It was found that while being transported the packing would move in the crushed ice—it would be shaken about—and on occasions the receptacle was partly uncovered. This affected the conception rate of the semen.

I am convinced that artificial breeding has proved its success in the few years it has been in operation, and the standard of many of our dairy herds has been improved. I refer particularly to the Friesian herds in the whole milk area. There has been a marked improvement in the quality

of the milk from the animals generally and this has been largely due to artificial breeding.

The Friesian is the most popular breed in the State today. It is used for artificial breeding not only in the whole milk industry but also in the butterfat areas, where it serves the dual purpose of providing for the requirements of whole milk and butterfat herds and also of beef cattle.

Artificial breeding has proved invaluable in controlling and eradicating disease which might well have been bred into a herd by the use of unclean bulls.

Last year some 17,000 cows were inseminated in this State, which is quite a good percentage of dairy cows—approximately 200,000—cows which we have in Western Australia. Like other members I think artificial breeding has a tremendous future.

I was interested to learn that one of the big graziers in the southern part of the State had ordered something like 2,000 ampoules of semen of the Charolais breed of cattle from the United Kingdom. This will have a tremendous effect on breeding in this State. Other pastoralists and graziers are also interested and are investigating the possibility of importing beef semen from the United Kingdom. There is a quarantine period of two years involved. Semen can also be imported from New Zealand, and we are thus able to obtain the benefit of the best bulls of that country.

I understand something like 40 per cent. of cows are inseminated in New Zealand. That is a pretty high proportion, but it is much higher in parts of Europe. The sale of semen from these centres is big business. It is sent to all parts of the Commonwealth and to the islands in the Pacific. From the United Kingdom, I understand semen is sent to 20 or more different countries.

Those of us who are interested in the future of the artificial breeding work of the board will look forward to the end of the year when we will be able to obtain the board's report. I understand the Bill provides that at the end of the next six months we will obtain a report on the work of the board for six months of this year, and that, in future, we will obtain an annual report each January.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [7.47 p.m.]: It has been interesting to listen to the comments of the various speakers on this amending legislation. It is well for us to be reminded, from time to time, of the importance of the industry and the substantial part it has played in the development of this State.

In this amending legislation reference is made to the board and to the request of the board to alter the period at

which it shall make its annual report to give an account of its activities during the previous 12 months. Under the parent Act this report and the details of the accounts have to be made at the end of June. Already the board, in the short period in which it has been in action, has found that this will clash with the highest point of its activity. Therefore it has requested this amendment.

I think those members who have listened to the various speakers on the measure will appreciate how important this is, because at the particular time of the year when the original legislation demanded that this report be submitted, the board is actually at the height of its activities. Having regard for the whole of the activities of the board, it is much better that it be allowed to make its report and finalise its accounts at the end of December.

Several points have been made to which I would like to refer. One is the possibility of extending to other animals the type of work in which the board is engaged. To a certain extent, this has been done by assisting the whole-milk industry, and then the dairy section of the cattle industry. The board has now extended its work to the beef breeds.

The member for Murray mentioned the importance to a large number of people in Western Australia of the importation of semen. I might say that all the States of Australia are interested in introducing the French beef breed Charolais into Australia. Everyone knows that quarantine regulations will not allow the importation of livestock into this country; and there is also some restriction on the importation of semen. This has to be in quarantine for two years. Quite an amount is already in quarantine and it will not be long before it is introduced into Australia. We will closely watch the results.

I understand quite a number of property owners are choosing dams to inseminate in order to see what results they can achieve. They will have to continue increasing the quality of the breed by introducing still more semen to produce animals which will eventually reach the stage of being classed as purebreds. I feel sure there will be other opportunities, too. I am thinking of sheep and pig breeding. Work in these fields will be carried on in the years to come.

The member for Murray mentioned that he was rather surprised the board left Wokalup much earlier than was anticipated. Here again, this represents quite a change in the activities of the board. Until that period of time, the whole of the work of producing the semen was centred on Wokalup. Very little was imported into this State. However, because of the facilities offered in other States, proven sires were used. We could not do this in Western Australia because it was

uneconomic for the department; but when facilities were offered in the Eastern States, this proved to be attractive to Western Australian producers and the board immediately decided to dissociate itself from Wokalup. The board disposed of its facilities, sold the bulls, and imported the whole of the semen from the Eastern States.

This is going to make a wonderful contribution towards improving the quality of the cows that will be used for milk production in Western Australia. So it is well for us to remind ourselves of the importance of this industry and the work the new board has undertaken on behalf of dairy and beef cattle producers in Western Australia.

I am glad the member for Cockburn and the member for Blackwood have referred to the importance of the board; and I think we can extend our good wishes to the board, which has been in operation for only a short period of time. We are quite certain its activities will be watched closely and will be supported by every right-thinking citizen in Western Australia.

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.

## EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. LEWIS (Moore—Minister for Education) [7.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members will have observed this is a very short Bill; and its intention is mainly to give effect to the undertaking given by the Premier in his policy speech to increase certain subsidies for schools.

Prior to the last general election this Government undertook, if re-elected, to introduce a textbook subsidy for all secondary students. The subsidy is to become effective from the 1st January, 1969, and is payable on a basis of \$5 a year for students up to third year and \$10 a year for students in the fourth and fifth years. The Government also promised to subsidise special reading and reference books for matriculation students. Payment of this subsidy will date from the beginning of the present financial year.

These undertakings were given with a view to relieving parents of secondary students of some of their heavy financial commitments for textbooks. They apply equally to Government and non-Government secondary students. The only exception will be in the case of Commonwealth secondary scholarship holders, who are already in receipt of \$50 a year from

the Federal Government for the purchase of textbooks, and students studying in Western Australian schools but whose homes are outside the State. This exclusion will be effected by regulation.

I might add here that in allocating textbook subsidies, care will be taken to devise a system of distribution which will ensure that correct use is made of the subsidy. The subsidy for matriculation reference books will, of course, be payable direct to the school and not to the individual. Payment of these subsidies to Government schools and students is authorised simply by amending the relevant regulations. However, in the case of independent schools, before the subsidies can be paid, it will be necessary to amend the Act.

Increased library book subsidies were also promised to all schools as well as the extension of the subsidy system to the purchase of a wide range of teaching aids and equipment. These, too, will apply equally to Government and non-Government schools but, unlike the textbook subsidies, their payment to independent schools will not require an amendment of the Act since they are already provided for under existing provisions.

I might interpolate here that the Federal Government's recent announcement of its secondary school library subsidies will also make a major impact on the standards of secondary school libraries. The funds will be available for the erection, alteration, or extension of library buildings and for the provision of furniture, equipment, and the basic stock of reference books and materials for a secondary school library.

Funds allocated by the Commonwealth for the triennium 1968-69 to 1970-71 will total \$27,000,000, of which this State's average annual entitlement will be \$677,200, made up of \$503,200 for Government schools and \$174,000 for non-Government schools. This is on a *per capita* basis of secondary students.

The steadily increasing costs of education, together with the necessity for primary denominational schools to employ a greater percentage of lay teachers, is placing a very severe stress on those responsible for financing these schools, and the Government has become concerned that their standards may be forced down below an acceptable minimum through sheer lack of funds.

The pupils attending non-Government schools are also citizens of this State and their future contributions will play a major part in its development. It is essential, therefore, to ensure that these children are not penalised because it is their parents' wish that they shall receive a certain type of education.

It is for this reason that in the 1967 session of the Parliament the Government introduced a measure to provide an annual subsidy to all efficient primary schools of

\$10 per primary pupil. The amendment became effective from the 1st January, 1967. This measure, in varying degrees, relieved the very real financial hardship to which some of these schools were being subjected.

Following a further close look at the situation early this year the Government announced that if re-elected it would increase the \$10 per annum subsidy to \$20 per annum. This Bill will amend the existing provisions of the Act to enable this additional \$10 per student per year to be paid as from the 1st January, 1969.

At present the compulsory attendance provisions of the Education Act are limited to children less than nine years of age living within two miles of a school or, if satisfactory transport is available, living within one mile of such transport; and to children not less than nine years of age living within three miles of a school or, if satisfactory transport is available, living within two miles of such transport.

For children living at greater distances than those I have just quoted, who are unable, for some reason, to take direct advantage of school facilities, the Education Department's boarding allowance or, in the case of native children, the hostel accommodation provided at a cost parents can afford, correspondence lessons are available. However, these are not compulsory.

Members will appreciate that circumstances can arise where parents could deliberately avoid the responsibility of ensuring that their children receive an efficient education and yet still be within the letter of the law.

I have recently been disturbed by reports that such practices are being deliberately employed by a group of parents; and despite the department's best endeavours there has been no way of insisting that the children concerned obtain a formal education.

A provision in the Bill will overcome this problem by authorising the Minister, where he is of the opinion that a child is not receiving an efficient and suitable education, to cause the parent of that child to send it to a Government or efficient school.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Davies.

#### *Message: Appropriations*

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

### **COMMONWEALTH AND STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8.5 p.m.): This is a piffling Bill which, in my view, will have no effect whatever upon anything. I have no objection to it because it is completely innocuous notwithstanding the claims made when the Minister introduced it. He said—

It is but one more step in the Government's programme to attack the housing shortage being currently experienced in this State.

This Bill will not build a house or part of a house, or assist in so doing.

**Mr. Jamieson:** As a matter of fact, it will reduce the number.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** If the Minister and the Government have good and sufficient reasons for introducing legislation, then I suggest the Government should advance them. We were given some sort of spurious excuse as to why the Bill had seen the light of day; and, if members will bear with me for a few moments, they will appreciate, I am sure, that there is nothing to suggest there is any worth or merit in what is proposed.

Having given vent to these kindly feelings, I here and now indicate to the Minister and the House that it is not my intention to oppose the Bill.

I remember well, particularly after a little refreshing, introducing the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill in 1956, almost 12 years ago to the day. Section 6 of the Act which this Bill seeks to amend was of such importance at that time, and had such an impact upon building societies and the housing programme, that not one member of any party in either House even mentioned it, except the then member for Nedlands—now the Minister for Industrial Development. Not even he touched on the point dealt with in this Bill. Nor did the building societies make any protest or have any fears that they would in any way be trammelled if the legislation passed in the form in which it was introduced—which, in fact, it did.

So, for a period of 12 years, the building societies have been operating under the terms of the Act, without the assistance of this important further step on the part of the Government, in meeting the housing crisis which exists at the present moment. May I suggest here that if the Government cannot do anything more effective to improve the housing situation than occupy the time of Parliament with legislation like this, then the housing situation will inevitably be far worse at the end of another 12 months than it is at present.

The building societies have suffered to such an extent that, using the Minister's figures, since 1958-59—the period, of course, of a Labor Government, and, I suppose, this was a measure of party politics used when introducing the Bill—the

number of permanent societies has increased from seven to 14. The number has doubled, which is not bad.

The number of terminating building societies has increased from nine to 19, which is more than double. That is also a pretty fair effort. But, as the Minister indicated to us, those who would have an interest in the subject of this Bill would be the permanent building societies, and, I repeat, they have doubled in number.

I asked some questions of the Minister this afternoon with regard to the amount of money which had been made available from Commonwealth and State funds to the building societies and some figures were accordingly produced which enabled me to do some elementary mathematics. This brings me to the conclusion, which the Minister and anyone else can check, that the building societies are finding themselves so embarrassed with the present arrangement that if we put to one side—indeed, overlook altogether—the money they have received under the agreement, we find they were able to advance \$2,500,000 in the year 1958-59. However, in the year 1967-68, they advanced about \$18,000,000, an increase of approximately 700 per cent. Yet the Minister would have us believe that the existence of the charge over the whole of the funds of the building societies—to quote his words—

tends to inhibit the private borrowings of the permanent societies.

That is not so. That is an incorrect statement. From approximately \$2,500,000 they have been able to advance, nine years later, some \$18,000,000 in a year, over and above what they are drawing under the terms of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. It is obvious, therefore, that all the evidence is completely against the argument which was adduced by the Minister in making his submission in seeking our support for this Bill.

I start to ask myself: What is the true reason? What is the purpose of this Bill? Obviously it is not inhibiting, or interfering in any way whatever, with the activities of the permanent building societies. I wonder if, whilst he is no longer a member of this Parliament, the Chairman of the Perth Building Society, to whom any sort of State activity is an anathema, expressed the desire, which fell on receptive ears, that some steps should be taken to ensure that the State would not have this floating charge over all the assets, present and future, of the building societies.

Frankly, I cannot see why there is any real need for this floating charge to be held over all the assets of the societies, but it certainly has not done any harm; and I should say that perhaps an argument in favour of its retention would be that if the building societies had so much at stake and theoretically, in any event, the possibility of losing so much, they

would ensure that they exercised every discretion in the manner in which they made their loans available.

However, I suppose we could all agree that the building societies, and particularly the permanent building societies—although I have no grounds for differentiating between the two—have displayed a sense of responsibility. They are here to stay, and unquestionably they are rendering a considerable service by financing people to enable them to acquire homes for themselves, in contradistinction to the dismal failure of the Government in respect of the area for which it should cater; namely, those on the lower incomes—those whose incomes are below the \$50.86, which is the figure applying at the present moment.

Perhaps when the Minister replies—if he deigns to reply—he would be good enough to submit reasons, or at least one valid reason, for the introduction of this amendment. It certainly does not lie in the evidence he submitted in placing the Bill before this House. I say no more than that, but await with interest the comments of the Minister.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Belmont) [8.14 p.m.]: I have very few comments to make on this measure; but, as I see it, if a quantity of money is available for distribution for housing, be it through private sources or Government sources, the fewer organisations dealing with it, then obviously the more houses will be built in the long run. This seems to me to be the wrong way of tackling the problem.

My colleague mentioned that he did not consider one more house would be built; but I consider there will probably be one less built. The various organisations have their own administration and to some degree they are allowed to make charges upon the moneys they handle. As a consequence, they will be no better off.

I would like the Minister to comment and advise how he thinks even one extra house will be built under this system. There is a specific amount of money being used for housing at the moment and I would like to know how more houses will be built by this method. Undoubtedly money will become available somewhere along the line and it could probably be better used under housing schemes which already apply and which do not necessarily require any amendment to the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act.

**Mr. Graham:** The Minister is suggesting that people would be more eager to lend money to building societies.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** I cannot see that this would be apparent. Building societies such as Starr-Bowkett, the Perth Building Society, and others have reasonable security and many people do lend money to them. I cannot see how the creation of a greater number would attract any more money. The main building societies

have been in existence for a long while. If I had finance to invest in this sort of thing and was looking around, I would be inclined to be attracted to the existing societies rather than any other building societies which may appear from time to time. One would tend to be suspicious of newer societies.

As the Minister indicated, terminating societies are a different matter. They are usually associated with some particular union or club or some such body which channels money into the society and helps to finance homes in conjunction with the money which is made available through the Commonwealth-State scheme. I do not think we could expect a great improvement as a result of this amendment. In fact, on economic valuations over a long period, possibly it would be found that the State would be worse off in respect of the number of houses built than it would be if the Act were not amended.

**MR. O'NEIL** (East Melville—Minister for Housing) [8.17 p.m.]: Firstly, I would like to thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his unqualified and enthusiastic support of the measure.

**Mr. Jamieson:** You misinterpreted his remarks.

**Mr. O'NEIL:** I was careful in the use of words when I introduced the Bill and said that the floating charge by the State over all of the present and future assets of building societies tends to inhibit their capacity to attract money from other sources. It is perfectly true that to date this inhibition has not been evident, because building society movements have been growing apace, as was instanced by me and quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. However, we should not leave any stone unturned to enable more and more finance to be attracted into the field of housing.

The building societies advisory committee includes representatives of the permanent and terminating societies, the Treasury, and the Registrar of Building Societies. They have closely examined the requests made by the permanent societies relative to the removal of the total floating charge which the State has over the assets, and they have come down on the side of recommending that, in lieu, there should be an equitable mortgage—I think that is a better term to use than “floating charge”—over so much of the assets as will secure the State to the extent of the advance.

It is no argument to say this will not do any good because to date it has not been effective. Let us take this step—I appreciate the Opposition does not oppose the Bill—and see whether or not the removal of the inhibition will, in fact, attract more money to the building society movement.

The member for Belmont queried whether any further funds obtained through the removal of the inhibition would, in fact, produce more houses. He seemed to indicate that charges or costs would be increased. I could not quite see the point of his argument. The administration charges in respect of loans which are made from funds guaranteed by the State are restricted. The loans can only be guaranteed under certain circumstances. Included amongst the conditions are the terms of administrative charges by the building societies and also the terms under which the loans are made available to the homebuilders.

I think that covers the point raised by the member for Belmont. It is a fact that if more money goes into the building society movement for the building of houses, it certainly cannot possibly mean that fewer houses will be built.

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.

## STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

**MR. BRADY** (Swan) [8.23 p.m.]: Since the Minister introduced the measure last week, I have looked through his comments and read the Bill. I have gone into the matter pretty thoroughly and, whilst I will criticise some aspects, at the same time I indicate to the Minister that I will support the second reading.

As I have said, I want to criticise certain aspects and to do that effectively I think I should relate to the House what the Minister told us about the proposed amendments. If members recall, the Minister said he intended to add a new section 7A to the State Trading Concerns Act, with a view to allowing the West Australian Meat Export Works to borrow \$628,000 on the outside market. He told us that the money would be required in order that the Public Health Department and the Department of Primary Industry could do a job by the State in respect of meat handling, particularly in regard to hygiene. He also said it would enable the works to be improved and would provide for a more efficient handling of the through product. I want to remind members of the Minister's remarks in this regard, because later on I shall make some reference to it.

The Minister also told us that at the works extensions are currently being made to the mutton floor. The Minister also mentioned the installation of chillers, the new refrigeration plant which is being installed, the mechanical disposal system for

dealing with offal, and the extension of the Government institutions department which necessitates a transfer and rebuilding of the canteen. In other words, there are six rather big projects going on at the works at the present time.

The Minister said that the immediate programme of works requires somewhere in the vicinity of \$340,000; but the Government, through its funds, can only make available approximately \$121,000, which represents a leeway of \$220,000, and this has to be made up, even having regard to the immediate requirements of the works.

Members will see highlighted by this Bill the difficulties the Government is facing in regard to loan funds. Probably the Government thinks the best way to get over the difficulty is to allow this particular State trading concern to borrow on the outside market. That might be one way of getting over the difficulty but we on this side of the House—the Opposition—are rather suspicious of this sort of move, because it could be the thin edge of the wedge.

The Leader of the Opposition interjected the other night and said that something like this was done with regard to the Wyndham Meat Works. The next thing we knew, the Wyndham Meat Work was given away. The Opposition is sorry to see a State trading concern put into the position of having to go out onto the open market. After all, the people who lend the money on the open market are business people; it will be business firms with them, and the interests of the State trading concern and the people, generally will be second.

It is rather ironical that after 40 years of having a State Trading Concerns Act it is only now the Government has found it necessary to go on the outside market to borrow money. As I said before, that is of course, because of the grave position in which the Government finds itself with regard to loan funds.

I remind the House that State trading concerns were first brought into operation in Western Australia as a consequence of an Act which was passed in 1917, when the State was still in its infancy. At that time, there were no less than 10 State trading concerns operating in the interest of the people of Western Australia. Vestec interests, and private and overseas investors were not getting quite such a good rake-off—as the majority of the concerns are doing now—at the expense of our natural resources or of the ratepayer of Western Australia.

Most of the 10 to which I have referred have now passed away from State trading concern control and have been disposed of. The last three to be disposed of were the State Hotels, the Wyndham Meat Works, and the State Saw Mills and Brickworks.

New members of the House know what a pity the people of Western Australia are now paying as a consequence of the loss of the State trading concerns to the State.

When I was researching the records with regard to loan expenses today, I looked through the State Trading Concerns Estimates and found that—as I have said—years ago we had 10 State trading concerns whereas now we have only three. Those currently in existence are the West Australian Meat Export Works, the subject of the Minister's proposal, the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission, and the State Engineering Works.

So, of the original 10, plus another one or two added subsequently, the State has now only three State trading concerns, including the W.A. Meat Export Works. These works were originally sponsored by a Labor Government in 1942 when the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Wise) introduced a Bill to enable the works to become a State trading concern. It is now rather sad to find that the works are to be placed on the open market for the purpose of obtaining funds which, in my humble opinion as a layman in regard to accountancy matters, should have been found by the State Treasury.

Last year the Government raised loans to the extent of \$57,000,000 and no doubt, in the next few weeks, the Treasurer will be seeking approval for loan raisings for the ensuing 12 months which could amount to \$60,000,000, or even more. It seems rather sad, therefore, that the State Government is placing what is essentially a primary producers' concern on the market for the purpose of obtaining more capital. I would have thought that the State Treasury, if it did nothing else, would take steps to find the necessary \$68,000 for this State trading concern to carry on, as it was originally intended to do to enable meat to be exported overseas.

Mr. Nalder: You mean \$600,000.

Mr. BRADY: Yes; \$628,000 was the figure mentioned. I would have thought the Government would stretch a point, even at the sacrifice of some other works, to give the W.A. Meat Export Works some financial support. I am obliged to support the second reading of the Bill because I am most anxious to see these works make progress; and, after all is said and done, if they are to keep up with other industries in Western Australia they must spend more money on capital works to continue to export greater quantities of meat from this State. The works also handle fruit and other products, and therefore it is essential that extra capital be found.

Nevertheless, as I have said, it seems a pity that the State Treasury—in view of the fact that it has, over the years, found sufficient money to assist not only these

works but other State trading concerns—now finds that the necessary capital has to be raised from outside sources.

I do not know whether members are aware of the early history of the works, but it seems that they were originally formed by a private company in the 1920s. The late Hon. E. Lee Steere was one of the prime movers in having the company formed, and Alec Monger, who is a well known primary producer in this State, was another. The works were first formed with a view to exporting mutton overseas. Nominal capital amounting to £250,000 was to be raised, but, in fact, approximately only £55,000 was raised on the open market.

In 1942, according to *Hansard*, the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Wise) introduced a Bill to enable the Government to take over the works as a State trading concern. It seems that 40 shareholders held 60,000 shares, and 307 shareholders held only 4,935 shares. So the Government came to the aid of the company and financially assisted it to the extent of £167,000 in order to get it off the ground and enable it to export meat produced by primary producers. It seems that from 1936 to 1942 the company made some headway because it operated at a profit, but eventually it approached the Government to turn the works into a State trading concern.

The company could have been sold to other interested parties at the time, but the directors gave the Labor Party the first opportunity to take over the concern, and as far as I can understand, the Government agreed to their request in the interests of the State as a whole and in the interests of the primary producers in particular.

Since that time the works have performed an excellent job, and I express my regret that the Treasury cannot find the money required, because when the works have all the facilities they need they are bound to make fairly good profits. It seems that the net profit for 1965-66 was \$164,668, but the net profit for the following year was only \$8,485. To some extent this was brought about—the Minister will correct me if I am wrong—by a reduction in the quantity of meat available for export, and also, to some extent, because the machinery and plant could not efficiently handle any larger quantities of meat and fruit coming into the works.

The fact remains that if the W.A. Meat Export Works can obtain sufficient finance to purchase machinery and plant capable of doing a reasonable job, I am sure that increased efficiency will result, and I therefore hope the works will be successful in raising money on the outside market.

As I said previously, as a layman trying to analyse the overall position of the works, it appears that efficiency must be



the keynote of their future success. They will have to keep abreast of the times to meet the competition which will be forthcoming from private companies exporting meat. If they do this they will continue to do an efficient job for the State in the export of meat.

I recall—and I think most members of this House will recall—that recently in this State some problems were raised by the Commonwealth Health Department and the State Public Health Department regarding the export of meat. The position was that the conditions of export did not measure up to American hygiene standards. Therefore it would be a calamity if this money were not made available to the West Australian Meat Export Works to obtain the necessary efficiency which, on the one hand, would decrease costs and increase production, and, on the other hand, meet the necessary hygiene standards which are expected by the Americans and other people importing our meat.

I support the second reading of the Bill and I hope the management of the works does not experience a great deal of difficulty, because the raising of this finance means a great deal to the primary producers of Western Australia. One has only to read the Press articles of recent weeks to discover that primary producers are not very happy at the moment over rising costs, and decreased prices for their products; and if, in addition, they were to lose their meat export trade because of inefficient handling of the meat at Robb Jetty, the result would be a tragedy.

Throughout their history it would appear that the success of the West Australian Meat Export Works has ebbed and flowed, but by and large I think they have done a great deal of good for the State. Glancing quickly at the balance sheet today, I notice that over the years the accumulated profits from these works since they were first formed in 1942 total \$536,838. That is approximately one-third of the funds now employed in the industry itself. To some extent this amount has been ploughed back into reserves, but a sum of money has been paid off the original capital loan borrowed to get the works off the ground, and some money has been paid into Consolidated Revenue.

So by and large the works earned the confidence of the Labor Government which introduced the original legislation in 1942 to enable them to carry out their task. I therefore hope the management will be successful in raising capital at a cost which will enable it to obtain efficient results and reach a high standard of hygiene for the benefit of the meat export trade.

**MR. FLETCHER** (Fremantle) [8.4 p.m.] : Like the speaker who has just resumed his seat, I express concern that the State Treasury finds it necessary to go to the loan market to borrow money to finance improvements in a State instrumentality as important as the West Australian Meat Export Works. I notice that \$628,000 is required this financial year to raise the standard of hygiene necessary for meat handling and to increase the operating efficiency of this establishment. I am most concerned about the works having to raise money in this way because the Government cannot find the necessary finance to improve the works.

It is inevitable, as the State grows, there will be an increased demand for the facilities available at the West Australian Meat Export Works. Being well acquainted with this establishment and its management I can speak highly of both especially of the capable and efficient management. The works have conferred great benefit on the State. It should not be necessary to point that out to the members of this House and, in particular, the Country Party members.

The works do not confer great benefit only on the pastoral industry, but also on the members of the general public. I, any member of this House visited the meatworks I am sure he would be surprised to see the diversity of perishable goods that are handled. It is indeed an eye-opener. The methods of handling the various types of produce are also greatly diversified. These products include fruit, vegetables, poultry, seal fish, crayfish, and prawns. These would be only a few of the perishable products that are kept at the works in an extremely efficient manner.

Members of the House would be aware that expert knowledge is necessary for the efficient storage of each particular variety of the foodstuffs I have mentioned. A difference of one degree or more in the temperature could destroy the product that is held in storage at the works. It has occurred to me that as other people own these foodstuffs, if they were destroyed as a result of negligence on the part of the management, a consequential liability would be placed upon it. I am not aware that that has ever occurred under the very efficient management at that address.

I cannot speak too highly of the cleanliness and the efficiency of the establishment. It is to me another example of the efficiency of a splendid public utility. Frequently we hear laudatory remarks about private enterprise, but not very often do we hear commendation of public utilities. I therefore have much pleasure in expressing commendation of this establishment.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the Minister for Agriculture when the Leader of the Opposition interjected to

say that he hoped this move was not in preparation for the disposal of the meatworks on a similar basis to that on which the Wyndham Meat Works were disposed of.

Mr. Nalder: Apparently the member for Swan doubted the sincerity of the reply I gave him.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is possible; but I do not doubt the Minister's words, because he is already in enough trouble with the primary industries. He would be in greater trouble if he disposed of this great public utility which is such a great help to the industries which he and his party represent.

Mr. Davies: That is the very reason the Government has not sold these meatworks.

Mr. FLETCHER: There is another matter which is of concern to me: if the meatworks at Robb Jetty were disposed of, the charges would inevitably be increased, and the increased costs would be passed on to the community as a consequence of the profit motive that goes with private enterprise. I am sure private enterprise would not be satisfied with the existing charges.

I sincerely hope that the meatworks at Robb Jetty stay, and always will stay, in the hands of the people of this State. There would be a big revolt within the pastoral industry if they were disposed of. Those are the few comments I have to make on the Bill. I cannot find anything in it to fight against, and as a consequence I support the measure.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [8.47 p.m.]: I support this Bill, and I am pleased that the Government has decided to make provision for extra finance to be available to extend and to improve the Robb Jetty meatworks. The member for Swan cast some doubt on the proposed method of raising finance, and suggested the money could be provided through the Treasury. There is very little difference between the two methods. Even if the Treasury provided the money it would have to be repaid by the public utility. There is no disgrace to the meatworks in having to borrow money on its own account.

I am pleased the West Australian Meat Export Works are able to raise money on their own account to extend their works, because in this State we are all too short of meat export establishments, especially at the present time when there is a vast increase in stock numbers. Last year we had the spectacle of stock being available, but insufficient treatment works to cater for them. It is not only urgent, but very necessary that the meatworks at Robb Jetty be expanded and improved, so that a greater number of sheep, cattle, and lambs can be treated there.

It is most essential that we have at least one meatworks in the State which is owned by the Government, to which pro-

ducers can consign their stock for treatment. There are very efficient private meatworks in Albany and other country centres, but in these cases producers who desire to have their stock treated for export on a consignment basis very often run into difficulties. It is only natural that these private meatworks will treat their own stock first. With the availability of a public utility, such as the W.A. Meat Export Works, that difficulty can be overcome.

As the member for Fremantle pointed out, in the sphere of livestock treatment or killing it is only natural that the meatworks at Robb Jetty are very important to the primary industries. They are important, because they provide cool storage and because they cater for all classes of primary products. These works are established on the seaboard, and are close to shipping. They are essential to the fruit industry and to other primary industries, because of the cool storage facilities which are available. It is important that these works be retained for the killing of stock, and for the cool storage of very many of our primary products.

I am pleased to see that it is proposed to improve and increase the facilities at those works. I would go along with anyone who deplores any suggestion that the Government might be considering the sale of these works. That would be the last thing in the mind of the Government. Very often the Opposition is suspicious when improvements are suggested; it suspects that the improvements are being effected for the purpose of selling a State trading concern. However, when the Government does not improve the facilities at some of these concerns the Opposition contends that it is inefficiency on the part of the Government. Whichever way we go we cannot seem to win. We want these meatworks to be improved and the facilities to be expanded. I support the Bill.

MR. TOMS (Ascot) [8.51 p.m.]: It is refreshing to hear remarks from the opposite side of the House in support of what can be termed a socialist venture. I only hope that the member for Stirling will remember, on a later occasion, the remarks which he has just made if a proposal is made to dispose of these particular works. The Minister for Agriculture's blood pressure need not be raised by any insinuation that the Government might be intending to sell these works.

Mr. Nalder: I have not worried about my blood pressure.

Mr. TOMS: The Minister has been in this Parliament long enough to know that some of the assurances which have been given to members on this side of the House have not been kept.

Mr. Nalder: I am talking about this Bill.

Mr. TOMS: I say that members on this side of the House are entitled to view the proposal before us with some suspicion, in view of our experience on other occasions.

Mr. Nalder: When you sit down I will assure you again.

Mr. TOMS: I am prepared to accept the assurance of the Minister.

Mr. Nalder: I will do so without my blood pressure going up!

Mr. TOMS: I look at this proposal from another angle. I am not opposed to the meatworks going onto the open market to obtain their financial requirements for extensions. For a long time in this House I have listened to a great deal of what has been said about the creation of boards and other bodies, in order that the responsibility might be taken off the shoulders of the Government. It is a wonder that the people have not woken up to the fact that the Government is finding great difficulty in fulfilling its commitments.

It seems that boards and State trading concerns are being shoved off by the Government to a greater extent by being provided with their own borrowing powers. This is an indication of weakness on the part of the Government in regard to borrowing money on the open market. Its loan commitments are as full as they can be.

What concerns me in the proposal in the Bill before us is that there is only a certain amount in the bucket to be obtained through borrowings. The adding to the number of bodies which can draw on the loan pool will eventually affect the local authorities and other institutions which obtain loans from this source. We will eventually reach the stage where the loan bucket will be drained, and then some societies and institutions might find their sources chopped off.

The Leader of the Opposition interjected the other evening—no doubt from experience—that he hoped the money proposed to be raised under the measure would not be spent on bolstering this industry with a view to selling it. I feel he was justified in making that remark, particularly in view of his past experience. We know that over the years profits from State trading concerns have been paid into Consolidated Revenue; but when new machinery or extensions have been required they have had to be provided from loans. That would only have added to the burden placed on those concerns.

One of the greatest misdemeanours perpetrated by this Government was the disposal of some State trading concerns. The fact that members of the Country Party played along with the Government in such moves is their business. When we had the State Saw Mills and Brickworks conducted as a State trading concern we had an efficient brake on the cost of building materials. This brake went by the board

when the Government gave this instrumentality away. It was only three days after this State trading concern had been disposed of that the cost of timber went up by 30c per 100 super feet. Members will be aware that the mere pittance which Hawker Siddeley paid for this establishment has been more than covered by the amount it has obtained from the increase in prices.

I hope that we do not finish up by adopting the method which seems to have been adopted over the last decade of giving various organisations borrowing power and so emptying the loan bucket and resulting eventually in other institutions—particularly local authorities—finding their source of loans chopped off.

I support the Bill. I assure the Minister that I am prepared to accept his assurance, although it would be nice to hear him give that assurance again when he replies to the debate.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.58 p.m.]: I could almost repeat what I said on a previous measure when we were discussing the amendment to another Act, that it is interesting to hear members refer to the importance of some of the industries we have in this State and of the contribution they are making.

In this case I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate. It is quite pleasing to me, as Minister responsible for overseeing the Robb Jetty meat export works, to hear commendation expressed on the work done by the staff and management. I am aware that in every centre of industry in this State, the Robb Jetty management and staff are held in very high regard, because they exert a very wide influence. It has been said that this establishment caters not only for abattoirs and for the treatment of meat for export and, in some cases, for home consumption but also for fruit growers, fishermen, poultry producers, potato producers, onion producers, and other producers.

It is very pleasing to hear some member say how much they appreciate the work that is being done in this establishment. Members who are inclined to be critical of the Government's action in seeking to obtain the approval of Parliament to allow the Robb Jetty meatworks to obtain finance to carry out the required extensions should realise this is quite normal practice. It is not necessary for any criticism to be levelled.

I am quite sure the member for Swainston did not mean what he said when he declared, "Let the Government find the money required for urgent work, and let some of the other organisations stand still."

Mr. Brady: I thought that should have been your approach to it.

**Mr. NALDER:** The men at the Midland Junction Abattoir are dependent on money from the Government. If we suggested that we should let the abattoir at Midland go for 12 months in order to help Robb Jetty, the member for Swan would be the first to stand on his feet, in and out of Parliament, to condemn the Government.

**Mr. Brady:** Too right I would!

**Mr. NALDER:** By that interjection the honourable member acknowledges the fact that he did not mean what he said.

**Mr. Brady:** I am sorry to see a primary industry having to struggle for cash like this.

**Mr. NALDER:** The works in the past have done a remarkably good job. On the financial side the budget has been met, but because of the demands of primary industry, and the need to improve the abattoir facilities, it is necessary for this work to be done fairly promptly, especially if we are to cater for the opportunity to export meat overseas. We have already been told of the effect of our not being able to export meat commodities overseas. I only want to underline the importance of this. To assist the management to obtain the finance it requires, the Government is prepared, under this legislation, to allow it to seek it outside. Every member who has spoken has agreed we should amend the Act in this way.

**Mr. Brady:** Won't it make fewer houses available for the Minister for Housing, if the abattoir does get the money?

**Mr. NALDER:** No, it will not.

**Mr. Graham:** Will it not make it harder for the State Electricity Commission?

**Mr. NALDER:** I should not think so. The Commonwealth Government has agreed our borrowing programme is a certain figure and I think the member for Ascot mentioned that this might interfere with local government borrowing. However, when the Premier goes to the Premiers' Conference and they agree to a certain amount of loan funds being made available, and so on, there is no doubt that all these aspects are catered for. I am sure that when the Treasury advised us on this fact, it would know it was quite possible for the abattoir to get this finance outside.

**Mr. Brady:** We hope they are right.

**Mr. NALDER:** Let us wait and see. I think we can be satisfied that the finance the abattoir requires will be available; and this is the only reason for the amendment. However, it has given members an opportunity to indicate their association with the works. I think practically every member has had some association with them, and, if not, will have sooner or later.

**Mr. Davies:** Is there any chance of the Commonwealth helping with finance because of the export aspect?

**Mr. NALDER:** No. This is a matter of local interest and it is our responsibility, not only at Robb Jetty, but also at Midland, to see the abattoir is up to the standard required by the Department of Primary Industry, which is responsible for the export of primary products overseas.

I thank members for their contributions and assure them again it is not the Government's intention to dispose of Robb Jetty. We believe it is playing an important part in catering for the requirements of so many sections of primary industry in this State. We accept the fact that it has carried out a responsibility and we are prepared to allow it to continue to cater for the requirements of those sections of primary industry which, in the first instance, use the abattoir; and, in the second, those sections which, in the main, use the freezing facilities which are available. 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.

## LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

**MR. BICKERTON** (Pilbara) [9.6 p.m.]: I do not intend to take any great time of the House on this Bill. I agree with the amendment it contains. I think the Minister was right when he said that the Liquid Petroleum Gas Act as it stands at present places our Western Australian manufacturers at a disadvantage compared with those manufacturing in the Eastern States. This product, through the pressure pack industry, is already being used in Western Australia, and no reason exists why the manufacture should not take place here. The amendment is designed for the sole purpose of protecting our own manufacturers, and I agree with it.

In view of the fact that my reply has been so brief, I do not expect the Minister to get up and thank me for my contribution; but I do agree with the Bill.

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.

**CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

**MR. TOMS** (Ascot) [9.9 p.m.]: I do not intend to dwell for very long on this morbid subject. The proposals in the Bill, as outlined by the Minister, seek to bring the Cremation Act in line with the Cemeteries Act. The Minister indicated that in the Cemeteries Act the definition of a dead human body is a body of a deceased person, including the body of an infant of not less than seven months' gestation which was stillborn.

I can quite appreciate that when the Cremation Act was passed the various aspects were not taken into account. From time to time we have this experience. The Minister indicated that the pattern of the Cemeteries Act has been followed in this Act, and the amendment in this Bill is to bring yet another provision in line with that Act.

I conclude by saying that I am particularly pleased with the last remark of the Minister. He said that despite the provisions in this Bill, if parents wish to bury or cremate a stillborn child of any gestation period, it is possible for them to do so.

**DR. HENN** (Wembley) [9.11 p.m.]: I wanted to say a few words in support of the Bill. As the Minister indicated, the provisions in this measure are designed to make uniform the provisions in the Cremation Act and the Cemeteries Act and, in particular, the provisions with regard to the definition.

The Cemeteries Act deals with various matters such as the Governor being able to establish or close cemeteries, appoint trustees, and vest the cemeteries in those trustees, and so on. The trustees can make by-laws and do all things which are for the good of the public in relation to cemeteries, and so on, and so forth.

The Cremation Act seems to deal exclusively with the setting up of crematoriums. Provision is made in that Act for a crematorium to be established not necessarily in a cemetery. I suppose that in the country areas this provision would be necessary, but in the metropolitan area we always associate a crematorium with a cemetery.

In that Act also are various regulations regarding medical certificates prior to cremation, and powers of justices of the peace and magistrates—and even Attorneys-General in some cases—to forbid cremations under certain circumstances.

I believe that an opportunity exists to streamline some of our legislation. We have heard on other occasions that some of it is cumbersome and that some of it could be repealed and brought under other Acts. I believe this is a case in

point. I consider we should place the provisions of the Cremation Act under the Cemeteries Act. After all, there is a close association of ideas between cemeteries and crematoriums. Perhaps one might say it is a very warm association.

The second point which occurs to me is that since the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act was amended I think two years ago, in regard to the registration of a stillborn child of 20 weeks' gestation, to my way of thinking it is strange that in the Cremation Act the gestation period is seven months; that is 28 weeks. If it is good enough for a foetus of 20 weeks' gestation to be registered as a birth, then it is equally fair that a stillborn child of 20 weeks' gestation should be given the opportunity to be law to be cremated.

I suppose I might be told that the procedure would be expensive for the parents of a child of only 20 weeks' gestation if such a child had to be buried or cremated and that the Government does not want to inflict that expense on any parents. However, I again say that if it is good enough for a stillborn child of 20 weeks' gestation to be registered, it is fair that it should also have the opportunity of being cremated.

I do not want to say any more. I merely wished to raise those two points. I do not propose to pursue them at another stage of the Bill; but perhaps at some later date someone might think that what I have said is worth considering. I support the Bill.

**MR. HARMAN** (Maylands) [9.15 p.m.]: I do not want to delay the House but would like to support the remarks made by the member for Wembley. Anyor who saw a particular television programme last night would have recognised the point being made by some of the people on the panel about the arbitrary period set in relation to unborn children. Under the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act, 20 weeks is the time set at which registration must be made. Some reasons have been advanced for this time limit, as can be seen from the debates when an amendment was introduced in 1965. Reference was made to recommendations by the National Health and Medical Research Council and certain other organisations who are eminent in this field.

Probably there were good reasons for setting the time at 20 weeks, but what are the reasons for a period of seven months as set out in the Cemeteries Act and the Cremation Act in relation to stillborn child? Probably this, too, was an arbitrary time set some years ago when the Cemeteries Act was first introduced.

Apparently the Cemeteries Act is under the control of the Minister for Local Government, but the Cremation Act is under the control of the Minister for Health.

Probably there are good reasons for this but, as the member for Wembley said, I wonder whether the fact that two departments are involved leads to a certain inefficiency because of overlapping. If this matter was looked at by those people who are anxious to bring about reform, it could well lead to greater efficiency; and perhaps overlapping could be reduced if the two Acts were combined and we had a composite Act brought before the House at some future time.

Also, I tried to find out whether any reports were submitted by the trustees of the Karrakatta Cemetery but I was unable to obtain one. I know we could hardly expect to have a report from the trustees of every cemetery in Western Australia, but at least I think a report should be prepared by the trustees of the major cemetery in the State, namely, Karrakatta. If there is a report available it could not be traced through the records of the House this evening. Perhaps the Minister may know whether such reports are submitted to him as a matter of administrative practice and he could tell the House whether they are tabled for the information of members.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Which reports?

Mr. HARMAN: Reports by the trustees of the Karrakatta Cemetery. With those remarks I support the Bill.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [9.19 p.m.]: I trust it will not be held against me that I am untrammelled by any great knowledge of this subject.

Mr. Graham: I think you are a bit too modest.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Not a bit. I appreciate the remarks that have been made on the discrepancy that exists in the gestation period referred to in the Acts that have been mentioned—I refer to the periods of 28 weeks and 20 weeks. I am unable to say whether or not this gap should be closed at some future time but I will certainly mention it to the Ministers concerned.

As I understand the situation, the 20-week gestation period applying in the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act was used to ensure that a scientific or medical inquiry could be held for the purpose of determining the cause of death. It was felt that this might add to the scientific and medical knowledge available. However, here again I am treading on ground about which I do not know a great deal.

During his speech, the member for Maylands made mention of the fact that the Cremation Act and the Cemeteries Act come under different ministerial jurisdictions, and he suggested it might be of value if the two Acts were combined and thus brought under the one Minister.

Here again, I am not sure whether this should be so. I imagine there is quite a deal of difference in the two Acts. I fancy the Cremation Act is the newer one and the reason it was placed under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Health was because of fears about the correct implementation of the legislation in regard to health matters generally. With the passage of time presumably any fears that may have been held have been allayed and the two Acts perhaps could be combined. This is another subject I will mention to the respective Ministers; and the honourable member, too, could make representations in that direction.

As regards the reports, I am afraid I have no knowledge whether or not they are tabled, but if the honourable member asked the Minister concerned he would be able to elicit that information.

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.

House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 4th September, 1968

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

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

*Acknowledgment of Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator*

THE PRESIDENT: I desire to announce that, accompanied by several members, I waited on His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator and presented the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech, agreed to by the House. His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:—

Mr. President and honourable members of the Legislative Council: I thank you for your expression of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen, and for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

### QUESTION: WITHOUT NOTICE RELEASED PRISONERS

*Publicity*

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has he seen, heard, or read any of the publicity which has been given to recently released prison