

Appointment of Select Committee

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [6.06 p.m.]: I move—

That the Hon. L. A. Logan, the Hon. D. K. Dans, and the mover be appointed to serve on the Committee.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [6.07 p.m.]: I move—

That the Committee have power to call for persons, papers, and documents, and to adjourn from place to place; that it may sit on days over which the Council stands adjourned; and that the Committee report on Thursday, the 29th November, 1973.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does that include weekends—seriously?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The thought did not cross my mind, but yes, no days are excluded.

Question put and passed.

**INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson (Minister for Police), read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [6.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [6.09 p.m.]: I refer to the answer to a question I asked today. I assume that the Leader of the House did not prepare this answer, but that it was prepared for him. I claim that I was maligned in the answer to my question. I object to an answer which tells me that I based a question on an assumption. I did no such thing. I asked a previous question on this subject of the Leader of the House on the 18th October, and this is recorded in *Hansard* at page 3948. The reply was as follows—

- (1) and (2) The Government has decided to limit the provision of these facilities to Members of the Legislative Assembly, as is the practice in South Australia.

I then asked today why it had been decided to adopt South Australian practices. The Minister replied as follows—

This question is based on an assumption, which is contrary to fact.

If that is the case, I did not state the fact. The fact was stated by the Leader of this House. I have no wish to impugn the Leader of the House or his motives. I have always said they are above reproach.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He is responsible for the answer to the question.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I ask the Leader of the House to look at this answer and to investigate the reason for it.

I also suggest that no members of this House should ask any questions because if they do so they will be called inquisitive. The word "inquisitive" means inquiring or being curious. There is another slant to that term which has a nasty connotation; that is, that it means prying.

I cannot state too strongly that I have been maligned, and I suggest in any other Parliament this answer would have been regarded as a breach of privilege.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [6.11 p.m.]: I will have the honourable member's comments examined, and I will give him a written answer.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 25th October, 1973

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

**CLOTHES AND FABRICS
(LABELLING) BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Harman (Minister for Consumer Protection), and read a first time.

**EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL (No. 4)**

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [11.07 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The relevant sections of the Act mentioned in this Bill concern, in brief, assistance to non-Government schools, textbook subsidy scheme for secondary students, onus of proof of age, authority for the Board of Secondary Education to levy fees for the issue of duplicate Achievement Certificates, and to change the name of the "Federation of Parents and Citizens' Association" to "Council of State School Organisations". I intend to deal with each of these items separately and in that order.

By way of introduction to the first amendment mentioned above and contained in clause 2 of the Bill, I will

remind members present of the general provisions of the relevant sections of the Act.

Sections 9A and 9B of the Act provide in various ways for assistance to non-Government schools. Section 9B provides for outright grants and regulation 57C gives details of how the total school grant is calculated. Under section 9A, schools receive assistance for various specific purposes which are listed. Among these are matriculation library issues—found in section 9A(d)—and equipment grants—section 9A(f). In the present situation when the gross amount per school is calculated for payments under the provisions of section 9B, the value of these two grants, which have been made separately, is deducted. The school's total allocation thus comes in three separate items.

The proposed amendments to section 9A of the Act are considered desirable because by deleting paragraphs (d) and (f) of the section, the school's gross allocation could be paid in the one cheque and not come from three sources as at present. This would be easier administratively for the Education Department and, it is thought, also convenient for the schools.

Since assistance under paragraph (f) of section 9A is in the form of a cash payment, the above proposals provide no difficulty. Assistance under paragraph (d) is in the form of books to a certain value according to enrolments. If the proposed amendments are approved, a school would receive cash instead of books but would be able to buy its own selection of books.

The next amendment I wish to deal with is that relating to section 9D of the Act which concerns the subsidisation of the cost of textbooks at efficient schools. The Premier, in introducing the 1972 Budget, announced that the textbook subsidy for fourth and fifth-year students—and this applies to Government as well as non-Government schools—would be increased from the 1st January, 1973, from \$10 to \$15 per annum. Through an oversight, no action was taken to amend the Education Act to allow for the higher subsidy although the increase has been paid this year. The proposed amendment is necessary to honour the Government's promise and the department's action in making the payments at the increased rate.

The third amendment I wish to deal with concerns the onus of proof relating to a child's age. It has come to the Government's attention that some recent prosecutions under the Act have been unsuccessful on technical grounds relating to the onus of proof concerning a child's age. In subsection (3) of section 16 of the Act, the responsibility for proving or disproving age rests with the parent but this is the only place in the Act where the onus is mentioned. In view of the doubt currently existing it has been decided to

amend the Act by the addition of section 21BA, and this will find its place in part V of the Act.

The amendments contained in clauses 5 and 6 of this Bill relate to the decision of the Board of Secondary Education, with the approval of the Treasury, to levy a fee for the issue of duplicate Achievement Certificates. The Public Examinations Board of the University of Western Australia has for some considerable time charged a fee for duplicate certificates issued, and it is considered desirable that the Board of Secondary Education should also make a levy.

Clause 7 of the Bill arises as a result of a decision taken at the 39th annual conference of the Western Australian Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations to amend the constitution of the federation to allow for change of the association's name to "The Western Australian Council of State School Organisations". The prime reason for changing the name of the organisation is that it is considered advantageous for the name to be an easily identifiable alignment with the Australian Council for State School Organisations.

Several of the other Australian States have already altered the names of their organisations in line with the Australian council. Because the name "Western Australian Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations" is referred to in section 22 of the Education Act, it is necessary to facilitate the change of name of the organisation by amending the Act as proposed before the amended constitution can take full effect.

On behalf of the Minister for Education I commend the Bill to the House.

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

CLOTHES AND FABRICS (LABELLING) BILL

Second Reading

MR. HARMAN (Maylands—Minister for Consumer Protection) [11.15 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The need for a Bill of this nature has evolved from the accidental happenings to persons, particularly young children, who have been severely burned when items of nightwear have caught on fire.

In recent years all State Governments have been actively engaged in taking preliminary steps to bring this legislation to fruition. It was in 1966 that State Ministers for Labour at their annual conference first discussed a need for Government action.

The problem of flammable clothing is basically that all fabric burns, even though the ease of ignition, rate of burning and heat output, surface burning characteristics, and other factors may vary.

The possibility of clothing—particularly that worn by young children—catching alight when close to room heaters or fires is a domestic hazard and, whilst the number of burn accidents to young children in which nightwear is involved is relatively small, the injuries can be highly traumatic. Over the past decade there has been a growing concern throughout the world that has led to demands for controls on flammability, but these controls can be introduced only if acceptable levels of flammability can be set in accordance with some criteria against which they can be tested in a meaningful way.

In 1966 when Ministers for Labour first discussed what action could be taken, the matter was also receiving the attention of the National Health and Medical Research Council, and subsequently the Ministers for Health considered a report from that council. However, they decided that it would be more appropriate for legislative action to be taken by the Ministers for Labour, who in the meantime had appointed a committee of officers to consider the matter in detail and make recommendations. About the same time the Standards Association of Australia set up a committee to prepare an Australian standard, to which committee the State Departments of Labour were invited to nominate representatives.

In 1966 and 1967 suggestions were made that, as an interim measure, British legislation should be adopted. On investigation it was found that the British legislation had not proved really satisfactory, but, more importantly, the British standards were inappropriate in the different climatic conditions that apply in Australia. Although Ministers wanted to take action, they unanimously agreed that a prerequisite to any legislation was the formulation of a satisfactory Australian standard method for determining degrees of flammability.

The State Ministers for Labour obtained assurances of willingness to co-operate in labelling from the Associated Chambers of Manufacturers of Australia, the Australian Council of Retailers, and the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia, but those bodies pointed to the need for first resolving technical problems, particularly as to what should be labelled and how. The Standards Association technical committee that had by 1968 commenced work on testing fabrics and evaluating the British standards, recommended that legislation should not be introduced until Australian standards for flame-proof fabrics and piece goods had been prepared, for which purpose some further detailed study was necessary.

Ministers for Labour of all States, although concerned at the delay, recognised that it would be useless to introduce legislation that was impracticable or which could not be enforced. They resolved to undertake an educational programme. This has continued for several years.

Not only was considerable research undertaken into burning characteristics of various fabrics by the Standards Association of Australia, but, with the concurrence of the Federal Minister concerned, the C.S.I.R.O. gave considerable assistance. This research confirmed that overseas test methods had been found to be unsatisfactory.

This history has been given in some detail to indicate to members that although it may appear on the surface that the matter has been delayed, a considerable amount of involved and highly complex technical research was involved in the production of the four Australian standards that have now been produced. So far as can be ascertained far more work has been put into the preparation of these standards than in any other part of the world and, without doubt, the Australian standard will prove to be satisfactory.

It will also be appreciated that having regard for the constitutional situation in Australia, legislation of this nature must be uniform in all States and similar requirements must apply in respect of imported goods. Agreement between the States was finally reached in July, 1973, and the Bill now introduced arises from that agreement.

It is a short enabling Bill that will permit regulations to be made in respect of articles of clothing that will be prescribed by regulation. Initially, it is proposed that the regulations will be made only in respect of children's nightwear and a draft of those regulations has now been prepared since the Ministers' conference, and is being considered by all States.

As all States propose to introduce uniformly the labelling requirements for nightclothes for children in respect of flammability on the 1st January, 1974, it is important that this Bill be agreed to so that the regulations can be made for Western Australia.

Ministers have asked their permanent heads to consider whether regulations should also be made in respect of other items of clothing and whether warnings can be conveyed by readily recognisable symbols as well as by words. If such other regulations are uniformly accepted, the passing of this Bill will allow those other regulations to be made.

In explaining the Bill I will refer to the main clauses. Clause 4 gives the power to prescribe, by regulations, articles subject to this Act. As mentioned, the markings or labelling shall be concerned with flammability, or other safety or protective purposes such as for the particular methods of washing or dry cleaning of the fabrics.

It is intended to adopt specifically or by reference, either wholly or in part, the standard rules, codes, or specifications set down by the Australian Standards Association of Australia on these matters.

Clause 5 deals with the prohibition on selling prescribed articles unless they are marked or labelled in conformity with the requirements in the regulations, and a substantial penalty is provided for offences where traders do not comply with the requirements.

Clauses 6 to 8 provide for the powers of inspectors in policing the requirements. Inspectors of the Factories and Shops Branch will be used in this capacity.

Clauses 9 and 10 make provision for offences to be disposed of summarily and for requisite evidentiary provisions in proceedings where the relevant Australian standards have to be produced in court.

Clause 11 provides for the power to make the necessary regulations under the Act.

So that members will have some appreciation of the regulations concerning the labelling of children's nightclothes, which it is intended to adopt with the passage of this Bill, I have with me six copies which those members who are interested may obtain from me.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. O'Neil (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

AERIAL SPRAYING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th October.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) (11.23 a.m.): This is a short amending Bill and I can assure the Minister that members on this side of the House are not opposed to it; we are quite happy to support it without much delay.

It might be wise for me to indicate the importance of aerial spraying with regard to the development of agriculture in Australia. We know that this applies to other parts of the world also, but at the moment I am thinking of the development which has taken place in Australia over the last decade and the value of the use of light aircraft in improving production in many areas where the land would otherwise be practically useless.

Only this morning I was talking about a gentleman who uses aircraft, almost exclusively, on his property for the purpose of spreading superphosphate. I was most interested to hear of his increase in productivity as a result of this. Land which was practically useless a few years ago, because it was infested with rabbits and was only a problem area, is today providing pasture for considerable numbers of stock. This indicates the value of the use of aircraft. The use of aircraft can bring into production land which would, as I have said, otherwise be practically useless.

Aerial spraying is also used to control weeds and insect pests. This method of control has been used extensively in West-

ern Australia, more so than in any other State, I believe. At least this was the position early in the 1960s and it was necessary for the Government to introduce legislation to control the use of aircraft. As a matter of fact, at one stage there was indiscriminate spraying and many crops, such as grapevines and tomato plants, were spoilt because insufficient care was taken.

For this reason it was necessary, as I have said, to introduce legislation to control the use of aircraft and, also, to control the chemicals which were to be used. We have come a long way in the last 10 years.

I can recall that this matter was discussed when I was a member of the Agricultural Council and, even a number of years ago, it was decided that, if possible, uniform legislation would be desirable because of the movement of pilots from one State to another. The reasons are obvious. In Queensland, for argument's sake, grain is sown much earlier than it is in the southern States and in Western Australia. Of course, aerial spraying is a business and quite a number of aircraft operate in the different States; that is, after spraying is finished in one State, the aircraft are used to spray in another State.

The Minister has indicated that a number of States are using this draft legislation. When the Minister replies I would like to know which States these are. I think it would be well for the House to know the States which are using it and whether any States are opposed to this legislation and have separate legislation. In a case such as this, every effort should be made to have uniform legislation. I know that when I was a member of the Agricultural Council one State was particularly opposed at that time but perhaps some progress has been made in this situation.

The Minister outlined the reasons for the amendments. During the last few years there has been something of a downturn in agriculture and, obviously, aircraft have not been used to the same extent as they were earlier. Doubtless some of the companies were finding it difficult to survive. As a matter of fact, I understand some did not survive. However, the industry is so important that we should give every consideration to lessening the costs and effecting some economies in certain directions provided that there is no lessening in the control. I am quite satisfied from my reading of the Minister's speech that this will not be the case. I am also satisfied that it is possible for some economies to be effected.

The operators have requested the legislation and, in the main, they are responsible people. They do not want to cause damage to crops, any more than anyone

else would want to cause such damage. Consequently they are prepared to accept a responsibility which is a credit to them.

In these circumstances I see no reason for not allowing the amending Bill to pass. I am sure the Minister's officers will keep a close watch on the situation as will officers of the Departments of Agriculture in other States.

If any weakness becomes evident, I am sure action will be taken promptly, through regulations, to ensure no damage is done to crops, resulting in a great deal of unnecessary expense.

I therefore have pleasure in supporting the legislation and I will be interested to see the results of its introduction.

MR. BATEMAN (Canning) [11.31 a.m.]: Five years ago I spoke to a Bill dealing with the spraying of Argentine ants, and I mentioned the effect such spraying had had up to that time in killing off many of our birds. I listened very intently to the member for Katanning and I was interested in what he had to say. I will not traverse the same ground.

I have always been very worried about the excessive use of chemicals such as 2,4-D Ester, which can kill off many crops. If one were to take through the Swan Valley a utility carrying an empty can of 2,4-D Ester, the fumes from the empty can could be responsible for killing some of the grapevines.

The aspect about which I am most worried is the effect these chemicals have on human life. One reads in the papers every day advertisements for fly sprays—"Pea Beau" and others—which are said to be quite harmless to children, but I am sure if we pump into the air enough of this type of spray to kill off insects such as mosquitos and flies we will eventually accumulate enough of it in our bodies to kill ourselves. We do not yet know enough about what these chemicals might do to us. I know I am straying from the Bill but I am taking the opportunity during this debate to tell the House about my great concern for the manner in which these sprays are advertised and used. We also puff these chemicals over our vegetable crops.

Three or four years ago I mentioned that aerial spraying of crops with DDT and other toxic chemicals resulted in those chemicals being blown over the wheat crops and into the dams. The sheep and other stock which drink the water must be affected by the chemical DDT because it is a poison which does not dissolve and has a cumulative effect. We eventually eat the meat and I am sure the poison must accumulate and remain in our bodies. The member for Subiaco would probably agree with me that it is a poison which does not dissolve but accumulates and remains in the tissue.

It is for this reason that I have risen this morning to enter into the debate. I consider we must have an ever-increasing respect for this type of poison because it has no respect for humanity. Only on the 15th October we read in *The West Australian* the headline, "Plants die as spray hits town", and the article went on to say—

Grape vines, tomato plants and rose bushes have died in Morawa, apparently because a weed control poison which is being sprayed from the air on cereal crops around the town drifts in on the wind.

It will also be remembered that some years ago the vegetable crops at Geraldton were affected by 2,4-D which had been sprayed in the Dongara area. That gives us an idea how far these sprays can be blown. As you know, Mr. Speaker, around Geraldton, where strong winds are experienced, sprays can be blown for 50 miles and can affect crops for which they were not intended.

I support the Bill because this legislation is necessary and will be of advantage to the rural community.

MR. A. A. LEWIS (Blackwood) [11.35 a.m.]: On behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to support the remarks made by the member for Katanning. This is a sane measure and I believe the security amount of \$30,000 is quite adequate for any of our normal crop dusting and spraying operations.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [11.36 a.m.]: I thank the members who have spoken in this debate for their support. They realise that the legislation is intended to benefit everyone. We hope that it will help to contain costs in the agricultural field, with particular reference to aerial spraying.

The member for Katanning illustrated his close association with and his knowledge of this legislation. He indicated the development of this operation and its value in increasing total production in our rural industry. He drew attention to the need to maintain continual vigilance in the control of the use of aerial spraying.

He raised a query in regard to the variations in similar legislation in the different States. My understanding is that there are some variations, although broadly the recommendations have been accepted throughout Australia. However, as the honourable member is sufficiently interested in this aspect, I will endeavour to find out the precise differences for his information.

Mr. Nalder: Are there any States which are not using this legislation?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Basically, I believe all the States are operating with similar legislation, but, as I say, I am uncertain

of the minor variations. I will supply this information to the honourable member.

The member for Katanning also drew attention to the danger of pesticides and sprays, and a very real danger does exist. I am indebted to him for mentioning this point as it is something which cannot be stressed too much. We must not forget the dangers which accompany progress. We know that small animals can die after eating the leaves of vegetables sprayed with a certain dust to destroy insects. We must be cognisant of this fact at all times.

I would also like to inform the honourable member that fairly stringent control is exercised through the Pesticides Advisory Committee. This body has the responsibility for determining the particular type of pesticide to be recommended and used. Of course, the committee was set up to ensure that the manufacturers do not have free rein in this field and that control is exercised at the manufacturing level. The committee ensures also that the application of different pesticides and chemicals is kept under stringent surveillance.

The member for Blackwood indicated the support of his party for the measure. With general agreement of this kind, it is hoped that the legislation will achieve the full purpose for which it was introduced. 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.

Third Reading

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

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Requested Amendment

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

The amendment requested by the Council was as follows—

Clause 4, page 2, after line 16—Add the following proviso—

Provided however that the Treasurer for the purpose of encouraging decentralisation of industry and employment may in his absolute discretion after receiving an application from an employer certify as appropriate

and allow any lesser rate or rates in respect of wages paid or payable by the employer in relation to work performed in an established place of employment more than seventy kilometres from the General Post Office, Perth.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Legislative Council has requested an amendment to this taxing Bill. It is well known, of course, that the Council has no power to make the amendment itself, but it desires that this Chamber agree to make the amendment. The amendment is precisely the same as the one the Opposition attempted to make when the Bill was under consideration in this Chamber, and one can agree with the objective of the Council in trying to write into this taxing Act a provision aimed at providing a special incentive for decentralisation.

The Government is all in favour of incentives for decentralisation, and gives a number of them. I refer to very substantial freight concessions, interest subsidies, and special loans—in some cases up to 100 per cent. of the amount required to establish the industry. Upon consideration of any special case the Government may decide from time to time to provide any other desirable incentives.

However, surely a little thought will show that it is a most undesirable principle in taxation to take the imposition of the rate of taxation away from Parliament and give it to the Treasurer. In those circumstances it is inevitable that inequities will arise. The Treasurer may be the most brilliant Treasurer in the world, but it would take a Solomon to make a precisely correct judgment, after having considered the number of requests which would come forward, as to the rate of tax which ought to apply as between industries which are 70 kilometres from the capital, and those which are 60 or 120 kilometres away from it.

Surely it is a basic principle of democratic government that the imposition of taxation shall be at the will and decision of Parliament. In my opinion it would not satisfy the requirements of that form of government if Parliament set only the maximum rate and then left it to the discretion of any Treasurer to determine how much of that maximum rate he will call upon A to bear, and how much he will call upon B and C to bear.

If we agree to this amendment it will mean that persons carrying on the same types of business in the same State may be required to pay different rates of taxation simply on the decision of the Treasurer. That is a most undesirable principle to adopt; and for that reason, although I sympathise with the desire to encourage decentralisation, I suggest other more equitable means of doing it are available. The present system in which it is left to the department and to the Government to

make a determination upon any special incentive from time to time is a far better system than that of providing in a taxing measure a maximum rate of tax without Parliament knowing what rate will be applied in various cases.

I hope we will never depart from the principle of Parliament always being in control of the rate of tax which individuals will be called upon to bear. That is our business, and any departure from it would leave the way open to tremendous inequality. For example, what would be the guidelines if the Treasurer is determining whether he will give A a substantial reduction in the rate of tax and saying to B that he need pay no tax at all? What a tremendous advantage that could be to a person in certain instances. I do not think that is a wise procedure at all. Therefore, I move—

That the amendment requested by the Council be not made.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Treasurer collapsed his own argument because he referred to the discretion that is already exercised by the Treasurer to provide many concessions in rural areas. The concessions are discriminatory—deliberately so, and this will always be so—but for good reason. I point out that it is the Treasurer who exercises the discretion; it does not matter which Minister is involved, where money is concerned the matter goes straight back to the Treasurer.

If a business wanted assistance in the city it would not be given a moment's thought; but it would be given special consideration if it wished to establish in Kalgoorlie. We could have a situation of a business wanting to establish in Bunbury and the Treasurer would not assist it; but there would be good reason to assist the establishment of the same industry in Albany. The situation varies from case to case. We have always accepted this in respect of decentralisation.

There are some industries 1,000 miles from Perth which do not have the disability, because of special local features and circumstances, of a business that is only 50 miles from Perth. So the Government of the day—and always eventually it comes back to the Treasury and the Treasurer—makes the decision that business "A" will be assisted one way or another, whereas business "B" will not. This assistance could be in the form of loans, extra freight assistance, or interest relief, because the schedule of assistance is really only a guide at the present time. The assistance could be in the form of greater interest assistance for a limited period, or for a set period. This, of course, is something with which we agree, because some of us have had experience in trying to assist these industries and we get an extraordinary set of circumstances where distance is not the final arbiter; local circumstances are the final arbiter.

We discriminate with one industry by giving assistance with services—water and power, for example—to the people who are beyond the normal town limits. The case of Mt. Barker comes to mind. This occurred many years ago. That town could not have had an abattoir if the Government had not given assistance in regard to water supplies, because the abattoir was beyond the normal limits of the water extension of the then existing authority. The same applies to power in a number of cases where extra extensions have to be made.

So it goes on. When we talk about decentralisation we must be able to select particular cases governed by special circumstances. Victoria has acknowledged this. That State has given extra assistance beyond 50 miles, but it has gone further and has said that if there are special circumstances the distance could be less than 50 miles.

For instance, Wundowie is an industry that has special problems because of its geographical location in relation to raw materials, the port, and the city. It could be that if we draw a line direct from the Perth G.P.O., 50 miles would be on the eastern side of Wundowie, I think. I recall that the turn-off point on the road would be 45 miles, and normal road miles are much greater than the actual number of miles as the crow flies. When we say 70 kilometres in a direct line we are talking about 46 to 47 miles. I think that this distance excluded Wundowie, but we took that as a selective case. There is some doubt whether it would exclude Pinjarra on a direct line, but that is not the point at issue.

We grant incentives through freight and reduced amounts of interest, so we do differentiate already. With a tax like income tax, normally it is wrong to have differentials at the discretion of a commissioner or a Minister, but it is not unheard of. I admit it is unusual.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Give me an example.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am trying to think of the section in the Income Tax Assessment Act where discretion is left with the Commissioner of Taxation. He has wide discretion as to the inclusion of income that is indisputable. In addition he has some discretion about the exemptions he will grant. Not being in daily practice, as I used to be, I just cannot remember the particular section.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I do not think he has any discretion as to the rate.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He has quite a few discretions.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: There are not many cases where the rate of tax is not laid down by Parliament.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The tax is laid down by Parliament, but discretion is given to the commissioner. I will now return to

the other point that seems to be completely overlooked by the Treasurer. I refer to the question of discrimination with rail freights where an established business is not granted any benefits under the new scheme and yet a newcomer to the field is granted various benefits which can result in discrimination to the disadvantage of the established operator in the district.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is the basis of this proposal—discrimination.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The whole basis of the amendment is to authorise the Treasurer to do something. Without this he cannot do it. The Government of the day can grant a freight concession and an interest concession. It can grant a loan on a discriminatory basis as to the amount, the conditions of interest, the conditions of repayment, and the conditions of security. The Government can be very discriminatory and for good reason. For instance the Treasurer and his Government have given assistance to the Trades Hall right in the city, which assistance is not available to other political parties, and the Parliament did not have any say in that. The Government did not even come to the Parliament to amend the definition of "industry", as occurred in other cases. So that was discriminatory, and this sort of thing can occur all the time. The Government of the day has to live with its conscience and the electors in due course, and so the checks and balances work in that way.

It is important to emphasise that we are only requesting that the Treasurer be authorised to do this; we are not directing him. The question of discrimination in this case is no different from that in many other cases in connection with decentralisation.

If we return to the requested amendment—and it can only be a requested amendment—sometimes it is not a bad thing if we look at these matters in an objective way and try to meet the wishes of another place set out in requested amendments as distinct from amendments it can make. I also wish to emphasise that this amendment relates only to work performed in an establishment situated more than 70 kilometres from the G.P.O. That provision is made for a purpose so that a business cannot indulge in subterfuge; that is, one that has a Perth office and a country office. That business could eventually convince the Government that it should get some special inducement to establish in a particular location and then use this as a subterfuge for getting some of its wages and salaries taxed on a reduced basis, by submitting the wages figures for the metropolitan and country business merged together. In other words, the work has actually to be performed in

that establishment which is more than 70 kilometres from the G.P.O. That, in itself, is an ample safeguard.

Therefore this kind of discrimination that seems to be the main point on which the Treasurer is arguing his case, to my mind collapses completely. We have had discrimination here in many ways, and I refer to the Treasurer's own experience when he went abroad some years ago in his capacity as Deputy Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition has two minutes.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He went abroad offering inducements to industry such as free land and interest-free loans. In fact, one such industry, Klinger, was established; when the Hawke Government went out of office in 1959 the industry was established on the basis of the agreement that had been arrived at by the Hawke Government. It was established in the city. If that was not a case of discrimination then I do not know what it was. However, no-one complained about the concessions granted to it. It was established to relieve an unemployment situation in the city which at that time was desperate.

We are now talking about decentralisation, which is the objective of all of us. To my mind the Government should welcome this type of discrimination as proposed in the Council's requested amendment.

My final thought is this: The pay-roll tax is an iniquitous tax; it is an inflationary tax; it is inescapable when imposed; and it goes straight to the wages factor. In the case of an industry established in the country area the wages paid per man per week are usually higher than the wages that are paid in the city, so such industries in the country or in mining areas are placed at a disadvantage.

It follows that not only do they suffer that particular burden, but they also pay the tax, which is a highly inflationary tax and in normal circumstances is inescapable, on a higher base. Even if the original Bill provided for some discrimination, to take into account the higher wages that remote and rural industries have to pay, there would be some equity in the proposal. We will examine this matter very closely to ascertain whether we can arrive at a more equitable basis.

In an area where traditionally higher wages are paid as compared with the metropolitan area, the industries not only suffer that burden but also the burden of having to pay the pay-roll tax on a higher base figure. This move by the Legislative Council should be welcomed by the Government, as it will give complete authority to the Treasurer to grant these concessions without the need to obtain the

approval of Parliament. Without this amendment the Treasurer cannot grant exemptions in respect of the pay-roll tax. Because of the flexibility provided by the amendment the Treasurer should grasp it.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Further consideration should be given to the Council's requested amendment. The Treasurer's objections were based on the fact that Parliament should be in control in respect of the granting of exemptions. I agree, but his objections could be overcome by agreeing to a part of the amendment, and by deleting the qualifying part which relates to the Treasurer. I therefore move—

That the requested amendment be amended by deleting all words after the word "that" in line 1, down to and including the word "rates" in line 8.

If the deletion of these words is agreed to I shall move for the insertion of the words "the rate shall be 2½ per centum of the total wages".

This will achieve the object which we are aiming at; that is, to decentralise industry. If my amendment to the Council's requested amendment is agreed to then industries established more than 70 kilometres from the city will pay 2½ per cent. instead of 3½ per cent. of the annual wages in pay-roll tax. This will achieve what the Treasurer wishes to achieve, and would overcome his objections to leaving this matter to be determined by the Treasurer.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The objective which the member for Narrogin seeks to achieve is easily understood. He is anxious to overcome the objections that have been raised by the Treasurer; namely, that Parliament should be the master of the rates. So far as these industries are concerned, the member for Narrogin is trying to get back to the rate that prevailed when the States took over in the field of pay-roll tax, and not even to the rate as at the date of the 1971 amendment to the Act.

Normally I would be very keen to support such an alternative amendment to the Council's requested amendment. I can see many advantages in it. I was hoping to hear the Treasurer's reaction, because this would overcome his main objection. If the alternative amendment is agreed to it would then be only a question of the quantum to be determined.

The only query I raise is that it bypasses the original intention of the requested amendment of the Council, and also of the amendment which was moved in this Chamber previously at the Committee stage; namely, to permit the Government of the day to exercise a discretion relating to two industries where the circumstances of the industries were different.

I think I mentioned earlier in my comments that an industry could be established 1,000 miles away from Perth, and not suffer certain disabilities that an industry established 60 to 200 miles from Perth could suffer. This is one of the advantages of giving complete discretion to the Treasurer, so that he can take into account special features affecting different industries.

One does not have to think very hard to visualise an industry that could be viable at, say, Merredin, Narrogin, or Albany, but because the circumstances are overwhelmingly burdensome they make the establishment of the industry impossible in another place unless it is granted some relief—whether the relief be the grant of land, exemption from pay-roll tax, or other concessions.

As against that, another industry in a remote area, because of its international markets and the price it is able to obtain for the mineral it produces—such as copper—could at any point of time be viable even though it is established 1,000 or 1,500 miles from Perth. That is why I favour the discretionary method outlined in the requested amendment of the Council, and also in the amendment moved in this Chamber when the Bill was before us at the Committee stage.

I hope the Treasurer will make some comments on this alternative amendment before I make my final comments on it. At the moment my intention is to support the alternative amendment. Whilst I can see some inherent difficulties in its administration, I think it is preferable to adopt it rather than leave the Bill as it is at present. This is especially so when this Parliament is making no other gesture to give relief to decentralised industry.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am quite prepared to go along with the first part of the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin because it will enable me to achieve my purpose in another way. I am prepared to have the words deleted, but I am not prepared to have others inserted. I welcome the support of the member for Narrogin for the principle I explained; that is, that Parliament should fix the rate of tax and no Treasurer should have the authority, once Parliament has fixed the maximum rate, to decide differing rates of tax to be paid by other people. What a principle that would be!

This principle could be applied to local government authorities. A maximum rate could be fixed and then the local authorities could stipulate that Bill Jones need pay only half the amount and Tom Smith only a third. That would be a ridiculous situation.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: The provision would be wide open to abuse.

Sir Charles Court: That does not apply in the requested amendment at all.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The fixing of a rate of tax should be done always by Parliament.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This is to enable Parliament to know what the rate is that people will be called upon to pay. The proposal from another place is simply another way to enlarge a discretion which the Treasurer has already to give as much incentive as he likes, but apart altogether from the imposition of a tax. As a matter of fact, under existing circumstances, the Treasurer could actually give as an incentive to a decentralised industry twice as much as he could give that industry under the proposal from the Legislative Council if he thought he would be justified in doing so. However, I submit that it is a very wrong principle indeed with regard to taxation to fix a maximum rate of tax and then leave it to the Treasurer to be discriminatory in its application. Such a provision would be wide open to abuse and misrepresentation.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Of course it would be.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: We should always be in control of the rate of tax which is being imposed upon the people. That is why all down the years in democratic government care has been taken to ensure that when a burden is to be placed upon the people it shall be done only by the vote of the Lower House which shall determine the extent of that burden from time to time.

Mr. W. A. Manning: This amendment does that.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: No, it does not.

Mr. O'Neill: It makes it specific.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: All this does is to say that the burden on taxpayers shall not be greater than a certain percentage, but the Treasurer at his discretion—

Mr. W. A. Manning: You are speaking of my amendment.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: When I commenced I said that with regard to the amendment of the member for Narrogin I would go along with the first part because it would wipe out completely the request from another place.

Mr. O'Neill: Only half the words are being deleted and then further on some will be inserted.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: All that will be left of the amendment from another place will be the words, "Provided however that".

Mr. O'Neill: No. The only words being taken out are all those after the word "that" in the first line down to and including the word "rates". That will leave some of the words in. Later, other words will be inserted after the word "performed".

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I understood the amendment to be that all words after the word "that" in the first line were to be deleted. This is what comes of not being supplied with a copy of the amendment in the first place. If the situation is as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has just outlined it, then I am opposed to the amendment in its entirety.

Sir Charles Court: That is what we wanted to know.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I would remind members that the imposition of this tax is the result of a unanimous agreement on the part of all Premiers that this was the only way open to them to obtain the revenue they required. It was decided that we would all introduce this proposal without any variation.

Sir Charles Court: That is not what we were told in 1971 you know.

Mr. R. L. Young: We were told there was no reason for there not being different treatment of the States.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. R. L. Young: That is exactly what you said.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am talking about an undertaking which was given at a Premiers' Conference in the presence of the Prime Minister that all Premiers would introduce legislation into their Parliaments to increase the pay-roll tax and every Treasurer would go for the same percentage.

Sir Charles Court: That is right. No-one is questioning that. Don't get excited about it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That was the agreement, so how on earth can I accept an amendment which is a variation of the obligation I undertook at that time? I am just not going to do it. All through my life my word has been my bond and I will stick to it through thick and thin.

Sir Charles Court: This is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: No, it is not.

Sir Charles Court: We were told in 1971—

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What members were told in 1971 has nothing to do with this.

Sir Charles Court: It has everything to do with it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am talking about a clear understanding on the part of all Premiers and as far as I know the others have fulfilled their undertaking.

Sir Charles Court: Except that Victoria gives exemptions.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Not in this way.

Sir Charles Court: For decentralised industry.

Mr. R. L. Young: It did not stop them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: As far as I am concerned I will stick to the undertaking I gave which was to try to get passed a Bill in accordance with the unanimous decision of the Premiers. Consequently I am not prepared to accept any amendment at all.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Wittingly or unwittingly, the Premier is overlooking two very important aspects about the amendment. The first of these is that he claims that decentralised industries can be given certain advantages by the Treasurer of the day anyway. That is a far different thing. Such a person in decentralised industry must go to the Treasurer and ask for assistance. I am not suggesting it is a real cap-in-the-hand exercise. It is an approach to the Treasurer of the day for assistance. It is not an inherently basic thing of right for which he can make application under the taxing law and claim he is entitled to a different rate of tax because he is in a certain industry. He must make application for financial assistance in some shape or form.

The second point concerns what was said by the then Treasurer in 1971. When the Bill was introduced on that occasion we were told that the States would have the right to vary the rate of tax if they so chose.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is right. The States subsequently agreed to adopt this uniform rate, as the Premier has indicated.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Are we to understand then, that all the States can do anything they like provided they all do it together?

Mr. T. D. Evans: No.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is what the Attorney-General has just said.

Mr. T. D. Evans: In 1971 the rate under the Commonwealth Act was 2½ per cent. The States agreed to increase it and on the handover it was up to the States to do what they liked, but the States agreed to adopt this uniform rate.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We are playing with words. The Treasurer, in his second reading speech at that time, indicated that the States would have the power and, naturally, it has the power to legislate in respect of its own pay-roll tax rates, in addition to any other matters.

It hardly seems to matter if the Treasurers of the other States decide that they will all have a uniform rate, if it was for a specific undertaking or a specific purpose. That is one thing, but surely at some subsequent time the Treasurer of the day would have the power to vary that specific purpose. It has been done in Victoria.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It has not, at all.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Not under the rates, but under a rebate system. What would be the situation if this State became tremendously affluent because of a change of Government, and we had the situation whereby we did not need to impose pay-roll tax or we could reduce it to 2½ per cent.?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The member for Wembley overlooks the fact that there was no undertaking to introduce it and keep it forever. The undertaking was that after we left the conference each Premier would move to increase the pay-roll tax by precisely the same amount. Having done that, it would then be open to any Treasurer, subsequently, to abolish the tax altogether if he so wished, or to vary it. We have not done that as yet.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: But not to amend the rate.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: To amend the rate, subsequently, but first we have to honour our undertaking.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The Treasurer has done that.

Mr. Taylor: No.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The undertaking will not be honoured until the Bill has passed.

Mr. Taylor: This Parliament consists of two Chambers.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: All the States stuck together and the rate went up to 3½ per cent. Now it is to go up to 4½ per cent. We know that almost everyone in Western Australia will be paying 4½ per cent. We also know that even if the amendment is included in the Bill nothing will be granted to anybody because the Treasurer is taking the view that he does not consider this is the way to do it. If the effect is as minimal as that surely the argument which the Treasurer is using in respect of the undertaking to stick to a uniform rate does not hold water.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is what you think; I do not.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We are not talking about a major change in the rate, but the right of the Treasurer to declare, in specific circumstances, that a rate of 2½ per cent. shall apply outside certain areas provided he deems it to be a reasonable proposition. The Treasurer is not arguing the basis of the proposed amendment at all, he is simply saying he will not change his mind. It is a completely different proposition to have to go to the Treasurer and ask for financial assistance when such provision can be built into the Act. The Treasurer has claimed he would have to break an undertaking given to the Commonwealth by granting a reduction in a few isolated cases. The Treasurer is using that argument purely for the purpose of defeating the amendment, which obviously he does not want. Clearly, he would not think of using the provision.

Mr. Taylor: You are unfair.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think the Treasurer would almost agree.

Mr. Taylor: The Treasurer is asking that the Bill go through. It is for this Parliament to decide on subsequent amendments. The Bill has to go through two Chambers before that can be done. The Opposition is amending the Bill before it has gone through.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Obviously, the Deputy Premier has the same view as the Premier, but I do not.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: This is the only view a reasonable person can take in the circumstances, and the argument put forward by the member for Wembley about Victoria proves it. Why did not the Premier of Victoria make a variation if he wished to do it that way? Because he knew he would be breaking an obligation.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I do not think that is necessarily the reason. It happens that this method of amending the legislation is available to us so the argument does not really hold water. I think we are splitting straws in respect of a few specific industries. The Treasurer says we cannot amend the rate because of an undertaking given to the Commonwealth. That does not make sense to me.

Industry can be helped by amending this legislation before it goes through Parliament. I think that is a reasonable view to take. If the Government is dinkum about decentralisation discretion can be given to the Treasurer to use the provision in certain areas. If the Government is not dinkum it would be better for it to say it would prefer industry to approach the Government for assistance.

Mr. Taylor: That has nothing to do with it. You are talking about the attitude of the Treasurers at a conference. Our Treasurer has to adopt entirely what was decided at that conference.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Is that the entire argument?

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Well, why did not the Treasurer use that argument when we last introduced the amendment? The Deputy Premier does not know what he is talking about. This amendment was moved in this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition, but it was defeated. The Bill went to the Legislative Council and has been returned with the same requested amendment. The argument used against the amendment on this occasion is not the same argument as was used previously.

Mr. Bertram: That is not a principle you follow!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am not using that particular argument; it is the Treasurer who is using it. He has a new argument.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Under Standing Orders there is no limit to the arguments one is entitled to use as long as they are logical.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: In other words, one can switch one's argument. The Deputy Premier claims that the objection to the amendment is because of a recent decision, but that is different from the argument used by the Treasurer.

Mr. Taylor: It is the one being adopted.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The argument of the Treasurer is that he is sticking to an undertaking, but that does not work. We are talking about facts. We are not deviating from what we consider is a reasonable thing. We believe a reasonable thing is to give the power to the Treasurer to reduce the rate in certain circumstances which he, in his discretion, thinks are reasonable. That is our argument.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I moved the amendment to get over the objection by the Treasurer to the fixing of a set rate. The Treasurer now objects because he says he is committed under the terms of the Premiers' Conference. This is quite a different argument altogether.

The Treasurer opposes price-fixing collusion, but the Premiers are prepared to get together and decide that the charge will be a certain figure. Surely that is entirely against the principles of our Treasurer. Yet, he has told us he must abide by the decision and fall into line with the other States.

Surely this State can deal with its own decentralisation programme. I believe in establishing industry in the country. It seems that the objection to the amendment is aimed at industry in the country.

If the amendment were accepted and country industries were given a statutory benefit, this could be taken into account in any discussions with them in regard to other assistance they may require. This would be something that they would definitely have; they would have a grip on it and know that it was available to them permanently, or until such time as it was changed by the Parliament.

I ask the Treasurer to reconsider my amendment and let us deal with the matter so that country industries may see a reduction in their responsibilities for the purpose of covering the extra cost which they must face in establishing industries in the country.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is unfortunate that, when the Treasurer first spoke, he was under a misunderstanding about the nature of the amendment of the member for Narrogin. This is why I raised the query before I started to speak so that we were at one as to what we were speaking about. As I understand it, the member for Narrogin has moved to delete all the words after the word "that" in line 1

down to and including the word "rates" in line 8 of the proviso. It would then read—

Provided however that in respect of wages paid or payable by the employer in relation to work performed in an established place of employment more than seventy kilometres from the General Post Office, Perth, etc. . . . The Premier said that he would go along with deleting all the words after the word "that". I imagine he would, but it makes plain nonsense of the message from the Legislative Council! That would get us nowhere. It is best that we vote in the normal way and either defeat something or at least put it back into a meaningful form.

I made my comments about the amendment of the member for Narrogin because of the fact that there could be circumstances whereby industries situated at long distances from Perth could be at a different disadvantage from industries situated short distances from Perth, and vice versa. In the meantime I said I would go along with the amendment unless the Treasurer gave us good reason as to why the amendment should be defeated, perhaps in the light of considerations that are not known to us.

I can understand why the Treasurer would want to avoid this—namely, because it would make a sizeable hole in his revenue and would leave him without any discretion so far as he is concerned.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It would make a firm like Alcoa pay about half the rate of tax which other people would pay.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That would be so, but of course the Treasurer was given the opportunity to have some discretion so that this situation need not arise. Instead, he has forced the member for Narrogin into moving this sort of amendment merely to give effect to the Treasurer's objection.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: A principle with which the member for Narrogin agreed.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We do agree with this, but the Treasurer is not prepared to make any concession at all.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you agree with the principle that the Parliament itself should be responsible for fixing the rate of tax or not?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, but I make the point that the Treasurer has stubbornly refused to have anything to do with a proposition which would give him, and his Government, the right to give relief to decentralised industry in relation to this iniquitous tax.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I can give this in other ways.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Of course the Treasurer can give freight and interest concessions, loans, and guarantees. Many

other things can also be done administratively. However, the Treasurer cannot give an exemption or a concession in respect of this tax unless the Parliament authorises it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It would be possible to give more money than this would necessarily amount to in other ways.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We want some declaration in connection with this. Had the Treasurer been sincere in protecting decentralised industry from an iniquitous situation he could have said, "I do not want to do it this way because it will embarrass me with the other Premiers—or something of that nature—but I will do it another way."

Victoria has administrative and statistical reasons—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: And it has more reasons than those.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —which are apparent to all and I have explained them at length on previous occasions. In Victoria it is done on the basis of putting in a return and a company becomes liable for the tax; the Government then rebates it as a concession. The Treasurer has not come to light with anything such as this. It would be acceptable even if the Treasurer wanted to do it at a standard rate for everybody who qualified. However, the Treasurer has come up with no alternative.

I have been trying to find the reference in *Hansard* in 1971 when I spoke to an amending Bill which was before the Chamber at that time. Unfortunately, I cannot find it and I have sent for my marked copy from my office. Perhaps it will come before I conclude my remarks.

My understanding of what the Treasurer of the day told us is that the States had not left themselves free to change the rate. I do not argue with that, but they had left themselves free to alter some of the conditions.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is right.

Sir CHARLES COURT: One of the conditions in existence is that of the base exemption. It would be acceptable had the Treasurer said that he did not like what we are trying to do but he would make a gesture to decentralisation and would increase the base exemption for industries outside the 70-mile limit, or something of that nature. In this way we would at least be able to see that the Government of the day was trying to do something in connection with a burdensome tax which hits remote industries far harder than city-based industries. This is the worst feature, because industries which are decentralised already pay loaded rates in wages and salaries. The emoluments of office paid by such industries are out of all proportion to those paid in the metropolitan area. Now those industries are to be loaded with a 28.0 per

cent. increase in the tax. In fact they will have been loaded with an additional 80 per cent. increase since pay-roll tax was taken over by the State. It is a compounding factor as far as these industries are concerned.

As I understand it, the Attorney-General, who was Treasurer at the time, said in 1971 that there was no impediment, so far as the States were concerned, if they wanted to vary the base exemption figure of \$20,800. That is a crazy figure and would only exempt a business employing four people. Originally when that figure was set, it was intended to exempt businesses employing 15 to 20 people. It was meant to assist them against some of the big industries which have economies of scale working for them.

This has been eroded even further by inflation. The figure of 4½ employees, which I mentioned when I spoke to the Bill, would today be lower than four employees. This is the number which would be employed on a pay roll of \$20,800—the base exemption figure from pay-roll tax. This base exemption figure applies to all industries, big and small, regardless of whether they are situated in Wyndham, Esperance or Subiaco.

For these reasons, I go along with the amendment of the member for Narrogin. I must do so against my will in view of the stubborn attitude adopted by the Treasurer to the total problem and because he has not offered any alternative solution whereby we could at least demonstrate that we are trying to relieve some of the burden which falls on industry located in the rural areas.

Amendment put and negatived.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I assume that we now revert to the original request by the Legislative Council.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I wish to press this for the reasons I have given. These are that the Treasurer has given us no alternative. He has given us no hope. He has not suggested that he will bring down a Bill which will authorise him to rebate the tax administratively. If the Treasurer were to say this, we would have some hope. We would be achieving our objective in another way.

The Premier could say to the other State Premiers, "I have a piece of legislation which will impose a charge of 4½ per cent. I do not like it, but I will charge the 4½ per cent. regardless of whether an industry is struggling in the country, including the Kimberley, or is located in the city. However, I now want the right to give rebates."

If the Treasurer would say this we would withdraw our objection to his motion. Instead, he has offered us nothing.

He flatly refused all our efforts to lift the base exemption figure of \$20,800 to a somewhat more realistic amount when the measure was debated previously in this Chamber. This base exemption figure should, of necessity, be lifted in the light of the inflationary factor. A more realistic figure should be arrived at. However, we have been given no hope of this.

Under the circumstances, I intend to oppose the Treasurer's motion. In other words, I will be declaring our support for the requested amendment.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—20

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. E. T. Burke	Mr. Norton
Mr. T. J. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Moller

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Blakie	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rushton
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr. Bryce
Mr. Jones
Mr. May
Mr. Harman
Mr. Davies

Noes

Mr. Sibson
Sir David Brand
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis
Mr. Gayfer
Mr. Thompson

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's requested amendment not made.

Report, etc.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Sir Charles Court (Leader of the Opposition), Mr. Taylor (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Treasurer) drew up reasons for declining to make the Council's requested amendment.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 12.47 to 2.15 p.m.

PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [2.16 p.m.]: I desire to make a brief contribution to this debate for two reasons. Firstly, I was the former local member and I hope soon to be the local member for this particular area once again. Secondly, I desire to comment as Leader of the Opposition. I hope that the Minister, in the course of his reply to the speech made by the member for Subiaco, can give some assurances which will be acceptable to the local community. This happens to be the area in which I spent most of my life—in fact, about the whole of my life—until I married.

Mr. Davies: That is why it is getting special attention.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I was actually brought up in one of the streets concerned. In fact, my mother still lives there. Therefore I have some practical knowledge of the problems confronting the local residents since the development took place.

The people residing there will be much happier if we can make it obligatory for the whole of the complex to be subject to town planning provisions—and I am including the Repatriation General Hospital and the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital amongst other activities in the complex. Then at least the local authority and others will have an opportunity to express their point of view and to try at least to negotiate to influence any development which will affect the community.

It is quite remarkable how the area has changed. In my boyhood days this area was completely undeveloped, and the university endowment land extended right down to Verdun Street and Kings Park. In fact, a dairy was operated by a man named Allman on the site of the present sump within the total medical complex. It is hard to believe that cattle grazed from there to the cemetery, and sometimes in the cemetery.

The area was developed for housing, and in more recent times we have seen the establishment of the whole medical complex. It was a very quiet part and there was no need for a great deal of traffic. The odd motorcars owned by local citizens did not cause any traffic problems. In fact, in the early days it was a fairly poor community and very few of the residents owned cars. Cars became more and more popular, but even this traffic was of no moment in places such as Kingston Street, Campsie Street, Croydon Street, Burwood Street, and so on.

Anyone visiting this area today would get the shock of his life at the transformation of the roads when there is a change of shift in the hospital complex. I could not believe this until one day I was at my mother's place and I witnessed the impact of a change of shift. It reminded me of St. George's Terrace in peak hours. The

heavy traffic clears in about half an hour, but this clearly demonstrates the way the traffic is building up, and yet it is just a shadow of what is yet to come.

It is very important that the hospital authorities, as well as the local authority and other Government authorities involved, commence now to plan the complex and neighbourhood so that this area does not become intolerable to live in. Most of the time the traffic is heavy but not objectionable. However, as I have said, with a change of shift at the hospital complex the traffic build-up is unbelievable, and all these streets take their share of traffic. The authorities have attempted to keep down the traffic build-up in a number of ways, including proposals for one-way streets and cul-de-sacs. However, these changes are resented by the people who have lived unmolested in a fairly quiet area. They know in their hearts that some changes must take place, but they want the changes to be negotiated ones.

I hope the Minister can give us some ray of hope because to a high degree the residents of the area are feeling apprehensive about the fate of the total area between Verdun Street and Aberdare Road. With the development of the hospital complex, this may become almost a dormitory area for staff. We may see a completely different style of house being built, and certainly the use of the land will change. However, these changes should occur in the least painful manner possible for the residents. The main point is to ensure that the people are consulted. The local authority has a role to play, and the City of Nedlands is showing no lack of desire to participate because this area is within its boundaries.

Even if town planning is not a statutory requirement, I hope the Minister can suggest some way to ensure local consultation at a high level. Perhaps if the people in the area are kept well informed of any new proposals, a better result will be achieved.

Could I give just one example. I go down to this area often because my mother lives there; and naturally, even though it is in the electorate of the member for Subiaco and has been for years, the people there still think I am the local member. I think that is mainly because many of them think I have never grown up since I left school there. Perhaps they are right.

Mr. Hartrey: They could be right.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, that is what I said. However it is a pleasing association and I welcome it because one always has an attachment to these areas. The people there hear the most extraordinary rumours. Sometimes one hears that every house is going to be bulldozed from there right through to the cemetery. Somebody starts a rumour in the local hotel, and by the time it has gone the full circle and has been

added to, it gets to the point where the bulldozer is almost being revved up at the end of the road and whole streets are going to be demolished. If somebody can talk to these people and explain what is going on not only in respect of the area between Verdun Street and Aberdare Road, but in respect of the area right through to Onslow Road, I think most of the problems would be resolved. These people are sensible enough to realise that we must make progress, and as long as it is carried out on a sensible basis most people can accommodate themselves to it.

The worst thing that can happen is what has happened in Kingston Street where panic moves were instituted to acquire properties, and people were told they had to get out immediately. But then they saw the properties falling into disrepair and not being used for the purpose for which they were told they would be used; and even if there is good reason for this they still get upset about it.

The second point to which I would like to refer is concerned more generally with the total scheme. This is a magnificent site; I cannot imagine a better one. There is a park on one side of Thomas Street and on the other there was a large area of open space, which comprised some of the endowment lands of the university. The repatriation hospital is adjacent, and there was a large area of timbered country which is now the site of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital; and there was another area adjacent which was the old Allman's dairy. The location of the site in relation to Fremantle, Perth, Midland Junction—and all areas north and south of Perth—and all other features of metropolitan development is absolutely ideal.

I think most people—both lay people and medical practitioners—had tremendous hopes of this centre becoming one of the great medical centres of the world because it has the space, the location, and the environment. It seemed as though everything was in its favour. Added to that, we have the fact that the people of Western Australia showed tremendous understanding of the importance of the higher fields of medical research.

Mr. Brady: Didn't the Western Australian people find a lot of money for its establishment?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is right; they contributed generously towards the Medical School—and do not forget that the Medical School is in other places as well as this. However, the people of Western Australia had the inspiration and they subscribed to the school on a basis which was absolutely unbelievable. For that reason a residue of this goodwill still remains in respect of the development of medical facilities; and there is also the fact that we are all directly concerned with this matter in one way or another because if we enjoy

good health we know others who do not, and our turn will come in due course. So there is a great deal of goodwill.

I believe that all those concerned with this project—and I questioned this during the life of the previous Government—be they architects, medical people, or those responsible for the allocation of land, have been very prodigal with a site that was so readily available. To put it another way, if we had to acquire a developed area for this centre and were forced to pay huge sums of money to obtain the land, I think we would have been more discerning and cautious about the way we used the land; but because the land, or most of it, was available on a fairly cheap basis there has been a tendency to be prodigal with it.

As a layman I cannot for the life of me see how the present spread of buildings will be economic in the final analysis unless there is a very deliberate programme to enlarge the buildings already existing and to connect them. If one is sent, as I was the other day, from one department to another with a sick person one just has to get into one's car to travel around. A member mentioned yesterday that he saw a doctor riding around on a bicycle at the centre. That does not surprise me at all. He would be a smart fellow because he is getting some exercise and at the same time he is saving time and effort when compared with walking.

There may be good reason for this sprawl. However, when I look at the car parks—I am referring to the one on the western side of Thomas Street as one drives towards the university, and the other one on the Monash Avenue side of the hospital—I am simply amazed at the acres and acres that are involved. Possibly it is proposed one day to build a multi-storied car park and to release more land for medical buildings; I do not know. But somewhere along the line I believe there must be a good hard look at this site because we are not talking about somebody building a two-storied ward or some other specialised building; we are talking about something which I hope—as a complex—will still be there and famous in 100 years' time. Therefore the quality of the development and planning is paramount at the moment.

It may be that the Minister can tell us something of the ambitions of those concerned with the centre, but at the moment, as a person from the outside looking in, I have the distinct impression that there is a lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the various components within the centre, which should be corrected immediately. From the explanations given and the studies we have done so far—and in this regard I have kept closely in touch with the member for Subiaco—it would appear that the trustees are something like real estate developers.

Under their present charter they are not in any way either responsible for or able to tie together the loose ends of the total complex, and there are something like five different cells within the area. Surely at some point in time someone must step in and be responsible to see that planning is carried out and that we do not get little empires built up which create jealousies within the total project and avoid the final objective.

As far as I am concerned, if there is a change of Government next year one of the first things I would do would be to get some detached and competent persons to make a close examination of the total complex, including the repatriation hospital. Because the land was so readily available and there was so much of it, those concerned have been prodigal in its use, so much so that some of the ambitions that were originally held for this complex have been lost sight of and, in fact, will never be achieved unless the matter is taken in hand now.

The member for Subiaco was at pains to point out that he was not critical of the Minister, and I concur in that. This is not something new. I believe the cells which are starting to grow within themselves will have to be looked at by someone at the top level to make sure there is no extravagant use of the land—bearing in mind that the complex will need to be there in 100 and even 200 years' time, getting ever more efficient and sophisticated as time goes on. Therefore the use of the land today will determine, to a large extent, whether it will be economically used to the best advantage for the generations that lie ahead.

With those qualifications I support the Bill.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Health) [2.32 p.m.] : I thank the two members opposite who have made contributions to the debate on the Bill. They seem to have had very close contact with the Perth Medical Centre and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and have approached some of the problems in a very realistic manner.

The only way to amend the Act effectively is by enabling persons, other than those who are members of the trust, to be appointed to subcommittees, in order to achieve what we would like to achieve. These would be people closely identified with the running of the various organisations.

Briefly, what the two members opposite have said is that because of the development in the area and the progress that is being made, some people have been inconvenienced. They realise there must be some inconvenience, but they think this should be minimal. Of course it has been our desire to keep any worry associated

with the local residents down to an absolute minimum, so that we may develop the area as proposed and in accordance with our aspirations.

The total complex is still emerging, and the new development—which only came into being last year and was highlighted this year—has been the availability of beds in the repatriation hospital at Hollywood. For many years there was a reluctance on the part of the Australian Government to make any beds available, but after having made a breakthrough last year we were able to make a further breakthrough this year. If the bed space can be merged, a special committee will rationalise the beds that are available at the repatriation hospital with those that are available at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

The concern of the local residents is acknowledged. I have endeavoured as far as possible to meet all their requirements. I can understand how rumours spread, particularly in respect of the purchase by the hospital of some houses east of Kingston Street for purposes which were not generally within the residential qualifications. However, as the member for Subiaco has outlined, last January we were able to come to some agreement in respect of those houses, and there has been no change in their use since then. There will be no change in use, and as far as possible there will be a redevelopment of the area to provide accommodation only, and nothing else.

The story about the creche mentioned by the member for Subiaco was correct some months ago. It was thought that the establishment of a creche there, might be possible by using one of the houses. Subsequently this was found to be impracticable; the idea has been abandoned, and a creche has been designed as part of the diagnostic centre.

As regards the concern of the local residents on the use of the houses purchased by the hospital, there will be no change in their present usage. There are possibly two houses which the hospital might purchase as residences, but for no other reason.

Some people regard the hospital as a big bogeyman, and that is what some of the local residents are understandably doing. However, we should also realise there are some local residents who would like the hospital or the trust to take over their houses, because they want to shift from the area.

So, we have to protect the rights of those people as well as the right of the hospital to buy houses if they are required. The understanding is the use of the houses so purchased shall be for residential purposes only; and that any alterations to the buildings—whether they be outside the existing boundaries, or even within the existing boundaries—must be

in accordance with town planning requirements, and with the provisions that apply to all the people. What I have just pointed out applies not only to the Medical Department and the hospitals department, but to all Government departments.

The member for Subiaco mentioned that 12 months from last March the Government did arrive at a Cabinet decision in respect of this matter, and that decision has applied ever since. As far as I am concerned there is no fear that there will be any building outside of the requirements of town planning, and this undertaking has been given to the Nedlands City Council. I regret that instead of coming to me, some local residents thought it necessary to circulate a copy of a petition dealing with the future of the area.

On the day that I received a copy of the petition, I received in deputation two of the residents of that area. Subsequent to that, on the 18th October, I was able to give an undertaking in writing. This is set out in a letter of that date—

The undertaking given in my letter to Nedlands City Council, dated 7th January, 1972, and conveyed to you by that body under date 10th February, 1972, still stands.

In the letter I also said—

In regard to the first question, you are no doubt aware that the State Government has decided that its departments must comply with approved local authority town planning schemes as reported in *The West Australian* on 6th March, 1972. This applies to the Medical Department on whose behalf I give this assurance.

The other matters which have been of general concern relate to the future control and the planning of the area.

Let me point out that since the trust Bill was introduced, and indeed before that, a joint planning committee of the Perth Medical Centre on which the University of Western Australia, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and the Medical Department are represented was set up. Each of those bodies has four representatives. The Public Works Department is represented by the project architect (Mr. Fairbrother) and the principal architect (Mr. Cann). The Institute of Radiotherapy is also represented on that committee; and the project administrator of the Perth Medical Centre is a member.

The SPEAKER: There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. DAVIES: These people who really should be on a subcommittee of the trust have been concerned with the overall development of the area. They have brought together all the people who have buildings on the site at the present time. This has proved to be a very good committee, and the day-to-day working has been

supervised by the project administrator who is undoubtedly one of the best officers in the department in that kind of work. They have been able to bring together all the strings and the representatives of the various people who occupy the site.

Neither the trust nor the Bill would have been necessary, had it been possible in the first instance to vest the site in the University of Western Australia, in the hospital, or in some other authority. Of course, in this case it needed to be some other authority. The trust, the university, and one independent person have representation on the trust, and this is the organisation which controls the site. They control not only the site, but the placement of buildings thereon. They are not responsible for the running of the buildings and they cannot interfere with the Institute of Radiotherapy, the laboratory, or the Medical School, etc.

Those people run the site and from my speech the member for Subiaco quoted the functions of the trust. The words were, indeed, taken from the Act—of which he is aware—and are as follows—

The functions of the Trust are to undertake the development, control and management of the reserve . . .

That is where the functions start and finish. As I said in 1966, if it had been possible to give the site to one authority or the other, the trust would not have been necessary.

This is the final responsibility of the authority. It has to oversee the siting of buildings, and ensure that the whole of the site is used to the best advantage. However, its work has been limited because any subcommittee can consist only of members of the trust. It will be realised that it is not possible to get all the necessary expertise or all the people required to work out various problems from among the persons on the trust.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister referred to a subcommittee; is that an *ad hoc* committee?

Mr. DAVIES: No, a subcommittee appointed by the trust. Once the trust is able to appoint persons other than those who are members of the trust—and this provision is contained in one of the three amendments in the Bill—

Sir Charles Court: The committee has been operating up to date on an *ad hoc* basis?

Mr. DAVIES: There is a joint planning committee. I suppose that if it were challenged it could be found to have no authority. The members of the committee meet regularly, and it has been effective. It is a high-powered committee, but the fact remains that it was the result of a ministerial appointment whence, no doubt, it gets its authority. I have not gone

back into the history of the joint planning committee which has been operating since the site was selected.

There is not the slightest doubt that we must be careful regarding the use of the land. As members will probably be aware the school was designed on the "spread-out" basis. For the most part it consists of only one or two-storied buildings connected by tunnels. Apparently this is a fairly common way of establishing a school as an alternative to multi-storied type buildings such as at Flinders University in South Australia. There is some argument as to which method is the better, but the previous Government elected to evolve the present plan and I believe it has just as much merit as the Flinders type of development. One cannot change horses in midstream.

A considerable sum of money has been spent on the foundations and underground, and the extent of the work is not apparent. If members are interested I would be happy to arrange for a visit to the Medical Centre so that they can see for themselves what is proposed on the site, and how the buildings are to be laid out. I am sure that most members would be just as excited as I was when I first visited the site. I know that the member for Subiaco was pleasantly surprised. I think a visit to the site is a highly desirable exercise and I will attend to it. Members will be able to see for themselves that proper use has been made of the land which is available.

Due to the fact that beds have been made available in the Repatriation General Hospital there is some need for re-thinking concerning the Hollywood site and the Medical Centre site, and their amalgamation. We have a committee working on this amalgamation already. I believe it consists of two members from the repatriation hospital, two from the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and one from the Medical Department. That committee is currently looking into the integration of the whole system.

The control of the total development, when completed, is of real concern. I do not believe it is too early to start looking at this question. It would be wrong to change the existing set-up of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board on the one hand, and the joint planning committee on the other hand, and the trust looking after the site. Once the actual scheme is integrated and completed it may be necessary—I believe it will be necessary—to control the complex because the trust will not need to meet as often as it does now, and many other problems will arise which are not apparent at the present time. There will be a need for a closer integration of the controlling authorities.

I do not suggest there is no integration. It is available through the joint planning committee. There is university

representation on the board of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and there is university and Medical Department representation on the Perth Medical Centre Trust. So at the present time the whole thing is very well interlocked but I agree with the member for Subiaco that it is not too early to look at the future management of the whole scheme once it is completed.

Unfortunately I cannot give any assurance to the residents in the area regarding the flow of traffic. There has been communication between the responsible Government authorities and, I believe, the Nedlands City Council and the Subiaco City Council. The traffic flow patterns are being watched to see what needs to be done. As the member for Subiaco has said, the position is that the necessary work is not being carried out quickly enough.

Once the scheme is completed there will be a change in emphasis as far as traffic is concerned. For instance, I have noticed that many of the tradesmen who are working on the building park their vehicles in various places away from the car parks. It is possible that those vehicles are causing some congestion when emerging from the construction site. The parking areas have been planned so that they will have access to the main roads once the buildings are completed. I believe that rather than try to explain the position it would be better if members were to look at the model and the plan which are available.

Without the slightest doubt this will be the best medical centre in the Southern Hemisphere, and I am conscious of what is being done at the Flinders Medical Centre in South Australia. I am quite certain that everything associated with the Perth Medical Centre will ensure that it is, undoubtedly, the best in the Southern Hemisphere. Every Government has a responsibility to see that it gets full value from the centre and from the services it will provide. For that reason we must make sure that the management fits into the development and purpose of the centre.

I mentioned that I have given an undertaking to residents from Kingston Street. At the same time that I wrote to the person who was spokesman and representative of the people in that area I also wrote to Mr. Heath, the project administrator and explained the position to him. I also wrote to the Administrator of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital (Mr. Thompson). I told both of these people that I expected them to liaise fully with Mr. Sedgley. I received an acknowledgment from Mr. Thompson that the matter would be attended to, and I have also been advised by Mr. Heath that he has asked Mr. Sedgley and Mr. Meager to confer with him on Monday next, I believe. The whole scheme will be explained to them and a direct and permanent line of liaison

will be established as long as Messrs. Sedgley and Meager are available. This is encouraging.

I am sorry that on a previous occasion it did not get as far as Mr. Heath. This is possibly where at least half if not more of the liaison should have come from. He regrets he was not so aware of the situation as he could have been. However, those matters have been remedied. I have written to Mr. Heath and Mr. Thompson. I understand both Mr. Sedgley and Mr. Meager are happy with the arrangements which have been made and have accepted the undertaking I have given them.

I might say a few words in regard to the amendment. At first I thought it did not matter very much whether or not it was incorporated in the Bill, but of course it does not accomplish what we would like it to accomplish. There are two controllers of the site and they come together on the site, but the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital has control of part of the site and the university has control of the other part of it. If we reached an understanding that the trust must do things in accordance with the Town Planning and Development Act, despite the assurances I have given, that would not mean the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital had to do likewise. It can get together with the trust and say, "It is not written into our Act and we cannot do it, but you can do it."

The member for Subiaco and the Leader of the Opposition have indicated their concern and what their position would be if they were in Government. I have indicated clearly what my Government's position is, and because of that I do not believe there is any need for the amendment.

We shall try to eliminate any cause for concern. We have no aspirations to expand in the areas which are currently residential areas. We can see no reason for it and we would have less reason for it if the Repatriation General Hospital site were made available to us. I do not know what the future of that will be. We have a planning committee looking after one aspect and we have a committee looking after the amalgamation of the Hollywood hospital and the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital if necessary. We can appoint subcommittees if Parliament agrees to this Bill, and I believe it will cover the situation. It is not too early to be thinking of future management. If the member for Subiaco would like to give me a family tree, I will see how we can start planning ahead for management when the site is completed.

I thank members for their support of the Bill and hope I have been able to give them the assurances required. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. Davies (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Amendment to section 12—

Dr. DADOUR: I want a few more reassurances from the Minister in order to keep the co-operation at the level at which it has existed so far. At the moment, the main point of contention is the traffic. I do not believe the traffic situation will improve; I believe it will get worse because, as more and more buildings are completed, there will be more and more staff.

I would appreciate it if the Minister would give us an undertaking that he will examine the traffic situation in regard to the subways along Railway Road—the one at Hay Street, and the one at Nicholson Road—in an endeavour to push forward the works programme for the widening of the subways to allow right-hand turns to be made into Railway Road and to direct traffic along the main roads rather than have it filter through the quiet residential area. On the occasions when the member for Floreat and I, singly and together, have made representations about this matter, we have always been given the same old answer; that is, the future of the railways was unknown and that no money was available.

I believe money must be made available for this work as soon as possible because the one factor affecting the residential area is the increasing volume of traffic. There is not only a change of shift three times a day but there are also people beginning work at 9.00 a.m. and finishing at 5.00 p.m.; so at least five times a day there is a great surge of traffic, with the ensuing noise, dust, and everything else. I ask the Minister whether he will give us an assurance that he will examine this matter with his ministerial colleague as soon as possible. If these subways were widened to permit right-hand turns to be made into the main artery, I believe the traffic problem would be more than half solved.

Mr. DAVIES: I am quite happy to do that. If the member for Subiaco, the member for Floreat, and I were to get together, we might be able to induce the Minister for Works to press forward with this work. I will certainly give the undertaking that I will confer with him. As a matter of fact, I had already made a note to write to the department to check on the work that had been done on the traffic flow in the area. As far as the Town Planning Department is concerned, I will certainly see what it can recommend.

Finally, I will ask the Hollywood centre to consider the construction of a new road to the east of Kingston Street which will

cater for the whole of the traffic flow in the area. In view of the assurances I have given in regard to traffic matters, I hope the Committee will support the clause.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It will save time if we discuss this problem now instead of dealing with it on the next clause. The member for Subiaco has dealt with the matter which is really the root cause of the whole traffic problem. I believe that if the Minister and his colleagues really want to remove the irritation to and the uneasiness among the people, a time must come when the planners will have to give a much more frank statement than they have been prepared to give in the past about what they hope to achieve over the next 10 or 15 years.

Everyone who thinks about this proposed great medical complex will be aware that not only will many people be employed in it but also many others will visit it, and of necessity traffic must be a big problem.

When I first found that this huge complex was to be developed in my electorate I thought, "Well, this is one industry which will not cause trouble." However, there has been a great deal of trouble. I believe the repatriation hospital had the dirtiest incinerator ever invented. The hospital spent tens of thousands of dollars to cure the problem, but it is not completely fixed yet. It would have been better to start with a new incinerator.

Of course, we have a mighty power station on the western side of Thomas Street, and I almost feel that I now represent a major industrial area! However, this is part of the price we pay to establish an institution of this kind.

Surely someone in the planning organisation can produce a plan to show us what the area will look like basically in 20 years' time. At the present time snippets of information from uninformed sources sneak out. It would be far better to grasp the nettle firmly. I am sure the member for Subiaco would join with me in co-operating with the Minister to let the people know what will happen, and how it is proposed to cope with the problems. It is better to do this than to allow the rumours to develop. Rumours are rarely, if ever, true, but they often have some basis of fact to start them off and then the public puts their own interpretation on the rumours. Some of the rumours develop out of sheer fear.

We must accept that this will be a great complex with many vehicles travelling to and from it. On the eastern side we have a major artery, and this seems to be well planned so that traffic in this area has no adverse impact on the local residential people.

However, in the area around Verdun Street, Kingston Street, Croydon Street, Burwood Street, and Campsie Street, we have some very old houses. In the area

north of Aberdare Road, there is a maze of narrow streets with very narrow home blocks—some with frontages of only 18 feet. These places do not have garages because there is literally no room for them. Most home owners today have a car, and some of them own caravans and boats which are kept on boat trailers. If anyone wishes a hazardous experience, he should drive down Yilgarn Road, Commercial Road, or Murchison Road, about 12 midnight. All the cars are parked on the verges and there is a collection of caravans and boats on trailers. Into this already crowded area will pour a tremendous flow of traffic. The railway subways at the Subiaco and the Shenton Park ends, if enlarged, will give some relief to this congestion, but we must look at the total concept in order to provide a solution to the traffic problem.

We must inform the people that within a certain period the road system will be completely redeveloped, and they can be forewarned. The matter will not be resolved until the people know the best or the worst to come—and I do not think it will be the worst. We must show them the inevitable result of the establishment of an institution we will all eventually be proud of. I believe this will become a more high-class residential area than it is at the moment. Within a generation we will probably see an entirely new type of resident as the professional and academic people move in.

Mr. Davies: Yes, I was sorry to see some of the old sites being redeveloped without any joining up of the blocks.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is a problem. Some of these weatherboard homes are over 50 years old. Many of the residents keep them in extraordinarily good condition having regard for the age of the houses. However, the time comes when they can no longer be maintained. In one or two cases old weatherboard houses have been pulled down and quite good brick houses have been erected on the narrow blocks.

Mr. Davies: Some of these houses are quite nice.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I know the size of the blocks because in my youth I delivered newspapers in the area. I had to ride my bike slowly to get a newspaper into every house.

Mr. Davies: They take a lot of pamphlets there, too, don't they?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That was at another stage of my life. If we do something now about planning, we shall ease a lot of the irritation being felt by the residents. The member for Subiaco and I receive complaints about this at frequent intervals.

Mr. DAVIES: I can see we must undertake some public relations work. I thought the public at large had a fair idea of what was going on. However, it seems that a small pamphlet or brochure could be

made available and we could encourage further liaison between the planning committee and the public. I will be happy to do this, and I will be happy also to take up the question of the traffic flow, although it is not within my immediate jurisdiction. I hope I can put some pressure on the Minister for Works in regard to the points raised. We must treat it as a total scheme to fit into the community as a whole. Perhaps we can eliminate some of the difficulties before they arise.

I will do three things: I will see whether it is possible to prepare a brochure for the members to supply to their electorates; I will arrange for a visit to the area by any interested members of Parliament; I will take up the question of the traffic flow with the Minister for Works and also I will find out what is happening in regard to town planning development. I take the suggestion to improve public relations very seriously, and I will see that we do just that.

Dr. DADOUR: There is one other point I would like to raise, and I would like to refer to the document from which I read last evening in relation to the Perth Medical Centre Act, 1966; that is, the report for the year ending the 31st July, 1966. At that time the trust was extremely worried, and I would like to read the following—

The Trust Authority by the Statute named the Perth Medical Centre Trust has not, in terms, been given any power or authority with respect to the medical centre as distinct from reserve.

The Minister prefers to wait until all the buildings are completed before he gives control to one or other body.

I believe this matter has probably been delayed long enough without some control being exercised. I know it is a difficult decision to make. It is difficult to know whether to give control to the trust itself, the university, or the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. I am inclined to think that because the hospital is the largest tenant of the area probably there should be an extension of the hospital board. I believe that action should be taken now, because the building is progressing and the diagnostic centre will just about complete all our plans for the next five years, anyhow.

This has been a point at issue for some time. I do not believe the university wants to accept the responsibility for a moment and I do not think the trust should have it. As I have said, I think the problem could be better solved by an extension of the hospital board, because it will be responsible for the greatest number of people working on the site, and the centre should be attached to the hospital in some way or another.

I ask the Minister to give serious thought to bringing this about in the near future, because people on the site are very con-

cerned. The five tenants on the block have worked with the trust extremely well and it is amazing the progress that has been made without planning so far. I have seen the plans and I support the Minister's view that what is envisaged will be extremely pleasant when it is completed. It does give the appearance of a "sprawl" at the moment. A central tunnel will run from the Medical School site at one end to the psychiatric block at the other. When it is completed I am sure it will be a show-piece. To ensure that the standards of control are maintained, I ask the Minister to look at this problem as soon as possible, because it is causing many people a great deal of concern.

Mr. DAVIES: I have indicated that there are many difficulties associated with this problem. I am inclined to think that the trust is the authority that should carry out all the management, but if the member for Subiaco will sketch out the family tree with a view to outlining what he believes should be done I will have a look at it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Amendment to the Schedule to the Act—

Dr. DADOUR: Yesterday evening, by way of interjection, the Minister said that the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital owned the land on which it is built. The hospital owns the land in the residential area. I have made a check of the maps once again and all the land on which the Perth Medical Centre is situated—that is, within the confines of the site—is vested in the Perth Medical Centre. As I have said, I have checked the maps and I do not know how Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital was built on the land because the hospital was in existence long before the land was vested in the trust. The land that is owned by the hospital is in Kingston Street, and probably it owns some other houses on some other location.

Clause put and passed.

New clause 4—

Dr. DADOUR: I move—

Page 2—Insert after clause 3 the following new clause to stand as clause 4—

S. 19 amended.

4. Section 19 of the principal Act is amended by adding after subsection (2) subsections as follows—

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of—

- (a) section 4 and paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (2) of section 13A of this Act; and
- (b) any other Act or law

the use of any land reserved pursuant to the provisions of subsection (1) of section 6 and subsection (1) of section 13A of this Act shall at all times be in conformity with the provisions of any town planning scheme that has effect under section 7 of the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928 in the district in which the land so reserved is situated.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (3) of this section "district" has the same meaning as that assigned to it by section 2 of the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928.

I am obliged to move this new clause so that I may get my message across to the Minister. We wish to have inserted in the Perth Medical Centre Act a provision to say that any land that is procured and vested in it shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Town Planning and Development Act. If this were done the local people would feel that much safer.

Further, although an article appeared in *The West Australian* in March, 1972, stating that all Government departments would abide by the provisions of the Town Planning and Development Act when houses were resumed by such departments, and despite the fact that the Minister has given an assurance on many occasions that this will be the case, the residents of the area have asked that this new clause be incorporated in the Act as a further safeguard. There is also the fact that the houses in question will be used for residential purposes only. They cannot be used for any other purpose because the Perth Medical Centre has so many houses now within its complex. If we gave this right to the Perth Medical Centre I cannot see why the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital could not be granted the same privilege if it so desired.

In fact, the new clause should be inserted in the Town Planning and Development Act. Therefore, if I receive an assurance from the Minister that he will, at some future date, take steps to incorporate this new clause in the Town Planning and Development Act I will be quite happy to withdraw my amendment.

MR. DAVIES: This is a very difficult matter. It is hard to try to write into an Act a provision to ensure that the Government shall do all these things. I have been looking at the Town Planning and Development Act and the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act recently and some amendments will pos-

sibly be made to them. I will add this to them to see whether we can make the Government's position clear. However, in this way we would tie down future Governments. It must also be remembered that the Government controls the Town Planning Department anyhow and could probably get its way somehow. Nevertheless, I will undertake to study the matter.

Dr. DADOUR: Could I withdraw my new clause, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: A simpler way to achieve your objective would be to allow the new clause to be lost on the voices.

Dr. DADOUR: All right.

New clause put and negatived.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

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

JOINT PRINTING COMMITTEE

Membership: Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that The Hon. L. A. Logan had been elected as a member of the Printing Committee for the remainder of the present session.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [3.23 p.m.]: At the outset I want to answer some of the comments made by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn who made the last speech in the debate. Obviously his speech was construed, after a number of interjections from this side of the House, to be one which should be answered.

Mr. Taylor: Regrettably the Press did not see the value in it and it was not reported. I would not like to suggest the same fate will apply to your speech; but his good effort was limited to this House.

MR. R. L. YOUNG: It was regrettable from our point of view that the Press did not take it up.

Sir Charles Court: The Press was merciful to you.

MR. R. L. YOUNG: I do not think the member for Merredin-Yilgarn would have minded if the Press had reported his speech because he said at the time—

Mr. Brown: It has already been done.

MR. R. L. YOUNG: That is good.

Mr. Brown: They have a very efficient member.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I hope that some of the answers I give to his comments and some of the answers other members give will be circulated also.

Mr. Brown: Do you know very much about grain producers and farming?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Let us put it this way: I intend to talk about the subject dealt with by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn; that is, taxation. I do not claim to know anything much about grain production.

Mr. Brown: You would probably think a hand piece was a model on the beach.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am glad the member for Merredin-Yilgarn is in the Chamber. He is obviously proud of his utterances. However, until he interjected just now I imagined that by some mischance he had drawn the short straw in that someone had to defend the Federal Government and its actions concerning taxation, and he was the unlucky one. I could not imagine anyone in such a capital-orientated farming community making the statements he made unless he had drawn the short straw.

Mr. Brown: Come on; get on with it.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Obviously the member for Merredin-Yilgarn was happy to make the statements.

Mr. Moiler: He was the one member in the Chamber best qualified to speak on the topic.

Mr. O'Neill: Don't you think much of your front bench?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The honourable member's speech virtually centred around the fact that the farmers had not lost a single advantage under the Federal Government's Budget with the exception of the investment allowance which had been removed.

Mr. Brown: I said that except for the investment allowance their concessions were not taken away. You are quite right. That is what I said.

Mr. W. G. Young: How wrong can you be!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We must study the concessions previously available and understand why they were given in the first place. I do not know very much about farming, but I do know something about the establishment of farms and the costs involved; about the struggles people have in establishing farms; and about the amount of investment necessary at the outset of farming in order to get virgin land to the stage where it is capable of some sort of production.

Mr. Brown: It is not as much as you think.

Mr. McPharlin: How would you know?

Mr. Brown: I do know. I have seen many a fettler made into a farmer.

Mr. W. G. Young: What a know!

Mr. Brown: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Brown: In case some members opposite do not know what a fettler is, he works on the railways.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I was saying that the amount of investment necessary to get a farm from virgin territory to the stage where it can produce, is considerable. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn disagrees. However, the reason for the taxation concessions, as the honourable member calls them and as I will call them, was simply that the Government would not be putting the biggest possible oar into the resources of the new farmer at a time when he had no money.

After having invested the amount of money necessary to get virgin country to the stage where it was just producing, the farmer was down the drain by many thousands of dollars.

Mr. Brown: But you—

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Come now. I gave the honourable member a fair run.

Mr. Brown: I don't think you did.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If, just when a farm started producing, the Federal Government was seen by its taxing powers to go boring into the first profit made by the farmer following his tremendous investment, it would be thought to be unreasonable.

When we consider pragmatically the history of Australia's economic development the plain fact is, whether or not we like to admit it, that the farmer has carried, and still does carry, much of the burden of this country's development. The farmer is not the big, money-hungry corporation the Government thinks he is. He is the fellow who went onto the land, worked hard to get the land productive, and took his risks.

Mr. Brown: I think we all appreciate the deprivation of the farmers.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If we all appreciate that fact, do we not also agree that the Commonwealth Government should continue to maintain the previous concessions to encourage people to go onto the land, to make the investments and sacrifices they must make to get established, instead of boring into the very first profit the farmers make?

Mr. Brown: That is where we disagree, but I will not say more.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The member for Merredin-Yilgarn made certain claims. Previously all the deductions were allowed as complete write-offs in the first year and were capable of being carried forward, as losses, *ad infinitum* in the case of farmers—so that they carried into the first year of profit-making. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn claimed that the

concessions available to the farmer were still available because, instead of being written off in the first or second year, they will be written off in 10 years. The honourable member therefore claimed that the farmer has not lost anything.

Mr. Brown: There is no such thing as a second-year deduction.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: What does the honourable member mean by "no such thing"?

Mr. Brown: The member for Wembley said that they could be written off in the first or second year.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am talking about the first or second year of the farmer's activities. I should have said, "the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth year or any other year in which the expenditure is made".

Mr. Brown: It is instantaneous or over five years.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If the member for Merredin-Yilgarn misunderstood me and it was my fault, I apologise.

Mr. Brown: I did not misunderstand you.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I ask the honourable member to allow me to make my speech and to interject only occasionally.

Mr. Brown: As long as you are correct in what you are saying.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Let us not be ridiculous; this is wasting my time. I said that there were a number of things available to a farmer to write off in the first and second years. I should have said, I repeat, "the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth years". When a farmer spends money on certain items it is possible for him to write them off in those years—and in any other year in which money is spent, if the member for Merredin-Yilgarn wants to be pedantic.

Mr. Brown: In the year in which it is spent.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is what I said. The position now is that the farmer may write these off in the year in which the money is spent because the Government did not want to put the farmer in the situation which the present Commonwealth Government has done by saying that a farmer can write things off over 10 years. Therefore, at the end of the third year, a farmer who had spent on his property all the money he had could be called upon, after writing off a few losses, to pay all his taxation in what may well be his first or second year of profit. The reason is obvious.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn is shaking his head but I am stating the facts as they exist in the taxation Act. These provisions were incorporated for specific reasons which I have outlined. I do not think the member for Merredin-

Yilgarn is doing his constituents very much credit by suggesting they have not lost anything by virtue of this.

Let us consider the situation of a person who goes onto a farm and builds himself a tin shed on his property. I know many people who have only a tin shed on their properties at first.

Mr. Brown: He usually rides out on a motorbike.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: He may do that. The person has a shed on a property and he lives at one end of the shed with his wife and children. At the other end he has a few bits and pieces with which he intends to get his property started. This is where he works and lives.

Mr. Brown: Is this a new-land farmer?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The member for Merredin-Yilgarn can shake his head, but I have been on many such properties and have seen this type of thing. I have acted for and represented these people in taxation matters for years. If the honourable member has not seen them, that is his fault. I am talking of the sort of man I know personally.

Mr. Moller: What sort of farmer?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If the member for Merredin-Yilgarn and now the member for Toodyay do not appreciate that these people exist, they do not know what is going on. They have always existed and always will exist while there is virgin land in this country and someone has the guts to develop it.

Mr. Brown: Are you a million-acres-a-year man for clearing?

Sir Charles Court: Thank goodness that land was developed.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I do not understand what the member for Merredin-Yilgarn is saying.

Mr. Brown: You do not know too much about farming.

Mr. W. G. Young: Why were there 500 applicants for a block, if it was not necessary?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Let us look at some of the items which were previously available, as write-offs, in the year in which the farmer made the expenditure. I am talking specifically about the new farmer, although the Federal Treasurer did not differentiate. I am talking about the people whom the provisions were written into the legislation to protect.

Before the member for Merredin-Yilgarn starts his second speech—I have to keep up a fast rate to maintain the floor—let me mention some of the items which were available, as write-offs, prior to the recent Budget speech. These were—

Expenditure on water conservation.
Structural Improvements to store grain, hay, or fodder.

Expenditure on levee banks.

Mr. Brown: Is this section 75?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Yes, it is section 75. Another one is—

Expenditure on underground pipes.

These are but a few. These items were available to the farmer as complete write-offs in the year in which he made the expenditure.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn, in his speech, said that it does not matter that the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Crean) has now said that they will not be available as write-offs, because they can be written off over 10 years instead of in the year in which the money is spent.

Mr. Brown: I did not say that it does not matter.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That was the tenor of the remarks of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. If he must be pedantic, perhaps he did not say that it does not matter. He may not have said it but he was upon his feet to justify the Federal Budget, which will bring this about, and claimed that the only concession the farmer has lost is the 20 per cent. investment allowance.

Mr. Brown: That is right.

Mr. Hartrey: It is either true or false.

Mr. O'Connor: It is false.

Mr. Brown: I agree that is the only concession the farmer has lost.

Mr. Moller: What farmer is the member for Wembley concerned about? Is he concerned about the solicitor-farmer and the doctor-farmer—who operate from St. George's Terrace—or the actual farmer who is trying to make a living out of the land?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am glad the member for Toodyay introduced that point.

Mr. B. T. Burke: The City Beach farmer.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The member for Perth is also making a speech.

Mr. T. J. Burke: He is not the member for Perth but the member for Balcatta.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Apparently the member for Balcatta, who has made one speech in the House, is claiming that I represent the farmers in City Beach. The member for Toodyay should have more sense because he has been in this place for a longer period.

Mr. Jamieson: It has not improved you.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: In his speech, the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Crean) scathingly referred to the Pitt Street farmer—and the St. George's Terrace farmer, to bring it to the local scene. I have his speech and I would like to read the innocuous words which he used when he said—

The deductions unduly favour those benefiting, and are seized upon by some, including "Pitt street farmers", to avoid tax.

It sounds innocuous, but members should have heard the way the Federal Treasurer said it in the Parliament. It was perfectly clear what Mr. Crean thought of Pitt Street farmers.

For some years people have been talking about amending the law to cut out the Pitt Street farmer—or the St. George's Terrace farmer.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you fully approve of them? I am referring to the investor-type farmer.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I approve of anybody who invests his money to enable him to make a profit and to enable production in this country to get off its tail and become active.

Mr. Brown: What about the real farmers?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If investors are working within the laws we frame in the Parliament, it is fair enough.

Mr. Hartrey: The Baron Lords thought that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The member for Wembley did not answer my question specifically.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I cannot answer it more specifically than I have done. This seems to be an exercise in taking up 45 minutes of the time of the member for Wembley. I will speak more loudly and I will not do what I usually do; that is, give every member the opportunity to interject and always the interjections.

Mr. Brown: Congratulations!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The exercise has become obvious and I will not be drawn into the trap. Members opposite have had a fair go, but that is finished and I intend to proceed with my speech.

There is nothing wrong with Pitt Street farmers and St. George's Terrace farmers. However this is not what we are talking about. I intended to say that for years the Federal Treasurer and others have been talking about what they would do to close loopholes in regard to Pitt Street farmers. They could not do it and every practitioner knew that they could not do it without catching all the farmers.

Mr. Brown: Medical practitioner?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am referring to practitioners in law, in accountancy, and in other spheres.

Mr. Brown: They are taking advantage of it.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It was found that it could not be done without catching every farmer. We realised this but we overlooked the fact that this would not matter to Mr. Crean, the A.L.P. Executive, or the new Cabinet. We stupidly thought that they would try to frame legislation to catch the Pitt Street and the St. George's Terrace farmers. We were actually stupid enough to believe that this was what they were trying to do.

We overlooked the fact that the Federal Government did not give a damn as to which farmer it got; its intention was to get them all, and that is what it did. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn knows this to be true and he tried to justify the Budget by referring to the sort of subterfuge of the member for Toodyay who made an interjection while the member for Balcatta was speaking about the Pitt Street farmer.

The plain fact of the matter is that it did not matter which farmer the Federal Government got; the important thing was to get the lot. As is evidenced by the speeches made by the Federal Treasurer and others, the A.L.P. believes that all farmers are rich; that all farmers are wealthy and grasping; and that they all drive Rolls Royce cars.

Mr. Brown: That has never been the case presented in this House.

Sir Charles Court: Not much!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is the attitude of the Federal Treasurer.

Mr. Brown: The Leader of the Opposition said "not much" but—

Sir Charles Court: I am merely going on your speech.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: This is the re-drafted Budget speech which the member for Merredin-Yilgarn personally got up and defended.

That is the attitude of the man; that is the attitude of the Cabinet of the Commonwealth Government, and the attitude of the people who framed the Budget which the member for Merredin-Yilgarn has been so keen to get up and defend, and which he continues to defend. I would not say there are no rich farmers; I would not say that at all. I do not deny that there are people in Perth, in Sydney, and in Melbourne who have no interest in farming at all, other than financial.

Mr. Hartrey: That is fair enough and I agree with you.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I agree there are city people who have invested their money in farming; perhaps just as many farmers have invested their money in city properties. There is a constant interchange of investment between the city and the country; there must be. I do not know, however, whether these are all wealthy farmers. There are some who are wealthy and no-one would deny that, but they have never been in the majority and never will be. One of the matters about which great play has been made is the fact that the farmer is supposed to sit on a very huge asset—his land.

Mr. Brown: That is fiction.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is something I will go into later on the death duty Bills.

Several Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that while I am on my feet I do not have to keep talking; as long as I remain on my feet I can stand here in silence. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: To assist the member for Merredin-Yilgarn to get what he has to say off his chest I will give him 30 seconds to say what he wants to.

Mr. Brown: I ask you whether you think the concessions that were allowed in the Federal Budget by way of subsidies were as satisfactory as those allowed in the State Budget to primary producers?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am prepared to give the member for Merredin-Yilgarn 30 seconds from time to time to permit him to lower his blood pressure, but I do not have to be quite so gifted as to understand the question he has asked. If the honourable member could be a little more specific in the time I allow him that would be all right, but unless he can I suggest he put the question on the notice paper.

The SPEAKER: I suggest the honourable member address the Chair.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think that is a fair go.

Mr. Blaikie: You certainly will not get a return bout.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It is claimed that farmers have considerable assets in the value of the properties which form their estates, and the hierarchy of the A.L.P. and the Federal Cabinet place the farmer in the category where he should be sat upon regardless of how he is creating his particular asset. The plain fact of the matter is that his farming assets and his land are both used in the production of various commodities.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 p.m.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: To carry on with the comments I was making before the afternoon tea suspension, I would like to draw the attention of the House to just what type of expenditure is concerned. Previously I read very briefly, despite a barrage of interjections from the other side of the House, some of the sorts of expenditure that will now become depreciable over 10 years instead of being allowed to be written off in the year in which the money is expended.

During his address the member for Merredin-Yilgarn referred to certain plant and structures which will now be written off on a normal depreciating basis instead

of being included under the provision which was described as accelerated allowances for depreciation purposes under section 57AA. The items include trucks, tractors, farm machinery, and the like. Those items which previously were allowed to be written off over five years will now be written off over periods ranging from seven years to 33 years.

Some of the items which previously were entirely deductible in the year in which the money was expended upon them—and which will now be written off over 10 years—include fairly important improvements as far as the new farmer is concerned; and I am speaking specifically about the new farmer, as no doubt the Government has by now understood. Now that the House is more quiet I will read out in a little more detail the items which will now be covered by writing them off over 10 years.

Firstly, under section 75 we find expenses in connection with the eradication or extermination of animal or vegetable pests from the land; the destruction or removal of timber, scrub, or undergrowth indigenous to the land; the destruction of plant growth detrimental to the land; the preparation of the land for agriculture; ploughing and grassing the land for grazing purposes; and the draining of swamp or low-lying land where that operation improves the agricultural value of the land. Perhaps the most important of all—there are others, but I am quoting only the more outstanding ones—is the provision for an outright deduction by a taxpayer who is a primary producer of expenditure incurred in the year of income on the conservation of water, including dams, earth tanks, underground tanks, concrete tanks and stands for tanks, and irrigation channels, or similar improvements for the purpose of carrying the water for agricultural use.

In a country like Australia in which perhaps the most important problem facing the nation, not only in respect of agriculture but in respect of the whole development and well-being of the country and its people, is water and water conservation—

Mr. Brown: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG:—I am glad the member agrees—it would seem rather ridiculous to me to include within the framework of the Federal Treasurer's Budget a provision whereby people conserving water in any one year by paying for this sort of development will have to write off that expenditure over a 10-year period.

I cannot justify any of the other items; but the last one seems to me to be outstanding because the whole idea of water conservation is that if water is not conserved it disappears. We may not lose it forever because some may drop back eventually, but in the meantime we have lost a great amount.

So if a person wishes to spend a great deal of money on the conservation of the water which is available at the time, he should be able to spend that money and obtain a full deduction. He should be given a full deduction to encourage him to conserve water. But this is one of the items that is caught in the net cast by the Federal Treasurer in his Budget.

Mr. O'Connor: It is a bad one for Merredin.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I believe the people in Merredin have some water this year.

Mr. Brown: What the member for Wembley says is very true. I heartily agree with him.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Does the member for Merredin-Yilgarn agree that this item should be caught in the net?

Mr. Brown: I mentioned in my speech that I had made representations to the Minister for Agriculture and the Federal member.

Mr. Stephens: You also referred to the 10 per cent. deduction as being "sufficient relief".

Mr. Brown: That is right, I did say "sufficient relief"; but I should have said "some relief".

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am glad that the member for Merredin-Yilgarn and I agree on this matter; at least we have struck some kind of accord on one point.

The situation, therefore, perhaps could be summed up by saying simply that the Federal Treasurer has taken steps which I think, technically, will not deny the farmer in the long run the right to deduct certain expenditure, but which will spread that expenditure over a period of years, and this will act to the detriment of the farmers who are trying desperately to develop land in our country.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You have developed a sudden interest in farmers. Are you a farmer?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: No.

Mr. Hutchinson: They are part of our economy.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am just wondering why there is a sudden change of interest.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I have an interest in a farming property, but I am not a farmer. The Premier's comments are strange because although I am not a member of a union I am entitled to speak about unions and industrial affairs.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Yes, of course you are; it is just that the changed attitude is most noticeable.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am entitled to talk about these things.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are entitled to talk about these things so long as they are relevant.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think what I have said so far is relevant to the comments made by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. I do not think the Premier would deny that.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am not questioning its relevancy.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Good; I am glad the Premier is not questioning the relevancy of my remarks. However, I am rather surprised that he questioned the fact that I am suddenly showing an interest in farmers.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is a bit odd.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think it is the duty of every member of Parliament to show an interest in everybody. The Premier has said that plenty of times. A member cannot speak about one subject all the time. I will be quite happy to go on and refer to the State Budget in a moment.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I don't think you will have much time.

Mr. Hutchinson: If farming prospers the State prospers.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think the situation could be summed up fairly by saying the Commonwealth Treasurer is taking some steps—to which the Cabinet of the Commonwealth Government has apparently agreed—which in the main will be to the detriment of the farmers. In general, the member for Merredin-Yilgarn has supported those steps. Deductions will not be available to the new farmer at the time when they will be of most benefit to him. I think, as a result of the Commonwealth Budget, we will see an extremely significant decrease in the amount of money available for developing land in our country which, although we had a very temporary stage of over-production some years ago, will be looked upon in the future to produce vast amounts of food for the world.

It seems passing strange that a Government charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of this country should take steps to discourage that sort of investment. One of the comments made by the Federal Treasurer in his Budget speech with regard to investment allowances is also very strange. He said—

There is a variety of concessions subsidising capital expenditures or encouraging otherwise uneconomic investment that the Government has decided to end.

Those words were not spoken in haste during the course of a debate; they are part of the Budget speech written for, and perhaps even by, the Commonwealth Treasurer. Those words were not used lightly; they were used for a specific purpose. In the wildest flight of anyone's fancy, with the possible exception of the Commonwealth Treasurer, I cannot see

how investment in farming plant and equipment could be described as an uneconomic investment. I think I have made my point on that subject.

Mr. Davies: Didn't that clearing have some relation to the protection of the environment? Wasn't that one of the reasons?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is a rather incredible statement. I am glad the Minister for Health said that, because it is pertinent to another comment of the Commonwealth Treasurer which I would like to read to the House. He said—

The deductions unduly favour those benefiting, and are seized upon by some, including 'Pitt Street farmers', to avoid tax. They can lead to resources being channelled into uneconomic activity and, in the process, may have questionable environmental consequences.

That is also part of the same speech written for the Commonwealth Treasurer. I would like an explanation of that, and perhaps someone might be able to say what it means.

Mr. Brown: It could be very valid.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It could be! The Minister for Health has jogged my memory on this, and I am sure he will find it is valid! I wanted this to be recorded in *Hansard*, but I forgot to mention it previously in the heat of the exchange.

Mr. Davies: I do not think your environmentalist friends would think it was a rash statement.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: No environmentalist who wants the environment to be protected could possibly swallow that sort of garbage. What the Federal Treasurer was doing was using an emotive term in speaking about the environmental consequences and tying that in with the taking away of the financial concessions for the development of the land.

Mr. Davies: What you are doing is calling some of your party members on the environmental council nuts.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If anyone can read validity into that action taken by the Federal Treasurer then he would amaze me.

Mr. Davies: You should talk to some of your own Ministers about this.

Sir David Brand: Could the Minister name those Ministers?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I now wish to deal with one area that should be covered. It has been referred to in debates and dealt with in motions; however, it has not been analysed to any great degree. I refer to a rather inane suggestion that was unfortunately taken up by the Press at the time; it is that when this Government

came into office it faced a bankrupt Treasury. Time and time again the Premier has used that term.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you happen to know what the situation really was?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I shall try to explain what the position must have been.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: To make your criticism valid you ought to say that you know what the position was.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I shall explain what the situation must have been, based on subsequent events.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You should explain what the position was. I claim that I was told by the Under-Treasurer that there was a \$10,000,000 deficit.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: When this Government took office there was an unfunded deficit from the 1969-1970 period of about \$100,000. The 1970-71 year resulted in a deficit of \$4,400,000.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Alice in Wonderland is speaking!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: This meant there was a total deficit of \$4,500,000 at the end of June, 1971, which was four months after this Government came into office.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Tell me why did the previous Treasurer, Sir David Brand, travel to the Eastern States to ask for special financial consideration from Mr. John Gorton if that was the situation?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Perhaps the Premier could tell me. What Premier would not have taken that step?

Sir David Brand: The reason I did that was obvious; it was to ask for more money.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: According to the member for Wembley you were not short of money.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I do not want to run out of time. The 1971-72 deficit was \$900,000, under the present Government; and in the 1972-73 period the deficit was \$3,500,000, making a total of \$4,400,000. That makes a grand total of \$8,900,000 which has been funded out of the funds available under the Public Moneys Investment Act, as mentioned by the Treasurer.

Another \$4,300,000 will be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund during the 1973-74 financial year. This makes a total of \$13,200,000 that has been used out of that fund for funding purposes and for payment into Consolidated Revenue.

In addition, in the 1973-74 period we have a State Budget deficit of \$6,900,000 which will be funded out of next year's loan moneys. That makes a total of \$20,100,000, and that is the extent to which Western Australia is worse off since the 30th June, 1969. If we deduct from that total the sum of \$4,500,000 which was unfunded to the 30th June, 1971, we still

have a total of \$15,600,000, and that is the extent to which the State is worse off since this Government took office.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Was this one of your strong subjects when you were at school?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It was not particularly. Is there anything wrong with what I have said?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: There is a lot wrong. It is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I did not think that nonsense, which is subject to the laws of logic, had anything to do with arithmetic. The situation in regard to the Public Moneys Investment Act is that since it was introduced in 1961 the fund has earned \$26,300,000. The whole of that amount has been used to fund deficits and has been transferred to State undertakings, or paid into Consolidated Revenue. All that money has gone.

From 1961 to 1971 the Brand Liberal Government used no more than \$9,100,000 of that, and no less than \$8,100,000 of it. I am not sure of the exact amount because I cannot get the figures I require.

Mr. Harman: You are not being fair, because there would be a difference in the amount earned each year.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am talking about the moneys in the Public Moneys Investment Fund that have been used by the Government to fund deficits or for payment into Consolidated Revenue. The Government under the present Treasurer has used \$18,200,000, or thereabouts, in the 2½ years it has been in office. The amount could be \$1,000,000 less.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: So in its 2½ years of office the present Government has used between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000 from the fund, while the previous Brand Government used between \$8,000,000 and \$9,000,000 from the fund in its 10 years of office.

Mr. Harman: What you are saying is illogical.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We should compare those figures with the claim by this Government that when it came to office it inherited a bankrupt Treasury. In introducing the second reading of the Bill the Treasurer said—

With careful management, the flow of funds in and out of the Treasury results in a level of cash balances in the Government account which can be invested for short periods until required.

Further on he said—

Members will be interested to note that as a result of this policy of carefully investing our cash balances on

the short-term market, a total of slightly more than \$26,300,000 has earned . . .

The Treasurer referred to careful management. The fund I have mentioned has funded all the deficits of this Government. It has paid \$4,300,000 into Consolidated Revenue to make the financial position of the State for 1973-74 look better. The Government has used \$3,300,000 out of the total of \$6,200,000 for payment into the State utilities since it took office. This money was accumulated in a 12-year period and was there at a time when this Government said the Treasury was bankrupt.

Mr. Harman: What is wrong with the money being paid into Consolidated Revenue?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Nothing at all.

Sir David Brand: That has been the case all the time.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The State today is about \$20,000,000 worse off than it was before this Government came into office, and the money has been available to this Government to fund its deficits. The State is that much worse off, and it is facing a further deficit of about \$7,000,000. That is not readily seen when we look at the accounts of the State, but that is the plain fact of the matter.

Because of a lack of time I shall sum up the situation briefly. After 2½ years of office this Government is responsible for the State being \$20,000,000 worse off than it was before it took office. There is no money left in the Public Moneys Investment Fund.

Mr. Harman: Why should there be? Why should not the money be paid into Consolidated Revenue?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I have already said there is no reason why it should not be. I am pointing out that what money was there at one time is now gone. Therefore the Treasurer cannot justify the claim that the State was broke when his Government came into office, because he has used all that money to fund the deficits and used the rest to bolster up the 1973-74 financial situation so as to make it look better. He cannot have it both ways.

In regard to taxation the Treasurer said in his speech that there were no major increases in taxes in the present Budget. He referred to the fact that the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill had already been introduced and this would increase the taxes. The Budget figures say that increased State taxation, including pay-roll tax, would total about \$18,000,000, but the total taxation increases since this Government took office amount to about \$67,000,000 in a full year.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Where did you get that figure from?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: From the Budget.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You did not.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: In the financial statement attached to the Estimates the amount of State taxes collected in 1970-71 totalled \$48,434,257, whereas the amount estimated for 1973-74 is \$115,795,000, or an increase of about \$67,000,000.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: When does the 1973-74 year end?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Oh, come on!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

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

(Continued on page 4440)

QUESTIONS (44): ON NOTICE

1. TOWN PLANNING

Coastal Areas: Report on Usage

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

Adverting to my question 16 on 23rd October, I refer to the inquiry headed by Mr. Hiller of the Town Planning Department which was initiated some years ago to review and report upon the future usage and preservation of our coastal areas—

- (a) will he now please table the report; or
- (b) will he advise the House why no conclusion was reached in this lengthy inquiry?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (a) A first draft of this one man report on the south western coasts was completed several months ago and given limited circulation for comment. A final draft incorporating new material is now to be prepared for publication. The final report will be tabled when printed.
- (b) At no stage has it proved possible to detach an officer from other, and generally more pressing, duties to deal with this project. It has therefore taken longer than desirable to conclude the work.

Yesterday I said there was no committee. Of course, there is none, because it is a one-man effort.

2. ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Commonwealth Takeover

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Further to earlier advice given that the Western Australian Government was working towards handing over control of Aboriginal

affairs to the Commonwealth Government, will he now explain what stage the negotiations have reached?

- (2) What is the last date on which negotiations were conducted?
- (3) When is it anticipated that the next meeting will be held?
- (4) Is legislation required for any part of the handover?
- (5) Will he advise the approximate date of the proposed handover?
- (6) Will he advise how Members of the State Parliament will be able to bring the searchlight of public opinion onto departmental affairs by asking questions, when the handover takes place?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Agreement has been reached in principle that the Australian Government will assume responsibility for policy planning and co-ordination in relation to Aboriginal affairs from a date to be agreed upon.
- (2) Consideration is currently being given to a letter addressed to the Premier by the Prime Minister on 8th October, 1973.
- (3) Formal negotiations are being conducted by letter rather than by meetings.
- (4) Yes. The Aboriginal Affairs (Arrangements with the States) Bill concluded its passage through the Australian Parliament on 23rd October, 1973. It is intended to introduce complementary legislation into the State Parliament as soon as possible.
- (5) Depending on the passage of the State legislation and on the completion of other necessary formalities, the effective date could be 1st January, 1974.
- (6) The proposed arrangement provides for the continued operation of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act 1972. If adopted this will mean that a Cabinet Minister in State Parliament will be in a position to answer questions as at present.

3. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Commonwealth Grants

Dr. DADOUR, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the total of moneys for all purposes granted by the Commonwealth Government since December 1972 through all State departments to regional areas of Western Australia?
- (2) What were the amounts and specific use of the moneys and to which regions were they granted?
- (3) Who is in charge of the dispersal of funds in the various regions?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (3) It is assumed that the questions relate to the Australian Government's scheme of financial assistance to regional groupings of local government authorities. There has been no allocation of funds to date, as the procedure for the determination of grants is still under consideration.

4. MT. BARKER RAILWAY STATION

Parcels and Goods Freight

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

In relation to parcels and goods handled at Mt. Barker for the years ended 30th June, 1967, 1972 and 1973, what were—

- (a) the number of inward transactions and value of freight paid;
- (b) the number of outward transactions and value of freight paid?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (a) and (b) The number of individual transactions as requested is not available and would need considerable research to extract.

Details available are as follows—

Total parcels revenue—

1967—\$6,430
1972—\$4,307
1973—\$4,446

Inwards goods tonnages—

1967—7,505
1972—3,785
1973—4,451

Outwards goods tonnages—

1967—13,894
1972—8,519
1973—6,602

Total goods revenue for inwards and outwards traffic—

1967—\$69,050
1972—\$51,839
1973—\$62,778.

5. GOVERNOR STIRLING HIGH SCHOOL

Sports Ground

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are any negotiations going on with the Swan Shire or others for filling in the low lying portions of the Governor Stirling high school playground joining the Swan River at West Midland?
- (2) At what stage, if any, are the negotiations?

- (3) Has any filling or improvement been made to the above playgrounds in the past 12 months?
- (4) Approximately how many children use the playground for sporting purposes?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) and (2) Arrangements have been made with the Shire of Swan for the sanitary landfill method to be used to fill the school playing fields and nearby recreational area developments.
- (3) Filling is proceeding but has not yet reached the school area.
- (4) Governor Stirling senior high school students use this area on an intermittent basis during the year. It is not possible to estimate the number of students using the ground as the number varies according to season, type of sport, student interests and availability of other areas.

6.

LAND

Swan River Banks: Pegging

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Have officers from the Lands and Surveys Department pegged out land on the banks of the Swan River at Bassendean near North Street and at Guildford near Barker Bridge?
- (2) If so, will he state for what purpose the land is being pegged?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) No land has been formally pegged at either site.
- (2) Investigation surveys have been effected for the Swan River Conservation Board relating to a boat landing near Barker Bridge and for the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority relating to proposed reserves near North Street.

7. HOSPITAL BEDS: OCCUPANCY

Hysterectomy, Appendectomy, and Cholecystectomy

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Health:

What is the average bed occupancy for—

hysterectomy;
appendectomy;
cholecystectomy,

at the following hospitals—

Royal Perth;
Fremantle;
Bentley;
Osborne Park;
Bunbury Regional;
Narrogin Regional?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The question asks for the average bed occupancy and I assume that

the answer is as required. The figures relate to the number of beds occupied each day for the various complaints listed, rather than the length of stay of the patient in the hospital for the particular complaint.

The answer is supplied according to the wording of the question. If the information is not as required the honourable member might ask the question again in a different form.

	Hysterectomy Bed Occupancy	Appendectomy Bed Occupancy	Cholecystectomy Bed Occupancy
R.P.H.	2.7	7.7	11.3
Fremantle	3.1	6.6	4.4
Bentley	3.5	2.7	2.4
Osborne Park	1.9	2.5	3.3
Bunbury Regional	0.0	1.0	0.4
Narrogin Regional	1.1	1.0	0.6

8. EXECUTIVES' TRAINING SCHEMES

T.L.C. and Public Service: Grants

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) What was the amount each year made available by the Government to the Trades and Labor Council for training purposes since the scheme's inception in 1971?
- (2) Does this scheme include training of union executives?
- (3) Has the Government similar scheme(s) for the purpose of training managerial staff?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) Trades and Labor Council of W.A.
1971-72—\$4,531
1972-73—\$7,911

W.A. Employers' Federation Inc.
1971-72—Nil
1972-73—\$5,885

1973-74—A total of \$13,550 has been provided in the estimates for the scheme for this year. No payments made to-date.

- (2) The trade union education scheme has essentially applied to the training of shop stewards both locally and at the A.C.T.U./A.C.S.P.A. national trade union school.
- (3) The Government extended financial assistance to the W.A. Employers' Federation in 1973 to assist in the training of labour relations of supervisors from small undertakings.

9. SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

Clarification

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Could he please describe what is meant under "small claims tribunal" which, as reported, the A.L.P. requested the Government to establish?

- (2) Can he give information as to the tribunal allegedly existing in Queensland?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) The small claims tribunal envisaged is to deal as informally as possible with a certain class of claims. It is not a Court of record. In principle it would align with the Victorian and Queensland legislation establishing small claims tribunals.
- (2) The Queensland Small Claims Tribunal Act contains the following features:—
 - (a) The Governor appoints a number of referees of small claims tribunals.
 - (b) Primary function of referee is to attempt to bring parties to a dispute involving a small claim to a settlement acceptable to all parties.
 - (c) Where a referee finds this impossible in a particular case he is to make an order which is fair and equitable; or
 - (d) Where he thinks it is desirable, dismisses the claim.
 - (e) No costs are payable.
 - (f) A small claim means a claim for payment of money or performance of work of value not exceeding \$450 where the case arises out of a contract for supply of goods for provision of services between a consumer on one hand and a trader on the other.

10. BUILDING SITES

Thefts and Malicious Damage

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Has he examined the mounting incidence of thefts and malicious damage at building sites?
- (2) If not, will he ask for a report on this subject?
- (3) As through the acute shortage of many building materials, which is expected to worsen, such offences are likely still to increase, will he consider to legislate for more severe penalties for these specific thefts and causing of damage?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) and (2) These matters have been brought to my notice.
- (3) Yes.

11. ARTS ADVISORY BOARD

Grants

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

What type and how many grants given by the Government (either

directly or through the Arts Advisory Board) to cultural activities are dependent on the amount of grant given to the recipient by the Commonwealth Government or its instrumentalities?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The Arts Advisory Board, in considering applications for financial assistance, takes into account the amount of assistance given by the Australian Council for the Arts to avoid unnecessary duplication. In the current list of grants to the arts, issued by me on 9th October, 1973, the words "pending the outcome of the deliberations of the Australian Council for the Arts"—or words to that effect—have been used in relation to grant money reserved for the following organisations:—

National Theatre Company

Fellowship of Australian Composers

W.A. Band Association

W.A. Opera Company.

The reason for this is that the Australian Council for the Arts has not, as yet, announced its decision on duplicate applications made to it by these organisations so that, if the Commonwealth body meets all, or the greater part of the assistance required, it will be possible for the State body to divert some of the funds provisionally set aside to other necessary functions.

12. MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Staff and Offices

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Have any office and secretarial facilities in a Member's own electorate been approved in principle or in detail?
- (2) If so, in which electorates?
- (3) Are any approvals expected in the course of the next two weeks?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Quite likely.

13. HOUSING

One Arm Point: Cost of Sand

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it a fact that the building sand required for concrete at the One Arm Point Aboriginal village is being transported by road from the Fitzroy River, a distance of about 270 miles, and at a cost in the order of \$25 per cubic yard?
 - (a) If "No" from where is the sand being acquired;

(b) If "Yes" what quantity of sand is required for the project?

- (2) As a local builder has described the sand from the Cygnet Bay settlement as being superior in quality has consideration been given to acquiring it from this source which is only about three miles away?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Yes. The supply and transported cost of sand from Langi Point is approximately \$20.00 per cubic yard.

(a) Answered by (1).

(b) Of the order of 300 cubic yards.

- (2) Before arranging the procurement of sand from Langi Point which is a known and acceptable source, sand in the vicinity of One Arm Point but not necessarily from the Cygnet Bay settlement, was tested at the Government chemical laboratories and found to be unsuitable for concrete work.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Lake Kununurra

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) In relation to my question 23 on 2nd October regarding irrigation drainage outlets from Packsaddle Plains blocks, being directed into Lake Kununurra, is he now in a position to give the assurances I sought or to advise what action he proposes taking?
- (2) If "No" will he please advise when consideration of the matter will be concluded?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No, but the matter has been referred to the Public Works Department for discussion and will also be referred to the Ord Project Co-ordinating Committee.
- (2) The matter will be reviewed after the deliberations by the groups referred to in (1).

15. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN THE NORTH

Air-conditioning Allowance

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Considering that Government employees in the north are eligible to receive an air conditioning subsidy if they occupy Government Employees' Housing Authority, departmental or State rental homes, will he extend the benefit to Government employees who occupy privately owned houses?
- (2) If "No" why not?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) Information has been sought from Government departments to enable this proposal to receive consideration.

16. EDUCATION

School of the Air: Transceivers

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

- (1) What is the total number of pupils using school-of-the-air facilities in the State education system?
- (2) How many transceivers are based on listed school-of-the-air centres located at Meekatharra, Eastern Goldfields, Carnarvon, Port Hedland and Derby?
- (3) What numbers of these sets are privately owned and what numbers are hired?
- (4) What is the approximate cost of the type of single sideband transceiver that will replace the present equipment when the new system becomes mandatory?
- (5) Does the proposed Commonwealth plan of assistance (recently announced, 25th September, 1973) in replacement of outdated equipment, envisage an overall hire system or is it planned to subsidise individual purchasers?
- (6) If not, what plans are under consideration to assist parents in obtaining the use of this very vital facility?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) 200.
- (2) Meekatharra—34.
Eastern goldfields—22.
Carnarvon—18.
Port Hedland—10.
Derby—22.
- (3) Privately owned—79.
Leased—27.
- (4) The approximate cost of a single side band transceiver 60 watt and single channel is \$600.
- (5) The proposed plan seeks to provide assistance to those organisations which lease transceivers to parents. Assistance for the replacement of privately owned sets is provided for under a separate scheme of assistance to parents of isolated children. Details of this plan are not yet available through the Perth Office of the Commonwealth Department of Education.
- (6) A parent may apply to join a leasing scheme or may seek assistance from the Commonwealth Government as a parent of an isolated child.

17. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE

Bridgetown Office: Spraying Plant

Mr. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Has there been an increase in the charge of hiring spraying plant from the department's Bridgetown office; if so, why?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

Yes. Charges have been increased on all plant hired by the Agriculture Protection Board so that two-thirds of the actual operating cost of the unit is recouped from the hirer, and the Board meets a subsidy of one-third. Charges have never been increased previously and greater costs of supplying and maintaining the units made a revision of the scale of charges necessary.

18. POST OFFICES

Country Towns: Closure

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

Will the Premier protest to the Federal Government against the proposals to downgrade thirty-five post offices in country towns in Western Australia?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I have no information regarding the proposals which the Leader of the Country Party alleges are intended. If his information is authentic, and he is prepared to furnish me with the details, appropriate action will be taken.

19. LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Throughput, July to September

Mr. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many lambs have been handled by the Lamb Marketing Board in the months July to September, 1973 as—

- (a) sucker lambs;
- (b) summer lambs?

(2) In the same period how many of these lambs were slaughtered in—

- (a) country abattoirs;
- (b) Midland abattoirs?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

(1) The only complete details for sucker lambs and summer lambs at present available are for Midland Abattoirs, W.A. Meat Export Works and Tip Top. Full details of the breakdown for country abattoirs may be made available

at a later stage when they are complete. The details are as follows:

	State Total	Kill at W.A. Meat Export Works, Tip Top and Midland		
			Summer	Sucker
July	87,673		51,509	12,604
August	112,233		27,022	59,476
September	154,162		9,905	111,352

(2) Kill at Midland Abattoirs—

July—29,119

August—51,831

September—70,343

Country abattoirs excluding Robb, Midland and Anchorage—

July—27,372

August—26,496

September—32,393

The figures for September are subject to slight adjustments as final details come in from country areas.

20. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN ARTS
COUNCIL

Appointment of Members

Mr. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

When is it expected that the members of the Western Australian Arts Council will be appointed?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Shortly after the Act has been proclaimed.

21. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN ARTS
COUNCIL

Agent for Federal Boards

Mr. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

(1) Is the Western Australian Arts Council acting as host to members of—

- (a) Australian Council of Arts Craft Board;
 - (b) Australian Council of Arts Film and Television Board,
- both of whom are visiting Western Australia in the near future?

(2) If so, is it intended for the Western Australian body to become agents for these Federal boards?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) No. In fact, both the craft enquiry and the Film and Television Board are acting as hosts to members of the W.A. Arts Council at informal working suppers.

(2) The present policy of the Australian Council for the Arts is to employ its own staff in all its functions. This question would better be asked in Federal, rather than State Parliament.

22. BRIDGETOWN HOSPITAL*Cost*

Mr. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Health:

What is the total estimated cost of the new Bridgetown hospital and when is the proposed starting date of building?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

No firm estimate has been prepared but it is expected to be in the region of \$1,000,000. Sketch plans have been agreed and the brief should be in the hands of the architect within 6-8 weeks. During this period the architect will be commissioned, funds having been provided in the 1973-74 loan programme to meet the cost of professional fees. The preparation of contract documents is expected to take approximately six months. The starting date of building cannot be specified until a tender is accepted.

23. COTTON FARMERS*Financial Assistance*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has finality been reached on the level of financial assistance which is to be extended to Ord River cotton farmers?
- (2) If "Yes" will he advise what short term and long term aid will be provided?
- (3) If "No" will he indicate when a decision will be reached?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) It is anticipated that a decision will be announced by the Government within the next two weeks.

24. CHALLIS ROAD SCHOOL*Site and Completion*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the \$80,000 for the new Challis Road primary school Armadale, included in the General Loan Estimates introduced on 23rd October, mean only part of the school will be built by 30th June, 1974?
- (2) What buildings are to be provided from the \$80,000?
- (3) Has the land for this school been acquired?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), will he advise me the area and site identification?
- (5) If "No" to (3), when is the school site expected to be purchased?
- (6) When is this school expected to be ready to receive students?

- (7) What arrangements are being made for the schooling of the children for the commencement of the 1974 school year who would normally attend Challis Road school?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The amount of \$80,000 represents the progressive payment towards the completion of the development.
- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) A notice of intention to acquire the land was gazetted on 12th October, 1973. The registered proprietors have 30 days in which to object. The date of purchase will depend on the outcome of the objections.
- (6) In view of the uncertainty of site acquisition, it is not possible to nominate a completion date.
- (7) Junior grades from the Challis Road area will be housed at Neerigen Brook and the remainder will be transported to Armadale primary school.

25. NEERIGEN BROOK SCHOOL*Enrolments*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many children—
 - (a) are presently attending Neerigen Brook primary school;
 - (b) are estimated to commence at this school in February 1974?
- (2) What arrangements are being made to accommodate the estimated student enrolment at commencement of the 1974 school year?
- (3) How many students are estimated to attend this school at the beginning of 1974 who could have been enrolled at Challis Road primary school had it been available?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) (a) 646 pupils as at 1st August, 1973.
(b) 760 pupils.
- (2) Two demountable classrooms will remain on-site to cater for the increased enrolment and additional demountable classrooms will be provided.
- (3) 200 pupils.

26. ARMADALE SCHOOL*Enrolments*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many students—
 - (a) attend Armadale primary school;

- (b) are estimated to attend this school in February 1974?
- (2) How many students will attend this school at the beginning of the 1974 school year who could have commenced at the new Challis Road school if it were completed?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) (a) 486 pupils as at 1st August, 1973.
(b) 610 pupils.
(2) 154 pupils.

27. TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES

Enrolments and Staff

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) (a) Will it be necessary for boards of teachers' colleges to be re-elected on or after the "appointed day";
(b) what is the situation of boards in the various teachers' colleges in regard to elections held prior to the appointed day?
- (2) To whom is the principal of each teachers' college immediately responsible—
(a) before the appointed day;
(b) after the appointed day?
- (3) Under what conditions and in what situations will a lecturer-in-charge be appointed after the appointed day?
- (4) Under what conditions and in what situations will lecturers-in-charge at present in the colleges continue to be employed after the appointed day?
- (5) If there are to be lecturers-in-charge after the appointed day how will the duties of such people differ from those of a senior lecturer?
- (6) Would the Minister please indicate the representatives, if any, of the staff associations on the Western Australian Teachers Education Authority of—
(i) Claremont Teachers' College;
(ii) Graylands Teachers' College;
(iii) Mt. Lawley Teachers' College;
(iv) Churchlands Teachers' College; and
(v) W.A. Secondary Teachers' College?
- (7) In response to questions asked on 20th September, 1973, when the Minister stated the enrolments for each of the teachers' colleges and the number of senior staff positions, can the Minister justify that a college with an enrolment of 2,035 students requires the same number of senior staff as a college of 507 students?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) (a) They may be re-elected or confirmed in their appointment.
(b) They are interim boards. Staffs of colleges and students who carried out the elections may decide to allow the elections to stand and so confirm them in their appointments or hold fresh elections.
- (2) (a) The Director-General of Education who acts on the advice of the Council of the Teacher Education Authority.
(b) The college board of the college of which he is principal.
- (3) Where there is no senior lecturer and a college board decides that a lecturer in charge is necessary. He will receive no allowance as a lecturer in charge unless he was receiving such an allowance before the "appointed day".
- (4) Lecturers in charge who have not been promoted to senior lecturer and where there is no senior lecturer for the section will continue to be employed after the "appointed day" and will continue to receive an allowance as lecturer in charge.
- (5) In general, lecturers in charge, after the "appointed day", will be in charge of smaller sections than those under the charge of a senior lecturer. They have considerably less general college administration responsibility than a senior lecturer.
- (6) (i) Claremont Teachers' College—1.
(ii) Graylands Teachers' College—0.
(iii) Mount Lawley Teachers' College—0.
(iv) Churchlands Teachers' College—1.
(v) W.A. Secondary Teachers' College—1.
- Under section 84, subsection 2 (b) of the Act.
- (7) The enrolment of 2,035 students includes many students who are only infrequently attending the college since they are also enrolled as full-time students at the University or the Western Australian Institute of Technology. The 507 students mentioned are all full-time students.
Provision of senior staff is also required to plan for increased enrolments and planning of new buildings.

28. ABORIGINES

Wiluna: Use of Lake Way Hotel

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) As a recent news item announced an Aboriginal community enterprise in the Wiluna district and using the delicensed Lake Way Hotel building as administration headquarters, is it the intention of the Community Welfare Department to house Aboriginal students or administration staff in the living areas of this building which were formerly occupied by the Department of Agriculture staff?
- (2) Has consideration been given to the incorporation of a manual training centre, covering mechanical, electrical and woodworking courses, to train young Aborigines?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the ground floor of this building could provide a spacious area in which to house equipment needed for and necessary for such training?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) The Lake Way Hotel building is being handed over to the Aboriginal Lands Trust to house staff employed on behalf of the Wiluna Aboriginal Community. The Department for Community Welfare is not directly involved.
- (2) Current planning is for practical training in horticulture, agriculture and plant operation on the old research station itself with some training in vehicle and plant maintenance on the ground floor of the hotel building. More formal training along the lines suggested is being kept under consideration.
- (3) Yes.

29. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

Budget Allocation

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the criterion for allocating the \$200,000 estimate for disadvantaged schools?
- (2) Will he please name individually the school and sum to be allocated?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The proposals for assistance to disadvantaged schools, the general criteria and the amount of finance to be made available, are contained in chapter 9 of the Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools' Commission.
- (2) Allocations to individual schools have not yet been determined.

30. SOCIAL WELFARE
REGIONAL COUNCILS
Establishment

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) What part has his department played in creating the proposed regional councils for social welfare in the great southern and south-west of this State?
- (2) Will he please table the departmental file containing the reports and communications for the establishment of this project?
- (3) Of the total grant available for the three year period, what sum is to be for—
 - (a) administration;
 - (b) social welfare payments;
 - (c) projects, such as clinics, etc.?
- (4) Will he designate the proposed zones?
- (5) What negotiation has taken place in creating these councils?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) In response to the announcement by the Chairman of the Social Welfare Commission of the Australian Government concerning the availability of funds for regional social development, the Community Welfare Department submitted a proposal for community services programmes in three regions in Western Australia.

As the total number of grants in Australia was reduced owing to the commission's own budget limitations, only two of our proposals were accepted as pilot projects—

1. A major social welfare co-ordinating project in the south-west and southern agricultural statistic divisions region for a period of three years.
Estimated cost—\$284,000 per annum.
2. An investigatory study into ways and means of co-ordinating social welfare in the eastern goldfields region.
Cost—\$20,000.

The Community Welfare Department has instituted the initial operation of disseminating information concerning the expenditure proposals. The next step will be to set up an interim board responsible for establishing an autonomous community structure.

This structure will contain 32 local government area committees, 3 special regional committees and the regional council responsible for allocating funds and deciding on general policy for the region.

Once the autonomous community bodies are established the department will be involved in an advisory and enabling capacity only and the autonomous bodies will be funded directly by the commission.

Six copies of the proposal to the National Commission on Social Welfare have been tabled in this House.

- (2) The Minister for Community Welfare is not prepared to table the departmental file because it is in constant use within his department. He has, however, given instructions that the file is to be readily available at the director's office for perusal by the member for Dale or any other member.

- (3) Grants are given under the Australian assistance plan if the Social Welfare Commission is convinced that the decisions on expenditure are made by an autonomous community body. It is not possible, therefore, for the Minister to provide information as to how the grants will be spent as these decisions will be made by the community itself through the autonomous community structure to be set up by the interim board. However, in making its submission the Community Welfare Department put forward a tentative budget for the first year of operation.

In regard to the proposal for the south-west and southern agricultural region, the estimate of sums to be spent was—

(a) Administration—

It was considered that much of the regional council's activities would be directed towards setting up the programme and that administrative costs, i.e. salaries and operation expenditure, would be heavy but partly non-recurring—estimated at \$76,000.

(b) Social welfare payments—Nil.

(c) Projects such as clinics, etc. Projects, i.e. grants and subsidies and information dissemination—\$208,000.

- (4) The region in the first proposal is delineated by the boundary of the south-west and southern agricultural statistical division—an area of 33,000 square miles and a population of 122,000.

The second region consists of the local government areas—the Town of Kalgoorlie, the Shires of Coolgardie, Laverton, Boulder, Leonora, Menzies and Dundas—an area of 220,000 square miles and a population of 33,000.

- (5) The department has had discussions with the Chairman and the Consultant to the Social Welfare Commission.

In regard to the proposal for the south-west and southern agricultural region, the department has already visited the region and held meetings with local Government authorities, representatives of voluntary organisations and interested individuals at Albany, Katanning and Bunbury.

As a result it is hoped to form an interim board within the next few weeks.

In regard to the proposal for the eastern goldfields region, some preliminary investigations into demographic features have been undertaken, but as yet no direct approach to local people has been made.

31.

SCHOOLS

Libraries: Provision

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many primary school libraries were completed between 30th June, 1970 and 1st January, 1972?
- (2) Which of these involved a subsidy payment to the respective parents and citizens' associations?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) Six.
- (2) All six schools, namely Mirrabooka, Dianella, Woodlands, Balga, Yokine and Morley, received a subsidy.

32.

MORLEY SCHOOL

Library Subsidy

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Will he table the files dealing with approaches made for subsidy payment with respect to the Beaulivey Library at Morley primary school?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

The file in question is a general buildings file which contains other material not related to the library. If the member wishes to examine the relevant papers on file, he may do so in the office of the Minister for Education at a mutually convenient time.

33.

EDUCATION

Schools: Lesmurdie Area

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that there has been an increase in the rate of housing

development in the Lesmurdie area over recent months?

- (2) What plans has he made to ensure that adequate primary school accommodation will be available?
- (3) When is it anticipated that the proposed new primary school in Falls/Burma Road will be built?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A new six-room cluster unit, a resource centre and a covered assembly area are to be built at Lesmurdie.
- (3) A definite date has not been determined.

34. TOWN PLANNING

Foothills Area: Report

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

Will he table a copy of the report of a study done on foothills land between Malda Vale and Maddington?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The report referred to has not yet been finally considered by the District Planning Committee or the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and cannot be tabled at this stage.

35. PROBATE

Primary Producers: Estates and Concessions

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) How many primary producers' estates which have been registered under the Companies Act as private companies and arranged with a "life governor's" share have been assessed for death duties in Western Australia during the last five years?
- (2) Was he correctly reported in *The West Australian* of 23rd October, 1973 that the increased concessions proposed in legislation contained in the Death Duty Bill would benefit all farmers?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) This question should have more properly been addressed to the Assistant to the Treasurer rather than the Attorney-General. Specific records of estates with life governor share assets have not been kept. Estimate of revenue loss is based on current cases which are increasingly coming forward for assessment.

- (2) Yes, the increased concessions for widows, dependent children and orphans will apply to these beneficiaries of all deceased persons irrespective of the nature of the deceased's occupation.

36. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Talc Plant at Leighton

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Has he read the Press report in *The West Australian* dated 20th October, headed "Westside plan for Leighton talc plant"?
- (2) Will he explain what pollution making properties a talc milling plant has?
- (3) Where is the proposed site, and what is its area?
- (4) Where will the raw talc be dumped and what size will the dump be?
- (5) Is it a fact that the Government proposes to guarantee a loan of \$136,000 to assist the company to build the mill at Leighton?
- (6) Has his department or the Environmental Protection Authority been asked for a report on the siting of the proposed plant?
- (7) If not, could he explain the reason?
- (8) If so, will he table the report and also advise the date the report was requested?
- (9) In his capacity as environmental Minister does he agree with the siting?
- (10) Will he use the teeth in the Act to safeguard people and places in Leighton from talc pollution?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This matter is being investigated and I will advise the member when results of the investigation are complete.
- (3) The proposed site is Walter Place, Leighton, opposite the intersection of Bracks Street, and the area is 6081 square metres.
- (4) The raw talc will be dumped on the site at Leighton, but information is not available as to the size of the dump.
- (5) The Government has guaranteed a loan of \$113,600 and not \$136,000.
- (6) I have asked the Department of Environmental Protection for such a report.
- (7) Answered by (6).
- (8) The report which was requested on 24th October is not yet available.

- (9) Since I have not yet received this report I have no comment to make.
- (10) Yes, or other appropriate legislation.

38.

PROBATE DUTY

Concessions and Deductions

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Assistant to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the estimated cost to the State in a full year of the concessions to be granted under the Death Duty Assessment Bill (1973) in respect of—
- increased concessional deductions for dependants;
 - payments to dependants under a bona fide superannuation or pension scheme;
 - increases in concessions for requests to—
 - charitable bodies;
 - local government organisations;
 - extension of the periods in which special exemptions apply for ex-servicemen?
- (2) What is the estimated increase to the State's revenue in a full year resulting from the actions in respect of—
- "life governors' shares";
 - long-term interest free debts normally discountable on an actuarial basis;
 - balancing annuities and assigned life policies on expectation of death within a short period;
 - assigning life policies at surrender value without normal life expectancy;
 - the reduction of option periods to within three years of death under clause 48;
 - certain settlements now subject of paragraph (f) of clause 10;
 - savings in administration by the Commissioner of Taxation?
- (3) How many estates were probated in the year ended 30th June, 1973—
- where the sole beneficiary was a spouse and the value of the estate, before allowing concessional deductions—
 - exceeded \$26,500;
 - did not exceed \$26,500;
 - exceeded \$36,500;
 - fell between \$26,500 and \$36,500;
 - where the beneficiaries consisted of a spouse and two dependent children and the value of the estate, before allowing concessional deductions—
 - exceeded \$36,500;
 - did not exceed \$36,500;

37. METROPOLITAN AND REGIONAL HOSPITALS

"A"-Class Beds

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Health:

- (a) How many "A"-class beds are there in hospitals in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) what was the daily bed occupancy for each of the last two years?
- (a) How many "A"-class beds are there in hospitals within 150 miles of Perth;
 - (b) what was the daily bed occupancy for each of the last two years?
- (a) How many "A"-class beds are there in the regional hospitals at Narrogin, Bunbury, and Northam;
 - (b) what was the daily bed occupancy in each of the last two years?
- (4) Could there be a definite effort to refer cases to regional hospitals where there is efficient medical and surgical treatment available and thus relieve congestion in Perth and Fremantle?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1)—

	1971-72		1972-73
(a) Private beds	1,233		1,302
Public beds	2,602		2,635
	3,835		3,937
(b) Private	895	*(1971)	931
Public	2,250		2,234
	3,145		3,165

(2)—

	1971-72		1972-73
(a) Private beds	1,285		1,412
Public beds	3,696		3,713
	4,981		5,125
(b) Private	934	*(1971)	1,009
Public	2,570		2,806
	3,504		3,815

* These figures relate to calendar years specified.

(3)—

	1971-72		1972-73
(a)	337		339
(b)	232		232

- (4) Referral to any hospital is a matter between the doctor and the patient. Metropolitan hospitals endeavour to transfer appropriate long stay cases to the country hospital associated with the patient's home.

- (iii) exceeded \$56,500;
- (iv) fell between \$36,500 and \$56,500?

(4) How many estates were probated during the year ended 30th June, 1973, in total?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) (a) \$1.7 million.
- (b) Nil. This is a clarification of an existing section.
- (c) (i) \$20,000.
- (ii) \$15,000.
- (d) \$5,000.
- (2) (a) \$400,000.
- (b) \$250,000.
- (c) \$30,000.
- (d) \$70,000.
- (e) Nil.
- (f) \$10,000.
- (g) Nil, but expenditure savings of approximately \$4,000 on current rates should be achieved.
- (3) (a) and (b) This information is not available in the form requested, as statistics are not maintained in this way. Available statistics of net values of estates assessed and distributions to classes of beneficiaries are published in appendix "E" of the third annual report of the State Taxation Department.
- (4) This information is not available in the form requested but 4,624 local estates were assessed by the State Taxation Department in 1972-73.

39. WATER SUPPLIES

Rates: Booragoon Garden City

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Would he please advise—

- (a) the total water rate account for the Booragoon Garden City shopping complex for each of the last three years; and
- (b) reasons for variations?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (a) The rates applicable to each of the last three years are:

	Water Rate	Sewerage Rate	Total
	\$	\$	\$
1971-72	1,550 00		1,550 00
1972-73	19,696 92	17,820 34	37,517 76
1973-74	28,716 07	30,572 19	59,288 26

- (b) 1971-72—Rated as vacant land for water only.

1972-73—Rated as vacant land from 1-7-72 to 31-10-72 and improved property from 1-11-72. Rated for sewerage as from 1-12-72.

1973-74—Rated as improved property for full year. \$17,820.84 sewerage rates for the period 1-12-72 to 30-6-73 (1972-73) included in 1973-74 account.

40. TRAFFIC OFFICES

Subiaco and Victoria Park: Functions

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

What is the future of the Subiaco and Victoria Park traffic offices with respect to—

- (a) traffic control; and
- (b) licensing?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (a) and (b) To continue.

41. PROBATE

Repurchase of Issued Shares at Paid-up Value

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Assistant to the Treasurer:

How many estates have been submitted for probate since 30th June, 1968, where a governing director had the power under his company's articles of association to "repurchase all of the other issued shares at paid up value" as described in the example on page 19 of the explanatory notes accompanying the Death Duty Assessment Bill, 1973?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

Not known, as papers dealing with the rights of governing directors in these cases have been returned to executors and detailed records of every case are not kept. Estimate of revenue is based on current cases which are increasingly coming forward for assessment.

42. PROBATE

Compensating Annuities and Life Policies

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Assistant to the Treasurer:

How many estates have been submitted for probate since 30th June, 1968 in which the circumstances of compensating annuities and life policies existed as described in the example on page 12 of the explanatory notes accompanying the Death Duty Assessment Bill, 1973?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

This is a relatively new scheme and to date only one case has been submitted.

43. VERMIN AND NOXIOUS WEEDS CONTROL

Cost

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many vermin and noxious weeds groups involving the Department of Agriculture and local authorities are in operation in—
 - (a) south-west land division;
 - (b) the remainder of the State?
- (2) How many officers are responsible for vermin control in the above groups?
- (3) How many officers are responsible for noxious weed control in the above groups?
- (4) What is the total cost to the Department of Agriculture for the services in (2)?
- (5) What is the total cost to the Department of Agriculture for the services in (3)?
- (6) What is the total contribution by local authorities to the cost of vermin control officers?
- (7) What is the total contribution by local authorities to the cost of weed control officers?
- (8) What is the total cost of wages, salaries and equipment for the control of vermin in the various groups?
- (9) What is the total cost of wages, salaries and equipment for the control of noxious weeds in the various groups?
- (10) Are all local authorities in the country areas involved in the group control?
- (11) If (10) is "No" how many shires do not take part in group control?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

The Agriculture Protection Board is the body responsible for vermin and noxious weed control.

The answers to the specific questions asked are—

- (1) (a) 62.
- (b) 12.
- (2) 93.
- (3) 9.
- (4) \$561,177.
- (5) \$56,835.
- (6) \$183,389.
- (7) \$20,133.
- (8) \$744,566.
- (9) \$76,968.
- (10) No.
- (11) Noxious weeds = 11 take part; 112 do not.
Vermin = 107 take part; 16 (4 agricultural, 12 pastoral) do not.

44.

PETROLEUM

Farm-in and Farm-out Agreements

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Will he please list all the petroleum farm-ins and farm-outs that have been submitted to him and which have—
 - (a) not been approved by the State Government;
 - (b) been approved, or recommended by the State Government, submitted to the Commonwealth Government and not yet approved by the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) In each of the cases covered by (1) (b), what are the dates on which the State Government approved or recommended the farm-ins or farm-outs and submitted them to the Commonwealth for its concurrence and/or approval?
- (3) (a) What is the reason given by the Commonwealth Government for not approving the submissions made to them;
- (b) does he approve of the reasons given by the Commonwealth Government?
- (4) Which of the farm-ins and farm-outs mentioned above does the State Government still want to see approved?
- (5) (a) Which applications to the State Government for approval or recommendation over the last 12 months have not been approved by the State Government;
- (b) what were the reasons for not approving?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) (a) (i) Agreement No. 13SL/1972. Abrolhos Oil No Liability and B.P. Petroleum Development Australia Proprietary Limited to Ocean Ventures Proprietary Limited and Jild (Australia) Proprietary Limited affecting Exploration Permit No. WA-39-P.
- (ii) Agreement No. 14SL/1972. Shell Development (Australia) Proprietary Limited. to Forex Australia Pty. Limited affecting Farm-out Agreement No. 8SL/1972 registered against Exploration Permit No. WA-30-P.

- (iii) Agreement No. 1SL/1973
B.O.C. of Australia Limited *et al*
to
Black Star Petroleum Pty. Ltd.
affecting
Exploration Permit No. WA-32-P.
- (iv) Agreement No. 2SL/1973.
Abrolhos Oil No Liability and B.P. Petroleum Development Australia Proprietary Limited
to
Esso Exploration & Production Australia Inc.
affecting
Exploration Permit No. W.A.-40-P.
- (v) Agreement No. 3SL/1973.
Canadian Superior Oil (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. *et al*
to
Continental Oil Company of Australia Limited
affecting
Exploration Permit No. WA-27-P.
- (vi) Heads of Agreement. West Australian Petroleum Pty. Limited
to
Ocean Ventures Pty. Limited, Interstate Oil Limited and the Tidewater Group of Companies
affecting
Exploration Permit No. WA-21-P.
- (vii) Agreement in Principle. West Australian Petroleum Pty. Limited
to
Bridge Oil N.L., Olay Explorations Pty. Limited, Okura Trading Co. (Australia) Pty. Limited and Toyoda Kosan K.K.
affecting
Exploration Permit No. WA-2-P.
- (viii) Approval in Principle. Beaver Exploration Australia N.L.
to
An overseas partner yet to be nominated
affecting
Farm-out Agreement No. 11SL/1972 registered against Exploration Permit No. WA-31-P.

- (b) A condition precedent to my approving a farm agreement is the obtaining of a clearance from the Australian Government. This clearance must

be based on that Government's specified responsibilities under the Commonwealth-States Agreement. Applications received are referred initially without recommendation to the Australian Government. Follow-up action in respect of these applications has indicated support by this State.

- (2) In accordance with 1 (b) above, the agreements and proposals have been referred to the Australian Government on the following dates—
(i) 30/11/72
(ii) 28/12/72
(iii) 12/2/73
(iv) As heads of agreement 24/11/72. As a formal agreement 12/3/73
(v) 10/8/73
(vi) 31/1/73
(vii) 21/3/73
(viii) 14/9/73
- (3) (a) The Australian Government has deferred its consent in all cases except (viii). The Australian Government has not yet replied to the referral under (viii).
(b) Because of the deferrals no reasons have been given. In two instances, a reason for deferral has been given, i.e. in (v) and (vii)—in the "national interest".
- (4) *Prima facie* I would like to see all the farm-ins and farm-outs mentioned above approved but it must be appreciated that I am unable to make a formal and final decision until a clearance from the Australian Government in respect of its specified responsibilities has been obtained.
- (5) (a) and (b) Answered by (1).

QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Exports

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Lamb Marketing Board and the United Farmers and Graziers Sales, or any other organisation, have an arrangement whereby United Farmers and Graziers Sales, or any other organisation, handles all Lamb Marketing Board export sales?
- (2) Has such an export sales organisation arranged a processing room at Midland Junction?

- (3) If the processing room has been arranged, does this arrangement have the approval of the State Government and appropriate departments?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

- (1) No. The board has no such arrangement with any organisation.
- (2) No.
- (3) No.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Talc Plant at Leighton

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

I wish to ask the Minister a further question arising out of his answer to question 36 on today's notice paper. The second part of my question reads as follows—

Will he explain what pollution making properties a talc milling plant has?

The Minister replied that the matter is being investigated and he will advise me of the result of this in due course.

My question now is: Will the Minister advise the Chamber of the result if the report following the investigation is not too long for inclusion in *Hansard*?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Yes.

3. TIMBER SLEEPERS

Commonwealth Railways: Tenders

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Forests:

What is the significance of the tenders to be called for 200,000 replacement sleepers for the Commonwealth Railways, and in particular—

- (a) Are these purely for maintenance and replacement purposes on the existing permanent way?
- (b) What is the relationship of the area in which these sleepers are to be used as against the area where the concrete sleepers recently contracted for by the Commonwealth Railways are to be used?
- (c) What are the prospects of Commonwealth Railways follow-on orders for Western Australian timber sleepers?
- (d) Are these wooden sleepers to be used as a phasing out programme by the Commonwealth Railways, while concrete sleepers are being phased in?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. H. D. EVANS) replied:

In general, it is welcome news to sawmillers and the south-west of this State. The fact that substantial quantities of timber sleepers will be required beyond the next three or four years, up to 10 years, will certainly assist in the long term stability of the timber industry.

- (a) Yes.
- (b) The timber sleepers will be used to maintain that part of the Commonwealth track not being resleepered with concrete.
- (c) Similar contracts to the one just called for will continue for three or four years and in substantial quantities beyond that time up to 10 years.
- (d) Whilst there is no precise information on this aspect, it would be a reasonable assumption, but it is regarded also as an opportunity to establish more accurately the economics of treated timber versus concrete in this application.

4.

PYRAMID SELLING

Effect of Legislation

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

In view of the concern of a large number of people who now are either members of a pyramid organisation or are considering joining one as to their position if the proposed legislation to ban pyramid selling comes into law, could the Minister for Consumer Protection indicate to Parliament what is generally proposed under this legislation to clarify the situation for the public?

Mr. HARMAN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of his question.

The answer is as follows—

As a number of pyramid organisations are obviously continuing their recruiting activity at least at their previous level and, in some cases, at an increased level since the Government's announcement of its proposal to ban pyramid selling, I agree that some clarification is necessary.

As stated previously, it is the Government's intention to introduce legislation to ban pyramid selling in this State.

The Australian Government is taking similar action in the restrictive trade practices legislation at present before Parliament. It is our intention to use a similar definition to that used by the Australian Government to ensure there is no confusion in the matter. We intend to include similar penalties to those suggested by the Australian Government. The effect of the legislation will be to make it illegal for a person or persons to seek or obtain a benefit by inducing others to join in a scheme. The legislation will further ban the endless recruiting involved in pyramid selling schemes.

People who have stocks of goods supplied by a pyramid selling scheme will not be prevented from selling these provided they do so within the other laws of the State. However, the main profits normally come from the introduction of new members into the scheme, a practice which will be banned. Members of the public are again strongly urged not to join these schemes. The Chairman of the Consumer Affairs Council, in his recent report, named the companies active in Western Australia and it is considered that all these companies will be prevented from carrying on their present pyramid operation under this legislation.

I have been informed that some participants in Golden Products are advising intending members that this company has been exempted from the provisions of legislation in other States. No State has legislated yet in this regard, although most have either introduced Bills into Parliament or announced they intend to introduce legislation. As far as I am aware the intent of these Bills is identical to our intent and certainly firms such as Golden Products and Dare to be Great will not be able to continue their present form of operation anywhere in Australia, if the intended legislation becomes law in each State.

Some of the better known companies are using a range of different names to confuse the public and the public is

warned to be careful of vague advertisements for ambitious people, offering executive positions, or part-time work with promises of large rewards. Legitimate advertisements of this sort are usually over a firm's name or a recognised management consultant's name. In many cases the telephone number quoted is an answering service and details are not available over the telephone. Appointments are generally made for the evening and applicants are often asked to bring their spouses.

5.

POST OFFICES

Country Towns: Closure

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

I would like to ask the Premier a further question in relation to the Press report that the Commonwealth Government intends to downgrade 35 post offices in Western Australia. For the information of the Premier, I have checked this report at the Federal level and it is authentic.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How do you know it is authentic?

Mr. McPHARLIN: My information came from a senior member of Parliament.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are then in a position to supply the answer.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I asked the Premier whether he had protested to the Federal Government and he said he has no information regarding the proposal. Surely if such action is proposed this information should be forthcoming to the Premier. I ask the Premier again: Will he take action to protest against these proposals?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied: The Leader of the Country Party is entitled to think what he likes—that is his prerogative. However, as I told him earlier, I have no information.

Mr. O'Connor: If it is true, will you take the action?

Mr. Nalder: In the interests of Western Australia?

Mr. O'Neil: Supposititious!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is not always safe to rely on Press articles. I will give a classic example of an incorrect Press report this month. Whilst in Canberra recently I read in one newspaper that a man working in the Queen's Household had paid his own fare to Australia.

On the same day I read a report in another newspaper that he had travelled to Australia but did not have to pay his fare.

Sir Charles Court: What has that to do with post offices?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: In view of this recent experience, I am not prepared to take as Gospel everything which appears in the Press. I make the same reply to the question: If the Leader of the Country Party will supply me with authentic information that it is the intention of the Australian Government to close 35 post offices

Mr. McPharlin: Downgrade.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: —or to downgrade certain post offices, then I will take the appropriate action.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. HARMAN (Maylands—Minister for Labour) [5.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.10 p.m.]: I wish briefly to record our final protest against this measure. I state quite unequivocally our belief that this piece of legislation does a great disservice to the majority of the moderate unionists in Western Australia. The Bill was clearly designed to emasculate the arbitration system as we know it, and to throw total control of the industries of this State and the men who work in those industries into the hands of the militant left wing of the union movement.

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [5.11 p.m.]: I want to endorse the remarks just made. The second reading debate was very efficiently handled by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harman: And the Minister.

Mr. O'Neil: You know the story about self-praise!

Mr. McPHARLIN: When this Bill was introduced, it was handled by the previous Minister for Labour. I sympathise with the present Minister who had to take over in midstream. It was not an easy piece of legislation, and we all felt sympathetic towards him, although we do not believe in the legislation.

The Opposition feels this measure would give too much control to unionists who would be able to dictate policy to a greater extent than they can at present. This measure will not supply the service to the community that was intended. I use this

debate as the last opportunity to protest against this measure on behalf of the Country Party.

MR. HARMAN (Maylands—Minister for Labour) [5.12 p.m.]: I wish to say that this Bill is probably one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation in regard to industrial arbitration to come before this Parliament. We have taken the opportunity to include in the industrial arbitration law a system known as mediation and conciliation to determine industrial disputes. I hope that when this measure goes to another place the members there will consider earnestly the proposals we seek to add to the legislation.

Mr. O'Neil: Tell us about the other diabolical clauses—putting certain people above the law.

Mr. HARMAN: Members will notice that the Bill provides also for quarterly cost-of-living adjustments; for the commission to grant retrospective payments; and for the reinstatement of workers in certain circumstances. Provision is made to settle industrial disputes and to preserve industrial harmony.

Sir Charles Court: And to defeat the Industrial Commission!

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Harman
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Hickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. May
Mr. B. T. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. T. J. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Moller

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Blakie	Mr. McPharlin
Sir David Brand	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neil
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rushton
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Sibson
Mr. Jones	Mr. Gayfer
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Thompson
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Mensaros

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR. A. A. LEWIS (Blackwood) [5.18 p.m.]: Before commencing my remarks, I congratulate the member for Balcatta on his maiden speech. I hope he makes many more here in that form because the brevity of his speech was commendable.

I notice the Premier looking at me very wisely. I wish he was as wise in making public statements as he appears to be when he is looking at people, because in this morning's newspaper there appears an article with the heading—

Tonkin sees no acute shortages

As the member for Moore has said, the statement may not be correct, but in another set of papers I have here there is printed a similar statement made by the Premier, and as those papers are the *Votes and Proceedings* for this House I should imagine that they would be reasonably accurate.

Mr. Hutchinson: Shortages of what?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: He said there were no acute shortages of building materials, home appliances, spare parts, and farm machinery. I will deal with only one of those because I know something about it.

Mr. Lapham: Farm machinery.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: That interjection will stop any rot because the honourable member apparently agrees at the start that I know something about farm machinery. For the Treasurer and Premier of this State to state categorically that there was no acute shortage of farm equipment in this State is misleading in the extreme.

Mr. Bertram: There is nothing unusual about misleading the House.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Apparently the member for Mt. Hawthorn considers this to be somewhat amusing, but to the general public it is not amusing. It is disastrous that we should have the Premier and Treasurer of this State not knowing the condition of his major industry; namely, the rural industry. He does not know the conditions of the industry that is keeping his Treasury solvent.

It is a shocking state of affairs that such a statement by the Premier should be published in the Press and circulated among the public, following a misleading statement made in this House.

Let us review a few of the facts which will confirm that the farming machinery business is in a disastrous situation. After a number of poor seasons because of adverse climatic and economic conditions the farmers are now approaching somewhere near normality. However, as yet they are a long way from catching up with the rest of the community. Over a period of 10 years the rise in their earnings is approximately 1.2 per cent, which is lower than the increase in the average earnings of an ordinary member of the community. However, the farmers have gained new confidence, and despite what the Federal Govern-

ment is trying to do to them they will buy machinery if they can obtain it.

At present there is only about one-third of the farm machinery necessary in this State to meet the total demand. If that does not represent an acute shortage, I would like to know what does.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Could you tell me on what you base that opinion?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I base it on facts and not on misleading information.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Where are they available?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: If the Premier and his department cannot obtain this information I will get it for them. If he so desires he can telephone the Tractor Machinery Association and obtain the details. Instead the Premier makes these statements without referring to the people who know what they are talking about. Just because it is a slick answer anything can be said as though the members in this Chamber knew nothing.

Mr. Bertram: You can say that again.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Let me return to this critical situation in regard to farm machinery which the Premier still cannot understand. The position is that all makes of machinery have been sold out to at least the 30th June of next year, and many makes have been sold out to the end of next year. The dealers do not have any machines available. Two or three of the top dealers in this State who have up to 40 men employed do not have any machines for sale until the end of next year. Those men comprise salesmen and servicemen.

The servicemen may be retained by these firms, but I doubt whether they will be able to hold other members of their staff. I regret that the Minister for Development and Decentralisation is not present in the Chamber this evening, because we hear a great deal from those on the other side about decentralisation. This Government has made no effort to keep people in the country by taking steps to solve the present critical situation. In fact, Government members do not even understand the position.

I will cite as an example one country town which I know fairly well. The firm in that town, which holds the Western Australian dealership for a certain make of machinery, has 42 people on its staff. Of those 18 will have to be retrenched and they will be obliged to return to the city, because the machinery dealer cannot obtain sufficient stock to sell and he does not have any build-up of new machinery stock. As a result there is no free servicing on machines for mechanics to carry out and there are no machines for the salesmen to sell. Yet the Premier has stated that there is not an acute shortage of farm machinery! I have heard some rot in my time, but this statement really takes the bun!

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are talking some now.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Yet the Premier and his colleagues can stand up in this House and talk about decentralisation. What a hide!

Let us look at the future of the farm machinery business in this State. The imports of farm machinery for the next 12 months will meet only about one-fifth of the demand. One firm that I know of, which has ordered 287 headers from overseas, will be able to deliver 53 only. Yet the Premier has said there is no acute shortage of farm machinery in this State!

Mr. Bickerton: Apparently there is a shortage overseas.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The production of farm machinery in Australia is being held up by a series of strikes, either by clutch makers—

Mr. Bickerton: Oh!

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: They do not deal in used machines.

Mr. Bickerton: You certainly know something about culture. You would be the greatest actor I have seen.

Mr. O'Connor: It is all right to disregard this sort of thing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Blackwood.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: In such a serious situation—

Mr. Bickerton: I can see it is.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS:—one would think the Minister would be greatly concerned, but no, all he is thinking about is the "clutch" and not the manufacturer.

Mr. Bickerton: I am thinking about the clutch all right. We have the socialistic clutch.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I do not know whether the Minister could have a socialistic clutch. I am talking only about clutches in regard to which I have no intention of misleading the House. There are numerous situations of this kind in Western Australia where delivery of many machines is being held up because storemen in tyre factories will not deliver tyres. There are hundreds of places where hydraulic engineers are on strike and it is impossible to obtain hydraulic components. Strangely enough this occurred when the manufacturers were reaching the stage of making tyres available again following the storemen going out on strike. That is not coincidence; it has been organised to the detriment of our national economy.

Apart from there being an acute shortage of farm machinery, the Federal Government has taken steps to aggravate the position. The Premier said something about a shortage of steel, but who would have any desire to produce steel if a control is placed over prices and there is the prospect of receiving a return of only 1 per cent. on the money invested? Further, the firm that produces our steel was then

told that it could not import its own labour. What have these restrictions done to the industries of this country? They have put this country 12 months behind in all its production. I can see the member for Mt. Hawthorn is about to interject, but he knows nothing about the conditions in the city let alone in the country.

This steel shortage has been engendered by a series of decisions made by the prices tribunal people. The company was told it could have only a 3 per cent. rise in the price of its products and yet its cost of labour has risen by twice that figure. It was then told by the Minister for Immigration that it cannot continue with its immigration programme which it has conducted successfully for many years. Therefore, with an acute shortage of farm machinery within the State, and with political action being taken against farm machinery companies, where do we go? I wonder.

We should look at this question more closely because to date the Treasury has not conducted any survey with a view to seeking a solution to the problem, and it is about time it did. I received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition containing information that the Treasury may conduct such a survey, and I hope, after it has been advised of what I have said this afternoon, that it will take action to conduct a survey. I know that talks have been held between the major companies and the Government is fully aware of the situation. That information appears in part (2) of the answer to the question on this subject wherein it was stated that there is no acute shortage of farm machinery, and yet we are often told that the House is not misled.

Mr. Bertram: Who told you that?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The Premier has told us so many times that he does not mislead the House that it is absolutely laughable.

Ever since I have been in this Chamber he and the member for Mt. Lawley have been engaged in a running battle as to whether answers were accurate. While the point is still fresh in his mind I am bringing these facts to the attention of the House because if it is not deliberately misleading, it is scandalous when a Premier and Treasurer makes these statements without knowing the facts or attempting to obtain them.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: What is the meaning of the word "nominal"?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Who is talking about that word?

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: You are.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I am talking about something definite, not nominal. I am talking about someone misleading the House—

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: So am I.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: —when giving answers to questions. In my school we did not gain a 98.8 per cent. pass for nothing. We had to work for any pass we gained.

Point of Order

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I think it is time the new member started to learn a few lessons.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is against Standing Orders to accuse a member of deliberately misleading the House; and that is the accusation the member for Blackwood has made against me and which I ask to be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: If I did say that, I withdraw it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You did.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I will withdraw it if I said it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has withdrawn the statement. Carry on.

Debate Resumed

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I will, because it is obvious a certain gentleman leading the other side is getting touchy and is trying to teach younger members manners, and what-have-you.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am not touchy. You have a few lessons to learn and I thought you might just as well start learning now.

Mr. May: He did not refer to young members. He referred to new members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will respectfully ask the honourable member to address the Chair and then we will have no trouble.

Sir Charles Court: You will get a much more attentive audience, too. If the Premier does not believe there is a shortage, he should go to the country shows where they have only borrowed equipment to display.

Mr. Bickerton: I think the honourable member is getting touchy.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think so. He seldom does.

Mr. Bickerton: That is misleading the Chamber!

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I am sorry about that! Mr. Deputy Speaker, I actually thought you and not those on the front bench were in charge of the House. Am I at liberty to address you, Sir?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest you address the Chair and ignore interjections.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let me return to the tragedy of statements made in the House that there were no acute shortages. I think I

have proved fairly forcibly that acute shortages do exist. If the Government had any go in it at all it would be looking into this matter. However, with its total and utter lack of leadership which has been the case for 2½ years, it cannot be expected to do anything. The Government does not see the problems. It does not consider there are any problems, but that everything in the garden is rosy.

Nevertheless, the people producing the wealth of this State are being penalised because they are not being supplied with the tools with which to harvest our grain and with which to make hay and forage. While on the subject of hay and forage let me refer again to the Federal Budget. The two most important necessities in agriculture are water and fodder. We heard the member for Wembley discuss at length with other members the tragedy of the Federal Budget in relation to water.

Equally tragic is the lack of availability of hay sheds and silos, and the fact that forage machinery depreciation has been altered to a 10-year term. Those who know something about forage machinery would be aware of the fact that no forage machine would work efficiently for 10 years. The life of a highly productive machine like that is in the region of five to six years for a top producer.

Of course, in its usual way, the Federal Government could not care less about the farmer. It quotes arbitrary figures and could not care less about water in the country or whether machinery is available. I believe that if this trend continues, this State's agricultural production will fall dramatically, and whatever Government is in power in Canberra will be hit in its hip pocket. So I implore the Premier and Treasurer to study these matters and try to do something constructive before he goes out of office.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Grayden.

House adjourned at 5.37 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 30th October, 1973

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

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Tabling

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I wish to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations for the year ended the 30th June, 1973.

The report was tabled.