

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 18th October, 1978

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

ALCOA'S WAGERUP ALUMINA REFINERY

Government's Approval: Ministerial Statement

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [4.31 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on a matter of important public business.

Leave granted.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I thank members for their indulgence. I think they will appreciate that the matter about which I am to make the statement is of sufficient importance for the documents concerned to be tabled with an appropriate explanation.

The Government has given the go-ahead for the \$200 million first stage of the alumina refinery to be built at Wagerup by Alcoa of Australia Limited.

The Government has accepted the recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority.

Approval for the Wagerup project to proceed has been given subject to conditions recommended by the EPA and accepted by Alcoa.

The Government accepts EPA's assessment that, under these conditions, the new refinery can operate economically for a minimum of 30 years without risk to forestry, water resources, or conservation and recreation.

The first stage of the project will provide direct work for almost 700 people at the peak of construction.

It will have a significant multiplier effect in allied and service industries, and will have a big beneficial impact on public facilities like railways, the Bunbury Port, and housing.

The initial permanent work force will be 250 people, rising progressively to 1 000 as the refinery grows to its approved size.

Commonwealth Fully Informed:

The State, by arrangement with the Commonwealth, has had the responsibility for detailed environmental assessment of the project.

It has fully informed the Federal Government on this question and has advised them that it is satisfied the project should proceed.

The Minister for Conservation and the Environment (Mr O'Connor) has flown to Canberra so that the Federal Minister for the Environment (Mr Groom) could receive a final personal briefing.

Our environmental conditions and approval to proceed are supported by the Commonwealth on the assurance that the Western Australian Government will ensure Alcoa's compliance with any agreement made with that company and the conditions imposed by the EPA.

Significant Test:

The process of arriving at the decision has been a significant and satisfying test of the environmental assessment required for major projects.

In compliance with the terms of its agreement with the Government Alcoa submitted a draft environmental review and management programme last May for approval by the State.

The document was subjected to intensive official assessments by the EPA, supported by a technical advisory group.

The draft ERMP was available for public review and comment for eight weeks.

The EPA considered 186 submissions received from individuals and organisations in response to Government advertisements calling for comment. Of these, 63 were major submissions.

The EPA recommended that the draft ERMP not be accepted by the Government in the form in which it was submitted.

Alcoa then submitted amendments to its ERMP in line with the EPA's recommendations and these were accepted.

Conditions of Development:

The conditions under which Alcoa will operate are as follows—

Alcoa is authorised at this stage to develop the Wagerup refinery to a production level of two million tonnes a year.

Further development of the Wagerup refinery, or Alcoa's two other refineries at Kwinana and Pinjarra, will be subject to State Government approval following the same kind of environmental assessment as has been applied to Wagerup.

Alcoa's mining plans will be subject to agreement between the company and the State—with proper regard for commercial viability and the requirements of forest management, conservation, water supplies, and recreation.

Provision has been made for a process of arbitration in the event of disagreement. This is in line with other major development agreements.

Research:

The State Government will establish a body to co-ordinate all research associated with land use in the Darling Range.

It will be known as the "Darling Range Study Group", and will have—

A full-time chairman reporting directly to Cabinet via the Premier.

A chief research scientist to advise on research priorities, monitor specific projects, and co-ordinate all relevant research.

Land use analysts to examine existing land uses, develop alternate strategies, and undertake analysis of policy options.

As part of the research work to be done, there will be a major new initiative in dieback research. The Government has been assured of Alcoa's matching support and co-operation.

It is important for the public to appreciate that the procedures leading to the Government's approval of the Wagerup projects are part of a constant process of Government and company co-operation in the sound environmental management of the development.

It is one of the strengths of the State's approach to environmental assessment that we do not stop short of assessment of the initial impact.

The State recognises that there is a need not only for exhaustive initial assessment but also for a continuing environmental management programme.

The importance of this can be appreciated from the fact that mining is expected to continue in the safe western zone of the Darling Range well into the next century.

It is of importance also that the State and the company have agreed that mining will not take place in the eastern lower rainfall zone of Alcoa's mining lease until research shows that it can be done without significantly increasing the salinity of present or future public water supplies.

Going Ahead:

Now that the required assessment has been thoroughly and properly completed, and approval given, I am sure the whole State will look forward to this important project going ahead as quickly as possible.

It will bring great employment opportunities and economic and social benefits to the south-

west and to the State as a whole, without threat to the environment.

We intend to play our part in seeing that this job proceeds as quickly and effectively as possible.

I seek leave to table a copy of this statement together with the following associated documents—

- (1) Wagerup Alumina Project
Environmental Review and
Management Programme, dated
September, 1978.
- (2) Report and Recommendations by the
Environmental Protection Authority,
dated September, 1978, plus Addendum
dated October, 1978.
- (3) Bauxite Mining in the Darling Range,
Western Australia—Report to the
Environmental Protection Authority by
its Technical Advisory Group, dated
August, 1978.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 431).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

COLLEGES BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Education), and read a first time.

RESERVE AND ROAD CLOSURE BILL

Second Reading

Mr O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.02 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Reserve No. 28402 was set apart in 1966 for the purpose "site of main buildings of the University of WA" as part of a land exchange agreement between the then Government and the university. It is held in fee simple in trust by the university.

The original agreement between the Government and the university for a transfer of land along the Crawley foreshore and relocation of Hackett Drive was made during the time of the Hawke Government, but it is considered the present Government still has an obligation to retain the spirit of the original agreement.

Under the 1966 agreement, Hackett Drive was to be relocated and a road deviation was surveyed for this purpose. The redundant portion of Hackett Drive was deemed to be part of the exchange, and was to be included in Class "A"

Reserve No. 28402 when the new alignment was constructed which would divert traffic to The Esplanade. The new road was never built, and after several years of deliberation it is no longer considered an acceptable alignment to either the City of Subiaco or the City of Nedlands, which favour the use of Princess Road.

The new alignment of Hackett Drive has now been prepared by the Main Roads Department, and Cabinet has agreed to changes to the 1966 agreement in order to implement the proposal which involves excision from Class "A" Reserve No. 28402. Two portions of the reserve situated south-eastward of the new road will be excised also, and utilised for public open space, and the university is prepared to relinquish all three areas.

Agreement to the new plan has been indicated by the City of Nedlands. The previous Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning held informed talks with the Mayor and Town Clerk of Subiaco and, at council's request, the Minister met with them on the 14th September to discuss the issue.

Council believed that it was not bound with respect to the realignment of Hackett Drive, on the ground that it was not a party to the 1966 agreement and that it therefore does not have to agree with the proposed amendment. In addition, council felt that the road would be built too close to the river and that the design incorporating a reverse curve is unsound.

As it is possible that the Subiaco City Council may refuse to request the Lands and Surveys Department to dedicate the proposed road, it is proposed that all the land to be ceded by the university be vested in the Crown, in order that the Commissioner of Main Roads could be requested to construct the road.

This Bill seeks also the sanction of Parliament to permit closure of the deviated portions of road, part of which is already committed to the university. The smaller portion will probably be incorporated with the two portions of Reserve No. 28402, which will be excised.

This Bill seeks authority to amend Class "A" Reserve No. 28402 to exclude the Hackett Drive realignment, and Swan Locations 9881 and 8177, and to permit closure of the deviated portions of Hackett Drive when the new alignment has been officially constructed.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [5.05 p.m.]: I would like to take the time of the House to comment very briefly on the metropolitan aspects of this legislation and to try to place it into perspective. It seems to me that two aspects of Government policy with regard to water are clashing here and that the end result will not necessarily be a happy one for water users in the metropolitan area.

Before looking at the reasons that the Government has gone in for legislation concerning the taking of ground and artesian water—a practice which has become increasingly common over the last two summers in the Perth metropolitan area—I would like to refer to the action the Government took recently in very significantly increasing the charges that people pay for scheme water.

The fact of the matter is that we have had two dry summers and very heavy water restrictions over the last couple of years. The net result has been that many people have turned to providing their own water supply by way of artesian bores on their own properties to alleviate some of the problems which have arisen for them in maintaining their gardens because of the restrictions on the availability of water.

Fortunately, water seems to be a little more plentiful now but the Government is making the use of scheme water much more uneconomical for the average person by increasing the charges by what I estimate will be at least an average of 50 per cent for every person paying his water bill in the next year. That very significant increase in the cost of scheme water makes bore water a much more economic proposition.

The way in which the Government's charging system works allows for the further likelihood of bores being used and people providing their own water supplies for lawns and gardens because it is a much more economic proposition for them.

At the same time the Government is moving to place restrictions on artesian and groundwater for the very obvious, plausible, and solid reason that unrestricted use of groundwater by everyone in the Perth metropolitan area will result, in the long run, in damage to all.

However, it can be seen that these two aspects of Government policy clash. The Government is moving to place a limit or control on the use of artesian water. At the same time the water charging policies as they relate to scheme water

are making it more likely that people will use bores because of the economic implications involved.

I would like to jump on from that to the fear which many people who now own bores have. They fear the placing of restrictions on the use of bores will be the first step towards the introduction of a tax on the water they take from the ground.

I am sure the Minister has already said in the Press, if not in the Parliament, that the Government has no such intention of placing a tax on bores and it may well be the case that in the present stage of Government decision-making no such tax has even been discussed. But the implications of what I am saying make it quite clear that a tax on bores is a likely next step and it relates to the economic points I have made already.

The Government is making the use of scheme water uneconomic, which will tip people into using bores. They are becoming a more economical way of providing water because the cost of a bore is relatively constant and the water it supplies is free, apart from the cost of pumping.

The Government may find it has to put some sort of economic restriction on the use of ground or artesian water by placing a charge on the use of this water and so tipping the economies back in favour of people using the scheme water. It is a catch 22 situation. The more the Government charges for water the less people will use it because they will not be able to afford it. The more the people cut back on the use of scheme water the more costly the water will become per unit because the same operating and capital costs have to be met.

If this eventuates we will see spiralling costs for scheme water in the metropolitan area and the greater use by the public of artesian and groundwater for purely economic rather than the supply reasons which have been motivating people over the last couple of years.

What sort of restrictions can the Government put on people to persuade them not to use groundwater to such an extent? I believe it can straightout forbid it or refuse to give people licences to put down bores, which I would imagine would be such an unpopular move no Government would consider it. The Government might apply a tax on the use of artesian water. Even if the Government has not considered this it will be forced to consider it in a year or two when the situation works out in the way I am outlining.

That being the case we have to look at this legislation very carefully. It is not a final solution

to this matter; it is not even a partial solution. It is a partly thought out first step towards the sort of rationalised situation I am discussing.

People who have put down bores in the last couple of years, often at fairly considerable expense, are looking to recover that expense by way of free water. These people will be horrified at the thought they may be paying certain costs per unit of water they are taking from the ground.

I accept there cannot be an unrestricted taking of ground or artesian water from the Perth metropolitan area by all and sundry; some rationalising has to be done. I would like to hear exactly the way in which the Government intends to do that because the present legislation is nowhere near specific enough to say what action—

Mr O'Connor: Are you distinguishing between ground and artesian water?

Mr PEARCE: I will come to that distinction later because the Minister is making another error there. There is nothing in this legislation which would stop the practice of people putting down bores into either deep or shallow water levels. To sink bores to the deeper levels may require a licensed driller, but an amendment to the Bill may take out that aspect which may be a pity.

If everyone took water from the artesian levels we would be in a difficult situation indeed because all our scheme water, like that coming from the Gnangara mound, would be affected. In areas like the low-lying portions of Gosnells we are already seeing the effect on habitat by people taking water from the upper levels.

One of the realities is that it will be much cheaper for people to put down bores, not into the deep sections of water where the water is plentiful, but into the shallow levels. This water is replenished from rainfall and is easily affected. We may then find our environment is being affected, which would be most unfortunate indeed.

Again, the considerations involved in any one person's decision on what sort of bore to put down are such that the economic pressures push people into sinking shallow bores, which I believe are of a most undesirable type.

Many questions are raised by this legislation and not many answers are given. There is the possibility of a tax on bores, which is something which would horrify most people. Those members who have thought about the matter would see the Government does not have a coherent policy. This is the real problem and I am convinced the decision to allow the sinking of shallow bores,

which people can do themselves, is not in the best interests of the environment. Until these questions are resolved—and I do not think they are by this legislation—I will vote against the Bill.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.15 p.m.]: As a member who represents metropolitan constituents I accept the responsibility to express my opposition to the Bill and to express vocally the fears of those of my electors who have spoken to me about it.

In recent months this Government has proved to members in the House and to the people of Western Australia that it cannot be trusted. To our peril and much to the regret of Western Australians generally, we on this side of the House in respect of sensitive issues trusted this Government twice that I can recall and the people are now paying the price. We have absolutely no intention whatever of supporting the legislation despite the fact there are some parts of it which are worthy of support.

I draw attention to the double-cross as a result of the State Housing Commission legislation. On this side of the House we supported, with gentlemanly agreements and understandings, a proposition to impose a minimal charge for the keeping of accounts of tenants of the SHC.

Mr Blaikie: What has that to do with water?

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I will demonstrate it to the member for Vasse in a moment. We supported that proposition only to find that after a very short interval a very substantial fee was being imposed on the families who could least afford to pay it.

Mr P. V. Jones: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr Sodeman: What a weak excuse that is!

Mr BRYCE: Later in this Parliament, the other aspect of this Government's fairly disastrous water policy was introduced outlining the Government's future policies with regard to the pay-as-you-use water scheme. The Minister handling the Bill at the time, with all the soft-sell expertise in the world, convinced this Parliament there was one of four nice convenient methods available to the Government to implement, by regulation, the policy if the legislation was changed. In good faith we were prepared to accept the bona fides of the Government.

Mr Tonkin: Never again!

Mr BRYCE: However we were double-crossed because this Government brought in the most vicious system of pay-as-you-use water pricing the State has ever experienced. Not only did it bring in a vicious scheme, but also it back-dated the

charge. It was retrospective. Rather than adopt the scheme from the end of June or the beginning of July, the month the scheme itself was introduced, the decision was made to back-date it and many people began to receive these usurious water charges back-dated to February, 1978.

That gives us ample reason to say that the fears of the people are justified and that we on this side of the House will not trust the Government in respect of this legislation. We have ample justification to say that provided for in this Bill is the reality that people of the metropolitan area will face licences on their private bores and, inevitably, a tax and/or meter on those bores, in view of droughts we have had in recent times and the increasing cost of scheme water.

It is very fine indeed for the Minister to release a public statement indicating that the Government does not intend to do so, but the reality is that the Government can do it if this piece of legislation becomes law, and for that reason we are very much opposed to it.

My colleague, the member for Gosnells, has already indicated to members that because the Government has introduced a system of pay-as-you-use for water, the actual cost of scheme water is becoming prohibitive. If last year's drought is not a sufficient incentive, then this year's exorbitant costs will encourage more and more people to sink bores in their own back or front yards for a private supply of water. However, we find that the same Government which double-crossed the Opposition on the question of the SHC management fee, and the same Government which gave us these parsimonious guarantees that it would be a reasonable fee based on one of four options—

Mr Sodeman: How do you double-cross an Opposition?

Mr BRYCE: —now comes to the people and says that it does not really have any intention of licensing people's private bores or putting meters on them. We on this side of the House say that the power is being given to the Government to do so and when it suits the Government it will most certainly do it. We on this side of the House are opposed to the legislation.

MR TONKIN (Morley) [5.21 p.m.]: We do not believe a Government would give itself the power to license bores unless it intended to use it, and we believe the Government does intend to license bores. Under the legislation the Government is giving itself the power to fine people \$1 000 for using water from a bore they put down on their own property and which they may have put down years beforehand or because they were forced to

do so as a result of the Government's refusal to provide a proper water supply. These people who, in good faith, have put down these bores will be affected by the legislation because the Government is giving itself power to proclaim any part of the State as requiring a licence, and if the area is proclaimed and a licence is refused a person who takes one drop of water—that is what the Bill states—from a bore on his own property which he sank at a cost of \$2 000, will be fined up to \$1 000 and, in fact, \$50 a day for each day the offence continues.

Therefore we are opposed to the legislation. It is not good enough for the Government to say, "Trust us. We are nice people." Why on earth would the Government give itself the power if it did not intend to use it? Why submit the legislation to the House if it is not intended to be used? We believe the Government is likely to use it at any time.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that we trusted the Government twice recently. The people trusted the Government with respect to the pay-as-you-use water scheme and the SHC management fee. We do not intend to trust this Government again and we do not intend to recommend to the people that they trust the Government. If the Government does not want to fine people \$1 000 for taking water from their own bores, why is it giving itself these powers?

MR WILSON (Dianella) [5.23 p.m.]: The Bill before us at the moment is a good example of what might be called a sledgehammer Government. It is the kind of Government which gives itself more power than it says it needs. It is the kind of Government which is not prepared to put curbs on the power it gives itself. It is very willing to put curbs on the powers it gives individuals, but it is unwilling to put curbs on its own action or potential action.

We have read statements by the past Minister for Water Supplies—

Mr Blaikie: He is still with us!

Mr WILSON: —and the present Minister for Water Supplies. When he introduced the Bill, in his second reading speech the previous Minister said that the whole purpose of the Bill was a tidying-up procedure, and of course the new Minister—the present Minister—has used that same euphemism in his Press comments. He said that it is simply a tidying-up measure. One wonders whether there was a slip of the tongue by both Ministers and that they meant to say that it was a "tying-up" measure because in fact that is what it really is.

As I said before, it is a question of a Government giving itself more power than it needs. We have this quite well illustrated in the present Minister's comments reported in the Press. He said that most areas of the metropolitan region are not proclaimed areas and therefore it is not possible for the Government to license bores in those areas because they are not proclaimed areas. He goes on further to say that it would take something like a five-year drought before these areas were proclaimed.

To my knowledge, in living memory or from historical record, there has never been anything like a five-year drought in the metropolitan area of Perth thank goodness, especially with this Government in office! If it would take something like a five-year drought before an area was proclaimed so that bores could be licensed, why on earth are we going ahead with this measure? Can we conceive of such a situation arising? If we cannot conceive of such a situation arising, why does the Government need the power? Why is the Government not prepared to include in the measure limits on its own power to act?

If the Government were really dinkum and sincere when it said it does not intend to go ahead with the licensing of bores, it would be placing on itself curbs which would not allow this Government or any other Government, except through parliamentary measure, to take the action the Opposition is now suspicious it will be forced to take and which it will in fact take.

Of course it is not necessary for such a proposal to come through the Parliament. If the measure is passed it will be possible by means of regulation for this to be introduced, and we know how regulations can slip through even in Parliament. We know that hundreds or more are introduced in a session and that many of them get through without either the public or Parliament being able to give them satisfactory scrutiny.

So the Opposition and the public have good reason to be suspicious of this move by the Government. The Government is not giving enough guarantee that it is prepared to place sufficient controls on its own power to convince the Opposition and many members of the public that it is not intending to take this action. The Government itself does not realise and recognise that it will be forced as a result of its own water charging system to carry out this very policy we are suggesting is intended under the legislation.

Other members have shown, and the Auditor General's report shows, that the Metropolitan Water Board increased last year's earnings by 10 per cent while at the same time it lost 54.2 per

cent of its income from water sales. The report also stated that the deficiency was offset and the gain achieved by increased rates and extensions to services in new areas. If that situation is to worsen, as it undoubtedly will with the factors already brought to the attention of the House by members—the increase in bores and a decrease in use of scheme water—we have to assume what will happen next year.

Is the Government intending to go on increasing water rates to a degree which will make it electorally most unpopular? Will it take that course, or the only alternative course which it will have power to do under this legislation; that is, place licences on private bores put down by individuals to service their own properties?

If the Government is prepared to withdraw the legislation and to make further amendments to control its own powers under the legislation, well and good; but if it will not, it is the bounden duty of the Opposition to object to the Bill and to oppose it very strongly indeed.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [5.30 p.m.]: We in the National Party are a little concerned about the intention of the House to proceed with this legislation at this stage. I will not repeat the many arguments advanced tonight, and on a previous occasion, except to say that we have considerable sympathy with many of the arguments which have been put forward.

I particularly want to refer to a point made by the member for Collie last night. He said that an undertaking was given at a meeting recently held in the Donnybrook area that the Government would delay proceeding with this Bill for about three weeks in order to give the people vitally concerned time for further consideration, and time to advance amendments which they considered necessary. Those people were to be given an opportunity to express their ideas and suggest amendments which would make the Bill more acceptable to them and, perhaps, more workable.

During the speech of the member for Collie I left the Chamber at 10.30 last night and rang Mr Tuia, the shire president at Donnybrook, and he repeated to me that the people in that area were definitely under the impression there would be a delay in the passage of this legislation. In fact, those people were to hold a meeting today to consider further amendments which they were to put to the Government.

In view of that approach, and the undertaking that was given, I think the only reasonable course the Government can take is to delay further consideration of the Bill until such time as those

farmers, and other people vitally affected by this legislation, have time to put forward their views and suggested amendments for consideration by the Government. I ask—and I urge—the Government to take that course.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.32 p.m.]: I do not rise to thank members for their general support of the Bill, but I do wish to make some comments. The member for Warren commented on what he considered to be a hindrance in the construction of dams. From our point of view we have looked at this in the long term. Today, generally dams are much larger than was the case in the past. Where in the past individual farmers or mining companies have put in small dams, in recent times they have become much larger.

The purpose of this legislation is an attempt to make sure that when dams are built they are safe, and that they are not a hindrance.

Mr H. D. Evans: In your crass stupidity you will do just that.

Mr O'CONNOR: If I were like the member for Warren, I would be stupid.

Mr H. D. Evans: You should have more brains.

Mr O'CONNOR: Here we go again; the honourable member carries on in his usual fashion!

Mr H. D. Evans: You do not know the contents of the Bill, or what the Bill is all about.

Mr Bryce: The Minister for Everything!

Mr O'CONNOR: If members opposite do not want me to reply to the points they have raised, I will not do so.

Mr Bryce: That would be the easy way out.

Mr O'CONNOR: I want an opportunity to answer the questions which have been asked.

Mr T. H. Jones: You do not know what is in the Bill.

Mr O'CONNOR: We are concerned that as the dams become bigger there could be—and there has been in some cases—a danger to individuals and properties. We believe it is the job of government to try to protect the lives of people and protect property wherever we possibly can.

Last night the member for Warren instanced a case where a dam in the Pemberton area broke its banks. He said in this House that had it not been for other dams further down stream, which happened to hold back the water, the caravan park at Pemberton would have finished up in the Indian Ocean. Yet, here he is criticising our attempts to avoid that situation. We are trying to protect people from that type of situation.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is rubbish! Not one farmer has argued against the safety aspect; the argument has been against the costs. You will subsidise one half of the farmers, and charge the others.

Mr O'CONNOR: I listened to the member for Warren last night, but I regret that he has not the courtesy to do the same to me tonight.

Mr H. D. Evans: You did not learn much.

Mr O'CONNOR: Certainly. Who could learn anything from listening to the member for Warren?

Mr Bryce: The Minister would do well to listen.

Mr T. H. Jones: The big strong hand of government!

Mr O'CONNOR: We do not want to have to shut the gate after the horse has bolted. We want to make sure that people are protected, and that is the reason for the legislation now before the House. If certain members opposite want to disregard the safety of the community—human lives and property—let them oppose the measure.

Mr Davies: What about the rights of the individual?

Mr O'CONNOR: As far as we are concerned, the aspect of safety does come into the picture. There have been a number of cases where dams in other parts of the world have burst, and a considerable number of lives have been lost. We want to make sure this does not happen here. As I have said, the member for Warren last night indicated an instance in his own electorate where it almost happened.

Members came up with a considerable number of arguments in connection with dams, but if they look at the proposed amendments they will see that their objections will be overcome to a great extent.

Mr T. H. Jones: The amendments do nothing.

Mr H. D. Evans: There is not a thing with regard to new dams.

Mr O'CONNOR: In the case of completed referable dams, the engineers will be carrying out the work at Government expense.

Mr T. H. Jones: What happens with new dams?

Mr H. D. Evans: Why not with the new dams?

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not believe that is a Government responsibility. If an individual decides to construct a dam which is unsafe to the community in the area, it will be a danger. It is up to the individual to make sure that that dam is safe.

Mr H. D. Evans: But he will already do that.

Mr O'Neil: Then there will be no safety problem, will there?

Mr O'CONNOR: With regards to penalties, the member for Warren missed the important point. He displayed a total lack of knowledge. He has been in this place for many years, and he has been a Minister, but he does not know that when penalties are indicated in a Bill, they are maximum penalties. He has said that he did not know that was the case. He has introduced Bills into this place, as a Minister, and he does not know that when a Bill contains a penalty, it is a maximum penalty.

I refer members to the particular section of the Interpretation Act which covers the situation. Section 29 of that Act states that the penalty or punishment, pecuniary or otherwise, set out—

(b) in, or at the foot of, any part of any section of any Act,

shall indicate that any contravention of such section or part, whether by act or omission, shall be an offence against such Act, punishable upon conviction by a penalty or punishment not exceeding that so set out; or, where a minimum as well as a maximum penalty or punishment is so set out, by a penalty or punishment not less than such minimum, and not more than such maximum:

Provided that where the penalty or punishment is expressed to apply to a part only of the section, it shall apply to that part only.

I repeat: It amazes me that a person who has been a member of this House for so long, and who as a Minister has introduced Bills containing penalties, obviously did not know that the penalties imposed were maximum penalties.

Mr H. D. Evans: I would know more about the matter than does the Minister.

Mr O'CONNOR: At least we can now advise the member. It is a pity he did not take some notice when I introduced the Bill.

Mr H. D. Evans: We know the contents of the Bill, and we understand it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Warren does not. That probably worries the honourable member.

Mr H. D. Evans: The Bill does worry me.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Collie spoke for about 30 minutes, but not all of that time was spent on the Bill. He spent about 20 minutes telling us how he was not invited to the Donnybrook meeting; five minutes arguing with the member for Bunbury; and then he spoke for

about 5 minutes in connection with the Bill. Quite frankly, he could not have received many complaints.

Members must realise that where dams are constructed across creek beds, or in other similar areas, different soil structures require different types of walls. One type of wall may be suitable in certain areas, but certainly not in other areas. Clay moves quicker in some areas than it does in others, and it is more susceptible to damage. Individual dam builders must be careful about what is likely to occur.

Some members mentioned that they were worried about costs, and a figure of something like \$3 000 was plucked out of the air.

Mr H. D. Evans: It was not plucked out of the air. There were discussions with engineers.

Mr O'CONNOR: I make the point that if a person builds a house, he has to take out insurance. If a person builds a dam, which could create some danger, why should he not also insure?

Let us look at the type of dam which will be affected. It has to have a wall of 10 metres—35 feet. That is a very big wall. That dam will have a capacity of something like 10 million gallons of water. That is not the normal type of farm dam. Members have indicated that this is the type of dam which will be affected, and that it will worry farmers. Quite frankly, it will not affect a great number of farmers in this State.

Mr H. D. Evans: How many? You do not know.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member opposite does not know how many will be affected in his electorate, but in my electorate there are none.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: There was comment in connection with proclaimed areas and the licensing of bores. Members of this House are aware—and I repeat it again—that in the artesian basin there are certain proclaimed areas. Artesian water is vital. The member for Gosnells appears to think that where water comes from artesian basins it should not be protected. That water is vital and it should be protected. The areas where a problem exists, and from where we want to draw water, are proclaimed, and in those cases it is essential for an individual to get a licence to go down to the artesian basin. I do not think members disagree with that.

In one case where a licence was issued, because of the problems in the area, the Public Works Department requested that a meter should go on the bore, not to charge the individual for the

water, but in order to check the salinity variation after a certain amount of water had been drawn off. The department wanted to ascertain variations in the level of the water. The individual involved refused to allow a meter to be fitted to his bore and, quite frankly, I think that was quite unreasonable because of the area concerned.

I have a bore on my property that goes into the artesian basin and as far as I am concerned the Public Works Department can put a meter on it at any time—provided I am not charged!

Mr T. H. Jones: Have you checked what the Hon. A. A. Lewis had to say?

Mr O'CONNOR: I have checked, and I will give an answer in a moment. I believe the artesian basin is vital to Western Australia where we suffer from a lack of water. I believe we should be able to look after our supplies and place certain requirements on people who wish to use them.

I want to make it quite clear it is not the intention of the Government—nor are we at this stage considering it—to place meters on normal bores, or to license them. I repeat: It is not our intention to put meters on bores in the metropolitan area, or in other areas, apart from those in proclaimed areas.

Mr T. H. Jones: How long will the assurance last?

Mr O'CONNOR: Certainly during the term of this Government.

Mr T. H. Jones: That is another 18 months.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have no intentions any further. Will the member opposite indicate the intentions of the Opposition if it goes into government? The only people who have mentioned meters on bores have been Opposition members.

Mr Bryce: Because the writing is on the wall, and you know it. The member for Clontarf will have fun explaining it away.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the Opposition goes into government, it will probably meter bores. Certainly, they will not be metered in the term of this Government, nor is there any intention to meter bores when we are returned after the next election.

Mr Coyne: They will nationalise every bore in the place.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I repeat: We do not intend to meter bores.

Mr Bryce: But you are giving yourself the power to do it. That is the point.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the honourable member could not appreciate the reasons I gave a while back, I will not explain them again. I will give him a private lesson outside about this matter if he likes.

The member for Gosnells commented on the use of water in the upper aquifer, and I reply to him that most of the water in the upper aquifer in the metropolitan area is totally unsuitable; it is not potable water. Perhaps he would like to have some of this water tested; one needs only to smell it.

Mr Pearce: It still has environmental significance.

Mr O'CONNOR: Everything has environmental significance. Every time we breathe we pollute the environment. Everything we do has environmental significance.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: If we were to follow these environmental protectionist ideas to the nth degree, we would do nothing.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: I would just like to continue, but it is a little difficult with all these interjections. I do not know why there are so many interjections. Obviously the Opposition is concerned, but it is quite wrong in the attitude it is taking towards this issue.

The member for Gosnells told us that many people will now put down bores because it will be more economical to do so than to use the water supplied by the Metropolitan Water Board. One point that we must stress to the people is that anyone using underground water should use it early in the morning or late in the evening. This means there will be less evaporation and more of the water will go back into the ground. That point is certainly well worth considering, and we must encourage people to do this. When lawns are watered in the heat of the day a great deal of the water is lost through evaporation.

Let us take the case of a person who decides to put down a bore on his property. I do not believe that there are many places in the metropolitan area where a bore could be installed for less than \$2 000. So 10 per cent interest on that initial outlay of \$2 000 is \$200 a year. The board water will now be supplied at 17c a kilolitre, so that for \$200 a person would be entitled to 1 250 kilolitres of water—about four times the usage of an average household in a year. In this example we have considered just the interest on the money expended for the bore, but there is still the necessity to maintain the equipment, as well as

the cost of the electricity to run it. Also, every eight to 10 years it is necessary to check the well, perhaps repair it, and maybe even sink it a little deeper.

If we look at the matter in this light, it is more economical for the individual to use the water supplied by the board at 17c a kilolitre. The pumping is provided by the board, and any repairs outside the person's property are taken care of by the board.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have forgotten the restrictions—that is another problem.

Mr O'CONNOR: Of course that is a problem. We could make the comparison that 1 000 gallons of water would cost approximately the same as a bottle of beer. The average person does not worry much about paying out for a bottle of beer, but the Opposition is concerned about the price of 17c for a kilolitre of water. Water is the cheapest commodity we have today.

Mr T. H. Jones: That is if you are able to use the water. It may be that restrictions will be put on it.

Mr O'CONNOR: I believe the public understand this point, and so does the honourable member. At the moment the situation is better than it was last year, and if we do not have another drought next year—

Mr T. H. Jones: We want more dams.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have two dams in the course of construction now.

Mr O'Neil: It is no good having more dams if we cannot fill them.

Mr O'CONNOR: We could draw some more water from Collie.

Mr T. H. Jones: You want to do your homework about salinity.

Mr O'CONNOR: I know there are problems with the Wellington Dam, but there are other sources of water in the Collie area.

I will now return to the Bill. I repeat: The Government is in no way considering metering bores in the metropolitan and country areas, apart from those matters which I have mentioned.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made some very strange statements. He made his normal irrational utterances to indicate first of all that the Opposition would not support any of the Bill even though a lot of it is good.

Mr Bryce: We did not say a lot of it is good.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the Opposition did support—

Mr Bryce: Some parts of it.

Mr O'CONNOR: —some parts of the Bill, but that it intended to oppose the whole of it. What logic!

Mr Bryce: Because you cannot be trusted.

Mr O'CONNOR: Here we have the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who is supposed to be representing his electorate.

Mr Bryce: You cannot be trusted.

Mr O'CONNOR: The electors of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition cannot trust him. He is saying that although certain parts of the Bill are good, he cannot support them.

Mr Bryce: You cannot be trusted.

Mr O'CONNOR: What an irrational utterance by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What a representative of his electors he is. He has said that parts of the Bill will benefit his electors, but he will not support it. I find it difficult to understand this point of view, and I am sure other members of the House also will find it difficult to understand.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated his lack of concern for his electors in the childish way he dealt with the Bill. He also mentioned that the pay-as-you-use water scheme had been introduced in such a way that we had pulled the wool over the eyes of the Opposition. If there was any wool pulled over anyone's eyes in this case it was because Opposition members did not do their homework. We gave the details of the four alternatives from which we would make our selection.

Mr Davies: You could not tell us which one.

Mr O'CONNOR: If members opposite did not study the alternatives properly and understand them, that was their own fault.

Mr Davies: Why did you not tell us which one you were going to use?

Mr O'CONNOR: I indicated the alternative which I preferred.

Mr Davies: No, you did not. You did not do that when the Bill went through the House.

Mr O'CONNOR: Quite frankly I still believe that was the best choice; certainly it was as good as any. Did the Opposition come forward with any other plan? Did it come forward with any other alternatives? No, all the Opposition did was to wait and see, and when it received a few complaints it criticised the system put forward instead of doing its homework at the proper time.

Mr Davies: You do not know what you are talking about. What about our 20-page report?

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite are supposed to be the watchdogs, but obviously they went to sleep again.

Mr Davies: What about our 20-page report? You have not been able to criticise that.

Mr O'CONNOR: When was this put out? It was afterwards.

Mr Davies: Six weeks ago.

Mr O'CONNOR: Why did you not do your homework originally?

Mr Davies: Because the information was not available to us.

Mr O'CONNOR: We told the Opposition that we would give it more time.

Mr Bryce: The department would not give me the information, just like the other Government departments.

Mr O'CONNOR: We told the Opposition that we would give it access to the departmental officers and I told the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Davies: You did not say any such thing. Show me where and when you said this.

Mr Bryce: You are talking like a used-car salesman. Today you have it and tomorrow we will take it off you. You should read the fine print.

Mr Davies: You are in trouble with this Bill.

Mr O'CONNOR: The principle of retrospective payments has been rectified by the Government. The matter was investigated over a number of weeks by our party committee to find out how we could best ensure justice. The Government has taken action on this matter.

Mr Wilson: It was very reluctant about it.

Mr O'CONNOR: We decided the best way to handle this, and I thank the members of the financial committee on this matter.

Mr Davies: Cabinet overruled the party request.

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not know what happened in the party room as I was not there.

Mr Davies: Don't you? Well you answered it.

Mr O'CONNOR: Listen to that, Mr Speaker.

Mr Davies: Did not Cabinet override the party room direction?

Mr O'Neil: The party room does not direct us.

Mr O'CONNOR: Again, I say that I cannot tell the Opposition—

Mr Davies: Your members are worried that you will lose three seats over the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. The House will come to order.

Mr O'CONNOR: I said to the Leader of the Opposition: How can Cabinet overrule the party? If the members of the party generally decide to do something, that is the decision of the party.

Mr Wilson: We know who the Cabinet is.

Mr O'CONNOR: I was simply referring to the comment made.

Mr Davies: You do not want to treat the truth so lightly.

Mr O'CONNOR: The water in the artesian basin is required for the population generally in view of the dry years we have had. There is nothing really wrong with the idea of monitoring bore water, but I repeat that the Government does not intend to meter bores.

Mr Davies: What about curing inflation in six months?

Mr O'CONNOR: In replying to a comment made by the member for Collie, I can tell him that it is not the intention of the Government to complete the passage of this Bill through the two Houses before Wednesday week—

Mr T. H. Jones: Was I correct in what I said? This is the matter I wanted you to check on. Did I give correct information last night?

Mr O'CONNOR: I have not seen the individual involved. To satisfy the honourable member I will tell him that it is not the intention of the Government to allow this Bill to pass through the two Houses prior to the three weeks after the Wednesday that such an invitation was given.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have had second thoughts about it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 27

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Mr Clarko	Mr Old
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Neil
Mr Cowan	Mr Ridge
Mr Coyne	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Spriggs
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Stephens
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Williams
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Noes 18

Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Pearce
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Dr Troy
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

Pairs

Noes

Mrs Craig	Mr B. T. Burke
Mr Young	Mr Barnett
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Hassell	Mr T. J. Burke

(Teller)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Minister for Labour and Industry) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed

Clause 3: Long title amended—

Mr JAMIESON: I think the Minister in charge of the Bill owes some explanation to the Chamber about the withdrawal of a great section of it in respect of the licensing of wells, drill operators, and waterwell drillers.

Mr Davies: It just shows how sloppy the research was.

Mr JAMIESON: I commented on this matter in my second reading speech. Of all the parts of the Bill, possibly this part was the one we could give our support to because of the consumer protection it afforded.

I listened intently to the Minister's reply, but no reference was made to the fact that it was intended to delete such a large portion of the Bill. I do not think I have ever heard of an amendment to delete such a large portion of a Bill before the Chamber. If the amendment is carried, approximately half of the 47 pages of the Bill will be deleted. Therefore, we should have been presented with much more information as to the reason this amendment is on the notice paper.

The Minister clearly indicated to the Chamber that all other States and the Territories already had such a licensing provision in their legislation and that it was thought desirable to introduce similar legislation in Western Australia.

It is true there would be problems associated with imposing such restrictions and the Opposition appreciates future amendments to the legislation may be necessary. However, with his proposed amendment, the Minister is throwing the baby out with the bath water, and I believe it is only fair that he should inform the Committee

why the Government suddenly has decided not to proceed with this licensing requirement.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government's initial wish was to proceed with legislation to license well drillers and wells throughout the State. We intended to impose 20 metres as the maximum depth to which an individual could drill without requiring a licence.

However, since the introduction of the Bill the Government has received representations from many people, including the farming community, to withdraw this provision.

Mr H. D. Evans: Should not this have been referred to them before the Bill was introduced? It is simply a matter of lack of consultation.

Mr O'CONNOR: Hello, it is the chatterbox again.

Mr Watt: I thought he was paired.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am glad he is not; we could not do with two of him!

The case put to us by these people was quite logical. They said, "We are farmers. If we put down a bore on our own property to a depth of 20 metres and do not strike water who is to prevent us from proceeding to 25 metres, 35 metres or whatever?" I am quite sure if the Government had proceeded with its initial intention, the Opposition would have criticised us for not considering the interests of the farmers.

It is obvious it would be impossible to police such a provision in a State the size of Western Australia. No doubt, people would drill past the statutory maximum without first obtaining a licence; many people would break the law. In fact, the Government felt if it proceeded with this proposal it would be virtually encouraging people to break the law. We did not feel inclined to put people in this position, and then attempt to convict them for not abiding by the regulations.

Perhaps such a proposal could be controlled within a restricted area. However, in a State as large as Western Australia, where many individuals desperately are seeking water, the Government thought it unreasonable in the long term to continue with this proposal and it has decided to delete it from the Bill.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Had the Minister the courtesy of consulting all the bodies most involved with this proposal prior to its introduction to this place in the form of legislation, he would not have been in this embarrassing position of having to carve up his Bill. Had he consulted with those people, a matter as fundamental as the depth to which people should be allowed to drill on their own farms would have been so obvious the

Government would not have placed itself in the position of looking as silly as it now does.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 6 and 7—Delete the passage "the licensing of wells, drill operators and waterwell drillers and".

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 25

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Neil
Dr Dadour	Mr Ridge
Mr Grayden	Mr Rushton
Mr Grewar	Mr Sibson
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Spriggs
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Williams
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Noes 18

Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Pearce
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Dr Troy
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mrs Craig	Mr B. T. Burke
Mr Young	Mr Barnett
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Hassell	Mr T. J. Burke

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 2 amended—

Mr JAMIESON: The Minister stated he was not keen on embracing ordinary wells or bores within this legislation. Therefore, he owes the Committee an explanation of the new definition contained in this clause. The Rights in Water and Irrigation Act contains the following definitions—

"Artesian Well" means an artesian well or bore, including all works within the meaning of this Act, constructed or erected therewith, from which water flows, or has flowed, naturally to the surface.

"Non-artesian Well" means a well or bore, including all works within the meaning of this Act, constructed or erected therewith, from which water does not flow, and has not flowed, naturally to the surface but has to be raised, or has been raised, by pumping or other artificial means.

On top of those definitions we have the following, which appears in clause 5—

“well” includes a bore or drill-hole.

The effect of this appears to make the legislation all-embracing to include every kind of well, drill-hole or bore-hole. It appears to extend the scope of the legislation quite considerably. I should like an explanation from the Minister.

Mr O'Connor: Do you object to this? Do you oppose its inclusion?

Mr JAMIESON: I want to know why it has been included. Our complaint is that it will make the legislation all-embracing. While at the moment the Government has not indicated it intends to change regulations relating to proclaimed areas it may do so at a later time. This new definition has the effect of embracing all areas which currently are not covered by the legislation.

Mr O'CONNOR: As I understand it, the member for Welshpool wants to know why we have included the new definition in clause 5. From our point of view, these are all things which affect the water table and the supply of water itself.

The taking of water from, say, the artesian basin will have some effect on our water supplies in the long term. The Government thought it was logical to include this new definition as one, rather than each time having to regard wells separately, one from the other.

Mr Jamieson: But you have not taken out the other two definitions.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government thought it could take a short cut by including a bore or a drill-hole as a well; it will have the effect of saving some words on the way through, not only now, but also in the future.

Mr JAMIESON: I have heard some explanations in this Chamber, but that one romps in! The Minister has not explained the matter at all. The position is there are two normal sources of supply of underground water, the artesian and the non-artesian, and the two are clearly defined in that artesian water forces itself to the surface while non-artesian water must be pumped to the surface. What other kinds of wells are there?

The Minister says this new definition will cover circumstances which may arise in the future; in other words, it is all-embracing. In fact, the new definition does not refer to the depth a bore or a drill-hole may be allowed to be drilled; this has the effect of eliminating the need for the other two definitions. To leave them in the legislation

will confuse the issue by providing for three types of wells or bores.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Welshpool has made a perfectly valid point. This is one of those clauses which many people will remember for a very long time. The Minister is seeking to change the definition of what constitutes a well. He is suggesting that in future it should include what we understand to be a bore or a drill-hole.

I have had a look at the parent Act and it is my clear impression that if we allow this new definition to go through on the basis of the Minister's fairly flimsy explanation or impression we are going to rue this day. That was the basis of my remarks during the second reading debate.

Mr O'CONNOR: Quite frankly, I can see nothing wrong with this clause. However, I am quite happy to refer the comments of members opposite to the Minister and have him examine the matter. If he believes further alterations to the legislation are necessary, that can be done during its passage through the upper House.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 25

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Neil
Dr Dadour	Mr Ridge
Mr Grayden	Mr Rushton
Mr Grewar	Mr Sibson
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Spriggs
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Williams
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

Noes 18

Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Pearce
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Dr Troy
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mrs Craig	Mr B. T. Burke
Mr Young	Mr Barnett
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Hassell	Mr T. J. Burke

Clause thus passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.17 to 7.30 p.m.

Clauses 6 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Sub-heading added—

The CHAIRMAN: I see on the notice paper that there is an amendment, the purport of which

would be to delete clauses 10, 11, and 12. This objective would be achieved by the Committee voting against those clauses when I put them.

Mr JAMIESON: This clause is the first of those clauses dealing with the licensing of drillers. We ought to have some assurance from the Minister that we will see legislation on this matter fairly soon if the Government is not prepared to tackle the problem at this time. As I said earlier, it is the only part of the Bill which seems to be at all appealing. By deleting these clauses we will be taking out about half the Bill. It does not leave us with anything that will be of any real help to the people.

It has been clearly indicated that the higher price of water will mean more people requiring bores if they are to look after their gardens. I imagine a lot of people will get "taken off" by others who do not really know what they are doing when they purport to be efficient in the art of drilling wells. As there is no protecting legislation at present, I am sure the Small Claims Tribunal will be inundated with claims which should be covered by a specific Act such as this. I would like to hear from the Minister on the Government's future policy on this matter.

Mr O'CONNOR: We had difficulties arise with this area of the Bill both before and after it was introduced. I assure the member I will take his comments back to the relevant Minister. From information I have, the Well Drillers' Association, whose members comprise most of the major operators in this field in this State, is proposing further meetings and will present further recommendations to the Minister in connection with the matter. The great majority of these people are anxious to proceed with this sort of legislation, but there are others who are not quite as anxious. Again, I shall forward the member's comments to the Minister for consideration.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 11 and 12 put and negatived.

Clause 13: Sub-heading added—

Mr JAMIESON: This clause has the power to make regulations under division 4 and the powers are rather widespread. It allows, without prejudice to the generality of subsection (1) of this section, for regulations to be made as to—

- (a) the conditions and provisions applicable to special licenses, the consideration of objections thereto, and the operation, modification, or termination thereof, pursuant to section fifteen of this Act;
- (b) ordinary licenses, pursuant to section sixteen of this Act;

(c) the exercise of rights affected by section seventeen of this Act;

(d) well licenses, and artesian and non-artesian wells subject to licensing;

They are in regard to "proclaimed areas". This proposal allows the variation of conditions that apply and the Minister explained in the introductory speech and in his reply to the second reading debate that it has been introduced because it was found the Government did not have certain powers that it thought it had. A certain person was granted some rights to obtain water, but he refused to allow his bore to be metered. So it became necessary to alter the section to give this power to make regulations in regard to altering conditions that prevail.

We have been assured that we will have proclaimed areas and the outer metropolitan area is already proclaimed, not that the water used by the Metropolitan Water Board is all artesian water. Some water is from the mid-distance groundwater, and this is quite suitable. I think all of the northern suburbs, such as Mirrabooka—

Mr O'Connor: And Wanneroo.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, Wanneroo; but the treatment plant at Mirrabooka uses water taken from underground which is aerated and filtered. Koondoola is another area. Undoubtedly there is the possibility of the proclaimed areas being extended to cover these housing areas. If this is to be the case, I see the problem that we first envisaged in regard to metering or controlling measures being implemented by the Government.

This is the clause that would be used for this purpose and I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that I do not want to be placed in the position at some later time of being told that I had the four alternatives of the Water Board—

Mr O'Connor: The regulations would be tabled.

Mr JAMIESON: With the majority the Government has in both Houses, the tabling of regulations means absolutely nothing. The Opposition does not have the numbers to defeat them, even if they are tabled. The situation could occur whereby Parliament could rise in September and the regulations could be drafted in December and have the effect of law right through the summer—even if we were able to defeat them later.

I am protesting that this could be the clause which the Government could use and people might object. I do not want people to say that the Labor Party, as the Opposition in the Parliament, went along with these propositions. We do not like

the idea of this practice being extended in this way, and we strongly object.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 14: Section 25 amended—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 25—Delete paragraph (f).

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 15 to 18 put and passed.

Clause 19: Section 45A added—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 28, lines 11 and 12—Delete the passage "dam, reservoir or levee" and substitute the words "dam or reservoir".

Members will note the definition in connection with this matter has been altered all the way through the Bill and several of the following amendments are to include the definition. This simplifies the issue.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister must give a better explanation than that. The word "levee" was included in the interpretation in the Bill. We want to know why the word was included originally, and why it is being taken out?

Mr O'CONNOR: Members will see in proposed new section 45A the passage "dam, reservoir or levee" and further down in the definition of "dam" the words "or levee" appear. Therefore, levees are not being left out but are being included in the definition of "dam".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 28, line 22—After the word "barrier", insert the words "or levee".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 28, line 29—Delete the words "or levee".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 29—Delete the interpretation "levee" in lines 1 to 3 inclusive.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 29, line 38—Delete the passage "dam, reservoir, or levee" and substitute the words "dam or reservoir".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 20: Section 45B added—

Mr H. D. EVANS: This clause deals with the specifications and criteria of referable dams. Perhaps the Minister could explain how the specifications were arrived at. As far as I am aware no international or national standards stipulate an earthen wall dam of a particular size shall be considered a referable dam. One of the general criteria seems to be a dam with a 15-metre high wall.

The question then arises as to the charges for the design and supervision of referable dams. It is obvious no farmer will meet the cost of \$2 000 to \$3 000. That figure was calculated by one of the few earth engineers in the business. He could nominate only two practising earth engineers in Perth who had experience in earthen wall dams. He indicated the scale of fees is calculated on the various components of the particular project. The Minister said we had plucked the figure of \$2 000 to \$3 000 out of the air; but that is not correct. Perhaps the Minister can tell us the cost of design and supervision of an earthen wall dam of this type. He has not made any endeavour to do so up to this stage.

Whilst a dam of this size may be considered to be potentially dangerous, a dam which is six inches lower could be equally dangerous. If the farmer has to pay \$2 000 to \$3 000 for a referable dam with a 10-metre wall, he will construct a dam with a 9.9 metre wall in order to save the fee. He would be far better off having one eight-metre wall dam and building a second dam for the same money.

This will defeat the object of safety upon which the Minister has been harping. Dams will be built which potentially are just as dangerous and they will not be supervised. It is obvious to the farmers and they will be the ones constructing the dams. It is only the stupidity of the Government which is being led by the bureaucrats who have not analysed the situation which results in this provision.

It would be preferable and it would be in the interests of fairness and justice to waive the fee a farmer must pay to build a referable dam. An irrigation scheme is in existence already and 654 farmers draw from the scheme which is run by the PWD. It costs the PWD \$1.25 million to run the scheme. That means each of the farmers is receiving a handout in the form of water which amounts to \$2 000 a year. It is a subsidy. That may be able to be reconciled in the interests of the economy of the State. We will not argue about that principle. However, why should one section of farmers receive favoured treatment while another section of farmers, providing equally important irrigation services and making a

similar, if not greater, contribution to the State's economy, be charged a fee by the Government for the design and supervision of the dams which will be the means of improving the economy of the State? It would be better if the Department of Agriculture extension service examined the sites, and carried out the basic planning and supervision at a nominal cost. This could be done to the specifications laid down by the PWD. In this way the interests of justice, fairness and safety would be served.

Every farmer who attended the meetings in the south-west over the past three weeks accepted very readily that safety was a prime requirement. Not one farmer objected to that. The Minister was saying earlier that we were disinterested in safety. I make the point that safety of dam walls and overflows are of paramount importance. The question of common justice to the total farming community of the State must be considered. The cost which will be involved must be looked at also.

In the first instance could the Minister explain why the specific criteria for a referable dam have been set and, secondly, how the principle and thinking of he and his department will react if farmers opt for a slightly smaller dam with almost the same degree of potential danger.

Mr O'CONNOR: Discussions have taken place between the interstate organisations and the various departments; that is, the water supply department. These discussions have been going on for some time.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Has there been any agreement on this?

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not believe total agreement has been achieved; but this does not mean that we should be the last in the safety field. Not only have we had interstate discussions, but also we have had discussions with engineers and with the department as to the size of dams which are most likely to be affected. This legislation was introduced not to affect normal dams or farm reservoirs which were not a hazard, but to apply only to those dams which are a hazard and could cause danger to property or person.

The member for Warren mentioned the case of a person building a dam wall of a height of 9.9 metres instead of 10 metres. Of course, this does not overcome the problem if it is a dangerous dam. If the member looks at the next clause he will see any referable dam is one which is dangerous. Therefore, a dam of a height of 9.9 metres could be declared a referable dam if in fact it is dangerous.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I make the point every dam of a certain size will be considered a referable

dam; but if the wall is lowered a little, it will not be, unless it is situated in an area which has a particular topography which renders the dam dangerous. Certainly the size criterion is automatic as far as the dam being declared referable is concerned.

Mr O'Connor: This applies to whatever size. Whether the dam is 10, 20, or 30 metres, it will be referable.

Mr H. D. EVANS: But there are so many more dams which do not come under the scope of the legislation because the level of the wall will be dropped a few inches and unless the dam is situated in a potentially dangerous locality, it will not be referable.

Mr O'Connor: This does not matter, if it is not a dangerous dam. We are concerned about dams which are likely to be a danger to property or persons.

Mr H. D. EVANS: These dams will not even be considered on the grounds of size.

Mr T. H. JONES: I oppose the clause. It places extra financial burdens on the farmers involved. If extra costs are incurred in constructing a dam of a certain size, the farmer will construct a dam with a lower wall. There is no argument about safety. Of course the farmers agree with the safety aspect. If the Government is prepared to assist the farmers financially with the building of dams in the future, and if it considers referable dams should be examined by an engineer, the Government should meet the costs involved.

The Opposition considers the farmer should not have to meet the cost. As mentioned by the member for Warren, certain farmers receive a subsidy on their water. This subsidy is not received by the farmers who construct their own dams.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It is the equivalent of a supervision fee every year.

Mr T. H. JONES: The overall cost to the PWD is \$1.25 million a year for 654 farmers. Those farmers know their financial commitments. The Government is introducing a Bill and is thrusting these costs onto the farmers without consultation.

Mr Davies: Once again.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Opposition wants to know who recommended the standards. We do not know from where the standards came.

Mr O'Connor: I told you.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister answered the question to a certain degree.

Mr O'Connor: In reply to the member for Warren.

Mr T. H. JONES: As I mentioned last night in the second reading debate, farmers are constructing dams and have been doing so for many years without any problems being encountered. The Minister cannot give one example where problems have arisen in relation to a dam in the south-west or the great southern part of the State.

Mr O'Connor: Yes I have.

Mr T. H. JONES: Last night the Minister mentioned one dam at Pemberton.

Mr O'Connor: I mentioned two at Pemberton.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister mentioned two dams in the south-west and the great southern part of this State. The Minister did not know the answer when the question was asked of him.

Mr Jamieson: He knows he has not got any dams of that size in his electorate.

Mr T. H. JONES: All we know, on the information supplied by the member for Warren, is that two dams have caused trouble. I ask the Minister: Are there any others?

Mr O'Connor: According to the information I have from the department, yes, but no record is kept of them.

Mr T. H. JONES: That is a good answer!

Mr O'Connor: What answer do you want?

Mr T. H. JONES: From where does the department obtain its information? It must be from records. If the Public Works Department supplied the information that there were more dams, the information must have been obtained from records.

Mr O'Connor: Do you know about the dam of 10 million gallons capacity?

Mr T. H. JONES: Never mind about that. Where are the dams which are involved?

Mr O'Connor: Some are at Pemberton.

Mr T. H. JONES: That is what the member for Warren said last night. Where are the other dams? That is what the Parliament is waiting to hear.

Mr O'Connor: I have already answered that question.

Mr T. H. JONES: Where are the dams which cause concern situated? We on this side of the Chamber want to know. Can the Minister tell us?

Mr O'Connor: I have already replied.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister cannot specify which other dams are involved. He has been caught with his pants down. He does not know where the other dams are. Perhaps I will pause

for a moment and give the Minister an opportunity to answer by interjection.

Mr O'Connor: You do not even know whether there is one of that size in your electorate.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is not my province to know. It is the province of the Minister and the Public Works Department to know. The Minister is introducing the legislation because in his opinion there are good reasons for it. If he is introducing legislation, he must give cause or reason for it. All we know on the information supplied is that two dams in Pemberton have caused trouble, and that information was supplied by the member for Warren. The Minister cannot give us any other instance of dams collapsing.

Mr Shalders: Dalgara Station had a dam which burst.

Mr T. H. JONES: The honourable member is better informed than the Minister is. That makes three dams. Can any other member make a contribution?

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. JONES: Other members are coming to the assistance of the Minister. We now know that in the history of farming in Western Australia three dams are on record as causing trouble in this regard. At least we are getting somewhere.

Mr Laurance: Passed in at three.

Mr T. H. JONES: The honourable member can make a joke of it if he wishes. Farmers in Donnybrook, Bridgetown, and Manjimup are asking what is the reason for this legislation. If the Government wants to introduce examination requirements, why not let it be free of cost to the farmers involved? The records show there has been no trouble. The Government would be doing the farmers a service if it told those who come into the category of owning referable dams, "We will examine them to ensure they are sound in structure." There is nothing wrong with that proposition. In the future, any person constructing a dam would know his involvement.

I have made my point clear. It is quite evident that farmers in one category receive a subsidy of \$2 000 to \$3 000 a year, while farmers in another category have to pay \$2 000 to \$3 000. Is that a fair proposition? The Minister knows that is the situation—a subsidy for one and no subsidy for the other. The people in the apple-growing districts are saying, "We can't afford to pay it. You are subsidising farmers in the Harvey area; why not subsidise us?"

Mr O'Connor: They do get subsidies.

Mr T. H. JONES: Not as far as this requirement is concerned.

Mr O'Connor: As far as water is concerned.

Mr T. H. JONES: They do not pay for the water; that is the only subsidy they get. They do not get a subsidy when they build a dam. The cost of the dam is entirely the responsibility of the farmer involved. These referable dams must now be examined by an engineer. For the reasons I have outlined, and the reasons indicated by the farmers and orchardists, generally, I strongly oppose the conditions contained in clause 20.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Connor
Mr Coyne	Mr Old
Dr Dadour	Mr O'Neil
Mr Grayden	Mr Ridge
Mr Grewar	Mr Rushton
Mr Hassell	Mr Sodeman
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Spriggs
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr McPharlin	Mr Shalders
Mr Mensaros	

(Teller)

Noes 16

Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Carr	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Davies	Mr McIver
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Pearce
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Dr Troy
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Mrs Craig
Mr Young
Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Crane
Mr Sibson
Mr Watt

Noes

Mr B. T. Burke
Mr Barnett
Mr Skidmore
Mr T. J. Burke
Mr Taylor
Mr Bryce

Clause thus passed.

Clause 21: Section 45C added—

Mr H. D. EVANS: This is the nub of the issue as far as the farming community is concerned. There is no cavilling at the safety angle. Most farmers are aware that it is not only in the interests of the district at large but also in their own interests. They accept it and are happy about it, and I am sure in many instances farmers would be happy to see an errant farmer have his views revised to some extent.

The cost is the problem. In subsection (2) of proposed new section 45C we are coming to the cost and the reason for it. Here is the sting in the tail. Dealing with referable dams it says—

(2) An application may be made under subsection (1) of this section in respect of a dam that is proposed to be constructed or completed at a specified place in accordance with the plans and specifications accompanying the application.

Those plans and specifications must be drawn up by a qualified and acceptable engineer, and supervision must be by a qualified and acceptable engineer. In country areas it is difficult to find an engineer who has this degree of speciality. So not only is a cost involved but also inconvenience to the individual farmer. It is not as though an engineer can come down and make a run of six or seven dams. The dams may be built in dribs and drabs, and as a consequence each farmer would have to pay his own individual costs. This is where the objection lies.

It is accepted that there are other dams built by mining companies and people of that type. Why not distinguish between farmers' dams and those built by companies for mining purposes which would normally be much bigger than referable dams and which would be the dams mainly causing the worry? Why not spell it out that the cost of a dam used for agricultural purposes would not be an imposition on the individual farmer but would be borne by the Department of Agriculture's extension service? The Department of Agriculture has some excellent men in the water field who could operate in an advisory and supervisory capacity to the standards required by the Public Works Department. It is as simple as that. The officers are already there and the service could be provided. I am sure that if no cost were involved the farmers would very readily accept the supervision and the standards. This clause should be amended to allow for that.

This Bill will probably finish up as one of the worst pieces of legislation which have ever come before this Chamber. It will be amended beyond recognition for the reason that it has been hastily drafted. It was introduced with indecent haste and there was a total absence of consultation with the farmers, the Farmers' Union, the local government authorities, the fruit growers, and everyone else who is directly involved in the legislation.

The Government is completely out of touch with the practicalities of irrigation from earth wall dams, apart from the inherent unfairness of imposing this charge on some farmers. I would not be disappointed if the Minister for Agriculture were prepared to make some contribution at this juncture, at least to have the Bill looked at in the interest of the people he represents, and perhaps even to have the Minister

for Water Supplies defer the legislation until such time as a proposition can be arrived at after discussion with the farmers and the farmers' organisations. As it stands now, legislation of this kind is a reflection on any Government.

Mr Davies: It is sloppy.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Not only that but it is badly spelt out. For that reason I suggest it be deferred to allow consultation on the amendments which are being sought with the farmers' organisations. There are quite a few amendments and I am certain the Government will accept some of them before the farmers' organisations are through. A distinction should be made between agricultural and mining dams, for a start, and the impost involved in planning, specifications, and supervision should be removed. If it is allowed to go through I think it will be a running sore for many years and a monumental mistake which the Government will never live down.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is quite obvious the Minister does not intend to answer the points made by the member for Warren.

Mr H. D. Evans: He cannot. The Bill is indefensible.

Mr T. H. JONES: The contents of this clause worry farmers. I do not know whether members appreciate what it involves. Farmers must obtain specifications and the services of an approved engineer before they can commence the construction of a dam. First of all, where in Western Australia are engineers available to carry out this work?

Of course, not only is this a problem, but there is also the time factor and the question of costs. While members on the Government side may not appreciate the depressed condition of the farming community, particularly in the Donnybrook area, I do. I would expect the member for Vasse and the member for Bunbury who have been to Donnybrook to support me in these remarks.

Mr Sibson: I know how many dams are in my electorate, and you don't.

Mr Davies: You would have none—anyone would know that.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am afraid I cannot hear the member for Bunbury. I agree with the member for Warren. This provision is strongly opposed by the farmers and orchardists in Donnybrook and in Manjimup.

Mr Sibson: Only certain sections.

Mr T. H. JONES: Of whom will the Government take notice? It will not take any notice of the Opposition, and it will not take any

notice of the farmers. Many complaints have come from the protest meetings that have been held.

Mr O'Connor: A number of the amendments were made at the request of the farming community.

Mr T. H. JONES: Of course, because of pressure applied to the Government. As I said last night, the Government did not introduce these amendments voluntarily; it was happy with the Bill.

Mr O'Connor: You said, "Why don't we take notice of the farmers?" and I said that we did take notice of them.

Mr T. H. JONES: As I said last night, the farmers do not think the amendments go far enough. Last Wednesday the Donnybrook Shire Council appointed a committee to study the Bill. I made a copy of the proposed amendments available to the council and they were discussed at a meeting lasting in excess of three hours. The farmers are still not happy with the situation. That is the true position; I cannot put it any more clearly than that.

When I spoke to the farmers last night they requested a delay of three weeks to consider the amendments. I do not feel it is necessary to go over all that was said last night. I am not putting forward my views, but rather the views of the farmers and the orchardists; the people who are objecting to this legislation. Again, I suggest to the Government that it should report progress on this measure and allow more discussion to take place.

Surely the Government has got the message that many of its supporters are unhappy with the measure. At the Donnybrook meeting many prominent members of the Liberal Party and the National Country Party expressed their concern. I hope the Minister for Cultural Affairs will enter this debate. Surely he is concerned that some of his supporters are opposed to this measure.

Mr Sibson: That is not true.

Mr T. H. JONES: The member for Bunbury was not even at the meeting so he does not know what he is talking about. It was not Labor Party supporters who opposed the Bill. I believe one of the farmers from Balingup who is a very active member of the Liberal Party was of the opinion that this Bill should be thrown out. If that example does not spell out clearly the antagonism that the measure has created, I do not know what does. I cannot say any more.

Mr Old: I would not think so.

Mr T. H. JONES: At the meeting I said that we are dealing with a very dictatorial Government. Very few of our amendments are accepted.

Mr Sibson: He is saying that the Labor Party supports the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Sibson: That is what the member for Collie is really saying.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Collie.

Mr T. H. JONES: Now that the member for Bunbury has finished his speech, sitting down as usual, I will conclude my remarks.

Mr Sibson: But it is a fact, isn't it?

Mr T. H. JONES: Approximately 80 of the farmers at Donnybrook were unanimous in the view that the Bill should be thrown out. They are not happy with it because of the financial demands it will place on the farmers. The Government should reconsider this legislation and, in particular, this clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 26 put and passed.

Clause 27: Section 45J added—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 36, line 36—Delete the words "the prescribed fee" with a view to substituting the passage "such fee, if any, as is prescribed".

This amendment is to include other words so that further consideration can be given to the individual involved.

Mr T. H. JONES: I wonder what this amendment means.

Mr Jamieson: That is what I was going to ask.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is a couple of bob each way.

Mr Jamieson: Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Mr O'Connor: It allows for no fee at all to be charged.

Mr T. H. JONES: Why does it not say so? Why does not the Minister say, "No fee will be chargeable"? At the moment he has amended the clause piecemeal.

Mr Sibson: That advances your argument.

Mr T. H. JONES: Will somebody throw the honourable member back onto the beach at Bunbury?

Proposed new subsection (1) of new section 45J reads—

45J. (1) An application for the grant of a license under this Part of this Act shall be made to the Department in the prescribed manner accompanied by the prescribed fee.

The Minister now seeks to add the words "such fee, if any, as is prescribed". What is the difference?

Mr O'Connor: It allows you to charge nothing if you so desire.

Mr T. H. JONES: All the Minister is doing is playing with words.

Mr O'Connor: As it stands it means that you have to charge a fee.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is up to the Government to charge a fee if applicable. The Government should clearly say, "No fee will be applicable." The clause could be amended in this way and such a move would be to the credit of the Government. The Government is trying to have two bob each way and so remain popular with the farmers. We do not know what the prescribed fee will be.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thought the position was very clear. There are occasions when a fee is not applicable. So that we can cope with such a position and so that the person is not charged a fee when a fee is not considered necessary, this amendment is required. The Government will not need to charge a fee where it feels a fee should not be applied. The Minister included this amendment at the request of the farming community. As I pointed out earlier, we have tried to comply with some of the requests made.

Mr JAMIESON: This seems to be a rather funny amendment for the farmers to have requested.

Mr O'Connor: Most of the amendments on the notice paper are those we were requested to make.

Mr JAMIESON: It is a wonder that some indication was not given to the two Opposition members who have been speaking tonight that a request had been made along these lines.

Mr T. H. Jones: They did not know of it at the meeting.

Mr JAMIESON: That is the point. The Government should be prepared to have another look at this matter. We should hear the farmers' viewpoints on it. Mr Lewis has consulted with the Minister on this matter, and he offered to arrange for some delay. If it can be shown that it is undesirable to have a fee charged in such cases, then I suggest we should report progress at that time. We can then find out the farmers' views on this matter.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 36, line 36—Substitute for the words deleted the passage “such fee, if any, as is prescribed”.

I have explained the reasons for this amendment, and I do not propose to make any further comment.

Mr T. H. JONES: While I have to admit this is some improvement on the existing provision, it does not go far enough. It does not spell out clearly the intention of the Government or the department.

Mr Sibson: It does.

Mr T. H. JONES: The member for Bunbury should get up and have his say. To me there is very little difference between the original wording and that contained in the amendment. On behalf of the people I represent I say that no fee should be charged. We know the financial problems of the people concerned. As the amendment makes no significant alteration to the provision, I oppose it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 28: Section 45K added—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 38, lines 20 and 21—Delete the passage “or (c) by the cancellation of a license,” and substitute the passage—

- (c) by the cancellation of a license;
- (d) by measures required by the Minister, or taken by the Department, pursuant to section forty-five G of this Act; or
- (e) by measures taken by the Department pursuant to section forty-five H of this Act, .

In the case of an aggrieved person he has the right to do certain things, and the amendment will extend the conditions under which he can make a complaint and perhaps attain the result he desires.

Mr T. H. JONES: Could the Minister indicate what the measures might be for the clarification of members?

Mr O'Connor: I do not quite understand what the member means by that.

Mr T. H. JONES: Proposed new paragraph (d) refers to “measures required by the Minister”. Can the Minister explain this?

Mr O'CONNOR: This refers back to the present section 45. I looked at this section earlier. It refers to the supplying of water being compulsory; if the department is required to supply the water, certain conditions must apply.

The department is exonerated from this requirement in the case of a drought, or some other accident which prevents it from supplying the water.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 38, line 28—Delete the words “such person or persons as he shall appoint” and substitute the passage—

a tribunal consisting of—

- (a) a chairman, appointed by the Minister with the agreement of the person aggrieved or in default of agreement on the nomination of the President for the time being of the body known as the Institution of Engineers, Australia;
- (b) a person nominated by the permanent head of the Department; and
- (c) a person nominated by the person aggrieved, .

This amendment is in connection with the appointment of a tribunal, and again it was requested by a number of people in the farming community.

Mr T. H. JONES: I want to indicate that the Opposition agrees with this proposition. It emanated from a meeting held at Manjimup.

It seems that there is little point in the Opposition arguing that the Government should report progress on the Bill. Obviously the Government is adamant that it should be passed through this Chamber tonight. Therefore, there is no point in my wasting the time of members. I will have nothing more to say about it, except to express my amazement that the Country Party members are not supporting the Opposition.

Mr Harman: Which party?

Mr T. H. JONES: The Country Party. Since the debate on this Bill was resumed last night, only one member of the National Party has had anything to say about it, and not one member of the Country Party has risen to his feet to defend the interests of farmers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I urge the member to relate his remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr T. H. JONES: Having made those remarks, I will resume my seat.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 29 put and passed.

Clause 30: Section 45M added—

Mr O'CONNOR: This provision refers to the people in charge of dams, or the person who purports to be in charge of dams. The amendment I propose to move was suggested by the farming community because it was believed it would be a fairer way to achieve the objective of the Government rather than the way proposed in the Bill. I move an amendment—

Page 41, lines 10 to 12—Delete the words "any person apparently in charge of or apparently employed in or about" and substitute the words "the owner or any person authorised by the owner in charge of".

This relates to the person against whom action would be taken if there was any difficulty in connection with a dam. As I pointed out, that is in accord with the meeting at Manjimup.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 41, line 15—Insert a new subsection to stand as subsection (3), as follows—

- (3) Any referable dam which is—
- (a) situate on a farming property;
 - (b) used for domestic purposes or for stock or irrigation; and
 - (c) does not exceed fifteen metres in height,

shall, if requested by the owner, be inspected by the Department at no cost to the owner.

This matter has been raised by the Opposition tonight. It was one of the amendments requested at the meeting in Manjimup, which was agreed to by the Minister.

Mr T. H. JONES: I will be consistent with my earlier attitude. While the Opposition agrees with the amendment, it feels the amendment does not go far enough. This should apply to any dam presently constructed. Why limit the free service to a dam not exceeding 15 metres in height? This is our argument. Why did the Government select a size of dam to be inspected by the department at no cost? Why did it not make it open to any dam? This is what the Opposition argues on behalf of the farmers. This is consistent with the argument being advanced by the member for Warren and myself.

Mr Davies: The only ones arguing on behalf of the farmers!

Mr T. H. JONES: My leader said we are the only ones arguing. In the debate tonight, some of the Liberal members and some of the National Country Party members have remained silent on

the subject. They know the problems facing the farmers. They know the problem of increased charges. I would have thought, as they represented the interests of farmers generally, they would have been supporting me tonight and indicating clearly the opinions of farmers who will be subjected to this amending legislation. Why are they not doing it?

Mr Harman: They could not care less.

Mr T. H. JONES: They have been told in the party room that they are not allowed to speak on the Bill. If they were genuine in representing agricultural electorates where dams are situated, they would be speaking tonight, as I am, trying to protect the interests of the farmers. They are not doing that.

Mr Harman: Where is the member for Bunbury?

Mr T. H. JONES: Not one member of the Government, whether he be Liberal or National Country Party, has supported us on this side of the Chamber. They know the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: I would urge the member to confine his remarks to the question before us.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am getting to the point. In relation to this—

Mr Sibson interjected.

Mr T. H. JONES: —our argument is: Why does not Mr Sibson rise to his feet and have a few words to say? I would have greater respect for him if he did. He sits down and loses my respect.

Of course, we have to admit this amendment is an improvement. However, the Opposition says it does not go far enough. The farmers say it does not go far enough. We maintain no cost should be applied to any dam presently constructed. The examination should be made free of cost, irrespective of questions of height of the dams involved.

Mr O'CONNOR: The insertion that I have suggested covers the point the member has been arguing about. If we look at the words included in the amendment, it reads—

- (3) Any referable dam which is—
- (a) situate on a farming property;
 - (b) used for domestic purposes or for stock or irrigation; and
 - (c) does not exceed fifteen metres in height,

shall, if requested by the owner, be inspected by the Department at no cost to the owner.

Mr T. H. Jones: And then you come to the size of the dam. Do not read half of it.

Mr O'CONNOR: I repeat that it reads—

- (3) Any referable dam which is—
 (a) situate on a farming property;
 (b) used for domestic purposes or for stock or irrigation; and
 (c) does not exceed fifteen metres in height,—

Mr T. H. Jones: That is the point I make.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is a concession being given to the farming community. When members consider a dam over 50 feet high, that is a very big dam. When talking about \$2 for 5 000 gallons of water—if the figures supplied by the Opposition are correct—there are many features involved. This is quite a reasonable proposition. It is one that extends to the farming community a concession that others do not have. It is a concession not extended to mining companies. It is limited to the farming community. I think it is reasonable.

Mr T. H. JONES: The point is, the Minister does not know how many dams are involved—

Mr O'Connor: You would not know how many were in your electorate.

Mr Sibson: He knows how many dams.

Mr T. H. JONES: I did not introduce the legislation. The Opposition did not sponsor the legislation. The facts are that whilst the Minister says all sorts of glossy things will happen, he does not know. The Public Works Department does not know how many dams are involved in all of the categories. This is the unfortunate situation. Of course, the Minister cannot explain the situation of how many dams in Western Australia will be involved.

Whilst this amendment will assist to a degree, it does not go far enough.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 41, line 15—Renummer the subsection as subsection (4).

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 31 put and passed.

Clause 32: Section 45P added—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 42, line 7—Delete the words "or levee".

This is in accord with previous advice I gave to members in connection with a levee being included in the definition of a dam.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 33 and 34 put and passed.

Clause 35: Section 45S added—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

Page 44, line 10—Delete the word "The" and substitute the passage—

Subject to the provisions of subsection (3) of section forty-five M of this Act, the

This amendment was made at the request of the farming community in Manjimup at the meeting which was held there. It refers to section 45 which indicates the department must supply water to the individual farmers except in special circumstances such as drought.

I should like to indicate also that at the conclusion of the Committee stage we will not pass the Bill through this Chamber and the upper House, in line with the undertaking we have given.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 36 to 40 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [8.48 p.m.]: I wish to indicate my support for the Budget and I join with my colleagues on this side of the House who have already done so. It has been a Budget of constraint. Naturally many members on the Government side of the House would have preferred the Budget to be more expansive; but we cannot applaud the improvements in the nation's economy generally—such matters as significantly lower inflation and stabilising of wage increases—without realising that these measures must flow back through to the State and must limit the funds available.

Whilst no doubt there are many people who would like to see the Government funding more new initiatives in this Budget, the simple fact is the funds to be able to do that are not available. That is not a bad situation. Constraint in the Government sector and providing greater initiatives to the private sector will help restore the balance which our economy needs, where private sector growth is greater than public sector growth. Expenditure restraint on Government

departments is a commendable factor also in this Budget.

I noted with interest the comments of the Treasurer when he indicated expenditure overruns will not be tolerated. So not only do the departments have tight budgets, but they will be made to stick to them also.

Mr Pearce: What about under-runs?

Mr LAURANCE: By returning the departments to a responsible base, I believe we should rectify the problems we have experienced in this regard right across the nation in recent years. Tremendous increases have been made in Government spending and a great number of those increases have been made irresponsibly. Keeping a tight rein on Government expenditure is consistent also with the mood which is sweeping the western world in this regard for decreased taxation and Government expenditure.

The stimulus to the economy which is required urgently in this country must come from the private sector and our State has the best chance to provide that. The announcements such as the one made by the Premier today giving the go-ahead for the Wagerup refinery and also for the Worsley refinery project are to be commended. The Yeelirrie uranium project is another great development which will take place in this great State in the next few months.

Mr Sibson: The North-West Shelf.

Mr LAURANCE: I want to refer particularly to the North-West Shelf gas project. The Treasurer indicated in his Budget speech that our 150th Anniversary Year may be highlighted by an announcement by the joint venturers that the project will proceed. This will follow the \$50 million feasibility stage we are now undergoing. The Treasury document introduced by the Treasurer at the time he introduced the Budget, referred also to this project in a very brief manner only. I think in future Budget speeches this matter will take a far more prominent place. Nevertheless, the Treasury predictions give an outline of the various components of this \$3 400 million project. Some idea of the investment and employment potential which will be gained from the project is given by the advice of Treasury that a sum of \$2 400 million—and I obtained that figure by subtracting approximately \$1 000 million from the overall project which will be required for the provision of the LNG ships—will cover the cost of production of the gas. It will provide for the cost of bringing the gas on shore, the LNG plant, and the pipeline to Perth.

Australian industry, according to the Treasury, has the capacity to provide 58 per cent of the total

cost of \$2 400 million. It can be seen, therefore, that a significant amount of the development can be carried out by Australian industry.

The State Government is to be congratulated on the exploration programme it has fostered already. Companies have committed already an expenditure of \$438 million for 102 wells in the six-year period to 1983. Included in this figure, and a matter which is even more significant particularly for my own electorate, is an amount of \$213 million for 34 wells on the Exmouth plateau blocks.

These are considered to be Australia's last chance for a really big oilfield. Because of the importance of the North-West Shelf and the Exmouth plateau to the nation, and particularly to my electorate of Gascoyne, I visited the North Sea oil and gas developments during the last parliamentary recess in June-July of this year.

Many lessons are to be learnt from the North Sea experience. We see the enormous physical dimensions of the overall project, such things as the rigs, the production platforms, the fabrication yards, the supply boat bases, and the service industries. Whilst they are magnificent and impressive and I saw plenty of them because I was fortunate to join two executives of the operating company for the North-West Shelf consortium whilst I was in Scotland, many other factors also were worthy of consideration. I have no doubt we will be discussing a great number of these matters at a future time in this House. I am referring to such matters as safety which is a particularly important area. The offshore production of oil and gas is a very dangerous operation. I took careful note of the safety factors involved in the transportation of the workers to the rig by helicopter and the other extremely complex safety arrangements on the rigs themselves. These safety factors are necessary, because it is a dangerous occupation.

The rigs are built to withstand 90-foot waves. They stand 120 feet out of the water. One of the rigs I visited was standing in well over 400 feet of water. We must consider also the safety of the divers. They have an extremely hazardous occupation. A number of safety factors are involved.

I found security another matter which was extremely interesting to study. Industrial relations and environmental protection were interesting also. Environmental protection involved such matters as the flaring of the excess gas from the oil-producing rigs, the pipelines ashore, and the conflict with the fishing industry—ensuring the fishermen did not drag anchors across undersea

pipelines—and so on. These were extremely interesting features.

But the biggest lesson to learn from the North Sea experience is the question of the extent of Government involvement. When we are talking about Australia's future energy demands, two factors are very clear. The first is that our demand for petroleum products will increase steadily despite the efforts we will go to to develop suitable alternatives. I should like to quote briefly from an Esso report which members no doubt have seen. It is called, "Australian Energy Outlook". It says that even after allowing for economic growth patterns and more enlightened energy consumption patterns, it is projected that the world's total energy requirements will be about 65 per cent higher in 1990 than they are now.

So whilst we have to look at all these alternatives, it is not a practical solution to find alternative energy sources in this century.

The second point we have to remember about our energy demands in this country is that by 1985 our present reserves will start to run out and our fuel bill—remembering we will be at world parity prices—will start to soar. We have to remember in that context also that our currently producing oilfields already have passed their peak productivity and if we had a significant find this year or next year, we would still be in the decline phase of our present known production before the new field could contribute to our national supplies of crude oil.

That would be the situation even if we found the new field within the next few months. Let us go back and have a look at the situation in the United Kingdom. Initially the British Government gave great encouragement and incentives to the oil industry to explore and develop. It could see the situation which was about to confront it with the Middle East price hike from the OPEC countries which hit the United Kingdom in the 1970s. The British Government was desperate to develop the North Sea and provided a great number of incentives.

Now that the problem has been solved at least temporarily, and for Britain I believe it is only temporary, the British Government has taken a very shortsighted view and has removed almost all of those incentives and has virtually nationalised the industry. In my opinion, the Government is killing the goose which is laying the golden egg as far as their economy is concerned.

Mr Shalders: They have done a Connors.

Mr LAURANCE: The honourable member is correct. I believe in the long term the British

Government will pay dearly for this policy. The British Government take from North Sea oil is as follows: Firstly, the royalty on North Sea oil is 12½ per cent of the wellhead value; secondly, it has a petroleum revenue tax which is known by its initials, PRT, and until recently this was set at 45 per cent of the gross revenue from the sale of oil, after deducting expenses and other taxes. PRT is the second level of taxing. Thirdly, the companies involved have company or corporation tax and that is at the rate of 52 per cent of their net revenue.

Mr Pearce: Do they still make a profit?

Mr LAURANCE: I will come to that. Recently petroleum revenue tax was increased from 45 per cent to 60 per cent which the industry told me would lift the total take by the British Government from just over 75 per cent to in excess of 80 per cent. So 80 per cent of the total value of the North Sea oil and gas is taken directly by the British Government.

I believe this could prove to be a bonanza for Western Australia. Operators will desert the North Sea, and this is the answer to the honourable member's question. There is so much capital involvement in a producing well that no matter how much the Government turns on the screws, it will still produce.

The lesson we must never forget is that they will not explore anymore. They will not find anymore if the conditions are not right.

Mr Grill: They are not going broke though, are they?

Mr LAURANCE: Let me go on.

Mr Grill: You would not have a clue about the profits of those particular companies.

Mr LAURANCE: We have only to look at their performance. We are not worried about profits, only performance. We are worried about finding oil to meet the energy demands. The honourable member is worrying only about making a dollar.

Mr Grill: The companies that you are referring to have a myriad of ways of avoiding taxation.

Mr LAURANCE: Avoiding taxation? I am saying there is nothing left after taxation.

Mr Pearce: There is. They make thousands.

Mr LAURANCE: I believe it will be a bonanza for Western Australia because at the first sniff of oil here those companies will desert the North Sea, provided the conditions are sensible.

Several members interjected.

Mr LAURANCE: In addition to taxing the companies out of the area, the United Kingdom Government has an organisation about which I wish to speak. I am referring to the British National Oil Corporation or BNOC. Under the present licensing agreements, the companies, when signing up for new licences, must agree to give a 51 per cent participation to BNOC or they do not get the licence. It is a diabolical situation and it is a lesson for us again. It is diabolical that this Government corporation is not only the umpire for North Sea Oil, but also the chief player, and it plays the game roughly.

Mr Grill: You say the companies do not play it rough?

Mr LAURANCE: Let me explain the point I want to make about the corporation. I had ample evidence given to me verbally by the companies and a number of members of the British Parliament that the corporation blackmails the companies. It says that unless there is an agreement which gives 51 per cent participation to the corporation the companies will not get any more licences.

Mr Jamieson: That is Godfathering. That is the difference. It is making propositions they cannot refuse.

Mr LAURANCE: It holds the nationalisation club over the companies.

Mr Grill: You know you have to play the game fairly well.

Mr LAURANCE: I believe that is morally criminal.

Several members interjected.

Mr LAURANCE: They have asked world industries to invest enormous sums of money in exploration and then changed the rules. That is not right. The lesson this country must learn is that it must set the ground rules for private enterprise. We must make them fair to all concerned and then let the companies get on with the work.

Mr Grill: The greatest instance of changing of rules was by Menzies on the two-airline policy.

Mr LAURANCE: The honourable member is getting away from oil.

Several member interjected.

Mr Grill: You are proving this yourself. Everywhere else Governments are tough with these multi-nationals. Here we let them take what they like.

Mr LAURANCE: Let us set the ground rules for them and allow them to continue exploration. We must provide incentives to the operators to

continue the exploration. The Government must be assured of a reasonable share. Sufficient profits must be available for the industry as an incentive to it to continue to mobilise the enormous amounts of high-risk funds the oil industry requires.

Once the ground rules are set, then that is the name of the game and the rules should stay that way. It is reprehensible of Governments to offer incentives in order to get an industry into the area, and then plunder it once it is there. These companies will not stay under those conditions. The British Government is finding this out. There will be no more exploration under the British conditions. The companies will look to New Zealand, Brazil, and offshore Western Australia.

Mr Cowan: Have you any indication of the number of oil companies which have left the North Sea?

Mr LAURANCE: I have all the figures and I would like to discuss the matter with the honourable member. Members have only to consider the effort in Brazil, offshore New Zealand, and the potential in Western Australia to realise the truth of what I am saying. These companies will drift away from the North Sea. They will not stop producing, but they will not stay there.

Mr Pearce: They have not left yet.

Mr LAURANCE: They are deflecting their attention.

Mr Pearce: They have not left yet though, and that is the point the member for Merredin was making.

Mr LAURANCE: They will continue to produce. I have said that. They will not stop producing.

A member: They will stop exploring.

Mr Grill: You are gullible. You accepted it hook, line, and sinker.

Mr LAURANCE: Did not the Labor Party prove gullible when Mr Connor was around? We all know what the situation was in Australia then. No exploration companies would stay here. Can any member opposite tell me one which did stay? Not one.

We have learnt the lesson once and that should be enough, because we are already going to pay very dearly for that five years when no further exploration was undertaken in this country. We will pay dearly for it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! *Hansard* is having considerable difficulty in

hearing. The member on his feet should be permitted to make his speech without interruption.

Mr LAURANCE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. We know the situation which has occurred in Australia, and it has given us cause for concern. The position has changed from the days of Rex Connor when his friends opposite—

Mr Grill: He did not tell us any lies.

Mr LAURANCE: He drove all the companies out of the country. We saw what the industry did under that regime. The companies just vanished from this country.

Mr Grill: That is rubbish! The figures do not bear it out.

Mr LAURANCE: The member for Yilgarn-Dundas must be looking at an entirely different set of figures.

Mr Grill: The greatest downturn in exploration in this State took place the year before the Labor Government came into office, and that can be verified.

Mr LAURANCE: The honourable member would have to prove that to me and to many other people.

Mr Grill: It does not have to be proved. It is in black and white.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LAURANCE: Thank you, Sir. I do not believe the figures substantiate what the honourable member is trying to say. We lost the companies over that period. Explorers left this country. However, they have returned now and the State and Federal Governments are to be congratulated for that. The honourable member knows very well that the figures I have quoted concerning the committed expenditure are far above anything spent in this industry here previously.

Mr Grill: They are committing more money, that is true, but—

Mr LAURANCE: I am still worried about the fact that the present Federal Government has taken far too long to kill the old Whitlam syndrome of a resources tax. While I was away I was delighted to learn that this idea of a resources tax had finally been killed, but it took a long time to die after the change of Government.

I am also concerned about Mr Anthony's latest statement in which he talked about a cartel in the iron ore industry. His idea is to get the companies to club together. This is resource diplomacy. Such interference in a major industry is something we should not tolerate. If we allow this sort of thing

we will not have companies putting in the effort which the country requires. It is this type of action which leaves industries with no confidence. I do not like the portent for industry which the latest action by Mr Anthony has given.

If I am concerned about some of the things said and done by the present Federal Government, obviously I must look at the other side of the coin. Companies will do that very quickly if they see they have some difficulties in coming onstream with some of the policies of the Fraser Government. What about the alternative Government? In the last few days we have seen that that would be enough to drive the whole industry to any other part of the world. We have all heard of the talk of nationalisation and the heroics of the Leader of the Opposition who said he would resign and then found he ran out of chain in the Trades Hall and left-wing string he had to dance with. He felt this string suddenly tightening around his neck and he had to retract.

Mr Pearce: There was no retraction.

Mr LAURANCE: There was no retraction from the member for Fremantle. He still goes on the village green at Fremantle on a Sunday afternoon and advocates the nationalisation of everything, despite the experience of the UK with British Steel. Over £500 million a year has been necessary to prop up that nationalised industry. Yet the member for Fremantle advocates that we go wholesale into the nationalisation business.

Mr Pearce: He is not articulating party policy.

Mr MacKinnon: You are worried he is.

Mr LAURANCE: These people we are hoping to bring to the country to develop much needed energy resources are not faced with a very good picture.

We are on the edge of exciting times with these developments. We desperately need more energy resources. We also need new technology to accompany the developments, particularly with the depth of 2 000 metres at Exmouth plateau. Such type of work has not been done before. We have drilled, but we have not produced the oil and a whole new technology will be required to enable us to do so. We need the employment which will be created by the developments.

Mr Bryce: We sure do!

Mr LAURANCE: I would take this opportunity to answer part of a question the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked today. The trip I made was undertaken completely at my own expense. I thought I would give the answer to that part of his question.

Mr Bryce: I was not singling you out at all.

Mr LAURANCE: In order to gain all these benefits, we must have stable, responsible, and long-term policies. We must not only provide the right climate in which these developments may take place, but also preserve that climate.

MR HODGE (Melville) [9.11 p.m.]: The Budget debate is one of the few opportunities a member has to address the Parliament on a matter which is of concern to him or to his electorate. I intend to take the opportunity to speak about traffic noise.

Traffic noise pollution has reached very serious and alarming proportions in some parts of the Perth metropolitan area. Thousands of Western Australian citizens have their daily lives affected in a detrimental way by traffic noise pollution.

Road traffic noise, caused by the ever-increasing volume of cars, trucks, and motorcycles is escalating within the streets of Perth at a very alarming rate. It is escalating virtually unchecked.

Problems associated with traffic noise pollution are becoming apparent in most Perth suburbs. In the Melville district in particular, many householders residing on or near some of the busier major roads are becoming distressed and resentful at the effect traffic noise is having on their health, happiness, and way of life. They are puzzled and annoyed that the Government appears to be either unable or unwilling to do anything about traffic noise.

Constant traffic noise can make people physically as well as psychically ill. Among the complaints it causes are lack of concentration, insomnia, high blood pressure, increased susceptibility to illness, and heart and circulatory illnesses.

Many residents living near busy roads in Melville have been forced to reorganise the use of their homes, by moving sleeping quarters to the rear of the house. Telephones, televisions, and stereos have had to be moved away from the street and its noise. In addition many residents have made substantial monetary outlays in an effort to achieve some quietness. Dozens of high brick walls have been built around residences in Melville. People have installed air-conditioners and insulation and some have been contemplating double glazing on their windows.

Many residents constantly have their sleep interrupted because trucks now operate 24 hours a day. In summer people sleep with their doors and windows tightly closed in order to keep the noise down. Front verandahs, porches, and gardens have become almost uninhabitable. At certain times of the day if people living on Leach Highway wish to sit on their front lawn or

verandah they almost need to wear ear muffs and a gas mask.

Mr Mackinnon: That is ridiculous!

Mr HODGE: It is true.

Mr MacKinnon: How far do you live from the highway? I live 100 yards from it and it is nowhere near as bad as you say.

Mr HODGE: The residents living on those roads have, in most cases, invested their life savings in their homes.

Mr MacKinnon: The roads were there before their homes.

Mr HODGE: Many have spent thousands of dollars extra building brick walls, installing air-conditioners, and taking other measures to try to restore peace, quiet, and comfort to their homes. These people feel angry and upset at what is happening—and rightly so.

What is the Western Australian Government doing about controlling and reducing traffic noise? The answer is, "Very little". The control of noise pollution in Western Australia is disorganised, fragmented, and totally inadequate. Numerous Government departments have some responsibility or interest in the subject, but not one department or Minister has the overall responsibility or control.

The existing traffic laws in Western Australia are farcical. What few laws we have are difficult to enforce because of their vague wording and a lack of suitably trained staff, technical equipment, and facilities.

The first problem which needs to be overcome in respect of fighting noise pollution in this State, is the Government's inertia and apathy on the issue.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr HODGE: Once the Government can be convinced of the seriousness of the problem and that something can and must be done, the fight can begin.

This form of pollution has been contained and minimised in many cities and countries overseas. It is not too hard. The control of traffic noise pollution can be achieved, but it must be tackled urgently.

Noise is a waste product of the modern technological age. For many years amid the euphoria of technological advancement, noise was tolerated; it was accepted as a nuisance, but it was not really known whether it affected health or just how dangerous it could be. It is only relatively recently it has been accepted that noise can cause physical and mental illness.

The control of all forms of pollution, and particularly air and water pollution, has become one of the greatest challenges facing most Governments today. There is hardly a nation in the world that is not facing some form of pollution problem, and Australia is no exception. We have most of the pollution problems that other industrialised and urbanised nations have, including traffic noise pollution.

Australia's traffic noise pollution is severe by world standards. We are a highly motorised community. I understand that Perth has the highest vehicle ownership ratio per head of population in Australia. Additionally, Governments, State and Federal in Australia have, by a series of policy decisions over the years, thrust more traffic onto our roads, heavy transport, by starving the railways and shipping services of funds.

Most Governments of nations or States with pollution problems have responded by establishing environmental protection departments or authorities. The national Government of Australia has created a Department of the Environment, and in Western Australia we have had a Department of Conservation and Environment for several years. The aims of most of these environmental protection authorities are similar; they are to protect and enrich the environment of the people through the management of noise, waste, and the prevention of pollution now and in the future. The reduction of environmental noise levels to levels acceptable to the community should be an important aim of any environmental protection authority.

Some forms of pollution receive more attention from environmental protection authorities than others. Some forms of pollution are visible and apparent, and receive a great deal of attention from the public, the media, and then from the Government. Unfortunately traffic noise pollution is not one of these forms of pollution that is readily visible, and until recently it has received only very minor attention from the media and the Government. There has been a remarkable lack of concern by the Government in Western Australia about the traffic noise problem. Apparently the Government here thinks that the problem is too difficult to overcome, and our Department of Conservation and Environment apparently shares that view. It seems to take very little interest in traffic noise pollution and apparently it is most reluctant to tackle the problem.

I am not aware of any activity on the part of the Department of Conservation and Environment in respect of fighting traffic noise pollution. Apparently traffic noise pollution is not

considered officially to be a form of pollution. The only involvement by the department on this question that I can see is that it has a representative on the interdepartmental committee recently established by the Minister for Health to look into traffic noise problems.

While the Department of Conservation and Environment has not taken much interest in the matter, and it has not yet started to act, this is certainly not the situation in other parts of Australia and in other nations. The Environmental Protection Agency in the United States has undertaken a great deal of work and study into this problem.

Traffic noise in the United States is a serious problem and it has overtaken aircraft noise as the nation's No. 1 noise menace. It is estimated that up to 33 million Americans a day are subjected to excessive levels of traffic noise. Heavy trucks are the main offenders. Of the more than 125 million vehicles on the roads in the United States, only about 3.75 million are classified as medium or heavy trucks; that is, trucks exceeding 10 000 lb gross weight. These vehicles comprise only 10 per cent of the total traffic, and yet they radiate 75 per cent of the total noise from all vehicles.

In 1973 the United States Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transport brought down strict new procedures in respect of noise control. Each State desiring Federal road funds is required to agree to achieve certain noise levels on all its highway road projects. For example, new roads adjacent to residences, churches, hospitals, schools, or parks, must not exceed a noise level of 70 dba's for more than 10 per cent of the time, even during the rush hour.

Mr Hassell: Do you agree with that method of imposing control from the Federal Government to the State Government?

Mr HODGE: I think it is one way to do it. It appears to be working reasonably successfully in the United States, and perhaps it is worth a try here.

Mr Hassell: This means that the Federal Government makes the funds available, but only on condition that the States do what that Government wants.

Mr HODGE: If the States are not acting on their own initiative. Shortly I will come to what the Victorian Government is doing about this problem.

Mr Sibson: You have not been to Victoria lately.

Mr HODGE: I was there a few weeks ago. The United States is far advanced in studies on the

ways and means of quietening the worst offenders on the road, and these are the heavy diesel trucks. Regulations were introduced on the 1st January this year placing strict limits on the noise which trucks can make. These regulations are to be amended on the 1st January, 1982, to make them even stricter.

In Vienna, Austria, a special traffic noise service is manned 24 hours a day. Citizens can ring up to report any examples of excessive noise, and each complaint is acted upon immediately. A police patrol is sent out to investigate each complaint of excessive noise.

A similar service operates in Johannesburg, South Africa. A Department of Health noise control officer operates a special telephone service so that citizens can ring in with complaints. Each complaint is followed up.

In Tokyo many busy intersections are fitted with permanent noise-measuring devices which also show the time and temperature. Under national law in Japan, local government authorities are required to take annual noise measurements and to conduct surveys and report their findings to the national Government. Double glazing and double doors are common in buildings in Tokyo, and most schools have them. Many of the schools have permanent noise measurement devices built into them.

In Switzerland there are very tough anti-noise laws. When a vehicle on a public road is suspected of being too noisy, it is stopped and inspected. The problem should then be rectified but the vehicle has to undergo a test to see whether it complies with the noise regulations. In serious cases the vehicle can be confiscated and the driver's licence suspended.

There are strictly enforced speed limits for heavy vehicles, and no heavy trucks are allowed on the roads between 9.00 p.m. and 5.00 a.m. in the winter months and between 10.00 p.m. and 4.00 a.m. during summer.

In Sweden the Government provides financial assistance to residents affected by traffic noise and who wish to install double glazed windows. In some areas municipal governments have introduced by-laws prohibiting heavy vehicles from using certain roads at night. By so doing the Government has recognised the legitimate right of commerce to use the roads during the day and the legitimate right of residents to have undisturbed hours of recreation and sleep.

The United Kingdom is probably leading the world in fighting traffic noise pollution. Very strict laws have governed traffic noise since the late 1960s. Since 1973 residents affected by

traffic noise in the United Kingdom can claim compensation from the Government. The compensation ranges from money for double glazing, insulation, and air-conditioning, right though to, in some cases, the purchase of a home by the Government if the noise becomes too great.

Closer to home the Victorian Government appears to be leading the battle in Australia against traffic noise pollution. Tough new laws in the form of Environment Protection (Motor Car Noise) Regulations, 1976, came into effect on the 15th October, 1976. These regulations were issued pursuant to the Environment Protection (Noise Control) Act, 1975. The regulations cover noise from "in-service" passenger cars, panel vans, stations wagons, utilities, and four-wheel drive vehicles. Similar regulations governing noise emissions from "in-service" trucks, buses, and motorcycles, came into effect in July of this year.

The purpose of the Victorian legislation is to control noise from "in-service" vehicles in order to support the existing Australian design rules for new vehicles. If a noise control inspector of the Victorian Environmental Protection Authority suspects a vehicle being driven on a public road is excessively noisy, he records the registration number of the vehicle and reports reports it to the EPA. The EPA then sends a notice to the owner of the vehicle requiring that the vehicle be presented at the testing station within 14 days.

Most car owners take advantage of the 14-day period to have any noise faults rectified so that when the car is presented for testing, it complies with the regulations. If the person fails to present his vehicle for testing when required to do so, he can be fined the maximum penalty of \$200. The maximum penalty for owners of vehicles which fail the noise test is \$400. If a person continues to use an excessively noisy vehicle, he can be fined a maximum penalty of \$100 a day.

The Victorian Government opened its first vehicle testing station at Altona on the 21st April, 1978. The station has two main testing functions—exhaust emission and noise emission.

Melbourne has a serious air pollution problem caused mainly by vehicle exhaust pollution. In June, 1976, the Government introduced air emission standards for motor vehicles in the form of the Environment Protection (Motor Vehicle Emission Control) Regulations, 1976. The Environmental Protection Authority has a statutory responsibility to ensure that motor vehicles manufactured, sold, or used in Victoria, comply with the regulations applicable to such vehicles. The new testing station plays a vital role

in equipping the Environmental Protection Authority to perform that function.

When a vehicle is presented for a noise test, it is checked by very accurate and sophisticated equipment. The engine speed of the stationary vehicle is taken up to a prescribed number of revolutions and a very sensitive microphone is attached to a precision meter placed at a specific distance from the vehicle exhaust. The engine speed is measured with a tachometer.

The sound measuring equipment, unlike the exhaust emission equipment, is not bulky and it is portable. It can be used anywhere provided that a suitably large obstruction-free paved area is available.

The Environmental Protection Authority in Victoria is planning to establish three testing stations in the Melbourne area, and also to conduct vehicle noise tests in various country areas by establishing temporary testing facilities in municipal car parks and other places.

Returning to the situation in Western Australia, there are vast numbers of unwarranted sources of sound in this State. They can be broadly grouped into domestic noise, industrial noise, motor vehicle noise, aircraft noise, and motorboat noise.

Attempts have been made to control domestic noise through the Noise Abatement Act. I am pleased to say that the Tonkin Labor Government was responsible for the introduction of that Act.

Industrial noise already is covered by legislation although from time to time I have heard doubts expressed about its adequacy.

The only legislation which attempts to control any aspect of traffic noise in Western Australia is the Road Traffic Act and its regulations. I will discuss that in more detail shortly.

There do not appear to be any adequate regulations concerning aircraft noise. Aircraft appear to arrive and depart from the Perth Airport at all hours around the clock; there does not seem to be any embargo upon aircraft movements from Perth. People are forced to put up with that noise during the sleeping hours.

Noise from motorboats is serious in a few areas of Perth, close to popular waterways, although I do not think it is worrying large numbers of people at present. I am aware in a few cases that householders have taken or threatened to take private legal action against owners of noisy boats, and this usually has achieved the desired effect; namely, the quieting of the noisy boat.

The noise generated from trail bikes and off-road vehicles creates a lot of problems to residents

in some suburbs. In my electorate it is a problem at Samson and Willagee. The Government is attempting to do something about this and although it is making heavy going of it, it appears legislation will eventually be passed to control this aspect of vehicle noise pollution.

Apart from the question of industrial noise and the damaging effect it can have on the health of workers, traffic noise seems to be the most serious form of noise pollution facing us and easily the most neglected by the Government. We have a tremendous task facing us today in Western Australia in respect of reducing traffic noise. The first step in doing something practical to overcome the problem is for the Government to acknowledge that the problem exists and then to decide to launch a determined, vigorous campaign to do something about it.

At the moment, the Government does not appear to recognise the seriousness of the problem. I have been receiving the same types of answers to my questions for the past 18 months—"The problem is very difficult and no early solution is envisaged" is the standard reply.

The Government needs to be convinced that the problem, while it is difficult, is not impossible and that action can be taken immediately to assist to solve the problem. The Government needs to be convinced that practical action must be taken before the problem gets completely out of hand.

There appears to be an almost total lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the various Government departments and agencies which have some interest in or responsibility towards traffic control. No one Minister or Government department appears to have overall authority or responsibility for the problem. This fact has been clearly demonstrated to me by the contradictory and conflicting answers I have received to a series of questions I have asked on traffic noise.

The Department of Conservation and the Environment, contrary to what one would expect, does not appear to play any role in fighting traffic noise pollution. Traffic noise is not officially considered to be a form of pollution. This attitude contrasts sharply with attitudes of Governments in other nations and with the Victorian Government where the EPA is given the prime responsibility of fighting traffic noise.

In Western Australia the Public Health Department is responsible for enforcing certain aspects of the Noise Abatement Act which covers some forms of noise, but not traffic noise. I understand that the Noise and Vibration Control Council and its committee of technical experts have done quite a deal of study on noise and its

effects. However, certainly there has not been any practical outcome in the form of laws or regulations to regulate in-service vehicle noise, as a result of those studies.

The Road Traffic Authority is the only Government body which appears to be responsible for the enforcement of any law which seeks to minimise vehicle noise. The RTA regulations are hopelessly inadequate for controlling the type of traffic noise we have today. Not only are the regulations inadequate but also the RTA appears to have a shortage of trained personnel and technical equipment which would enable them to do the job.

When a new vehicle is presented to the RTA for registration, the licensing authority must examine the vehicle to see whether it bears a certificate from the manufacturer stating that it complies with the Australian design standard in respect of noise emission. If the vehicle has that certificate, it may be registered. The RTA has to accept the manufacturer's assurance that the vehicle complies with the Australian design standards.

The RTA does not have a testing station, suitable facilities or adequate staff to conduct tests itself. The vehicle manufacturers do not test every vehicle. In fact, I am told they test only a prototype and if that prototype complies, it is assumed every other vehicle on the production line also complies. Assuming that all new vehicles do comply with the Australian design standard when registered, what is the situation once the vehicle is driven from the RTA yard? What is the situation once the vehicle has been in use for six months, 12 months, or two years? Does it still comply? The RTA has no way of knowing because it does not have the facilities to check.

The Road Traffic Act regulations cannot cope with the individually-noisy vehicle or with the general traffic noise problem. The regulations are not technically specific and do not mention any particular permissible noise levels. No mention of "decibels", the technical sound measuring unit, is included. The regulations are vague and subjective. Terms such as "excessive", "unavoidable" or "undue" are used. This makes the job of the RTA almost impossible.

A further limitation on the effectiveness of the RTA in controlling noise is the fact that its weights and measures patrols do not regularly operate at night. Many residents of Melville have stated to me that they believe one reason that the trucks coming through the district late at night make so much noise is that they are heavily overloaded.

I asked the Minister for Police and Traffic question 1041 recently which related to this matter and the Minister replied that the RTA weights and measures patrols do not operate regularly at night and that in the past 12 months, only six vehicles were apprehended for overloading between the hours of 6.00 p.m. and 6.00 a.m. I do not know whether that figure was for the Melville district alone, or for the entire State; either way it is rather worrying. Obviously, if a truck operator cares to take the risk of overloading his vehicle, the time to do it is at night, and the chance of being caught is practically nil.

In addition to the involvement of the RTA, the Public Health Department and the Department of Conservation and Environment with traffic noise control there is also some involvement—at least in an academic way—of the Department of Transport, the Main Roads Department, the Town Planning Department and the MRPA.

Apart from having a representative on the interdepartmental committee established a couple of months ago by the Minister for Health to examine traffic noise, I cannot see what role the Department of Transport plays, except perhaps as a contributor to the general traffic noise problem via the Metropolitan Transport Trust.

The Main Roads Department, the Town Planning Department, and, I imagine, the MRPA all would have some academic involvement in the traffic noise problem. I believe the Main Roads Department is doing considerable study on the prevention of excessive noise levels resulting from future road and freeway development but unfortunately, details of its work are not readily available to members of the Opposition.

None of the departments—the Public Health Department, the Main Roads Department, the Department of Conservation and Environment, or the RTA—conduct regular traffic noise checks on the major roads in the metropolitan area. Recently, because of the number of complaints from residents of the Melville area, the RTA conducted noise tests on Leach Highway and Stock Road. Some 56 vehicles were issued with work orders relating to inefficient muffler systems. This was just a scratch on the surface, as a result of only one blitz; however, it gives some idea of the extent of the problem.

Some confusion exists at the movement over the question of exhaust systems and mufflers. Mufflers are on sale in Perth shops at the moment which, when fitted to vehicles, render the drivers of those vehicles liable to prosecution for excessive noise; yet that muffler can be sold quite legally.

What a strange double-standard. This situation was pointed out to the Minister for Police and Traffic by the member for Dianella in April, 1978, by way of question 519. The Minister replied that no action was proposed to alter the situation.

The entire approach in Western Australia to the traffic noise problem needs to be rethought. Whilst it is acknowledged that traffic noise is detrimental to health, the practical solution does not lie with the Public Health Department. I believe traffic noise should be treated as a form of pollution. Legislation to define and regulate traffic noise primarily should be the responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Environment, with practical assistance in the enforcement of the law rendered by the RTA.

Naturally in a matter as complex as traffic noise, decisions by other departments such as the Main Roads Department and the MRPA must be considered from time to time; however, a single department and a single Minister need to be given overall responsibility and control.

The ramifications of traffic noise and its effects on the community are very great indeed. Traffic noise can be divided into two types—the noise created by individually noisy vehicles and the general traffic noise caused by the sheer volume of traffic. The cause and effects of the two types of noise are different and their control and reduction need to be approached differently.

A large degree of noise which currently is worrying people in Melville could be reasonably easily eradicated. I believe that many in-service vehicles presently on our roads do not comply with the Australian design standard rule in respect of noise emission.

Excessive noise from a vehicle, particularly a truck, can be caused by a number of factors which include—

The choice of tyre tread. Certain tread designs common on truck tyres can cause much greater road noise than car tyres.

Engine cooling fan. A substantial amount of engine noise is created by the operation of the fan. Some vehicles are already fitted with clutch-operated fans that disengage once the vehicle reaches normal running speeds.

Engine type. Diesel engines on average are at least twice as noisy as petrol driven engines.

Body shape and design. Poorly designed vehicles create much more wind resistance and noise.

Poor maintenance. Lack of maintenance to both the engine and the bodywork results in an increase in noise. A correctly tuned motor runs efficiently and quietly. Loose body panels can be a great source of noise if the road surface is uneven.

Road surface. A coarse road surface or an uneven road can both contribute to noise.

Vehicle speed and load. An overloaded truck obviously creates more noise and usually results in frequent gear changing and the use of low gears.

Muffler efficiency. The efficiency of the muffler has a large bearing on vehicle noise emission. The more efficient the muffler, the less efficient the engine. A heavily muffled engine uses more fuel and drops power. Many mufflers on vehicles creating excessive noise are burnt out or have been deliberately altered to increase the vehicle's engine efficiency.

Lack of sound proofing in the engine compartment.

If manufacturers were required by law to design vehicles which ran quieter, it could be done. The United States Environmental Protection Agency estimates that the technology already exists to reduce vehicle noise by up to 50 per cent. The disadvantage, of course, would be that the cost of manufacturing vehicles would increase, and running costs also would increase.

The Western Australian Government should be pressing through its representative on the Interstate Noise Control Committee for the gradual improvement of the standards imposed on Australian vehicle manufacturers.

A complete new Act, or major amendments to the Noise Abatement Act, are necessary to define what are acceptable vehicle noise levels in our community and to eradicate excessively noisy vehicles from our roads.

Sir Charles Court: Do you think there is a general public demand for increased restrictive attachments for motor vehicles which would further increase costs?

Mr HODGE: I am certain of it. If the Treasurer disbelieves me, I can show him a file of letters I have in my office which is about 15 inches high.

Sir Charles Court: People are demanding dearer vehicles and more operating costs?

Mr HODGE: They are demanding quieter vehicles. Private vehicles will cost more to manufacture and operate, but these restrictions could be brought in gradually. People are

demanding this, and we should be doing something now.

Sir Charles Court: That is the reverse of the representations made to the Government, which are to get away from the high costs of these devices.

Mr HODGE: Is the Premier disbelieving the correspondence I have?

Sir Charles Court: It is just that the representations to the Government are the reverse.

Mr HODGE: I am presenting another point of view to the Government on behalf of the many hundreds of people who have written to me, phoned me, handed me petitions, and called at my office. They have not all been from my electorate; they are from almost every electorate represented in this Parliament.

Mr MacKinnon: Even from mine?

Mr HODGE: Yes.

Mr Sibson: How many from Bunbury?

Mr HODGE: I do not remember offhand. A vigorous programme of law enforcement and public education in respect of traffic noise, vehicle maintenance, and driving habits should be embarked upon by the Western Australian Government.

If noise caused by individually noisy vehicles can be minimised then the other aspect of the problem—general noise caused by the sheer volume of traffic—can be tackled. This type of noise is affected by a whole range of Government policies. The Government's decision on the siting of roads, freeways, town planning, siting of commerce and industry, industrial development, and public transport policies, all have a bearing on general transport noise problems.

A Government decision can turn a quiet residential road into a very busy major highway. A decision by a Minister can turn a small road into a double six-lane highway, as has happened in Stock Road and Leach Highway in my electorate.

Mr MacKinnon: How long ago was Leach Highway planned?

Mr HODGE: I do not know, but when many of the houses were built there Leach Highway was just the old High Road and there were only two lanes. Several years ago the United Kingdom Government brought in legislation that provided people with compensation payable by the Government if their homes, lives, or health were affected in a detrimental way by traffic noise pollution.

The Victorian Government set up an inquiry chaired by Mr J. A. Gobbo, QC, which recommended that a similar system to the UK one be formed in Victoria to establish a system whereby Government compensation could be claimed if a person's home, health, or well-being was affected by excessive traffic noise.

I believe the Western Australian Government would do well to consider the report of Mr Gobbo which was presented to the Victorian Premier in March this year. The Western Australian Government should be considering the introduction of that type of scheme. Why should householders have to suffer an attack on their health, happiness, or well-being, without being able to claim compensation?

A further step in regard to controlling traffic noise would be to give local government more power to control this problem. A simple amendment to the Local Government Act to give councils the authority to prohibit heavy or noisy vehicles from using residential roads would achieve a significant improvement in the nuisance of traffic noise in residential areas. It would also save shire councils a considerable amount of money on damage to roads caused by heavy trucks using minor residential roads.

If heavy trucks could be re-routed away from residential areas, this would be a big improvement. The Local Government Act in Victoria has already been amended in this way.

Mr MacKinnon: It has already been done here.

Mr HODGE: No, it has not. I have asked the Minister to do something about it. I would be pleased if the Government would amend the Act in the way I suggest. Many people residing in Stock Road, Marmion Street, Carrington Street, and Preston Point Road are worried about architectural or structural damage to their homes caused by the vibration from heavy trucks.

It is time the Government stopped just moaning about how hard the traffic noise problem is to solve and actually started taking some practical action. I believe the following steps should be taken as soon as possible—

- (1) New legislation introduced to define acceptable traffic noise levels for residential areas, and maximum noise levels that individuals in service vehicles may generate.
- (2) Overall responsibility for the control and prevention of traffic noise pollution to be given to one department and one Minister.

- (3) Exhaust and noise emission testing stations to be constructed at various points in the metropolitan area.
- (4) Sufficient numbers of trained and equipped inspectors to be employed to apprehend and test noisy vehicles.
- (5) Local government authorities given power via an amendment to the Local Government Act to prohibit large, heavy, and noisy vehicles from using residential roads in built-up areas.
- (6) Legislation to enable householders affected by traffic noise to claim Government assistance and compensation in respect of minimising it or, if necessary, relocating their homes.
- (7) The imposition of an embargo for a trial period of six months on heavy and noisy vehicles using residential roads during the hours of 10.00 p.m. to 6.00 a.m.
- (8) The Government to use its influence to have the Australian design standard rules in respect of vehicle noise upgraded for motorbikes, cars, buses and trucks.
- (9) The Government to initiate a public education programme, similar to what was done in respect of water conservation, to raise public awareness of the need to quieten vehicles and to drive in a manner that will cause minimum noise nuisance.

I am sure if those suggestions were adopted they would at least provide a start in overcoming the problem and would go some of the way towards achieving a significant reduction in the menace of traffic noise pollution.

Mr MacKinnon: A well-read speech.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [9.53 p.m.]: This Budget has demonstrated to the people of Western Australia that finance is a very limited resource. The Federal Government's tight-fisted monetary policies and the reduction of income from the State's mining royalties, as well as the effect on the revenue of some of the State's essential services that the poor agricultural year has caused, have meant a very limited increase in revenue to the State. With the Treasurer's decision to introduce a balanced Budget—and I must admit in my opinion it was the right decision—we have a limited expenditure. If our financial resources are limited, it is my opinion those resources should be used judiciously.

I intend to address my remarks to three areas. Two areas will deal with expenditure where I think our financial resources could be better used, and the other area concerns revenue earning

where the State could review its policy with a view to having charges made a little more equitable for the people who have to pay them.

Most of us in the Chamber would agree that Western Australia's economy is related directly to the development of the State's natural resources. It should be the responsibility of Government to ensure those resources are developed in a steady, continuing, and very responsible manner.

I see one of the most difficult roles of government being the balance it must strike between incentives for private enterprise in developing our resources and the benefits that accrue to the people of the State in the development of those same resources.

The majority of people would agree that most of our legislation, and particularly the Mining Act, maintains that our resources are the property of the Crown and that it is only right the State has this responsibility to ensure the people of Western Australia benefit from any development of the resources we have.

The Government certainly has a responsibility to provide industrial infrastructure for the development of our resources. In his Budget Speech the Treasurer made a commitment to the provision of this infrastructure in some of the proposed project developments he has in mind. I have no quarrel with the provision of housing, power, and harbour facilities for projects such as the North-West Shelf gas and other ventures in the north. I agree that the cost of providing these infrastructures must be recouped, but there is one thing I do question and that is: How far can a private enterprise Government go in providing finance for the infrastructure for companies to develop our resources?

An example I could give where I think we have not been judicious with our funds, if the proposals do in fact go ahead, is the decision for the SEC to spend something like \$400 million to lay a pipeline from Dampier to Perth in order to pipe the natural gas to Perth. One of the basic reasons for this is that if one is chasing capital investment one has three requirements. One needs to have a proven resource in commercial quantities; one needs to have a captive market for the resource; and one needs to have a stable Government if capital investors from other countries—we must admit most of the money must come from foreign countries—are to be prepared to invest their money in this country.

One thing we do not have so far as our natural gas is concerned is a captive market. Perhaps the only potential market we have, other than the world export market, which is certainly not

captive but is highly competitive, is the high energy consumer of refining bauxite into alumina.

It is quite obvious to me that if the Treasurer's idea was to attract funds for the development of the North-West Shelf gas, then we must have some captive market for our gas. Consequently, the Government has committed itself to spending \$400 million for the provision of a pipeline from Dampier to Perth.

I raise two points on this matter. We have in the southern portion of Western Australia an energy source much closer than the North-West Shelf gas, and I refer to Collie coal.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr COWAN: I cannot see any reason that we should not use this source of energy for the production of heat, which, basically, is what the alumina refineries need. We could then use that \$400 million somewhere else.

There is another factor which must be considered and the member for Gascoyne demonstrated this very clearly tonight. Australia is going to become more and more dependent on the OPEC countries for its oil and, consequently, we are going to pay higher prices for our oil.

It is my belief we should be giving serious consideration to conserving quite a lot of our North-West Shelf gas for the automotive industry, because if we do not do so we are going to pay extremely high prices for the fuel which is so necessary for one of our other major industries—that is, the agricultural industry.

I think most members are well aware of the disaster created by the Federal Government's decision to increase fuel prices in rural communities. People have estimated the price will increase by 26 per cent this year, and that is a tremendous amount for which to budget if a person is in any industry.

The Government should be very wary of providing capital for works which should be the responsibility of private enterprise. Recently I was fortunate enough to be sent overseas on a CPA study tour, and of the six weeks I was away I spent three weeks in the United Kingdom talking to people in the oil industry and in local government, involved in providing the same infrastructure which will be required for our North-West Shelf project.

The lesson I learnt was that Governments must be wary of being put in a position where they provide money from the public purse for something which has been demanded by private industry. Perhaps the best example of this is to be found in an experience of the British Government.

It was told that if provision were made for facilities to construct concrete production platforms on the west coast of Scotland, the oil industry would ensure the facilities would be used. In the Glasgow or Clyde region where the highest unemployment ratio was experienced, this was very appealing to the British Government and so it committed itself to spending public money to provide land-backed, deep-water facilities for the construction of concrete platforms. The platforms were no sooner finished than the oil companies advised the Government that the concrete production platforms were unfashionable and that steel platforms were cheaper and easier to transport. Therefore they would have no use for the facilities the Government had provided.

I can visualise a similar situation occurring in Western Australia if we go ahead and construct the pipeline. Because of the increasing demand and price for gas, one of these days the refineries which will use the bulk of the gas will indicate that the price is too high and they would like to revert to coal, and the State of Western Australia will be left with a pipeline on its hands.

Mr T. H. Jones: I am glad I have a coal supporter in the House at last.

Mr COWAN: The people of Western Australia will be unable to support it and we will have a white elephant in our midst.

Sir Charles Court: You know there is a 20-year commitment involved in it.

Mr COWAN: I would certainly hope so.

Sir Charles Court: There is. It is a contractual commitment on a "take or pay" basis and provides for amortisation.

Mr COWAN: I hope the commitment is that the price will be on a parity with world gas prices. I hope the Government would not commit itself to 20 years on a resource which will be more and more valuable to this State and discover the price is 20 years old.

I would like to deal also with the allocation of funds to various departments and I will address most of my remarks to the Health and Education Departments which absorb something like 50 per cent of the Budget allocation.

The Government's policy on education meets with my approval, particularly in view of the Federal Government's decision to reduce its spending on education. The State is responsible for the areas of education which are the most important; that is, primary, secondary, and technical education. I am pleased the Government has increased its spending by 15 per cent. I would like the Government to ensure that enough money

is spent on technical education in the country. One of the greatest problems we face is that of keeping families together. A great deal of attention has been paid to giving students an academic education which is of very little help to people who reside in country areas.

All high schools in rural areas should be given priority to ensure they have a technical or prevocational wing—call it what we like—placed at the school so that students can spend at least two extra years at school and obtain a training which will be a good basis for some trade skill. This will keep them in rural areas.

It would be appropriate to make some comment about the recent teachers' strike, although I realise this does not involve the Budget.

Mr Davies: We are spending money on education. You are entitled to talk about it. My word!

Mr COWAN: The Government should give teachers access to arbitration. If it does not do that it should certainly ensure that the powers of the tribunal are extended to enable it to deal realistically with disputes. Working conditions of teachers are totally irrelevant. At the moment teachers seem to think they are entitled to 11 or 12 weeks' holiday every year. That is not so. Like all other professional people they should take no more than four weeks' annual leave plus long service leave when it is due to them. However, like all other teachers involved in tertiary education, technical education, or in private schools, State school teachers should have access to independent arbitration.

Mr Sibson: Do you mean for the interpretation of ordinary instructions?

Mr COWAN: I mean that teachers should be given access to independent arbitration.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr Sibson: They are.

Mr Davies: A little less stubbornness, and more common sense!

Mr COWAN: If the member for Bunbury were to study the situation he would find they are not.

Mr Sibson: They are asking to go to arbitration in regard to every-day instructions, and that is not on.

Mr Davies: Rubbish!

Mr COWAN: I now wish to turn my attention to health. I am particularly opposed to the fact that out of \$38 million which is allocated for improvements to hospitals in Western Australia only \$153 000 is allocated to country hospitals. Those figures are an indictment of any

department. It is time the Government reviewed its policy in regard to medical care and had a close look at where it is allocating the money. The Government should look closely at providing fewer medical beds as opposed to nursing beds and if that were done we would not have to make such a high allocation of funds to the major hospitals in Perth. A medical bed is so much more expensive to maintain than a nursing bed. If fewer medical beds were provided, the administrative costs of hospitals would be decreased.

It is high time the Government studied closely the amount it is allocating through the Medical Department for hospitals and hospital services for people who become ill, but who are able to be cured and thus enabled to return to the work force. It should provide less money to the major teaching hospitals which in most cases care for people who have a terminal illness.

I hope that in future years we do not have a repetition of what has occurred this year with regard to the allocation of only \$150 000 to country hospitals out of a total allocation of \$38 million. That is shameful.

Mr Grill: I would like some spent on the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital.

Mr COWAN: Promises have been made by other Governments about a regional hospital for Merredin and they were certainly not made by this Government. I am sure the member for Yilgarn-Dundas will be able to submit a case in respect of the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital.

I will turn now to certain areas of revenue the Government earns through its public utilities and draw the attention of the House to some of the anomalies which have occurred. Hopefully the Minister will make a note to have something done about them as soon as possible.

The greatest attention should be paid in respect of those people in rural areas who, through no fault of their own, are now paying 200 per cent and 300 per cent increases in charges for Government services. I am referring particularly to water and sewerage rates on commercial properties. The situation has occurred because of a revaluation of properties by the Taxation Department. Government utilities strike their rate on a stipulated amount. There is no sliding scale. Water rates were increased this year from 7.5c to 10c in the dollar and in some towns there has been an increase of more than 100 per cent in taxation valuations. There have been astronomical increases in the water and sewerage rates, particularly the water rates, because there was a 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent increase in the rate itself as well as an increase in the taxation revaluation.

I have a list of people, particularly hotel and tavern owners, who have had rate increases from \$390 last year to over \$1 200 this year. Members can imagine what would happen if some of the leading hotels in Perth had such an increase in their rates. I am sure something would have been done about it.

Some action should be taken to allow a reduction in the rate to property owners whose increase is in excess of 100 per cent. No-one, regardless of his profession or earnings, should be asked to meet an increase of more than 100 per cent in any Government charge. Such an increase is immoral, and swift action should be taken to do something about it. These rates have been applicable since the 1st July and it is now mid October, but so far all the people have received is an acknowledgment that the matter is being examined and that they will be advised in due course of the action that will be taken.

I am quite sure that the Government has in the benches behind it more rural members than it has had in a long time and yet in some instances the voices of the rural back-benchers are being ignored or are not being raised.

Mr Bryce: The rural front-benchers are being ignored.

Mr COWAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is probably quite right.

I have referred to water and sewerage rates, but I would like also to deal with the increase of 100 per cent which has occurred in respect of the CES; that is, the contributory extension scheme operated by the SEC.

In July last year people who were to be connected to the SEC under the CES scheme were told that their charges would increase by 100 per cent. When I was a back-bencher supporting the Government I brought this fact to the notice of the Premier and I asked whether a committee could be convened to look into it.

A committee of Government back-benchers was convened, and we made a recommendation. The recommendation included the proposal that the 100 per cent increase should be rescinded. The SEC addressed itself to every recommendation we made with the exception of the CES charge. It came up with some alternatives which were very acceptable to the people who were to be denied connection to the SEC, but the Government did not look at the proposal by the SEC to increase the CES charge by 100 per cent. To date I have not had a reply as to why that particular question was ignored.

I will now refer to Westrail which, it is estimated, will have an operating deficit of \$7

million this year. I do not have the figures with me but I think from memory that this will be the second time during the last 10 years Westrail has had an operating deficit. I believe the total commitment of the Government to Westrail would be something like \$27 million if we take into account interest repayments, debt charges, and depreciation on plant. I am very pleased to see the Government accepts that type of deficit. However, even though we accept that deficit, we still see a reduction in transport services generally throughout rural areas. If I ever hope for anything, I certainly hope that the SWATS report will help to improve conditions in areas relating to general transport. I am sure that the areas of the SWATS report which were implemented have not brought about a more efficient service.

The cost of the service has been very great, yet the quality of the service has been no better and in fact, in some cases it has been far worse. I certainly hope that the programme which SWATS has for Westrail proves to be better than what we have seen, especially with regard to chilled meat, freights generally, and the Meekatharra line.

During my term in politics—as has my National Party colleague, the member for Stirling—

Mr Sibson: What strength would a party like yours have to influence anybody?

Mr COWAN: I would like the member for Bunbury to ask me that question during the next election campaign. I am also certain he will have a little more to say, and that he will speak his mind better than the echoes we hear from the back benches of this House.

Mr T. H. Jones: Hear, hear!

Mr COWAN: I will refer back to Westrail. We tried for some time to obtain the freight rates which Westrail applies to iron ore from Koolyanobbing. We have always been told that the rate was confidential because it would jeopardise the company's ability to compete in the open market. However, the freight rate which applies to the Western Australian wheat industry is broadcast. The Australian Wheat Board competes on the international market, so why is the freight rate on wheat not confidential also? I would like to know whether the Government does or does not have something to hide so far as the freight rate on iron ore is concerned. Are the farmers paying more to freight their commodities to the ports than, perhaps, Dampier Mining is paying for its iron ore to be transported to the ports? Surely the Government has nothing to

hide. What is confidential to one group in order not to take away the competitive edge, surely should be confidential to the other group.

I would like to conclude on one aspect of the Budget which disturbs me greatly. I believe it is not totally honest for the Government to maintain that it has not increased State taxes, while knowing full well that on the 1st July last—or before that—it increased charges for each public utility that it controls.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr COWAN: I think it is time the Government gave serious consideration to including in the Budget the increases in charges. Regardless of whether or not they are taxes or charges, they are imposed by the Government. There is no reference to these increases in charges to the elected representatives of the people in Parliament. I think it is time the increased charges were brought into the Budget so that members of Parliament can scrutinise and debate them. Perhaps the heads of departments, and the Minister responsible for imposing the increased charges, would apply them with greater caution. That might prevent some of the increases I have mentioned of the magnitude of up to 300 per cent.

MR WILSON (Dianella) [10.21 p.m.]: No proper assessment of the priorities contained in the State Budget, or its fellow caricature at the Federal level, can be made without taking into account the current situation facing the 6-plus per cent of the State's human work reserves who are unemployed.

It is necessary to say that from the beginning, in view of the statements that keep coming from members opposite on this issue to emphasise that discussions about unemployment are in the end absolutely and utterly mischievous. It is accepted that there is a shortage of jobs and that there are not enough jobs for the majority of those who are unemployed.

Overall, this is something that is not according to the public statements of the Government and the utterances of members on the other side; it is something which is recognised by this State Government and by the Federal Government in Canberra. There is always a tendency for the Government to pretend that things are better than they are.

I recall some time ago in a national newspaper the Premier was caricatured in an editorial as "Mr Accentuate the Positive". Quite honestly, I have no quibble with those who tend to be positive and who want to place an emphasis on what is positive, but we must draw the line with those who say that they are being positive—particularly

(125)

about the situation confronting us on the unemployment issue—and who are actually dishonestly misrepresenting the real situation. We have a situation in which members of the Government spend a great deal of their time whipping themselves into a state of frenzy about the glorious prospects ahead—as we heard from the member for Gascoyne tonight—and the glorious prospects we are on the edge of. We had a sensitive interjection from the member for Yilgarn-Dundas.

Mr Nanovich: You had a statement in the House on that. What about that?

Mr WILSON: We have this sort of attitude being perpetuated when we are constantly being told about the good things that are coming in the future, as though this may be a way of diverting our attention—and particularly, I suppose, the attention of those who are unfortunately unemployed—from the present predicament.

Mr Nanovich: That is not fair and not true, and you know it.

Mr WILSON: Someone once said that the difference between an optimist and a pessimist is that an optimist is a pessimist with more information! If the Government—as it constantly epitomises itself as an optimist and caricatures the Opposition as pessimists—has any extra information which makes it so constantly optimistic, we have never been told what it is. It is always something secret.

Mr Blaikie: Let me assure you of one thing. You are one of the best knockers of projects in this House that I have seen since I have been here, especially in relation to bauxite mining.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Sibson: The member for Dianella has never supported anything since he has been here.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Davies: Speak for yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like members of the House to have some regard for the calls from this Chair to come to order. The member for Dianella.

Mr WILSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The State and Federal Budgets are based on a strategy which is aimed at decreasing inflation while bringing better levels of employment. While the success in bringing down inflation is to be applauded, it is a matter of great concern that the expected dip in unemployment has not followed.

The sort of single-minded optimism of the Prime Minister of Australia for the time being, and the Government of Western Australia, with

regard to the inflation rate at the expense of having high levels of unemployment can only be interpreted as basic insensitivity to the real problems of the unemployed and the potential unemployed. It is not only the Opposition that is saying these things; friends of the Government are making the same sort of comments. I will refer to a speech made by Mr R. M. B. Reynolds who happens to be the Chairman of the Perth Chamber of Commerce. He was speaking at the annual general meeting of that body and he said that fighting inflation and reducing the deficit were becoming guidelines to be followed regardless of the consequences. They were given as the answer to every economic ill, and the justification for every move. The simplicity of the principles must not be allowed to conceal the complexity of the consequences.

I assume that normally speaking a person in his position would have to be considered as a friend of this Government, yet he is making that point.

Mr Davies: A friend of the Premier!

Mr WILSON: The strategy which is implicit in the Federal Budget, and slavishly followed in the State Budget, is that whether it is to be helped or not we have the situation where this obsession with inflation and with the deficit is detracting attention from the very real and increasing problems facing the unemployed and the potential unemployed. Job prospects for people out of work in Western Australia have deteriorated rapidly in the past year.

It is now twice as hard as it was a year ago to find a job in Western Australia. At the end of August last year, 11.6 people were unemployed for every vacancy in Western Australia. At the end of August this year, 23.8 people were seeking each vacant job. The decline in job prospects is worse in Western Australia than in all States except South Australia.

Several members interjected.

Mr Shalders: Don't talk nonsense.

Mr WILSON: Let the figures speak for themselves. The decline in job prospects has been much greater in Western Australia than in Australia as a whole.

Mr Shalders: Why do we have more people working than we had four years ago?

Mr WILSON: These figures were obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Even the State Minister for Labour and Industry tried to discount the significance of such statistics by saying that 27 000 jobs had been created in Western Australia in four years—I think that is

what he said—as a result of investigations carried out by the officers of his department.

Mr O'Connor: The best in Australia.

Mr WILSON: The Minister was forced to admit that in spite of that, unemployment rose at the same time. He is reported to have said, and I quote his words—

Unfortunately the number of jobs we have been able to create has not kept pace with the number of people coming into the work force.

Mr O'Connor: And the number of people coming in from the other States—about 8 000 a year.

Mr WILSON: I am quoting the report of the actual words of the Minister.

Mr O'Connor: You know that is true.

Mr WILSON: Those are the reported comments of the Minister, and he made no qualification at the time.

Mr Sodeman: It has been said here before, and you know it.

Mr WILSON: Even though there has been a sort of muted recognition of this developing and increasing problem, the Government continues to tell us to sit back, not to worry, because everything will be rosy in the indeterminate future.

Mr Sibson: That has never been said, and you know it.

Mr WILSON: One Liberal is prepared to tell the truth. There is one Liberal who has put the true picture about unemployment in this country, but he is certainly not a member of the State Government of Western Australia. Of course, although he is a member of the Liberal Party, he is certainly a person with whom many members of this State Government would find themselves out of kilter.

Mr Blaikie: Don't keep us in suspense.

Mr WILSON: Last month the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Street) listened to his conscience; he took the plunge and told the truth. He owned up to the true situation.

Mr Sibson: Don't you think this Government is concerned about unemployment?

Mr WILSON: Mr Street owned up to the fact that there is no sign of any significant improvement in the unemployment situation. He went on to say that on present indications it seems likely that a new peak will be reached in January and February of 1979.

Mr Davies: While he was saying that, I think the Prime Minister was saying in Werriwa that the policies were working.

Mr WILSON: That may be so. At least Mr Street was saying that, in contradistinction to the comments of the Prime Minister during the last Federal election campaign when he stood up on the platform and was foolish enough to say that under his Government unemployment would fall from February, 1978. Not only that but he went on to say that it would keep on falling.

Mr Clarko: Do you know that the two highest unemployment figures in Australia have been presided over by Labor Party Governments?

Mr O'Connor: Did not Cameron say he would resign when unemployment reached a certain figure, but then he did not?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILSON: The Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations was prepared to own up to the fact that the trend in private sector employment—where the major improvement in employment opportunities must take place if the Federal Budget strategy and the State Budget strategy are to succeed—has been steadily decreasing. He went on to own up to the fact that the Australian economy would have to achieve an improvement rate comparable with the very best post-war experience consistently over the next five years even to reduce unemployment to 4.5 per cent by 1983. It is reported that such an objective would require the creation of 130 000 jobs each year until that time.

Mr Clarko: Under Labor unemployment went up by 192 000 in one year.

Mr WILSON: That is clearly beyond realistic expectation. If we look at the recently released report of the Australian Industries Development Association we see it is predicting something much worse than that. The report estimates that unemployment will increase each year from 6 per cent in 1977-78 to 10 per cent in 1984-85. The AIDA predicts that non-farm gross domestic product will grow by 2.5 per cent only this financial year, increasing to 4 per cent next year, and then to 5.5 per cent in 1984-85. I point out that this is an independent authority making these predictions, predictions even worse than those owned up to by Mr Street.

The Federal Minister went on to own up to the fact that given present levels of industrial assistance and productivity, it seems unlikely that more than 10 per cent of newly created jobs will be generated in the manufacturing, mining, and rural industries in those years. This is of tremendous significance to Western Australia,

and I draw it to the attention of those members who constantly tell us that mining projects in the pipeline will provide so many more employment opportunities that they will solve our unemployment problems. So according to the Liberal Minister in the Federal Government, no more than 10 per cent of the jobs that need to be created will be created in the manufacturing, mining, and rural industries. Mr Street said also that most of the new jobs would have to come from the services sector; in other words, from the Government sector. This was the Federal Minister who said that most of the new jobs would have to come from the Government sector.

Mr Mensaros: That is a different connotation; you do not know the correct use of the term "services sector".

Mr WILSON: It really means that the Government must provide these jobs. This is at a time when our State Government, in collusion with the Federal Government, is actually reducing employment opportunities in the Government sector.

Mr Sibson: Service industries have nothing to do with the Public Service.

Mr WILSON: The Federal Minister owned up to a fact which this State Government has been very reluctant to own up to; the growth of the new labour-saving technology will increase our unemployment problem.

Mr Sibson: Who encourages that?

Mr WILSON: This is something the State Government has been very reluctant to look at and examine.

Mr Sibson: People on your side of the House encourage that sort of activity.

Mr WILSON: The Federal Liberal Minister also owned up to the social consequences of prolonged unemployment in these terms: He said that by the early 1980s the situation could be one where in addition to the problem of 15 to 19-year-olds being unemployed there is a growing proportion of people in their early 20s who have little work experience or prospects of employment. He went on to say that if this situation develops as it has in a number of other countries there will be real dangers to the fabric of society. He further said that in these circumstances the attractiveness of Australia as a place to live and as an investment prospect, and indeed its credibility as a stable community, would be weakened. He made an appeal to all sections of the community—and presumably that would include members of the State Government of Western Australia—to face up to the real employment picture.

It is not until Governments of this country face up to the real employment picture that we will begin to tackle the question of unemployment and the problems of people affected by this terrible thing. In fact, one wonders whether it was not so much the Minister's conscience that was being exercised in those comments, as his sense of the sheer political necessity. His comments certainly have made it much more difficult for his Government to talk as optimistically as before about unemployment. The Minister himself has said it, "Unemployment will deteriorate."

No doubt the State Government will continue with its Canute-like stand of telling the seas to go back; but it should be aware of the fact that any Government which continues to promote false expectations of the future also ultimately and inevitably promotes political retribution against itself if those hopes are disappointed.

Mr Clarko: Your Jeremiah-like comments simply aid unemployment.

Mr WILSON: The comment of the member for Karrinyup is the epitome of the very thing I have just been saying.

Mr Clarko: It is basic economics, which you know nothing about.

Mr WILSON: His comment is the epitome of the "bury-your-head-in-the-sand" attitude to which I have been referring.

Mr Clarko: The more you undermine confidence, the more you increase unemployment.

Mr WILSON: To face up to the real situation is not to undermine confidence. That is the mistake made by members of the Government, such as the member who is now interjecting.

Other members have referred to the need for increased productivity as being a very important factor in bringing about economic recovery and reducing unemployment. In speaking about this, other members have linked it with a call for wage moderation. However, no-one has talked about the possible correlation between productivity and working conditions. The Jackson committee has commented on the quality of work life in manufacturing industry in the following manner—

Working conditions in Australian factories range from good to archaic, unhealthy and unsafe. Migrants and women on whom some parts of manufacturing depend are disadvantaged and even exploited. Many workers are frustrated and dissatisfied with jobs that offer them little interest or sense of personal involvement. Many are unable to adjust easily to change.

The report comments that workers—

... provide the effort and creativity to convert physical resources into products. They have an important stake in the firms for which they work. The continuity of their employment depends on the firm's ability to sell its product, to raise the necessary capital to finance operations and to compete with other firms. The importance an individual places on a particular job varies according to the ease with which he or she can find another offering comparable pay, security, working conditions, satisfaction and acceptable location.

I would like to draw attention to a major employing company which has provided substantial incentives in terms of working conditions, which have contributed significantly to good industrial relations and improved productivity. I refer to Civil and Civic, a subsidiary of the Lend Lease company, which has been involved in the construction of the Mirrabooka shopping centre in my electorate in recent times.

Civil and Civic and Lend Lease are one of the biggest builders in Australia. Civil and Civic was able to go through 1977-78 with no significant strikes in what is, as everyone will recognise quite readily, Australia's most strike-prone industry. This has been achieved by the company as a result of giving more careful—and, I might add, more costly—consideration to its work force, by offering more rewards, and giving greater appreciation to the efforts of its workers and greater attention to their conditions of employment.

Civil and Civic has introduced a superannuation fund which provides the same benefits for every employee from the managing director down to the lowest building worker.

Mr Blaikie: Are they employing more people?

Mr WILSON: I will come to that in a moment. The basic benefits from the superannuation fund come in a group which consists, for instance, of the member's own contributions which are purely voluntary, although generally employees subscribe 5 per cent of their salary; 3.5 per cent of Lend Lease's pre-tax profit divided equally amongst each worker from the managing director down; and company contributions, which total 7.5 per cent of base pay fund profits—and earnings of the fund have averaged 10 per cent, although last year the figure was 26 per cent.

In a special share allotment in August, 1973, and June, 1974, each member was allotted 100 shares, which are now equal to 240 shares after

bonus issues. An important aspect of this package is that it is all a part of the superannuation, and is all tax free. If a building worker is retrenched he receives all these benefits. If a worker resigns before he has completed three years' service he receives the Lend Lease profit share, plus his own money; after additional years of service he receives progressively more of the total package, up to 10 years when he receives the total entitlement.

As everybody knows, in the building industry it is common for workers to be retrenched. When this company completed a major building project in Melbourne, it retrenched a number of workers who received a substantial repayment from the fund. When the same company commenced another major building project in the same city, most of the workers were hastily contacted, and almost all of them returned to the company to become eligible for further superannuation bonuses when the building was finished.

Mr Blaikie: How many people does it employ in Western Australia?

Mr WILSON: The company provides additional benefits to employees after 15 years of service. They receive 1.75 times the average base pay over the last three years of service, rising to 3.5 times the average base pay after 30 years of service. This has been a very expensive operation for the firm, but the company is recovering this extra cost by offering on-time completions. The company is benefiting from the consideration it is giving to its work force, in terms of the productivity resulting from that input.

I suggest it is in a situation such as that where there is due and proper recognition given to the work force, where people feel appreciated and are not just lumps of flesh and bone, to be used up till they drop dead, where their efforts are really appreciated and rewarded, that issues such as industrial relations and productivity will really become issues that are dealt with in a positive manner.

Mr Blaikie: How many people do Civil and Civic employ in Western Australia?

Mr WILSON: I cannot answer that question; however, what I am trying to say has nothing to do with that. In fact, many people were employed by Civil and Civic in the construction of the Mirrabooka shopping centre and many people are going to continue to be employed by that company because that company, operating as it does so efficiently and effectively is going to go on and carry out many more contracts for the local government authority, because the authority is so impressed with its industrial relations and

productivity record and its ability to complete on schedule the works it undertakes. That is no mean recognition, and it has a multiplier effect in the community.

Mr Williams: You cannot make a statement like that because local government must go to tender on buildings.

Mr WILSON: One of the most worrying aspects of the developing unemployment trends is the shrinkage in the total number of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs and the very real danger of virtually creating a new generation of unemployables who do not have the necessary skills and qualifications to make them employable.

It has been argued in a paper entitled, "What is Sweden doing about unemployment?" that the unemployment of young people entails social problems of a very specific kind and that the first apparently temporary period of unemployment can influence one's entire future, warping the mind of a young person and his whole attitude towards society.

There is a great need for the development of practical training schemes, of a broadly based and multi-skilled nature. For the unskilled and the semi-skilled unemployed to become employed and employable they need training for skilled jobs.

In a report prepared by a group of European organisations which have been critical of Government responses to unemployment and the unemployed, they called for reflection and analysis by Governments on the following theme: They say that Governments are willing to intervene only as a last resort to maintain the income of persons without employment.

They go on to say that Governments seem to show much less willingness to use these same sums to allow the same persons to have a job or another useful activity—for example, in education or training. They go on to say that a fairly low-cost effort would in fact be enough to change the character of the present essentially passive range of measures into measures of active employment policy.

They actually make some recommendations on a set of options they feel should be offered to people deprived of employment. They feel people deprived of employment should be offered a range of options in which they suggest the following: A new job similar to the former; a new job required after a period of retraining; work in one of a range of public programmes, including self-management projects; forms of training or education aimed at developing flexibility and raising personal capacities rather than acquiring a

particular technique; and, lastly, the traditional unemployment benefits.

I think there is a growing recognition that if as seems to be the case there is going to be a continuing problem of unemployment for some time it is not going to be enough just to go on offering the unemployed passive unemployment benefits. There must be more offered to these people.

Mr Sibson: Do you say they are being offered nothing?

Mr WILSON: No, I am saying for example that at the moment many people who are on unemployment benefits are unable to take part-time jobs. There is some sense in suggesting they should be permitted to accept part-time jobs and to earn more than the current permissible \$6 a week. They should be encouraged to supplement their unemployment benefits from earnings they can obtain from a part-time position. At least, that would have the benefit of keeping them in a frame of mind which is attuned to being employed rather than being thrown on the scrap heap and going in and collecting their unemployment benefits whenever they must be collected.

Mr Clarko: It would also create a problem, would it not? If you allow them to work for a few hours and they make more money than they would in full-time employment, it would act as a disincentive.

Mr WILSON: That may be the case; however, I think we must be in the position where we are looking positively at other alternatives. I am suggesting that only as an alternative to simply paying people the dole and in fact, in circumstances where they are genuinely unable to obtain work, putting them in a position where they have to do that for months on end; I consider that to be not a desirable position in human terms for a person to be placed in.

Mr Williams: You will find unemployment benefits will be the base rate and they will work a few hours a week to supplement that income.

Mr WILSON: That may be so, but I still think this sort of alternative is something to be examined.

Mr Williams: It is a poor old alternative.

Mr WILSON: Let us hear the suggestion of the member for Clontarf. Other positive suggestions have been put forward as ways of dealing with this problem. The Australian Frontier Movement, for instance, has suggested that an Australian voluntary service be promoted, a scheme wherein people of any age may spend a period of between six months and two years

undertaking work which they perceive as being of real value to themselves and the Australian community. Under the scheme, the work undertaken would range from conservation and park development work, community development, restoration of hospital buildings, community education, fish farming, recreation and welfare programmes through to health and hospital programmes and small capital works.

Mr MacKinnon: They would not do it for nothing?

Mr WILSON: That is right.

Mr Blaikie: I am pleased you did not mention turtle farming.

Mr WILSON: The member for Vasse can give us his suggestions about turtle farming later. A further suggestion has come from overseas that consideration be given to the development of small craft-based manufacturing enterprises and that public and private organisations be encouraged to undertake that kind of labour-intensive investment.

The Municipal Association of Victoria has suggested that municipalities in Victoria could provide jobs for 3 000 to 4 000 of the unemployed on a \$2:\$1 subsidy arrangement.

Also in Victoria, a recommendation has been made that consideration be given to the establishment of regional retraining centres which would combine facilities for technical education and retraining for people in required skilled areas alongside recreational opportunities. We should not just lull these people into a sense of meaninglessness and of being worthless in the community; we should give them the opportunity to maintain their ability to be concerned about the finding of work and the obtaining of the skills which are required at present.

Mr Blaikie: Can you tell us how private people in the community should invest their resources so that they in turn are able to employ people and therefore give them work that way?

Mr WILSON: That matter has been drawn to my attention.

Mr Blaikie: Surely that is the logical way to do it?

Mr WILSON: If the honourable member wishes to make a suggestion, I hope he will be making it in his party room to the Premier. All the suggestions that can be made should be made and should be considered. We want a whole range of suggestions about ways in which unemployment can be dealt with positively at the present time.

Mr MacKinnon: Have you any ideas as to how those suggestions can be funded?

Mr WILSON: Mr Speaker, when it comes to funding, that is a question of priorities for the Government of the day to determine. I am saying that the priorities in this Budget and the Federal Budget assume that the solution is in the future. The question of dealing with the problems which currently exist for those who are currently affected must be seen largely as a future prospect. That is a matter of priority.

If the priorities are to be rearranged, they have to be rearranged in terms of a wholly different approach to the emphasis that any Government gives to the need for dealing with unemployment as it exists at the moment. What I am trying to say is that if sufficient recognition is given to the real problem facing people in this situation, the means will be found. The means are always found when the problem is recognised.

I will give a few instances. When the request arose and was put to the Government about the need for a hockey stadium of international proportions in Western Australia, the Government found the money for that purpose. The Government found \$250 000 or \$300 000 to provide that. The Government rearranged its priorities in order to do it. It is possible for the Government to rearrange its priorities if it considers that the area of concern is of sufficient importance.

I am saying we have had no indication in this Budget that this Government is prepared to rearrange its priorities in that way, to deal with the problems of unemployment which currently exist. I accept that it is the Government's strategy to tackle employment, or the problem of unemployment, in terms of the projects which are in the pipeline and which the Government confidently expects to get off the ground in the future.

I am simply saying that we need to redirect our priorities, to consider the real predicament and the problem facing unemployed people at the present time. I am saying it is possible to do that if there is a will to do it.

Mr Speaker, there were other matters that I wished to raise. However, there is not sufficient time to do justice to them. I wish to conclude my remarks by dealing with one issue on which a great deal of distress has been expressed. It is a matter I feel I should raise. It has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition, but I wish to raise it because I feel it is of such great significance.

The matter deals with the problems presently facing an organisation which is known as GROW

Western Australia. I imagine that all members of Parliament have received letters from that organisation, which has been trying to put before us the problems confronting it. It has been faced with a substantial cut in the funds which are made available to it through the Federal Budget.

I know that submissions have been made to the Treasurer and to the State Government. I know that the Treasurer has announced that further consideration is being given to the provision of extra funds for GROW. I certainly hope that consideration will be followed through, because my personal experience of the work of this organisation indicates that it is extremely effective. It is a grass-roots organisation which serves 350 to 400 people every week in Western Australia. It provides a service which is a self-help service. The sorts of comments that I have received from individuals about the value that they attribute to this organisation are very impressive indeed.

I hope that these approaches to members of Parliament and to the Government will result in the Government and the Treasurer reallocating some of their priorities, and making funds available to GROW, at least to enable it to keep its central office open. I know that the office has been closed and that the phone service has been cut off. A lot of people who used that central facility as a place to meet and to gain help no longer have it available to them.

Sir Charles Court: If they keep going to other people, they will not get anything. In point of fact, a decision has been made by the Government.

Mr WILSON: Can the Treasurer say what that decision is?

Sir Charles Court: I am not going to say. I have written to the group and told them that I have to warn them if they keep running around asking everybody—

Mr Davies: They are entitled to, if they cannot get an answer from the Government.

Sir Charles Court: They have been making approaches—

Mr Davies: Goodness gracious me, if they cannot go around—

Mr WILSON: I consider these comments to be an intrusion into the rights of every Western Australian. Everybody has the right to make an approach to a member of Parliament. If that is the attitude of the Treasurer—stopping people from making representations—it is to be utterly condemned.

Several members interjected.

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

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tubby.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

LEGAL AID COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [11.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Since the Legal Aid Commission commenced operation in April this year, experience has shown that there are a few administrative problems which, to ensure that the commission continues to function effectively, could best be overcome by amendments to the Act.

The Act provides that the Legal Aid Commission is authorised to engage private solicitors in appropriate circumstances to act for persons who qualify for legal aid.

Under section 14 of the Act, the commission is authorised to prescribe by its rules "lump sum fees" to be paid to private practitioners for such services. As can be appreciated, there are marked variations in the amount of work required in individual cases, and the lump sum concept, which involves the same amount being paid for every case irrespective of the work involved, has proved quite unsatisfactory.

Further, as the Act presently stands, it does not enable the commission to prescribe scales of fees, and that deficiency also has posed considerable difficulties in assessing remuneration to be paid to private practitioners. The Bill therefore seeks to amend section 14 to remove the concept of "lump sum fees" and enable the commission to prescribe its own scales of costs.

The proposed new section 16A is to provide reciprocal arrangements for legal assistance. Experience has shown that it would be desirable to have some formal arrangement of reciprocity of representation through other legal aid bodies in

Australia. It would probably be possible for this to be done at present on an informal basis, but as there will undoubtedly be more cases in the future, it is preferable that a specific provision be made in the Act.

Section 62 of the Act allows a practitioner on the staff of the commission and who has received a delegation of power, to sign the name of the Director of Legal Aid on matters relating to a proceeding in which the commission is acting.

The commission feels that it would be more appropriate for the practitioner to be able to sign his own name on behalf of, instead of in the name of, the Director of Legal Aid. The delegation of this power would remain with the director as at present.

It has been suggested that the commission also lacks authority to obtain relevant information from a private practitioner to whom an assignment has been made, and the Bill proposes to add a new section 63A so that the commission may obtain information it requires for the purposes of the Act. This would include financial disclosures by the aided person to the private practitioner, to enable the commission to keep the former's eligibility for aid under review.

In effect, the commission wishes to make it clear that its role is similar to that of an instructing solicitor. Other than to comply with its own duties and obligations under the Act, the commission does not want to impinge on the normal solicitor-client relationship so far as the conduct of a particular case is concerned, but does want the right to obtain all relevant information from the assigned legal practitioner whilst at the same time ensuring that the client's position as against the third parties is safeguarded.

Secrecy of information received by a person by reason of his office or employment under this Act is preserved by section 64.

The commission is concerned that there are some difficulties with the concept of this section in so far as it relates to prosecutions under the Act. The commission does not require applicants to verify their applications by way of statutory declaration, but prefers instead to rely upon the general misrepresentation provisions of section 65. Legal opinion has been expressed that the narrow parameters of section 64 could inhibit the use of section 65 and an amendment is desirable to remove this barrier.

It is considered the proposals contained in this legislation will benefit the commission in its function and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Pearce.

House adjourned at 11.13 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HARBOUR AND LIGHT DEPARTMENT

Former Building

1971. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

With respect to the building formerly occupying the site at the corner of Cliff Street and Marine Terrace, Fremantle, and for many years occupied by the Harbour and Light Department:

- (1) Was it part of a complex which included the present warehouse buildings now being renovated as a Maritime Museum?
- (2) When was it built?
- (3) When was it demolished?
- (4) Who authorised its demolition?
- (5) Did the building, at the time of demolition, have any National Trust or other designation?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (5) Departmental inquiries are presently being made into the ownership of the building formerly on this site.

The information required by the member will be provided as soon as possible.

- (5) When is it anticipated that hills stages and underground supplies will require supplementation from other sources to meet needs of south-west and eastern goldfields areas?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department keeps up with published literature on towing of icebergs to offshore sites, but has only carried out cursory studies for delivering water to onshore sites.
- (2) (a) Water from icebergs would be far more expensive.
(b) Water from icebergs likely to be more expensive.
- (3) Technology to transport water from offshore sites to the shore appears to be available, but techniques to melt icebergs at the required rates and to collect the melted water have yet to be developed.
- (4) Unknown.
- (5) Water from conventional surface and underground sources is sufficient to well beyond the year 2000.

WATER SUPPLIES

Icebergs

1972. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Public Works Department carried out any studies in relation to the cost of delivering water to an on-shore site from Antarctic icebergs?
- (2) How does this cost compare with—
 - (a) the cost of water obtained from runoff into hills storage;
 - (b) the cost of desalinating saline underground or sea water by the most economical methods?
- (3) Is the technology available to be able to transport and extract water from icebergs?
- (4) What would be the percentage of fresh water extracted from an iceberg grounded on the southern coast of Western Australia?

EDUCATION

School: Bindi Bindi

1973. Mr CRANE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

Would the Minister please advise following costs with regard to water problems at Bindi Bindi school:

- (1) The cost of carting water to school from 1st January, 1977 to 31st December, 1977?
- (2) The cost of—
 - (a) supplying and constructing three 20 000 gallon tanks at school (underground);
 - (b) pumping equipment;
 - (c) new overhead tank and stand;
 - (d) harnessing of catchment area?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) \$2 160.
- (2) (a) \$18 230 including \$4 950 for security fencing to the high level and underground tanks and pumping equipment.
- (b) \$2 070 including \$690 for the pipework connecting the equipment to the high and low level tanks.
- (c) \$5 350 including \$1 550 for the relocation of the second 5 000 gallon tank provided by the Engineering Division, Public Works Department.
- (d) \$2 420.

HOSPITAL

Narembeen

1974. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it intended to connect the Narembeen Hospital to the town's sewerage?
- (2) If so, when is it likely this will be done?

Mr Ridge (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Public Works Department expects to have documents and a cost estimate complete in approximately three weeks. Subject to the estimate being within available funds, tenders will then be called and a contract let if a satisfactory tender is received.

TRAFFIC COUNTS

Albany Highway

1975. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have any traffic counts been made between Cecil Avenue and William Street, Cannington, in the last six months?
- (2) If "Yes" what was the result?
- (3) If "No" why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes, in Albany Highway at William Street and Bickley Road.
- (2) I hereby table copies of vehicular flow information from the automatic recorders.
- (3) Answered by (1).

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 432).

RECREATION

Point Walter Reserve

1976. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) On what date did negotiations between the Melville City Council and the Government commence over the future of the Point Walter Reserve?
- (2) Why has there been such a long delay in the finalisation of the negotiations?
- (3) Is it a fact that the Government is demanding that the Melville City Council agree to lease the Point Walter Reserve back to the Government for a period of 21 years with a further option of 21 years before vesting it in that authority?
- (4) If the Government is insisting on the abovementioned conditions, can he explain what point there is in going through the possible charade of handing the reserve over to the council?
- (5) If the Government sees a community need for the Point Walter recreation camp for the next 21 years or possibly 42 years, why is it proposing to give the area to the Melville City Council?
- (6) How much rent is it proposed to pay the Melville City Council for the lease of the reserve?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The first informal onsite meeting between the CRC and the City of Melville was held on the 28th September, 1976.
- (2) The Government is awaiting further advice from the City of Melville.
- (3) to (5) The Government has decided that the reserve be subdivided and vested in the City of Melville on condition the camping reserve be leased to the Minister for Recreation for 21 years, with an option of renewal for a further 21 years. The portion of the reserve not occupied by the camp will be available to the City of Melville on completion of negotiations.
- (6) The rent to be paid by the Government is to be nominal.

1977. *This question was postponed to Tuesday, the 24th October.*

WATER SUPPLIES

Mogumber School

1978. Mr CRANE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the cost of water drilling and cost of equipment for a new water supply at Mogumber school?
- (2) What is the supply and quality of the water?
- (3) Is this water suitable for human consumption?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Drilling cost—\$1 035.
Equipment cost—\$800.
- (2) 5 litres per second of poor quality water.
- (3) No.

FLORA

Native Flora Act and Supervision of Commercial Pickers

1979. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Further to question 1237 of 16th August, 1978 concerning conservation Acts, will he indicate:

- (a) which sections of the Act referred to require further amendments; and
- (b) when the proposed amendments are likely to be presented to the Parliament?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) The proposed amendments are confidential at this stage.
- (b) As soon as it is possible to do so.

HOUSING

Redcliffe-Belmont Estate

1980. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Housing:

With reference to part (2) of his answer to my question 1937 of 12th October, 1978, in view of the decision to indefinitely defer the re-development of the Redcliffe estate, will he grant approval for tenants-in-occupation to exercise their option to purchase their home within the area originally planned for re-development?

Mr RIDGE replied:

As indicated in my answer to part (2) of question 1937, this policy is currently under review and the decision emanating from the policy review will apply to all redevelopment areas.

PREMIER AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1981. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Premier:
 - (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
 - (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Full information on ministerial overseas travel was supplied on the 14th September, 1978, in answer to questions by the Leader of the Opposition.

I do not propose to agree to staff being diverted from other duties to obtain the additional information the member requests, either in respect of the Premier's Department or other Ministers' departments.

I assume the member realises that all transactions of this kind are subject to both internal auditing as well as the overall audit by the Auditor General's Department.

If the member has any reason to believe travel is being undertaken of an unauthorised or unnecessary nature in the conduct of legitimate Government business, then I suggest he lets me have the grounds for his beliefs and I will have them investigated.

I might add that if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition just thinks about the real import of the questions he has asked, he will see the impracticability in respect of

many departments being able to supply the information at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable time.

Mr Bryce: There is nothing sinister in the question.

- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

DEPUTY PREMIER AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1982. Mr BRYCE, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Deputy Premier:
 - (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
 - (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1983. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Agriculture—
 - (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
 - (a) overseas travel;

MINISTER FOR WORKS AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1984. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Works—
 - (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within the Minister's department during the last financial year in respect of—
 - (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1985. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Labour and Industry—
 - (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?

(3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—

- (a) overseas travel;
- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

(3) What is the total estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—

- (a) overseas travel;
- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

ATTORNEY GENERAL AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1986. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

(1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Attorney General—

- (a) travelled overseas;
- (b) travelled interstate;
- (c) used intra-state air facilities;
- (d) used charter aircraft?

(2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?

(3) What is the total estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within the Minister's department during the last financial year in respect of—

- (a) overseas travel;
- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1988. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Industrial Development—

- (a) travelled overseas;
- (b) travelled interstate;
- (c) used intra-state air facilities;
- (d) used charter aircraft?

(2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?

(3) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—

- (a) overseas travel;
- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) to (3) See answer to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1987. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Education—

- (a) travelled overseas;
- (b) travelled interstate;
- (c) used intra-state air facilities;
- (d) used charter aircraft?

(2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1989. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Transport:

- (a) travelled overseas;
- (b) travelled interstate;
- (c) used intra-state air facilities;
- (d) used charter aircraft?

- (2) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
- (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) I refer the member to the answer given to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR HOUSING AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1990. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Housing—
- (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
- (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) See answer to question 1981.

1991. *This question was postponed.*

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1992. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Local Government—
- (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?

- (2) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within her department during the last financial year in respect of—

- (a) overseas travel;
- (b) interstate travel;
- (c) intra-state travel;
- (d) air charter travel?

Mr O'Connor (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) and (2) See answer to question 1981.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND PUBLIC SERVANTS

Air Travel

1993. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has the Minister for Health—
- (a) travelled overseas;
 - (b) travelled interstate;
 - (c) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (d) used charter aircraft?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of air travel for all public servants within his department during the last financial year in respect of—
- (a) overseas travel;
 - (b) interstate travel;
 - (c) intra-state travel;
 - (d) air charter travel?

Mr Ridge (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) and (2) See answer to question 1981.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE CABINET

Air Travel

1994. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) On how many occasions during the 29th Parliament has—
- (a) The Leader of the Opposition; and
 - (b) the Parliamentary Secretary to Cabinet,
 - (i) travelled overseas;
 - (ii) travelled interstate;
 - (iii) used intra-state air facilities;
 - (iv) used charter aircraft?

- (2) What is the total estimated cost of such air travel?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

One can only assume from his series of questions, including this one, that he is not satisfied with the travel facilities made available to the Opposition.

If this is so, I remind him of two important points, namely—

- (1) The Government and not the Opposition has the responsibility to govern and to administer within the constitutional provisions; and
- (2) the present Opposition has been treated by the Government more generously for intrastate, interstate and international travel than any previous Opposition in this State. Likewise, provision of staff is more generous.

MINING: COAL

Conversion to Liquid Fuel

1995. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is it a fact that a joint feasibility study on the conversion of Australian coals into liquid fuels will be held by the Federal Republic of Germany, the Australian Government and the Governments of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria?
- (2) Was Western Australia invited to participate in the study?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Yes, but Western Australia did not participate because there are insufficient coal and water resources available for this purpose.

DAIRYING: MILK

Quotas: Additional

1996. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it intended to release any additional market milk quotas in Western Australia?

- (2) If "Yes" when is it expected any such quotas will be available?

- (3) (a) Are there any approved dairymen at present without a quota for market milk; and
(b) if so, how many?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) The Dairy Industry Authority advises that it reviews the allocation of new market milk quotas in relation to applications received and the availability of funds under the dairy assistance plan. No decision has been made at this time to grant further market milk quotas over and above those already allocated.
- (3) (a) No.
(b) Not applicable.

POLICE

Firearms Licences

1997. Mr TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it a fact that if several members of the one family wish to use a rifle, each person has to pay \$5 each for a licence, amounting to \$30 in some cases?
- (2) Will he consider lowering the charge for a firearm licence where more than one person in a family wishes to use the same firearm, without abrogating the necessity for each person to be so licensed?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The issue of a firearm licence to any member of a family necessitates the same amount of inquiry for each person. For this reason it would not be feasible to reduce the fee.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Bayswater Shire Council: Election and Rolls

1998. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) When do nominations close for the Bayswater Shire Council elections to be held on 24th February, 1979?
- (2) When do the electoral rolls close for such an election?

- (3) Why were the elections not set for a date earlier than 24th February?

Mr O'Connor (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) 2nd February, 1979.
 (2) I understand that the last settled electoral roll, that is the 1978 electoral roll, will be used for this election.

Applications for inclusion of names on this roll of persons who have since the 31st January, 1978, become eligible to be registered as electors and for other changes to the roll under the provisions of section 59 of the Local Government Act, close on 10th January, 1979.

- (3) The 24th February was determined as the most reasonably practicable date for the holding of the election bearing in mind the difficulties associated with the summer vacation period.

SEWERAGE

Morley

1999. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When will sewerage be provided in the south side of Fitzgerald Street, Morley, in the vicinity of house number 52?
 (2) Is it a fact that there is a high water table there which interferes with the proper functioning of leach drains and septic tanks which continually need pumping out?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Reticulation of the catchment area in which house No. 52 Fitzgerald Street, Morley is located is not included in the current MWB development plan 1978-1983.
 (2) Problems with the proper functioning of septic tanks, dry wells or leach drains are matters for the Public Health Department. However, the MWB is prepared to review its priorities for the provision of deep sewerage on advice from that department.

RAILWAYS

Buses: Air-conditioner Mountings

2000. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the purchase of engine mountings for air conditioners on Westrail Mercedes buses (part No. BC100/4002) arranged through tender?
 (2) If not, why not?
 (3) Who supplies these mountings?
 (4) What was the price paid for such mountings within the past year?
 (5) What mark-up on such items is acceptable by the Government?
 (6) Is the Government satisfied that the price referred to in (4) above is the lowest that can be obtained?
 (7) Does the Government desire to know the details of a supplier who could provide the mountings at less than one tenth of the cost referred to above?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
 (3) Howard Porter Pty. Ltd., O'Connor, WA.
 (4) \$156 each.
 (5) The mark-up charged by the firm is not known.
 (6) and (7) Westrail is continually endeavouring to identify cheaper sources of supply of parts originally related to a particular manufacturer and will continue to do so.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Sewerage and Water Rates

2001. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What concessions, if any, are granted to country local authorities for properties owned by them and serviced by departmental sewerage and water services?
 (2) Are normal valuation assessments made and charged against shire buildings such as council chambers?
 (3) (a) Has the Government received any recent requests for concessions for local authorities;
 (b) if so, what are the details?

- (4) Does the Government contemplate providing concessions for country shires in respect of abovementioned properties?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) In the case of offices, administrative centres, depots and similar premises used by local authorities for their own operational purposes, the premises have never been regarded as rateable, but if water and sewerage services are supplied, an annual service charge has been raised for each service.
- (2) These service charges have been equated to the amount that would have been paid had the premises been rateable. In other words, the annual charge has been based on the estimated net annual value.
- (3) (a) Yes.
- (b) In recent years the valuations in country areas have been revised by the Commissioner of State Taxation resulting in some very steep increases in charges. The severity of the increases has, in most cases, been due to the long period, sometimes nine years, between revaluations. This has led to a number of representations for relief from local authorities which have not budgeted for the higher charges.
- (4) As from the 1st July, 1978 flat charges will be introduced in place of the existing method of assessing annual fees. These charges will be \$160 per year for water and \$200 per year for sewerage. Amended accounts will be sent to local authorities within the next few weeks.

HEALTH

Dental: Therapists

2002. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Adverting to question 1932 of 1978 concerning dental therapists can I assume from his answer that all trainee dental therapists with the school dental service will be employed by the State Public Service on graduation?

- (2) Can I also assume that trainee dental therapists at the Western Australian Institute of Technology are not assured of employment with the State Public Service and must seek employment in the public sector?

Mr Ridge (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. (It is assumed that this question, line 6, should read "private sector" and not "public sector").

TOWN PLANNING: METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING AUTHORITY

Maylands Slipways

2003. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) When will the lease between the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Maylands slipways in Hardey Road, Maylands expire?
- (2) Has the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority another site for this purpose under consideration?
- (3) If so, where?

Mr O'Connor (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) The 31st January, 1980.
- (2) and (3) The MRPA is examining possible sites in the Belmont and Maylands areas for the establishment of facilities for the storage and maintenance of non-commercial craft. It will need to have the agreement of the appropriate local authority and Swan River Management Authority.

VEGETABLES: TOMATO CROPS IN GERALDTON

Herbicide 2,4-D: Effect

2004. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he seen press reports referring to the effects of 2,4-D on Geraldton tomato crops?
- (2) Are these reports factual?
- (3) If not, what is the detailed position as advised to him?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) and (3) Damage consistent with that associated with herbicidal spraying has occurred. An experienced officer of my department has investigated the damage and I expect to receive his report in the very near future.

BOATS: FISHING

Mandurah Estuary Channel

2005. Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of the necessary work involved in creating a navigable channel for the professional fishing boats at the mouth of the Mandurah estuary?
- (2) What expenditure on work of this nature occurred during the years—
 - (a) 1976-77;
 - (b) 1977-78?
- (3) When will a commencement be made on the work referred to in (1) of this question?
- (4) What investigations have, or are being made into the feasibility of undertaking some action which may prevent the almost annual occurrence of the entrance to the estuary becoming too shallow for the passage of both local professional fishing boats and private small craft?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) It is estimated that to cut a navigable channel will cost initially \$20 000. To maintain the channel throughout the summer may cost as much as an extra \$40 000.
- (2) (a) \$9 305.
(b) \$23 920.
- (3) The 23rd October, 1978.
- (4) The problems of the annual shoaling at the mouth of the estuary at Mandurah are of very long standing. Investigations have been carried out over some years but all available solutions are expensive and some could introduce other coastal problems.

EDUCATION

Western Australian Post-Secondary Education Commission

2006. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Can he say what the role of the Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission is within the State tertiary education system?
- (2) (a) Does WAPSEC co-ordinate the College of Advanced Education as well as the university sector;
(b) if not, why not?
- (3) Would not the control of courses applying in all tertiary level institutions on a State wide basis help to avoid possible fragmentation and duplication?
- (4) How does WAPSEC relate to the Minister?
- (5) Does WAPSEC include members of all tertiary level institutions or of only one sector?
- (6) Is WAPSEC now proposing to approve another Master of Education Course for this State?
- (7) If "Yes" to (6), how can such a recommendation be accepted when there are two universities with approved Master of Education Courses in Western Australia?
- (8) Is WAPSEC merely a control device for the University sector in a sense that they do not need WAPSEC approval of courses whereas the College of Advanced Education sector does?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The major role of WAPSEC is to co-ordinate and plan for the development of the post-secondary education system in Western Australia. Its functions, which it is required to perform subject to the Minister and with due regard to the traditional autonomy of universities and to the major role of universities in areas outside the scope of post-secondary education, are:—

- (a) to assist the Minister, and the Government of the State, in formation of State views on the promotion, development and co-ordination of post-secondary education and for that purpose to make recommendations to the Minister on those matters having regard to the needs of the State, the number of students to be provided for, and the financial and other resources available;
 - (b) to make recommendations to the Minister and where appropriate, the relevant Commonwealth education commissions on the establishment and location of, and the acquisition and reservation of sites for, new post-secondary education institutions;
 - (c) to advise the relevant Commonwealth education commissions on—
 - (i) the levels of financial support requested by post-secondary education institutions, or authorities governing such institutions, for the purposes of post-secondary education; and
 - (ii) requests for a variation from an approved triennial program of a post-secondary education institution or an authority governing such institutions;
 - (d) for the purpose of achieving rationalisation of resources and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication, to—
 - (i) advise the governing authorities of the respective post-secondary education institutions; and
 - (ii) make recommendations, where appropriate, to the relevant Commonwealth education commissions on proposals for the establishment of new post-secondary education courses of study;
 - (e) to advise the governing authorities of the respective post-secondary education institutions on—
 - (i) the terms and conditions of appointment and employment, including salary payable, of the staff, whether academic or otherwise of those institutions;
 - (ii) all claims relating to the terms and conditions referred to in sub-paragraph (i) of this paragraph;
 - (iii) the fees to be charged by and paid to those institutions for classes or courses, examinations, and academic awards conferred; and
 - (iv) the criteria for entrance to those institutions with a view to avoiding multiple examinations and facilitating, where desirable, the movement of students between those institutions;
 - (f) to determine, when so requested by a post-secondary education institution or an authority governing such institutions, the minimum requirements for new academic awards and to accredit those awards; and
 - (g) to collaborate, where appropriate, with the relevant State and Commonwealth authorities with regard to the preparation of plans for buildings to be used by post-secondary education institutions, the letting of contracts for the building of such buildings, and the general supervision of building operations in relation to such buildings.
- (2) WAPSEC is involved in the co-ordination of the advanced education, university and technical and further education sectors.
 - (3) Refer to function (d) in response to question (1) above.
 - (4) WAPSEC provides advice to the Minister on a variety of issues of relevance to the development and co-ordination of post-secondary education in the State.
 - (5) The membership of WAPSEC consists of a full-time Chairman and the Director-General of Education as *ex-officio* members, and thirteen other members, of whom—

- (i) two are selected for their knowledge of an interest in university education and research;
- (ii) two are selected for their knowledge of and interest in advanced education;
- (iii) one is selected for his knowledge of and interest in teacher education;
- (iv) two are selected for their knowledge of and interest in technical and further education; and
- (v) six are selected for their knowledge of and interest in community affairs in the city and country, employment problems, secondary education, or government.

At present, membership of the commission includes two university staff members, one teachers' college staff member, and one technical education division staff member.

- (6) WAPSEC has recently recommended to the Commonwealth Advanced Education Council that approval be granted for the Western Australian Institute of Technology to introduce a Master of Education course in 1980.
- (7) I understand that WAPSEC recommended the introduction of this course following detailed consideration of information provided by the two universities and the WAIT.

I also understand that WAPSEC discussions regarding this matter took particular account of—

- (a) the overall demand for Master's degree programs in Education;
 - (b) the extent to which the proposed WAIT program differs from the programs offered by the two universities; and
 - (c) the implications of the introduction of the WAIT program for resource use at the WAIT and at the two universities.
- (8) Refer to function (d) in response to question (1) above.

HOUSING: BUILDING SOCIETIES

Permanent: Deposit Insurance Scheme

2007. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he say whether any discussions have been held with the Federal Government regarding the Prime Minister's election

promise to introduce a deposit insurance scheme for permanent building societies?

- (2) Has the State Government been given any indication of when details of the proposed scheme are to be announced?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) A Commonwealth interdepartmental committee met with State officers and also with permanent building society representatives in April, 1978.
- (2) No.

FARMERS

Wellington Catchment Area

2008. Mr McPHARLIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many farmers who held land in the Wellington catchment area have sold their farms to the Public Works Department due to salt encroachment?
- (2) Have these farmers been able to purchase farms in other areas?
- (3) How much money has been advanced to farmers in this area by way of compensation for restrictions placed on clearing under the Country Areas Water Supply Act?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) None.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) \$480 000 for compensation or acquisitions has or is in the course of being paid.

SHOPPING: LATE NIGHT

Optional

2009. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is it still Government policy that the opening of shops on Thursday evening is optional as stated by his immediate predecessor in the House on 20th April, 1978?

- (2) Is it a fact that pressure is being exerted by the owners of some shopping centres upon lessees to force them to open their shops on Thursday evenings?
- (3) In particular, is it a fact that pressure is being placed upon lessees in the Morley Mall?
- (4) What will his Government do to protect the legitimate rights of shop owners who may not wish to open on Thursday evenings?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) It is known that some form of pressure is being placed on the lessees in the Morley Mall for shops to be opened on Thursday evenings. There is no evidence available to suggest that pressure is being exerted on shopkeepers in other centres.
- (4) Section 57A of the Factories and Shops Act contains provision to protect any shopkeeper who may not wish to open on Thursday evenings against any terms of an agreement, lease or contract which provide for opening a shop between the hours of 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Thursdays.

HEALTH

Serenity Lodge: Financial Assistance

2010. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has Serenity Lodge applied for assistance in—
 - (a) forming a drop-in centre at Fremantle for alcoholics;
 - (b) the purchase of transport; and
 - (c) the provision of storage facilities?
- (2) If "Yes" can he advise what consideration has been given to the request and when a decision will be made?

Mr Ridge (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) Yes.
- (2) The request has been investigated and a recommendation on the funding of the above items has been submitted for consideration of the Alcohol and Drug Authority when it is considering the allocation of funds made available for this and other similar requests at a meeting to be held in the near future.

JETTY

Kwinana: Storm Damage

2011. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has damage been caused to the jetty adjacent to the Kwinana wreck by recent storm activity?
- (2) (a) Is action in hand to restore the jetty; and
 - (b) if so, when is it expected to complete this work;
 - (c) at what cost?
- (3) If action is not in hand what is the reason?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes. This jetty was damaged by cyclone "Alby" in April, 1978.
- (2) (a) The Town of Kwinana was advised by the Treasury on the 31st July, 1978 that 50 per cent of the estimated cost of restoration and improvement of this jetty would be funded under the natural disaster assistance arrangements, and that the restoration work should be put in hand.
 - (b) The Public Works Department has had no involvement in the ownership, construction, funding or repair of this jetty. The Town of Kwinana should be approached on this question.
 - (c) The original estimate submitted by the Town of Kwinana to the Treasury was \$45 000.
- (3) Refer to the Town of Kwinana.

EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

Warnbro Area: Committee

2012. Mr BARNETT, to the Deputy Premier:

Relative to the committee set up for the purpose of investigating the problem of high explosive devices in the Warnbro area, what initiatives, if any, have been made by that committee?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

A prime impact area has been identified. Equipment, including essential items obtained from outside the State, is being assembled for commencement of on-site operations on Tuesday, the 24th October, 1978.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PORT: FREMANTLE

Dockers

1. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Transport:

My question is in three parts—

(1) Did Commissioner Cort, following two inquiries, recommend to the Government—

(a) that the present level of 68 men be retained for the casual dockers' roster in Fremantle;

(b) that the guaranteed earnings fund be paid by a levy against all shipping using the port?

(2) Will the Government move to implement the commissioner's recommendations?

(3) What is the attitude of the Chamber of Shipping, representing shipowners, to—

(a) these recommendations;

(b) redundancy payments?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) to (3) The question of the member for Fremantle is of considerable magnitude and detail. I ask him to put it on notice, and I will give him a considered reply.

MINING BILL

Government's Intention

2. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Mines:

In view of the meeting of a considerable number of people associated with mining interests yesterday, and in view of the decision they made in regard to the Mining Bill now before the House, is it still the Government's intention to proceed with this Bill?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

According to the newspaper report I do not think it can be claimed that the mining companies which participated in the meeting were truly representative of the mining industry. As it stands the Government's intention is to proceed with the Bill, but the offer which the Government has often made still stands; namely, that any meaningful proposal will be considered seriously. This is borne out by the amendments already on the notice paper.