

might be considerably embarrassed. In relation to clause 14, I think there is a saver in clause 15. Clause 15 states that the director shall keep proper records and accounts of all moneys and other property received or dealt with by him under the provisions of this part of the Act, and in relation thereto is deemed to be a person subject to the provisions of the Audit Act of 1904. That is a very important saving clause in relation to the conduct of the director when he declares a person to be disadvantaged.

Of the other four clauses in the Bill, two or three deal with the right of representation in proceedings. Clause 16 states that any officer of the department, or any person generally or specifically authorised in writing by the director for that purpose, may in any legal proceedings in any court concerning a person who is, in the opinion of the director, a disadvantaged individual, or in which such a person is indicted for or charged with any crime, misdemeanor, or offence, address the court or the jury on behalf of that person and examine and cross-examine witnesses.

This is a departure from the normal court procedures and laws of evidence, and I wonder if it is a good departure. We seem to be inclined to say—or we want to say—that with the passing of the legislation there will be no segregation. However, having said that, we seem to slant the legislation—perhaps unintentionally—and say there is a certain section of the community to which we want to give special treatment. In fact, we are saying that the community is made up of Aboriginal people as well as the rest of the people.

Some Aboriginal people are just as capable of taking care of themselves in employment and business as are other people in the community. Not only must we talk about the lack of segregation, but we must also try to practice it. I wonder whether or not we should be doing this sort of thing. I have already mentioned that clause 18 provides that any person who obstructs inquiries authorised by the director becomes liable to a penalty of \$200.

The final clause gives the Governor the authority to make regulations not inconsistent with the Act. This is machinery legislation to permit the making of regulations.

I have no further comment except to say I would like the Minister to do what he did with the other Bill, and ask his departmental officers to look into the points I have raised. Perhaps the Minister will have an opportunity to answer me, not necessarily before the Committee stage of the Bill. I understand there is a certain desire on the part of the Minister to see this Bill go through the House as soon as reasonably practicable. I can understand that desire because, no doubt, he will have

the problem of arranging and re-arranging the new department as it relates to the two older departments.

I do not see any reason to hold up the passage of this Bill, but I am sure the Minister will want to deal with it, or think about it, in conjunction with the previous measure. We might like to think it is not part and parcel of the previous Bill, but really it is. That is the way I see it, and my comment is not made in any critical sense at all.

I have satisfied myself by pointing out a few points which, in my opinion, deserve some explanation in some respects. I am certain the Minister will confer with his departmental officers and legal advisers and answer our queries on the points raised. In that spirit I give my support to the second reading of the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan.

House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 18th April, 1972

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

MINING BILL

Availability of Mines Department Officers

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) [4.31 p.m.]: I have been asked to remind members that between 2.15 and 3.30 p.m. tomorrow officers of the Mines Department will be available in the Ministers' writing room to answer queries and to supply information to members on the Mining Bill; and on Wednesday, the 26th April, they will be there from 9.30 until 11.30 a.m.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Practice: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) [4.32 p.m.]: No doubt most, if not all, members will have read the article on page 14 of the *Daily News* of last Thursday containing statements alleged to have been made by the member for Darling Range outside the House. To say the least, these were in very bad taste and were, in my opinion, contempt or verging on contempt by the honourable member and the Press. This point I will deal with later.

As it appears that some members are not conversant with the Standing Orders in respect of questions, and the powers and duties of the Speaker—or at least one member is not—it is now my intention to bring before the notice of members the relevant Standing Orders relating to questions. I will also draw their attention to

a section of the Parliamentary Privileges Act. In conjunction with this, it is necessary that I also bring to the notice of members the rulings of previous Speakers since 1953. After that I will deal with the statements attributed to the member for Darling Range, as published in the *Daily News*.

With regard to questions, members will find that this matter is dealt with in Standing Orders 106, 106A, 107, 108, 109, and 110. Members will find in the seventeenth edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, on pages 351 and 352, the rules of order regarding the form and content of questions. There they will find 29 examples of inadmissible questions. I would advise members who are not sure of the rules relating to the asking of questions to read those pages of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*.

I also refer members to Standing Orders 128 and 129 which are relevant, and it is my intention to read these out. Standing Order 128, which comes under the heading of rules of debate, states—

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

Standing Order 129 states—

All imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on Members, shall be considered highly disorderly.

As members are aware, all questions on notice are vetted by the Clerks at the Table, and if necessary by myself. It seems that members are keeping within bounds in asking questions on notice. However, when it comes to questions without notice, the position is quite different, at least in some cases. Up till 1968 no mention whatsoever about questions without notice was made in the Standing Orders; but in 1968 a new section was added which states that the Speaker has the right at his discretion to admit questions without notice. This section is contained in Standing Order 82.

Regarding questions without notice, as has been laid down by previous Speakers, these must be of an urgent nature, and not merely be questions which seek information. I would point out to members that it is practically impossible for the Speaker to vet a question when it is asked without notice, especially when a part which should be disallowed comes some distance down the question. Hence a number of questions without notice have slipped through, when they should not have been permitted.

I now refer to some of the rulings of previous Speakers, given since 1953. The first ruling of a previous Speaker to which I draw the attention of members appears on page 110 of the 1955 *Hansard*. This

was a ruling given by Speaker Rodoreda, the last part of which is important. It reads—

I have, therefore, decided that in future questions without notice will not be allowed, except on matters of real urgency, in which case I would require prior notice from the members concerned. In case it may be thought that this ruling is to protect Ministers, I would point out that Ministers can, and frequently do, refuse to answer questions without notice and ask that they be put on the Notice Paper. If members do not agree with this ruling the remedy is in their own hands; this being to alter the Standing Orders so as to allow questions without notice. This will take effect as from next Tuesday.

On the following Tuesday the then Leader of the Opposition (Sir Ross McLarty) asked the Speaker whether he would submit his ruling for the consideration of the Standing Orders Committee. This was done. The Standing Orders Committee subsequently made a recommendation as follows:—

109A. At the discretion of the Speaker, questions may be asked without notice on important matters which call for immediate attention, and one supplementary question may be asked to elucidate an answer.

When this recommendation came before the House there were two speakers in the debate—The Hon. A. F. Watts and The Hon. J. B. Sleeman. The Hon. A. F. Watts opposed the whole proposition. The debate was adjourned, and it was never resumed.

I would point out that in 1956 Speaker Hegney gave a warning, as recorded on page 215 of the 1956 *Hansard*, that he would follow his predecessor's step in barring questions without notice if they did not improve.

Then we come to a considerably later stage in 1962, when Speaker Hearman had something to say on this matter. The reference will be found on page 864 of the 1962 *Hansard*. In one part of his speech he said—

Secondly, I would point out that questions without notice are not provided for in our Standing Orders and are allowed purely by the indulgence of the Speaker; and there has been a precedent since I have been in this House for a Speaker to completely stop all questions without notice.

I consider the practice that has developed is an abuse of the privilege of asking questions without notice. I do not wish to put a blanket disallowance on all such questions, but I will have to give serious consideration to the question of not allowing them from certain members who appear to be inclined to abuse this privilege, unless they previously submit them to me.

Speaker Hearman brought the same matter to the notice of Parliament again, approximately two years later.

It will also be found that Speaker Guthrie was very strict with questions, and I understand he has been known to direct that portions of questions which had already been printed and were on the notice paper were not to be answered.

I intend to take a far more strict attitude towards the interpretation of Standing Orders, particularly those relating to questions without notice.

MEMBER FOR DARLING RANGE

Press Statement

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) [4.41 p.m.]: I would now like to deal with an article which appeared in the Press last Thursday. The article states—

The Liberal member for Darling Range, Mr. I. D. Thompson, insisted today that he had acted correctly in Parliament House yesterday in accusing the Electricity Minister, Mr. May.

Mr. Thompson, in a question without notice accused the Minister of being high-handed and arrogant in refusing to receive a deputation of Guildford Grammar School students...

The words "high-handed" and "arrogant" are contrary to Standing Orders 128 and 129. In my opinion, the honourable member should have made an apology on that point. He further stated—

"The facts on which I framed the question were quite clear."

Does the member for Darling Range mean the fact that the Minister was high-handed and arrogant, or does he mean the whole question? Again, I think this is an insult. I quote further from the article as follows:—

Mr. Thompson accused the government of being touchy and of trying to use the Speaker to shield them from such questions.

I have no intention whatsoever of shielding Ministers from questions. Since I have been a member in this House Ministers have been well able to look after themselves, irrespective of the party to which they belonged, and in respect of all questions asked. I repeat: I have no intention of shielding Ministers.

My job, and my object, is to ensure that the Standing Orders as laid down and approved by this House are adhered to. The article continues—

He said he thought the Speaker was "on fairly shaky ground" when he threatened to stop all questions without notice.

I think I have proved my point by referring to the rulings of my predecessors.

I now come to the section of the article which, in my opinion, could have been contempt—or verging on contempt—and in this respect I obtained advice. I will say now the accusation was not contempt, but I also say that it was verging on contempt. The section of the report to which I am referring reads as follows:—

"When the Speaker tries to stifle and inhibit the Opposition he is on very shaky ground."

That statement means that the Speaker is actively partial or, in other words, biased and unfair, and it could be classed as insulting. I refer members to page 96 of *Acts, Etc., Relating to the Parliament of Western Australia* where this particular subject is dealt with in section 8. The side note states, "Houses empowered to punish summarily for certain contempts." On page 97 there is reference to the assaulting, obstructing, or insulting of any member on account of his behaviour in Parliament. I have not given the full content of the paragraph concerned but members can refer to it themselves.

In conclusion, I assure members that I do not get any satisfaction from having to speak to the House on these matters. However, I feel I should make my views quite clear: I intend to ensure that Standing Orders are adhered to and that parliamentary ethics are maintained.

I would now advise the member for Darling Range that during the course of questions without notice I will not acknowledge him until he has apologised to the Speaker and the House.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [4.44 p.m.]: I would like to say, Sir, to you and to the House—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Is the honourable member going to apologise?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am, Sir. In no way did I wish to show you, Mr. Speaker, or this House any disrespect. In so far as the statements in the Press are concerned—which are attributed to me and appear that way—I do apologise.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Guildford Grammar School Grounds: Petition

MR. BRADY (Swan) [4.45 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from the students of the Guildford Grammar School and members of the public from throughout Western Australia. It contains 1,526 signatures, and reads as follows:—

To the Hon. the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will favourably consider our request that the State Electricity Commission should not route its high-voltage power lines through the grounds of Guildford Grammar School.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and we your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have certified that this petition conforms to the rules of the House and I submit it to you, Mr. Speaker.

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

QUESTIONS (36): ON NOTICE

1. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Interest, and Resubmission of Applications

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many applications have been received to date for rural reconstruction loans?
- (2) How many have been granted under the scheme?
- (3) How many applications have been made for—
 - (a) farm build up;
 - (b) debt reconstruction;
 and how many have been approved in each classification?
- (4) What are the respective sums of money approved for—
 - (a) farm build up;
 - (b) debt reconstruction?
- (5) What is the range of interest charged against both classifications?
- (6) What is the average interest rate for—
 - (a) farm build up;
 - (b) debt reconstruction?
- (7) How many rejected applicants have re-applied for assistance and—
 - (a) been successful;
 - (b) been unsuccessful;
 - (c) been successful on their third or subsequent application?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 1,155.
- (2) 355.
- (3) (a) 183 (approved 68).
(b) 972 (approved 287).
- (4) (a) \$1,741,605.
(b) \$6,820,294.

- (5) Farm Build-up—6½% to 7½%.
Debt Reconstruction—all at 4%.
- (6) (a) 6.27%.
(b) 4%.
- (7) (a) 79.
(b) 157 = Total 236.
(c) 15 (included in the 79 of (a)).

2.

ABATTOIRS

Financial Assistance: Applications

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

With reference to the 42 enquiries for assistance to establish abattoirs and the upgrading of existing abattoir facilities received from applicants by the Department of Development and Decentralisation, has the department fully considered the applications received, and, if so—

- (a) what financial assistance has been approved by the Government in response to the applications;
- (b) what requests have been rejected by the Government;
- (c) what requests have been withdrawn by the applicants?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Of the forty-two enquiries mentioned in my reply to the member for Vasse on the 3rd December, 1971 all but five have been finalised.

- (a) Southern Meat Packers Ltd.—Katanning—\$1,200,000.
Carnarvon Butchers—Carnarvon—\$50,000.
Wyndham and Broome Meatworks—\$1,150,000.
- (b) Pinjarra Abattoirs Pty. Ltd.
- (c) The balance (33) have, in the main, been not pursued by the enquirers and are no longer regarded as current by the Department.

3.

SOUTH-EASTERN ROAD

Meekatharra

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he received an application from the Meekatharra Shire Council to assist in the upgrading and extension of the proposed south eastern road to service the uranium area at Yeelirrie?
- (2) If so, would he give urgent consideration to this request and would he, in the interests of the importance of this project to the area, do all in his power to accede to this request?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) The Main Roads Department has received and is considering an application from the Meekatharra Shire Council.

4.

KAOLIN

Deposits and Markets

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many commercial deposits of kaolin are known to exist in Western Australia, and in what districts?
- (2) What are the possible markets for kaolin?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Small deposits of kaolin have been known and worked in the Darling Ranges and eastwards, e.g. Goomalling, for many years. The size and grade only warrants development for local demand. Recent reports indicate that some mining companies have located large deposits at Greenbushes and Bromus (south of Norseman) and other localities.
- (2) There is an overseas demand—Japan in particular—for high grade white kaolin, which meets the required rigid specifications for use in the paper industry as a filler and coating.

5.

TOWN PLANNING

Research and Planning: Cost

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) From and including the Stephenson plan for the development of the metropolitan area, what has been the total cost of research and planning carried out to 31st March, 1972 on all the various plans and schemes initiated for the proposed development of the metropolitan area?
- (2) During the period mentioned in (1) above, has any money been spent on research and planning on a plan and/or policy for decentralisation?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Town Planning Department has a wide range of activities, covering advice to the Government and its agencies on planning matters and in providing professional and administrative support to the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority and the Town Planning Board. Because of this complex activity, records of detailed expenditure are not maintained in a form that would permit analysis to produce a Departmental figure.

In addition to the Town Planning Department, many other departments and authorities contribute to research and planning within the metropolitan region and an attempt to consolidate costing information is not considered practicable or fruitful.

- (2) In respect of the Town Planning Department, decentralisation is always a planning consideration, but primarily it is a matter of economic planning. The Government has established a Department of Development and Decentralisation which is studying the problems of decentralisation in Western Australia.

6. *This question was postponed.*

7. HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEES

Advances

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the total of advances from approved lending institutions that have been guaranteed by the State since the implementation of the Housing Loan Guarantee Act?
- (2) How many purchasers have been assisted under the scheme?
- (3) What advances have been made and how many home purchasers assisted in each of the last three years?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) The cumulative total of guarantees issued to date under the Housing Loan Guarantee Act since its inception is \$19,738,000.
- (2) 2,598 purchasers have been assisted under this scheme.
- (3) Details of operations during the last three years:—

	Advanced \$	Number of purchasers
1968-69	1,700,000	170
1969-70	1,700,000	170
1970-71	1,250,000	125

So far in this financial year \$425,785 have been advanced to assist fifty-four purchasers.

8. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Review of Act

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

Having regard to—

- (a) The Premier's policy speech delivered on 3rd February, 1971 wherein he said: "A review of the Workers' Compensation Act will be undertaken with the intention of raising it to the best possible standard"; and

- (b) the comments made by the Member for Boulder-Dundas on deficiencies in the Workers' Compensation Act on Wednesday, 28th July, 1971; and
 - (c) the statement in the 1972 Governor's Speech that "The Workers' Compensation Act is being reviewed and amending legislation will be recommended"; and
 - (d) his Government has been in office some 15 months,
- is he satisfied with progress being made in this regard?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

No—and in this regard, some comment may be of interest. The Government originally desired a completely new Act with emphasis on rehabilitation and incorporating a similar philosophy to the Ontario and proposed New Zealand legislations. Difficulties were encountered in how to apply certain principles to a dispersed population of only one million, and it was reluctantly decided to push ahead with important amendments to the Act as it now stands, while a comprehensive review of the Act will be attempted before the next session of Parliament.

9. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

English and New Zealand Legislation

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

Are any of his officers making a specific study of English and New Zealand law relating to workers' compensation?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I suggest the answer to the last question is probably what the honourable member is looking for in this particular question.

It is possible that I have not fully understood the question.

There has been no workers' compensation in England since 1946 when the then relevant Act was superseded by the National Insurance (Industrial Injuries) Act 1946. However, as our Act was originally based on its English counterpart, decisions of English courts are still used as precedents in the interpretation of our Act and for that purpose, are the subject of specific studies by the Chairman of the Board.

The New Zealand Workers' Compensation Act, 1956 appears currently to be in the course of supersession by the new Accident Compensation Bill which will provide

for general safety, prevention of accidents, rehabilitation and compensation for all accident victims, whether workers, victims of motor vehicle accidents, etc., and their dependants, and replaces action for damages.

The Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board specifically studies development in New Zealand, maintains a constant personal relationship with the New Zealand Board and, by arrangement, receives a copy of every decision given there direct from the judge delivering it.

10.

TEACHERS

Salaries: Comparison

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Would he please table a comparative list of salaries of teachers employed with State education departments in all States showing various grades, the time of service or experience and qualification needed for these grades?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

Teachers' salary awards from all States are tabled as requested.

The documents were tabled.

11.

CRAFT COUNCILS

Finance

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

(1) Of the finance made available by the Australian Council for the Arts for the craft councils of the States for the financial year 1971-72, how much did Western Australia receive?

(2) Was this finance made available for the purpose of encouraging development and promotion of Australian crafts or for additional other purposes as well?

(3) How was this finance used in Western Australia?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) to (3) All applications made to the Australian Council for the Arts are treated by that body as confidential. Therefore the State Government has no immediate knowledge of the amount of assistance requested or received by any particular group in Western Australia.

This question has therefore been referred to the Australian Council for the Arts for them to supply the details requested. When their reply is received the details will be communicated to the member.

12. COCKBURN SOUND

Port Developments and Finance

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

What is the estimated total of public funds considered necessary to finance the Fremantle Port Authority 1972 development plan for Cockburn Sound on Point Peron, stages 1, 2 and 3 in Mangles Bay, Kwinana Beach area and any other Fremantle Port Authority development included in the plan for Cockburn Sound?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Stages 1, 2 and 3—\$97,500,000.

Kwinana industrial area—

(a) Land acquisition—\$2,500,000.

(b) Jetties (2)—\$5,000,000.

13. COCKBURN SOUND

Port Developments, and Environmental Protection Report

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

Will he table the Environmental Resources of Australia Pty. Ltd. report or reports to the Fremantle Port Authority relating to Cockburn Sound?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Yes—for two weeks.

The reports were tabled.

14. LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Land Tax: Revaluations

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Which local authorities have been revalued since 1st March, 1971 by the State Taxation Department?
- (2) What percentage rise of value has been experienced by each local authority?
- (3) How much land tax has been collected this financial year?
- (4) What is the estimated shortfall or excess in land tax collections expected this financial year?
- (5) What has been the total to date of the relief of land tax resulting from legislation enacted in 1971?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Armadale-Kelmscott, Bayswater, Canning, Kwinana, Mosmans, North Perth, Peppermint Grove, Perth Municipal sheets 7, 10-18 inclusive, Rockingham, Subiaco, and Swan.

Claremont, Cottesloe, East Fremantle, Fremantle, Guildford, Mosman Park, Nedlands, Peppermint Grove, and Subiaco.

(2) Unimproved values—

Authority	Year of previous revaluation	Increase as at 30/6/71 on previous revaluation %
Armadale-Kelmscott	1966	136.1
Bayswater	1967	94.2
Canning	1967	102
Kwinana	1967	50.2
Mosmans	1967	85.4
North Perth	1967	109.1
Peppermint Grove	1967	60.2
Perth municipal sheets 7, 10/18 incl.	1967	51.8
Rockingham	1967, 1968, 1969	39.3
Subiaco	1967	100.5
Swan	1964, 1967, 1968	254.8

Annual values—

Authority	Year of previous revaluation	Increase as at 30/6/71 on previous revaluation %
Claremont	1968	64.5
Cottesloe	1968	66.6
East Fremantle	1968	49.3
Fremantle	1968	71.5
Guildford	1968	78.6
Mosman Park	1968	153
Nedlands	1968	36.4
Peppermint Grove	1968	71.7
Subiaco	1968	194

(3) Up to 31st March, 1972—\$4,934,788 has been collected.

(4) Currently collections are running at \$750,000 below the estimate for 1971-72.

(5) No detailed statistics of this relief have been kept, because of the cost involved. Based on examples extracted in response to this question, it is estimated that the cost would not have exceeded \$22,000 to 31st March, 1972.

15. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS: INCREASED CHARGES

Minister for Education

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Attorney General:

With reference to my question 36 Wednesday, 12th April, 1972 and his reply, would he give the dates and/or numbers of the *Government Gazettes* in which these increases to charges made by departments under his control can be found?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

Bills of Sale Act, No. 32 of 1971.
Companies Act, No. 31 of 1971.
Business Names Regulations—*Government Gazette*, 17-12-1971, p.5266.

16. **ABATTOIRS**

Esperance Project

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With reference to the statement of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation on Thursday, 6th April, 1972 announcing an abattoir for Esperance area, was the meat industry advisory committee requested to investigate the proposal, and, if so, when, and what were the recommendations?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Meat Industry Advisory Committee discussed this matter at a meeting held on 12th January.

It was agreed that sufficient livestock should be available from the Esperance district by the end of 1973 to enable an export abattoir to operate economically.

No final recommendation was made in view of lack of information on the site and supporting facilities.

The Meat Industry Advisory Committee will seek further information during a visit to Esperance at the end of April.

17. **GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS:
INCREASED CHARGES**

Minister for Lands

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Lands:

What increases in all charges have been made by departments under his control since 20th February, 1971 by regulation, administrative act or Statute, including those at actual production cost?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

There has been no increase in charges by Statute or regulation. Drafting charges were formerly based on an average charge of \$5.80 per hour for labour. On 22nd November, 1971, this practice was discontinued and the following hourly rates were substituted:—

Qualified draftsman—\$6.14.

Male drafting assistants—\$5.25.

Female drafting assistants—\$4.24.

Cadet draftsmen—\$4.12.

The surcharge component of survey charges has been increased by 2½%—other components, and survey fees fixed by regulation, have remained unaltered.

18. **TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Reading Course

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it not a fact that a valuable and highly useful reading course, for students severely handicapped in reading ability, which was conducted at the Claremont Technical School last year, has been discontinued this year?
- (2) Is lack of finance the reason why the course has been discontinued?
- (3) If not, what is the reason?
- (4) Will he request the department to restore the course as soon as possible?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Insufficient demand.
- (4) The course will be conducted when there is sufficient demand.

19. **TRAFFIC**

Crosswalk: Armadale High School

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

Will he take urgent action to ban vehicular parking 100 feet both sides of the highway and to the right and left from the pedestrian crossing over South Western Highway serving the 1,500 students and teachers attending Armadale Senior High School plus the numerous residents?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

The Minister for Police advises that Main Roads Department will carry out an investigation to ascertain whether there is a need to increase the parking restriction at present in force near this crosswalk.

20. **ELECTORAL**

East Melville Roll and Metropolitan Quota

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Since the current Legislative Assembly boundaries became effective—
 - (a) how many electors have been enrolled on the East Melville roll on each occasion that that roll has been printed and on what dates was that role reprinted;
 - (b) would he state the number of electors on the East Melville roll for any given month in each year?
- (2) What is the current quota of electors for metropolitan Legislative Assembly seats?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) (a) Since the current Legislative Assembly boundaries became effective the East Melville district roll has been printed on three occasions, as follows:

Date; Number of electors
on roll

21st February, 1968 13,351

25th July, 1970 14,649

20th January, 1971 16,472

- (b) Yes. From 1968 onwards on request.
- (2) The quota for metropolitan area districts in the Notice of Proposals published by the Electoral Commissioners in *Government Gazette* No. 4 of Friday, 21st January, 1972 is 15,496.

21. SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY

Upgrading, and Armadale High School Crosswalk

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What upgrading of the South Western Highway between Armadale and Bunbury is projected by the Main Roads Department in this year's programme?
- (2) Will he explain how this work will improve the road crossing in front of the Armadale Senior High School for the safety of the students?
- (3) Will the department immediately remedy the present unsatisfactory pedestrian crossover in front of the high school?
- (4) Will he support the establishment of a bus station in the school grounds to obviate the need for the buses to enter from the South Western Highway?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Main Roads Department's current programme of works provides for the following works on the South Western Highway . . .
- (a) Re-construct, prime and seal 22.75M. to 24.7M.
- (b) Construct bridge at Beenyup Brook.
- (2) The work referred to in reply to question (1) will not affect the pedestrian crossing at the Armadale Senior High School.
- (3) Yes. Improvements to the approach to the pedestrian crossing will be carried out by the Main Roads Department.
- (4) Yes—depending on the scheme and providing there are no objections from the Minister for Education.

22. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Break-up of Funds

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Was the statement made in *The West Australian* on Thursday, 8th April on farm reconstruction that the break-up of 50% of the total funds available from the Commonwealth would be used for debt reconstruction and the other 50% for farm build-up would continue?
- (2) Is it correct that Western Australia has already spent approximately 50% of the available funds for debt reconstruction?
- (3) What percentage has been spent on farm build-up?
- (4) What will happen to future applicants now that the 50% allocated for debt reconstruction is exhausted?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The statement was that this would remain an objective, but not necessarily possible of achievement.
- (2) No.
- (3) 10%.
- (4) Not exhausted.

23.

ABATTOIRS

Output and Saturday Work

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What numbers of sheep and lambs have been slaughtered at Midland and Robb Jetty abattoirs for each week for the months of February and March and up to the week ended 15th April, 1972?
- (2) Did the abattoirs operate during any of those weeks on Saturday morning, and, if so, what were the numbers slaughtered?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Sheep and lambs slaughtered at Midland since February, 1972:

	1972	Sheep	Lambs	Total
Week ending—				
February 4	...	29,000	6,550	35,550
February 11	...	39,406	7,255	46,661
February 18	...	38,702	6,796	45,558
February 25	...	32,290	7,445	39,735
March 3	...	39,710	7,652	47,371
March 10	...	33,091	6,438	39,529
March 17	...	40,216	8,671	48,887
March 24	...	41,586	7,421	49,007
March 31	...	25,850	6,436	32,286
April 7	...	25,357	8,168	33,525
April 14	...	34,574	8,090	42,664
		350,523	81,828	432,351

Sheep and lambs slaughtered at Robb Jetty since February, 1972:

1972	Sheep	Lambs	Total
Week ending—			
February 2	13,405	7,239	20,644
February 9	17,673	6,812	24,485
February 16	18,347	6,302	24,730
February 23	19,180	6,235	25,415
March 1	19,380	6,168	25,548
March 8	13,935	5,740	19,675
March 15	17,836	7,192	25,028
March 22	15,742	6,601	22,343
March 29	15,871	6,865	22,736
April 5	16,437	5,085	15,522
April 12	17,250	7,221	24,471
	179,056	71,550	250,606

- (2) Midland operated nine of the twelve Saturdays since the start of February:

Saturday kills were	Sheep and Lambs
January 29	5,013
February 5	5,771
February 12	5,583
February 26	6,000
March 4	5,857
March 11	5,501
March 18	6,181
April 8	6,371
April 15	6,197
	52,474

During this period no Saturdays were worked by the West Australian Meat Export Works.

24. FRUIT-FLY CONTROL

Transfer to Local Authorities

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Did he advise the Local Government Association of the Government's intention to amend the Local Government Act to allow the transfer of fruit fly control to local authorities, as outlined by him to the House on Tuesday, 11th April, 1972?
- (2) If "Yes" has he received a reply and on what date?
- (3) Did the Local Government Association support the proposals?
- (4) Did any local authority independently support the proposals?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. It was indicated that individual and community responsibility was the most practical means of achieving fruit fly control.
- (2) A reply was received on 20th October, 1971.
- (3) No.
- (4) Local authorities have not been approached independently.

25. AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES

Government Grant

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the total amount made available to agricultural societies by the Government for the financial year 1971-72?
- (2) Was the amount expended?
- (3) What agricultural societies, including the Royal Agricultural Society, received any Government grant for the financial year 1971-72, and what was the amount in each case?
- (4) How many societies applied and have had their applications deferred until 1972-73?
- (5) Will he advise the names of the societies in question and the amounts involved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) \$20,000 to agricultural societies, and \$120 prize money to the Royal Agricultural Society.
- (2) Of the \$20,000 allocated, \$13,434.43 has been claimed and paid to date.
- (3)

	Subsidy Paid
	\$
Albany Agriculture Society Inc.	{ 950.00
	{ 1,680.65
Narrogin Agricultural Society Inc.	2,084.25
Collie Agricultural Society Inc.	749.64
York Agricultural Society	366.67
Eastern Hills District Agricultural Society	203.58
Waroona District Agricultural Society	590.91
Koorda and Districts Agricultural Society	66.67
Margaret River and Districts Agricultural Society	1,264.54
Brunswick Agricultural Society (Inc.)	3,000.00
Central Midlands Agricultural Society (Inc.)	895.35
Harvey Agricultural Society	1,462.17
Royal Agricultural Society—	
(i) Prize money—Pure Bred Herd Testing Classes	60.00
(ii) Contribution to Baconer Carcass Competition	60.00
- (4) Four.

	Estimated subsidy \$
(5) Society	
Southern Districts Agri- cultural Society	976.00
Esperance and Districts Agricultural Society (Inc.)	1,683.00
Wanneroo Agricultural Society	1,533.00
Gidgegannup Agricultural Society	357.00

26. CRIMINAL CODE

Offences under Sections 317, 403, 404, 407

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney General:

Referring to his reply to my question 29 on 12th April, 1972—

(1) Would he disclose the number of—

(a) complaints;

(b) convictions,

in connection with offences violating sections 317, 403, 404 and 407 of the Criminal Code (shown separately) for any given period—for which statistical information is separately recorded—of approximately 12 months around the years 1950 and 1960?

(2) Alternatively, would he give any other statistical information which shows whether complaints and convictions regarding the offences mentioned in (1) have decreased, increased or remained static during the past 20 years?

Mr. JAMIESON (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

(1) This statistical information was not recorded until 1964.

(2) With the increase in population during the past 20 years, complaints and convictions have increased proportionally.

27. ABATTOIRS

Profits and Losses

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What has been the profit or loss at Midland and Robb Jetty abattoirs respectively for each of the previous five years?

(2) Where losses have been sustained how have these been met?

(3) What has happened to profits, if any?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Profit and losses at Midland for each of the previous five years:

	\$
1966-67	151,709 loss.
1967-68	128,176 loss.
1968-69	35,014 profit.
1969-70	307,273 loss.
1970-71	721,431 loss.

West Australian Meat Export Works:

	\$
1966-67	8,485 profit.
1967-68	58,468 profit.
1968-69	7,889 profit.
1969-70	54,089 profit.
1970-71	40,399 loss.

(2) The deficit at Midland Junction Abattoir has required the injection of additional loan funds for maintenance and capital works.

(3) West Australian Meat Export Works appropriated the profits to general reserve. For 1970-71 the loss was covered by a rebate of payroll tax affecting previous years, resulting in \$46,083 being appropriated to general reserve. Profit in 1968-69 has been retained by the Midland Junction Abattoir Board.

28. MEAT INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Towns and Austen Report

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

With reference to the Towns and Austen report of May, 1970, which included in its recommendations the establishment of a meat industry authority, has the present Government considered this recommendation, and, if so, what was the decision?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The Meat Industry Advisory Committee is currently making a detailed assessment of this matter.

29. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Farm Build-up Applications

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many applications have been received for farm buildup under the rural reconstruction scheme?

(2) What is the average size of these farms?

(3) How many of these farms are—

(a) under 1,000 acres;

(b) between 1,000 and 2,000 acres;

(c) between 2,000 and 3,000 acres;

(d) between 3,000 and 4,000 acres;

(e) over 4,000 acres?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 183.
- (2) and (3) Statistical dissection of applications is with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which will produce computerised tables from time to time. The bureau has been asked to provide the information applied for.

30. JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Upgrading

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What differences will there be in the quality and numbers of secondary staffing, equipment and curriculum in—
 - (a) district high schools;
 - (b) high schools?
- (2) When does he anticipate that the promised upgrading of education standards in the present junior high schools will become effective?
- (3) Is he in a position to indicate the priority in which these schools will be upgraded?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

- (1) Every attempt will be made to equalise the quality of staff and equipment at district high schools and high schools. The curriculum will be the same at both types of schools.
- (2) A start will be made during the next year by the provision of resource centres at eleven district high schools.
- (3) No.

31. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Extensions

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) In answer to a question it was stated in the *Votes and Proceedings* of 11th April, 1972 that the anticipated completion date of the existing extensions to the comprehensive water supply scheme is December, 1973. Because the very survival of people in drier areas depends on adequate water supplies, will he advise—

- (a) if the areas east of Pithara, north and east of Dalwallinu, west, north and east of Kalannie, north of Kalja, north west and east of Koorda, including areas west, north and east of Mollerin, west, north and east of Beacon, north to Wialki and areas north east

and east of Mukinbudin are to be considered in planning for any future extensions;

- (b) if he believes that plans for further extensions should be made long before the completion of the present scheme?
- (2) Will he indicate what action he has taken towards making a submission to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for further extensions?
- (3) If no action has been taken will he advise when it is anticipated that action will be taken?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) Yes. Requests for consideration of these areas and many other areas not yet served have been made. These will all be considered in planning future extensions.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) A submission was made in 1968 to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to provide water by pipeline to 640,000 acres of the York-Greenhills and the Corrigin-Bullaring areas. While no finality has yet been reached regarding this submission, recent correspondence has indicated that the Commonwealth's decision can be expected shortly.
- (3) Answered by above.

32. NEW SOUTH WALES GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Contributions to State Revenue

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

Referring to question (6) on 13th April, 1971 what percentage of total State revenue of New South Wales does the contributions in each of the years 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71 of the Government Insurance Office of New South Wales represent?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

1968-69—.096%.
1969-70—.26%.
1970-71—.24%.

33. COCKBURN SOUND

Port Developments, and Environmental Protection Report

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Will he equate his answers that the Environmental Protection Authority is carrying out an investigation of the amended Fremantle Port Authority plan for

development of Cockburn Sound and the Minister for Environmental Protection's answer (7) on 13th April that the investigation is not being carried out?

- (2) Will the investigation by the Environmental Protection Authority of the Fremantle Port Authority amended plan now be requested with a report to Parliament in due course?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes. In my answer to question 12 (9) on 22nd March in response to the question "Has the Government obtained a report from the Environmental Protection Authority on the issues raised in question (8)?" a simple answer would have been "No", but I sought to provide further information to the member that the Environmental Protection Authority was considering the matter. The member will appreciate the difference between having a report called for and the Environmental Protection Authority undertaking consideration of a matter it regards as of possible environmental concern.
- (2) Such a request should be conveyed to my colleague, the Minister for Environmental Protection.

34. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS: INCREASED CHARGES

Minister for Environmental Protection

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

What increases in all charges have been made by departments under his control since 20th February, 1971 by—

- (a) regulation and/or administrative act;
(b) Statute?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Medical and Health Services:

I have arranged for all variations in charges relating to public hospitals, public health and mental health to be tabled.

No fees have been varied by Statute, but the great majority of variations have occurred as the direct result of the Commonwealth Government altering scales of most common fees and Commonwealth benefits relating to doctors' fees, and pharmaceutical, radiological and pathological services, which necessitate changes to conform with the Commonwealth scales.

Department of Fisheries and Fauna:

Nil.

Department of Environmental Protection:

No charges have been made by this Department since it was set up.

The papers were tabled.

35. UNIVERSITY AND INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Scholarships and Fees

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many students at the University of Western Australia and at the Western Australian Institute of Technology respectively are receiving—
- (a) scholarships;
(b) bursaries;
(c) other assistance?
- (2) What percentage are students (a), (b) and (c) of each total enrolment?
- (3) What was the fee increase this financial year and the percentage increase of the previous fee for each of these centres of learning for—
- (a) full-time students;
(b) part-time students?
- (4) What has been the net gain or loss in fee expenses to full and part-time students at the institute and university after allowing for the increased subsidy by the State Government?
- (5) What did this subsidy cost our Government?
- (6) What sum has been recovered from the Commonwealth Government?
- (7) How many students have terminated or deferred their studies and in what year of their course, this financial year—
- (a) at the university;
(b) at the institute of technology?

Mr. DAVIES (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

				University of Western Australia	Western Australian Institute of Technology
(1)					
(a)	2,882	712
(b)	87	50
(c)	5,222	1,712
(2)—					
				Percent	Percent
(a)	33	10
(b)	1	1
(c)	60	25

(3)—

(i) University of Western Australia—

(a) Full-time students
(b) Part-time students

	Actual Increase \$	Percentage Increase
(a) Full-time students	168.00	45
(b) Part-time students	84.00	45

(ii) Western Australian Institute of Technology—

(a) Full-time students
(b) Part-time students

75.00 50

Weekly hours of
Tuition—

1	7.50	60
2	15.00	60
3	22.50	60
4	25.00	50
5	27.50	44
6	30.00	40
7	32.50	37
8	35.00	35
9	37.50	33
10	40.00	32
11	42.50	31
12	45.00	30
13	60.00	40
14	75.00	50

(4) (i) University of Western Australia:

Full-time first degree W.A. students—Nil.

Full-time second degree and diploma W.A. students—Saving \$12.

Full-time higher degree students—Saving \$8.

Part-time and external students—*pro rata* saving of \$12.

Interstate students—Saving \$12.

Overseas students—Increase \$78.

(ii) Western Australian Institute of Technology.

As detailed in (3) (ii).

(5) The additional cost of the increased tuition fee subsidy payable to University students is estimated at \$408,000 and fees for students sponsored by Government Departments a further \$234,000. However, these increases are offset by additional fee revenue of \$1,213,000.

(6) No part of the cost of the subsidy is recouped by the Commonwealth Government.

(7) (a) and (b) No information is available on terminations and deferrals.

(4) Is it intended to further retain any of those in (3) and for what reason?

(5) Will all others be transferred to the Public Works Department, and how soon?

Mr. MAY replied:

(1) 72.

(2) Bardoc
Beacon
Bencubbin
Bodallin
Boondi
Bonnie Rock
Burracoppin
Burngup
Cranbrook
Chinocup
Dudin
Esperance
Karalee
Kellerberrin
Koorada
Kwobrup
Kununoppin
Laverton
Malcolm
Merredin
Moorine Rock
Muntadgin
Newdegate
Pithara
Pioneer
Salmon Gums
Tambellup
Widgiemooltha
Wyalkatchem
Wyening

(3) Berginning
Etymilyn
Moolliaman
Pinjarra
Amery
Buntine
Boorabbin
Caron
Gabalong
Manmanning
Quairading
Wongan Hills
Chinocup
Broad Arrow
Bromus
Bullabulling
Kalgoorlie
Scaddan
Woolgangie
Yellowdine
Kylie
Nookanellup
Bowelling
Congelin
Corrigin
Duggan
Formby
Hillman
Katanning
Kondinin
Kweda
Narrogin
Wagin

36.

RAILWAYS

Dams

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many railway dams have ceased to function for railway purposes in the last 15 years?

(2) Which of these have been transferred to the Public Works Department?

(3) What dams are being held by the department without present use?

Wickepin
Williams
Yornaning
Perenjori
Koolanooka
Wurarga
Day Dawn
Nallan
Stake Well
Yaganoo
Meekatharra

(4) No.

- (5) Country Water Supply will be given first option to refuse acquisition, otherwise land to be re-vested by Under Secretary for Lands, but no firm indication of date of release can be given at this juncture.

QUESTIONS (7): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

English and New Zealand Legislation

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

In answer to my question 9 on today's notice paper, the Minister in the first part of his answer said—

It is possible that I have not fully understood the question. There has been no Workers' Compensation Act in England since 1946.

The Minister then went on to mention further matters relating to workers' compensation in New Zealand. My question to the Minister now is—

Was he not aware of the statement made by the now Premier in his policy speech, quoted on page 14 of that document, which states —

A review of the Workers' Compensation Act will be undertaken with the intention of raising it to the best possible standard. To this end a study of the English and New Zealand laws will be made?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I am aware of the Premier's statement, but I would point out to the honourable member that in the first sentence of my reply I mentioned that I was not sure of what the honourable member meant in his question. There was certainly no reference in the question to the Premier's policy speech.

I felt I might have misunderstood the honourable member's question and, in fact, I gave him a lead in answer to his first question on notice. The honourable member

is obviously interested in the direction in which the Government is thinking as far as the Workers' Compensation Act is concerned, and from a study of my answer to question 8 on notice he should be able to elicit the information he requires.

2.

ELECTORAL

East Melville Roll and Metropolitan Quota

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Speaker:

My next question without notice arises out of the answer to question 20 on the notice paper, but before asking the question I would like some assistance. Question 20 on the notice paper, addressed to the Attorney-General, was answered on his behalf by the Minister for Works. Since the Attorney-General is not present I would like an answer to my question tomorrow, but as I cannot put it on the notice paper I wonder whether one of the other Ministers could supply the information?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Is it so urgent that you cannot put it on the notice paper?

Mr. O'NEIL: Yes, it is. I am required to make certain submissions to the Electoral Commissioners by Friday. I have to make an apology here, because in consultation with the Clerk of the House—

The SPEAKER: I will allow you to ask the question without notice, but you cannot make a speech.

3.

ELECTORAL

East Melville Roll

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Attorney-General: Will he provide me with the number of electors on the East Melville electoral roll in March of each year since 1968? This is what I asked in the first question.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN (for Mr. T. D. Evans) replied:

On behalf of the Attorney-General I undertake to do what is possible to meet the honourable member's wishes.

4. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Route: Armadale-Kelmscott District

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

As the State Electricity Commission has now indicated to residents of my electorate that it intends to

move immediately into their properties, and now that the 330 kV transmission route as shown and published in the S.E.C. plan T7/1/12 of the 23rd November, 1971—

The SPEAKER: I hope you are not making a speech.

Mr. RUSHTON: No, I am asking a question. Continuing—
—is to be changed, will he—

- (1) Let me have suitably scaled plans of the present route—
 - (a) through the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott so that roads and properties can be identified; and,
 - (b) total route on smaller scale?
- (2) Will he confirm that the previously published plan showing the route to the north of Allen Road in Armadale and Kelmscott will be adhered to?
- (3) If not, what has influenced the change?
- (4) Has the commission received a notice from the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott and residents that they object to the change?
- (5) Will the commission replan to the west, the southern leg of the transmission line away from the M.R.P.A. corridor planned residential zone within the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No. There has been no change in principle in this area as it was always intended that the line would be located in the rural buffer zone between the Armadale - Kelmscott and Gosnells Shires.
A plan will not be available until surveys are completed.
- (2) No. The route is subject to change in detail during survey to fit in with development in the rural zone.
- (3) See (2) above.
- (4) Some objections have been received from individuals in response to the "notice of intention to enter and survey" sent out by the commission. There have been telephone discussions initiated by the shire's planner.
- (5) Further details are required of the location in question.

5. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Submission in Writing to Speaker

Mr. COURT, to the SPEAKER:

Sir, in view of Standing Order 106A, I cannot ask questions of you without notice—

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. COURT: —for which you are probably relieved. However, could I seek some information from you?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. COURT: In view of the fact that it was too late to get some important questions on today's notice paper, as a result of the ruling you have given on questions without notice today, if I hand you the questions in writing tomorrow morning, would you be prepared to treat them as questions on notice tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

6. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS: INCREASED CHARGES

Minister for Agriculture

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Lands:

Arising from the answer given to question 17 on today's notice paper, I thought, when I handed this question to the Clerk, that I had addressed it to the Minister for Agriculture, because last week the Minister for Lands answered questions of this nature at that time.

What I was seeking was: What were the increased charges made by the Department of Agriculture at that particular date? I do not think the Minister can get them for me now, but I was wondering whether he could obtain that information for me and advise me later.

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I am quite prepared to get that information for the member for Bunbury.

7. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Route: Armadale-Kelmscott District

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

As the plans for the 330 kV transmission route have been published, and the Minister has indicated there has been no change in principle in the Armadale-Kelmscott district, will he give adequate opportunity to the residents of the area to put forward their objections to this change in the route of the S.E.C. line?

Mr. MAY replied:

On a matter of clarification, the question that was originally asked by the honourable member was handed to me at a quarter past four this afternoon.

Mr. Rushton: That's not my fault.

Mr. MAY: In answering the question, I point out that everybody has been given ample opportunity to discuss the matter with the S.E.C., and the particular matter which the member for Dale has referred to will certainly receive adequate consideration.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Education Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Parks and Reserves Act Amendment Bill.

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

BILLS (2): REPORT

1. Western Australian Products Symbol Bill.

2. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill.

Reports of Committees adopted.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

During the last session of the previous Parliament this House amended its Standing Orders by adding provisions for—

the establishment of a Public Accounts Committee; and

the conditions under which the committee is to function.

The inaugural committee was appointed by this present Parliament at the commencement of the first session, and it presented its first report to this House in September last year. Since the commencement of this current session of Parliament the committee's second report has been laid upon the table of this House for the information of members.

As members are well aware, Parliament does not exercise detailed supervision of the administrative services of the Government, therefore committees of this nature are essential parts of a modern Parliament. The creation of this committee has afforded members the opportunity, through the functions of the committee, to take a closer look at the Government's administrative services, a task the need for which grows with the increasing complication of the business of governing this rapidly developing State.

As the committee becomes more experienced members will be afforded greater opportunities to become more cognisant of the administration by the Executive.

In carrying out their duties the members of this committee must inevitably incur expenditure in connection with such duties, for which they become justifiably entitled to reimbursement. Under the existing provisions of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899-1969, a member receiving reimbursement for expenditure of this nature may be liable to vacate his seat as a member of Parliament or to disqualification under that Act.

The object of this Bill is to permit a member of the Public Accounts Committee to receive expenses from the Crown in connection with his duties as such member without being liable to vacate his seat as a member of Parliament or to disqualification under the Act.

This can be achieved by the simple amendments proposed in the Bill and by similar amendments to the regulations authorised under the provisions of section 41A of the Act, which amendments I propose to lay on the Table of this House shortly. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 13th April.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville) [5.32 p.m.]: When introducing this Bill the Minister for Housing certainly gave a concise report of what it purports to do. However, he did not, in my view, explain fully enough what the Act itself does. A number of new members have been elected to the Chamber in recent years and perhaps I should therefore explain the purpose of the Act.

Mr. Court: None could do it better.

Mr. O'NEIL: With due deference to the Deputy Premier, who introduced the Act initially, I would say that this Bill is sometimes referred to by those who administer it as the Reader's Digest Act because the idea of a system of housing loan

guarantee was in fact contained in an article in the *Reader's Digest* of many years ago. The Minister for Environmental Protection would not appreciate this because he has already expressed his views of the *Reader's Digest*. However, that is by the way.

The principles of the Act are to enable funds which are made available from lending institutions to building societies to be totally protected by a State guarantee; and, further, to indemnify building societies against default on the part of borrowers of these funds for housing, provided always, of course, that the funds are lent by the principal lender to the building society on terms and conditions recommended by the Minister for Housing and approved by the Treasurer; and, in the second case, where the housing loans are advanced on terms and conditions recommended by the Minister for Housing and approved by the Treasurer. So, a form of State guarantee is behind the supply of institutional funds through building societies to the ultimate home owner. It is, in fact, a form of free home loans insurance.

Acts similar to this are in operation in some of the other States, but in those cases a rate is charged to the ultimate borrower in respect of the protection granted by virtue of the insurance. Since the Act has been operative in this State, the Commonwealth Government has itself introduced a form of housing loans insurance and has established a Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, a Commonwealth instrumentality which will, after the payment of a relatively small fee, insure the loan made by building societies to borrowers. Also a private enterprise housing loans insurance organisation, known as the Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Corporations of Australia, operates and follows the example set by its counterpart in America.

So generally a system which will facilitate the supply of funds from institutions to building societies and protect building societies in respect of funds which they lend to the ultimate home purchaser is in operation, and this has had a remarkable effect on maintaining, if not increasing, the rate of home ownership in this State and generally throughout Australia.

Since the Act has been in existence the particular section to which this Bill refers has been amended on a number of occasions. Firstly restrictions were placed on the value of the house in respect of which a guaranteed loan could be made available, and this Bill purports to remove that restriction altogether. Then, in different areas of the State the total amount of the loan varies quite considerably because of the different building costs in those areas. Also the percentage that the loan would bear to the total cost of the house varied for different classes of operations.

Gradually these provisions have been simplified and modified until now, under this Bill, one of the remaining minor restrictions—that is, the total value of the house—has been removed as an inhibiting factor. The remainder of the Bill simply provides that the amount of the advance under the Act may be increased to a figure which is more in keeping with modern-day costs.

When he introduced the Bill, the Minister said that one of the reasons for the Bill was that land costs had risen sharply. I am certain that if the Minister reads the Act and this Bill he will find the value of the land has, in fact, no bearing upon the amount of the loan. As it stands, the Act states that up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house including the land is the maximum advance allowable. Since, under this Bill, we are to lift the limit, the value of the land as a component of the total value is no longer a consideration. I do not raise an objection, but merely indicate that the surmise that the value of land is responsible for the amendment is not, in my view, completely valid.

The Minister also referred to different levels of loans which would be available in the north-west division, the Kimberley division, the metropolitan area, and country areas south of the 26th parallel. In other words, he designated four particular areas where the value of the advance varied. For example, the maximum advance prescribed for the metropolitan area and areas south of the 26th parallel will be \$12,000 and \$13,000 respectively. The maximum advance in the north-west division will be \$17,500, whilst for the Kimberley division the amount will be \$20,000. The Minister omitted to mention the eastern division. The Bill contains a definition of the divisions and they are described in a very simple amendment. However, the Minister omitted to refer to the eastern division and therefore his speech did not cover entirely the proposed contents of the Bill.

Finally I wish to make some comment on the last paragraph of his speech which reads—

Every advance made with guaranteed funds must have the approval of the Registrar of Building Societies who will ensure that funds are directed to the low and moderate income borrower.

This is not quite correct because, as I have mentioned, the terms and conditions under which these advances come under the protection of the Housing Loan Guarantee Act are that they must be recommended by the Minister for Housing and approved of by the Treasurer.

Mr. Bickerton: Perhaps I should have said that the advances are referred to the registrar.

Mr. O'NEIL: Probably the registrar would be the Minister's principal adviser in this matter. The Minister's apology is accepted.

One other matter in the Act itself requires clarification. A definition of a new house is given. It may well be that some people think these funds are available only in respect of a new house, which includes a house occupied for a limited time by the new purchaser or his dependants, but I would point out to the Minister that an amendment made to the Act in, I think, 1965 somewhat altered the definition of a new house. The following is to be found on page 705 of *Hansard*, 1965, and deals with the second proposal of the Bill then before the House:—

The purposes of the amendments proposed in this Bill are—

Secondly: To enable loans on houses, other than new houses, to be guaranteed under the Act by the Treasurer on the recommendation of the Minister if and when it is considered that finance available for loans on new houses is more than adequate to meet the demand. In some circumstances, the over-commitment of the building industry could have an inflationary effect on construction costs.

The Act has proven its worth and the modifications made over the years have improved it. The amendments which are now before the House will certainly do likewise. Therefore, rather belatedly, I indicate to the Minister that we fully support his proposals, especially as they were before me for consideration not too long ago.

I asked the Minister to give an indication of the situation which obtains in respect of guaranteed loans and it is extremely gratifying that by way of answer he indicated that some \$19,738,000 has been put into home ownership by virtue of the provision of guaranteed funds under this Act, and that a total of 2,598 families or purchasers have been assisted under the scheme.

I also asked him for specific figures for the last three years to ascertain whether they would indicate a need to increase the amounts of advances to be guaranteed. In each of the years 1968-69 and 1969-70 the same amount was advanced in total—namely, \$1,700,000—and the same number of purchasers were assisted; namely, 170. In 1970-71, \$1,250,000 was advanced to 125 purchasers which was a downturn in the number of people assisted and the amount of money advanced. So far in this financial year less than \$500,000 has been advanced and 54 purchasers have been assisted.

I thank the Minister for the information he gave because it confirms his statement that it is necessary to upgrade the amount of advances under this Act and it does, in fact, completely justify those on this side of the House giving the Bill our blessing and support.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara — Minister for Housing) [5.45 p.m.]: I thank the member for East Melville for his constructive comments on the measure. It is only a small Bill and probably that is why I did not go into great detail; in the main it amends only section 7B of the Act which is concerned with eligibility and the amount of money that can be lent under Treasury guarantee.

I am sure the explanation the honourable member gave of the Bill would assist some of the newer members. At the time of introducing it I did not think this was necessary and I concentrated simply on the amendment to section 7B as it concerned the amount of money that could be guaranteed by the Treasurer for certain buildings. I thank the member for East Melville very much for his contribution and I commend the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BEEKEEPERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd March.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [5.48 p.m.]: I have been waiting to make this speech since early October last year. I hope it will be appropriate to the occasion.

The Minister stated in his introductory remarks that the Beekeepers Act requires beekeepers to register so that their whereabouts may be known. At present the Act requires annual registration. If the proposed amendment is agreed to subsections (1) and (2) of section 8 of the parent Act will then read—

(1) Every person shall, within fourteen days after becoming a beekeeper, apply to be registered as such.

(2) Every beekeeper shall, on or before the thirty-first day of December, 1972, and on or before the thirty-first day of December in every fifth year thereafter, apply for the renewal of his registration as a beekeeper, and a beekeeper who fails to register, or to renew his registration, as a beekeeper commits an offence.

I am assuming that the registrar of beekeepers will send out a renewal notice when fees are due, but I would like the

Minister to confirm this. The current annual fee is \$1 and it is proposed that \$1 shall be the fee for the five-year period. This proposition has the support of the beekeepers section of the Farmers' Union and all members on this side of the House.

I would like to comment further that one of the outstanding differences between the Australian honey industry and that in other parts of the world is the high proportion of honey produced by migratory apiarists and, in Western Australia, many of the 820 registered beekeepers move their bees many hundreds of miles seeking the honey flow. I am certainly amazed the Department of Agriculture is able to keep track of them all.

During the year ended the 30th June, 1970, some 7,500,000 lb. of honey was produced in Western Australia. Despite this quantity, it seems that many portions of the State are untapped as far as the production of honey is concerned. Western Australia has an excellent climate for the production of honey and one area of considerable potential where no great number of beehives is in evidence is the irrigation districts. It is a recognised fact that some of the choicest quality honey in the world comes from the flowers of clover and lucerne. At one time I heard an eminent authority on bees and honey say that some of the finest honey in the world is produced from the white clover grown in the irrigated pastures at Uduc in the Harvey district.

Had I been able to make this speech in October of last year, I would have been able to say that the New Zealand wild white clover, which is so much in evidence in irrigated pastures, was out in full bloom at that time; namely, the month of October. Consequently if at any time members hear me say that I represent the land of milk and honey, that statement is correct in every detail.

I repeat that the proposition contained in the measure is acceptable to the people concerned and to members on this side of the House who give it full support.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [5.53 p.m.]: I, too, support the Bill. The amendment is largely an administrative one to allow for the collection of registration fees every five years instead of the yearly collection as at present. It must therefore lead to economy in administration and is worthy of support.

Beekeeping is not a large industry when viewed in terms of the economy as a whole, and the numbers involved in it are relatively static. When The Hon. C. D. Nalder, who was at the time Minister for Agriculture, spoke to an amendment to the principal Act in 1963 he mentioned there were 649 registered beekeepers with a total of 45,000 hives, and of this number 48 were regarded as full-time commercial beekeepers. At the 30th June, 1971, some eight

years later, there were 820 registered beekeepers with 41,713 hives, and of that number 68 have hives in excess of 200 or more. It has been agreed that 200 hives are the minimum number to provide a reasonable living.

The numbers involved in the bee industry are not great, as I said before, but it is interesting to note that legislation for the control of beekeeping was first enacted in 1899. The legislation was called the Contagious Diseases of Bees Act and it was drafted, even in those days, as a result of a motion moved at a conference of producers who requested the Government to legislate. As the member for Wellington has pointed out, the current legislation also has the support of the beekeeping industry. When speaking on the introduction of the Bill in 1898 the then Colonial Secretary pointed out that at that time the value of honey imported into the colony of Western Australia was \$40,000. In introducing the present Bill the Minister pointed out that for the year 1970-71 production of honey was worth \$266,000. He also mentioned that because of the adverse season production of honey was only half the usual average.

Mr. Nalder: What about the price?

Mr. STEPHENS: Unfortunately I do not have any indication of the price per pound. The Contagious Diseases of Bees Act was superseded in 1930 by the Bees Act which, in 1963, became the Beekeepers Act, an amendment to which we are now discussing.

In reading *Hansard* debates over the period it is of interest to comment that, basically, the legislation has always had the support of both sides of the House. This is further proof, if proof is necessary, it is not only on the matter of parliamentary salaries that both sides of the House can agree.

I ask the Minister to clarify one point when he replies. I find one remark in connection with registrations somewhat ambiguous, namely—

All registrations are to have a common expiry date and it is proposed that the present annual fee of \$1 remain as the fee for the new five-yearly period.

Does the Minister mean that in future beekeepers will only have to pay \$1 every five years or \$1 for each year which, for the five years, would make a total of \$5? If it is the latter, this could impose something of a burden on beekeepers because 39 producers have between 200 to 399 hives. If we multiply that figure by five, which is for the five-yearly period, a beekeeper would be up for \$1,000 to \$2,000 upon registration. Of course the men who have over 1,000 hives would pay considerably more.

I have read the Bill but I cannot see any reference to a refund being made if a person sells his hives. Perhaps the Minister would give some consideration to the suggestion of a refund since the period has been extended to five years, provided of course I have not overlooked the provision. With those few words I support the Bill.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [5.59 p.m.]: I thank the two members opposite for the manner in which they spoke to the Bill. This was to be expected because it is a beneficial type of legislation introduced as a domestic matter and purely as a housekeeping measure to assist those within the industry.

The member for "the land of milk and honey" made reference to the possibility of extending production within the State. Whilst superficially that may be desirable, there is difficulty with the sale of honey, as those who have been associated with the honey pool know. Dependence on the notoriously unreliable world markets has caused difficulties not only in the honey industry but also in other industries.

Mr. Nalder: The world price at the present time is fairly good.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Yes. The member for Stirling has agreed with the Bill with the exception of the one point he raised about the period of the registration. As I understand it, registration is covered by the \$1 fee. I do not think there will be any difficulty when hives are sold or a beekeeper withdraws from the industry.

I would like again to express my appreciation of the ready support for this measure. I do not feel it presents any difficulty.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BEE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 23rd March.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [6.03 p.m.]: The parent Act which this Bill amends was introduced in 1953, although legislation affecting the industry goes back to 1899. At that time it was found necessary, because of the difficulties associated with the control of disease in the early years of settlement, to pass legislation in connection with the industry.

The parent Act makes provision for the payment of compensation to a beekeeper in the event of a disease striking his hives

to such an extent that the bees, the hives, and the material and equipment must be destroyed.

The most common diseases in the industry are foul brood, Isle of Wight disease, and sour brood. The only disease of which I have experience is foul brood which I believe is introduced into the hives by bees scrounging in empty jam tins and things of this nature. However, there is very little problem with disease in Western Australia.

The parent Act sets up a committee to administer the fund to which the Treasurer may make advances. The beekeepers are required to pay a fixed amount per hive at a rate declared by the committee. The maximum amount which the fund may have in credit is to be lifted from \$6,000 to \$30,000.

In recent years beekeepers have been contributing at the rate of 5c per hive annually. The provisions in this Bill require that the contributions be paid at the same time as registration—that is, every five years. In other words, 25c per hive is to be paid each five years. The minimum contribution to the fund is to be \$1. The registration fee and compensation fund levy can be paid at the one time on a single card.

My only misgiving about this provision is the one mentioned by the member for Stirling during the debate on the previous Bill, when he said that some of the larger apiarists would be paying a large sum of money at one particular time.

The beekeepers section of the Farmers' Union is agreeable to the provisions of this Bill, and we on this side of the House have no objections. I support the measure.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [6.07 p.m.]: I rise to support this measure also. However, in opening my remarks I would just like to say my research appears to be at variance with the research carried out by the member for Wellington. When speaking on the previous Bill a moment ago, I mentioned that the first legislation in that connection was in 1899, with further legislation in 1930 and again in 1963. I would just like to reiterate that I feel my assertion on that occasion was correct.

In looking at the history of the parent Bill of the Bee Industry Compensation Act, I see it was first introduced in 1953, and the then Minister for Agriculture admitted that the need for compensation had been brought to his attention by the beekeepers of the State. This was further endorsed by a conference of the Farmers' Union and I understand this present measure is the result of a decision at a conference of the Farmers' Union in 1971.

I realise that not all beekeepers belong to the Farmers' Union, but from inquiries in my electorate, I believe that this legislation has the support of all beekeepers in that area.

I would like to make reference to a point made earlier. Is there any provision for a refund to the beekeeper on the transfer of hives? The amount of money paid to cover five years' contributions will be considerable for a beekeeper owning 1,000 hives. If he disposes of them after 12 months he should be entitled to some refund of the money paid to the fund. Having drawn this matter to the Minister's attention, I indicate my support of this Bill. The fund is self-supporting and only requires the payment of administrative costs by the Government.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [6.09 p.m.]: The same two members have demonstrated a considerable amount of research on this subject. They have given us a very useful and thorough background to the parent Acts associated with these two amending Bills.

I would just like to say in answer to both the member for Wellington and the member for Stirling, that the provisions of this Bill were accepted by the Beekeepers' Association, and I am certain the question of refunds will have been examined. Apparently the association has accepted the situation. However, an entitlement to a refund on the sale of hives may be desirable and I will look into it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.13 to 7.30 p.m.

PIG INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd March.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [7.30 p.m.]: This amending legislation is quite clear cut. When introducing the Bill the Minister indicated that the amendments were necessary, because past experience had shown that parts of the industry should be given the attention set out in the measure.

The Minister outlined the history of the compensation that has been paid to producers when animals have been certified as coming under the conditions applicable to condemnations after the pigs have been slaughtered. If the animals contract any of the diseases before they have been destroyed compensation is then paid to the farmer.

Those farmers who have had anything to do with the production of pigs know that in 1942 the pigs in this State were afflicted with swine fever. This was possibly introduced after the outbreak of the war and as a consequence quite a number of animals were slaughtered.

Because of this experience it was necessary for legislation to be introduced to permit the producers of pigs to have a certain amount deducted from their proceeds, which amount was paid into a fund. The people concerned were recompensed on this basis if their pigs were condemned. In respect of those in the industry who purchased pigs, whether for fresh pork or for processed meats, compensation would be paid them if their animals were condemned. The provision covered all sections of the industry—it covered the producers of pigs and also those who purchased the pigs for processing purposes.

This situation was quite satisfactory until a few years ago when those in the pig industry who purchased pigs from the growers requested that they be permitted to pay any contributions that might be necessary on behalf of the growers.

In explanation I would point out that very often the companies that process the animals buy large numbers of pigs privately and, in so doing, they are permitted to deduct a certain sum by way of compensation from the accounts before the accounts are sent to the owners.

It was agreed that it would be desirable to permit the companies to purchase the pigs and then, at the end of the month, submit the accounts to the Department of Agriculture together with a cheque covering the amount that had to be deducted.

This was a sensible approach and the companies were permitted to work in this manner on an acknowledged scale. I understand that this scheme was proceeding quite satisfactorily. However, some of the companies, which have been purchasing pigs privately, have ignored their responsibility and have omitted to pay in the necessary amounts; but at the same time they were able to receive compensation for those animals that were condemned.

Accordingly, I strongly support the Minister in the move he has made to ensure that prompt action be taken so that those entitled to compensation will be liable to pay into the compensation fund a sum of money which will be deducted from the purchase price of the pigs they buy.

I am sure every member in this House will agree that we should do all we can to tighten up the necessary legislation so that action can be taken promptly to ensure that those who are entitled to compensation should also make their contribution towards the fund. There is no doubt as to the necessity for the amendments contained in this part of the Bill.

Hand in hand with the above provision goes the amendment which allows for inspections. I am sure most of the processing companies would have no objection to an inspector from the Department of Agriculture inspecting their books to ensure that everything was in order. We would all welcome this. The processing companies which are avoiding their responsibilities could possibly object to having their books inspected and the amendment contained in the Bill makes provision for this aspect. In my view it is a most desirable provision.

So far as I can see the factors I have enumerated are those that most warrant the support of the House, and, accordingly, I am quite happy to give this amending legislation my full support.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Murray) [7.40 p.m.]: A fund was established in 1942 to provide compensation for certain diseases which afflict pigs. The three main diseases for which compensation was to be payable were swine fever, tuberculosis, and paratyphoid. All owners of pigs would pay a levy into this fund when selling their pigs.

Some producers make arrangements with their stock agents to pay the amount due to the fund for the pigs and then deduct it from the proceeds. This has been the procedure followed by most processing companies in recent years. Not all processing companies, however, have been prepared to do this and, as a result, a certain amount of money which was supposed to be paid into the fund has not been so paid and, because of this, it is now desirable to tighten up this legislation by the amendments contained in the Bill before us. Administrative expenses have been paid from the fund, but because the amount involved is not very great, and because a certain amount of bookkeeping is necessary, and so on, the Department of Agriculture has suggested that this amount be paid and that it be not taken out of the fund.

I consider this to be most desirable. A further aspect is that those producers who desire to make application for compensation for the animals that have been declared unfit as a result of their having contracted one of the diseases mentioned must make such application within 21 days.

Under the amendment contained in the Bill such a producer is now given 90 days within which to make his application. I have always considered the period of 21 days to be far too short, because it was difficult for some farmers to make their applications within that period. If they did not make application within 21 days the matter had to be referred to the Minister and it was necessary for the farmer to have a good excuse as to why the application was not made within the statutory time. By extending the period to 90 days

it will now make it possible for the farmers concerned to make the necessary request for compensation in the time provided.

The next amendment seeks to give permission under the Stamp Act for inspectors to inspect the books which are involved to ensure that the appropriate amount has been deducted. I think the amount involved is roughly three-tenths of a cent in the dollar. This is not a great deal. The money from this fund is used not only to pay for compensable diseases, but some of it is also used for research into the pig industry.

I am glad to say that the pig industry in Western Australia is in a very stable condition indeed. The industry relies very extensively on the home market which, we all know, is the best market. The rate of growth of the pig industry in Western Australia has been higher than in any other State which, of course, is a very good thing indeed.

The consumption of pigmeat per head of population in Western Australia has increased in recent years. I do not know whether this is because migrants are taking a greater interest in the various pigmeats but, as I have said, consumption has increased considerably in Western Australia which is certainly all to the good for the industry in this State.

Over the years the pig industry has been associated with the dairying industry. I can recall that years ago, it was considered by the Department of Agriculture that in the butterfat areas 25 per cent. of the butterfat producers' income should come from the rearing of pigs. Many farmers endeavoured to achieve that result, and some were successful. However, in recent years with the decline in the butterfat industry and with the demand at higher prices for calves and beef stock, the pig industry in those areas has declined considerably.

About 75 per cent. of the pigs in Western Australia are produced in the grain growing districts. Another main avenue of production comes from the highly specialised pig farms, of which there are quite a number in Western Australia at the present time. They are established on small areas, and are conducted on highly specialised lines in a very businesslike manner. Most of the fodder and foodstuffs for the animals has to be purchased, and one has to be a good buyer to do the right thing in rearing pigs profitably on these farms. Most of the highly specialised farms are doing quite well.

The pigs slaughtered in Western Australia in 1971 numbered 277,500, in 1970 the figure was 250,000, and in 1969 it was 219,000. One can see that the number increased steadily over the three-year period.

The number of holdings producing pigs in Western Australia has also increased, and at present it has reached almost 4,000.

The export of pigmeat to the Eastern States has reached a high figure, and it is good to know that Western Australia is exporting this primary product. In 1971 the quantity exported to the Eastern States was 2,270,260 lb. for a value of approximately \$806,000. Last year our export overseas declined. It amounted to approximately 212,233 lb. for a value of \$68,621. This is quite a considerable drop from the export figures for 1969-70, because in that year the quantity exported was 742,689 lb. for a value of \$275,000. These exports were mostly to countries in South-East Asia. Quite a number of countries were involved, but Singapore was the main outlet. There is very strong competition against our exports of pigmeat principally from Taiwan, China, the U.S.A., and Canada which exports large quantities to Japan.

The general outlook for exports to this area is not particularly bright. It will be noticed that Indonesia has placed a firm order in Australia for stud pigs, and that country intends to breed its own pigs.

Both the Federal Government and the State Government have taken a great interest in the pig industry, and have provided funds for research into suitable types of pigs, the feeding of pigs, sanitation, buildings, and similar factors. A great deal of work has been done in this respect. One of the most important developments in the pig industry in the last two years was the research carried out into marketing. The research institutes are doing a very fine job, and we all realise their importance.

All in all, the amendments contained in the Bill are commendable, and they will strengthen the legislation and make it much better. I believe the measure will benefit the industry in general.

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [7.49 p.m.]: In making my contribution to the debate on the Bill, I wish to raise one matter which has not been mentioned by previous speakers, and it was the intention of my leader to bring it forward. This relates to the question of compensation and the time factor involved in making applications.

At present the Act requires an application to be lodged within 21 days of the destruction or loss of a pig. It gives the Minister the prerogative to authorise payment up to 90 days after the destruction of the pig. I understand that in the past this provision has been used to advantage, and the prerogative has been applied whenever it was desirable to do so.

One proposal in the Bill seeks to amend the existing section in the Act relating to the time for making applications. The amendment provides that the time for making applications be prescribed in the

regulations. The question I pose is: Why not write the time into the Act, instead of prescribing it in the regulations? Is it not more desirable to write the time into the Act than to set it out in the regulations?

Mr. H. D. Evans: The intention is to bring this legislation into line with the cattle compensation regulations. The time stipulated is 30 days, but it can be changed when it is considered desirable.

Mr. Nalder: Does the Minister intend to extend the time beyond 21 days?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Extend it to 30 days, to make it the same as the time in the cattle industry compensation legislation, and remove the limitation of 90 days.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Minister did not mention that in his second reading speech. That is why I am raising the point.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [7.52 p.m.]: As I indicated in my second reading speech, there is nothing very controversial in the Bill. As was pointed out by the Leader of the Country Party, it is a matter of strengthening the existing legislation to allow the administration to be tightened.

I am sorry I did not make clear the time qualification; but just for the record and to ensure it is known, the idea is to extend the time for applications from 21 to 30 days, to bring it into line with other legislation, and to remove the limitation of 90 days for the possible use of the ministerial prerogative. In the past it has been shown in practical application that some people were disadvantaged when they should not have been, because the time in which they could lodge applications for compensation had lapsed. I think the provision in the Bill is a very desirable one, and I think members opposite will agree to it.

Mr. Nalder: Will you limit the time at all?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Not for the ministerial prerogative.

Mr. Nalder: So that if a person applies six or 12 months afterwards you would still be prepared to consider the application?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Yes, at least to consider it. There is nothing further I need add. The first two amendments seek to ensure that, as everybody in the industry has access to compensatory payments, everybody should make a contribution for this purpose. That is the fundamental principle underlying the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 11th April.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.56 p.m.]: This Bill to amend the Stamp Act is a far-reaching measure, although on the surface and after reading the second reading introductory speech of the Minister it would not appear to be of any great significance. I say it is far-reaching, because it involves a very hard to understand part of the Stamp Act, and the application of the Stamp Act.

The position is not helped by the fact that the Act has been amended several times and it is very difficult to put all the pieces together so that one can clearly understand the objectives of the draftsman in this latest piece of legislation. I must say at the outset that I hope the Treasurer will take an early opportunity to get the draftsman to look at the Bill he has brought in, before it is considered in another place, because I have serious doubts that it will achieve the purpose for which it is intended.

I am not holding myself up as an expert on this matter, because essentially it is a complicated legal matter; but I consider that in the interests of what the Government seeks to achieve it would be better for the draftsman to have a look at it again. I know how easy it is to make mistakes in drafting, when an Act has been amended several times and the draftsman has a patchwork type of document from which to draft. The draftsman has to put into effect the views and requests of other people, many of whom possess very advanced technical knowledge, and they expect the draftsman to absorb their thoughts and views—and even to create a few for them—when he is trying to translate them into a Bill.

The Treasurer has said quite categorically that the Bill does not break any new ground, and all that is intended is to bring down a Bill which will enable the Treasury to collect the money it thought it was going to get as a result of previous amendments. I would assure the Treasurer that the Opposition has no desire to be obstructive in this matter, or to deny him the opportunity to achieve what he seeks to do. However, I come back to the point I made earlier that if the legislation before us is subject to very close scrutiny I have a feeling it will be found that it does not achieve what the Treasurer has set out to achieve.

If he will accept our assurance that we are not seeking to be obstructive so far as the objective is concerned, it now becomes a question of whether the Bill will give effect to what is intended. In introducing the second reading of the Bill the Treasurer outlined the three problems that have beset the Treasury. One of them

is of no great significance because it seeks to repair an omission, whereby charitable bodies that were exempt from stamp duty when they were creating a charge found they were subject to stamp duty when they were discharging it. For that reason it would be quite foolish for us to oppose this amendment; so, we can dismiss that one.

Another amendment, which will cause very little argument here or in another place, relates to the difficulty of assessing the insurance premium on which stamp duty should be based when the premium details are not available. The Government has come forward with a practical approach to this problem. I cannot suggest any better alternative than that there be an arbitrary assessment of stamp duty based on the value of goods insured, and this is easy to determine. Where the parties are not prepared to demonstrate the true cost of insurance they will pay the Treasury a percentage on the value. One hopes and assumes that in arriving at this arbitrary percentage the research that has been done, as indicated in the Treasurer's speech, has led the Government to strike a rate which has some practical bearing on the estimated cost of insuring the type of chattels, etc. that are involved.

I think one could draw a fairly accurate line through the type of merchandise and other items which are being insured, and make a fairly accurate assessment, on a statistical basis, as to what the premiums would be. As far as I have been able to ascertain—in the very little time available to me to make an assessment—it would appear that the figure suggested to overcome this situation is realistic. However, knowing the Treasury as I do it would not be backward in pushing up the figure to an extra per cent. if there was any danger of that department being robbed of a dollar or two. I think that matter can be safely left in the hands of the Treasury. In any case, if statistical information proves otherwise, in the light of what we all know, the Treasurer will receive a nudge to correct the wrong. I do not think it is the aim of any of us to allow people to escape their just commitments because of unusual situations where information is not available. Up to that point we have nothing serious with which to quarrel.

I now come to another point which, I believe, is open to argument. If I understood the Treasurer aright—and I must apologise because I am replying on behalf of my leader and I did not have a chance to research the Bill as I normally do—the explanation given us was that when the original Act—or one of the many amendments made over the years—was drafted it provided for stamp duty to be attracted on insurance of property in Western Australia although it was insured by people outside of Western Australia.

The impression I gained from listening to the Treasurer, and also from a reading of his speech, was that the Treasury view was that it intended to catch all of those policies, regardless of whether they actually dealt in terms of property, as we know it, or dealt with other risks. However, when I read the introductory speeches in respect of the previous amendments to the parent Act—where this particular provision was inserted—I found it was categorically stated by the Treasurer of the day that he was seeking to be able to impose a tax in respect of insurance on actual properties. At no stage did he make any reference to other risks of which, of course, there are many.

I would like to hear from the Treasurer how the Treasury came to the view that it was seeking to redress the situation which was purely due to a drafting inadequacy when to my mind the Bill, in fact, introduces an entirely new principle. If one goes back to the amendment to the parent Act, to which I am referring, it will be found there was an argument about the avoidance of stamp duty in respect of insurance on chattels such as motor vehicles and property of that kind. The Government of the day rightly sought to close the loophole in respect of insurance policies written overseas and in other States and on which the amount of premium could not be determined from the invoice or other documents.

But I would like to hear why the argument is advanced that no new provision has been introduced, and that the Bill is merely to tidy up the drafting so as to achieve the original purpose. I might be wrong but I cannot find any reference in the introductory speeches, or in the earlier amendments, which go beyond this question of property.

The Treasurer quite rightly referred to the fact that the present law is specific on the question of property. I think most of us have a fairly clear idea of just what property is. We think of property in terms of tangible things and not in terms of things we cannot touch. We do not think of property in terms of risks outside of houses and motorcars, etc. We do not think of property in terms of a money risk such as an indemnity, loss of profits, or as against some disaster happening on a particular date. We think of property as straightout property.

In 1968 an amendment was made to section 92 of the Act. A new section 92A was added, and, in part, it read as follows:—

Every person resident in the State who on or after the date of the coming into operation of the Stamp Act Amendment Act, 1968, has effected or effects any insurance in respect of property in the State . . .

The Bill now before us proposes to delete certain words from that earlier amend-

ment, and insert other very important words. Section 92A of the Stamp Act would then read—

Every person resident in the State who effects any insurance in respect of property in the State, or in respect of any liability, loss or damage occurring, or brought about by the happening of any event, within the State . . .

In other words, we do what the Premier said was the original intention. Unless the Treasurer can show me where I have missed an amendment which might have been made since 1968, or missed something in the 1968 introductory speech, I cannot find any indication expressed by the then Treasurer to go beyond property. On reflection, I must admit that had he ever wished to have this present situation he might have dealt with it as a separate matter. However, if members look at the *Hansard* debates which occurred in 1968 they will see there was a very special reason for amending the Act at that time, and it was not for the reason now advanced. The amendment was definitely related to the evasion of a responsibility because insurances on certain properties were avoiding stamp duty by the business being written out of the State.

If it is the desire of the Government to deal with this as a new matter, okay; it is our duty to consider it on that basis. Personally, I would find it very hard to quarrel with the taxing of this sort of business but I believe it would have to be considered in its proper perspective and not as a mere redrafting of a situation because of an anomaly.

Another point I want to deal with concerns a problem of drafting. I cannot for the life of me see how the new Bill achieves what was intended. I would not risk my hand as a draftsman; I keep out of that business. I might suggest something to a draftsman in my simple language, telling him what I have in mind, but I have learnt from bitter experience that it is better to let the professionals provide the legal words. However, I understand the proposition of the Treasurer to be as follows: Where a property is sold by person A for \$20,000—to use a figure—to person B, and person B is able to pay person A \$10,000, which is half the total purchase price, a contract is entered into and stamped as a primary document in respect of \$20,000. If the vendor says that he will take \$10,000 cash, and then take a mortgage in respect of the remaining \$10,000, my understanding is that under the old arrangements it has been customary to stamp the original contract as a primary security—a primary document—and then the mortgage taken by the vendor—and I emphasize, “taken by the vendor” and not a third party—is stamped as a collateral document.

In other words, it attracts lower duties which are specifically set out in the second schedule for collateral documents. This has always made good sense. However, if one reads the argument put forward by the Treasury it seems that department goes back to an English case whereby it was sought to treat securities taken by a vendor—which we would normally regard as collateral—as primary securities for taxing purposes.

Let us return to the example transaction I mentioned where person A sells a property worth \$20,000 to person B. In this example person A is still the vendor and person B can only pay \$10,000 deposit, but person A tells person B that he will have to raise the balance of the money somewhere else. Person B, the purchaser, then goes to a bank or a trustee company, or some other fund which lends this sort of money, and borrows \$10,000 from person C—who is the third party. Person C takes a mortgage. So we will have a complete transaction. The original contract is stamped as a primary document. We then have the transfer of the property to the name of the new owner, and coinciding with this the mortgage to the third party, C. In that case the mortgage attracts the full stamp duty as a primary security; it is no longer a collateral security.

I gather from the wording of the Treasurer's speech—and the attempt made by the draftsman—that the Treasury is seeking to ensure that the original document is stamped as a primary security even where the vendor allows some of the purchase price to remain. The mortgage taken in respect of the unpaid balance becomes the primary security.

It could be argued: Why should these transactions escape the two lots of duty when a mortgage in respect of money borrowed from a third party, C, does attract full duty as a primary security?

The fact is that, to the best of my knowledge, we have always had it the other way. Therefore, I believe new ground has been broken. In spite of the assurances given, which I accept were given in good faith, new ground and new principles have been introduced into this legislation.

I have dealt with the two important matters. I do not regard the formula which has been introduced to cover the question of insurance where the cost of the insurance cannot be ascertained as breaking new ground. It is merely a device to overcome an administrative problem. However, so far as the other two matters I have mentioned are concerned, I regard them as breaking new ground and, therefore, I ask the Treasurer to give us some further explanation. I do not expect the Treasurer to enter into a detailed argument about drafting, any more than I would attempt to amend the measure tonight. I would like an assurance from him

that it was the intention of the Government and Treasury advisers to bring in these two new principles: Firstly, to go far beyond the question of property in respect of insurance policies written outside Western Australia, and, secondly, to make sure that even where the vendor is the mortgagee the full duty is paid on the mortgage as a primary security and not as a collateral security. We would like some further explanation on these points.

My final point is that the Premier said this Bill was merely to make sure revenue was protected. In other words, the present Bill would enable the Treasury to collect revenue which previous amendments failed to do. I must say I cannot go along with this.

I cannot provide the statistical data—only the Treasury can supply that—but I believe the legislation in its present form will attract to the Treasury considerably more revenue than that originally intended by previous amendments to the Stamp Act. I know the Treasurer needs all he can get, and periodically he has to come to us on these issues. But I would prefer to consider this on a correct statistical statement of what we are trying to get from the taxpayer and an accurate comparison between what was intended in the old legislation and what is contained in the new legislation rather than let the Bill go through on the assumption that no new ground has been broken.

I was rather amused at the Treasurer's reaction to my query whether the amendments will achieve their purpose. I think he understood the import of my interjection to the effect that we had had this experience previously, when, in trying to rewrite provisions to cope with some constitutional matters, our advisers had assured us everything was in order. I do not think this is really an issue because, if a constitutional matter were involved, obviously the 1968 amendments in regard to property insurance would have been challenged long ago and the same principles should apply in respect of the additional risks that are now to be covered.

I will not weary the House with the type of detailed utterance that the Treasurer was wont to make when he was on this side and we brought up these measures. I read some of his speech today and decided I would make the minimum amount of comment on the Bill and would not get involved in what I regard as extraneous matters.

I hope I have made clear to the Treasurer the points that are causing us concern. They really come down to the two issues I have mentioned. They do not concern the exemption for charitable bodies, the method of assessing insurance premiums when there are no invoices on which to assess them, etc. We are concerned with the two principles regarding the additional types of insurance policies

that will be covered where the risk insured is outside the State, and the question of taxing a mortgage as a primary security when the vendor is the person who actually has the mortgage.

We support the Bill. We would like to hear from the Treasurer, and perhaps we will have something further to say in the Committee stage.

MR. LEWIS (Moore) [8.18 p.m.]: I am not one of the "legal eagles" in this Chamber. There is probably a good deal of merit in the recommendation of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the Bill should be subjected to further legal scrutiny. However, I have made some examination of the Bill, the Act, and the relevant amendments to the Act, and I have also studied the speech of the Treasurer when introducing this Bill. Generally speaking, I support the measure. It proposes to plug up some of the holes which it is claimed still remain subsequent to the 1968 amendments, which were designed to do just that.

In his second reading speech, referring to the 1968 amending Bill, the Treasurer said that quite clearly it was intended that both property risk and liability policies should be subject to duty. He had correctly stated earlier that in the 1968 amendments the word "property" was used almost exclusively. However, it is now intended to embrace liability risks, and the tax that is at present being evaded could amount to a few hundred thousand dollars. As I am a loyal Western Australian when it comes to gathering revenue that is going out of the State, I support the Bill, which contains nothing to which I object.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Treasurer) [8.21 p.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Moore for their acceptance of this Bill and for the remarks they have made in connection with it. I shall do my best to explain again, as clearly as possible, the main points of the legislation.

I want it to be clearly understood that when I made the statement that this Bill does not break any new ground I was not just stating my own opinion. That was the expert opinion expressed to me by the Commissioner of Taxation, and if anybody should know, he should. Who am I to question him when he asserts very definitely that this Bill does not break any new ground? As far as I can see, it does not.

Mr. O'Neil: But if he is wrong, you are still responsible, are you not?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is right. I have never been one to dodge responsibility. Lest there be any doubt about it, I say here and now that if he is proved to be wrong it is my fault.

I had no hand in the original legislation and I had no cause, because I am not in Opposition, to look it up, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did. I accepted the statement of the Commissioner of Taxation that this amendment was intended to remedy a defect in the law which was not discovered until an inquiry was made by a person who wanted to ascertain whether or not he was liable to pay duty. Until the question was raised it was assumed by him and others that he was liable for it. It therefore seems the belief is well established that the law as it stood made certain persons liable. The question having been raised, it was then looked into, and it had to be conceded that the organisation which the person concerned represented was not liable. For that reason the Commissioner of Taxation suggested we should do something about remedying this defect in the law.

In view of that situation, I think we can consider we are now doing something which it was thought had already been done but, in fact, had not been done. The Bill provides that liability policies as well as property policies will be subject to duty. I am assured that was originally intended and, as far as lawyers can be sound judges, the Bill now takes the necessary steps to give effect to that proposal.

Mr. Lewis: The 1968 *Hansard* seems to support the contention that this was intended.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is not a very profitable exercise to rely too heavily upon what *Hansard* says.

Mr. Court: You have, more than anyone during the time I have been here. You regard it as the Bible.

Mr. O'Neil: If appropriate.

Mr. Court: If appropriate or convenient.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Having made one speech, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to make another one.

Mr. Court: We are trying to be helpful by telling you that the 1968 amendments did not deal with anything but property, and the introductory speech dealt with property.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Bill intends to ensure that where no primary security has been stamped for duty the collateral security will be stamped. This point was raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is the intention of the Bill to bring that about, but that is not the situation at present.

I should say here that I make no secret of the fact that this is a taxing measure, and it is proposed that the Commissioner of Taxation shall collect as much money as he can legitimately claim in connection with this particular type of tax. We are therefore endeavouring to close up the

ways of escape, whether they be as a result of some defect in the law or as a result of misinterpretation.

I say again that where no primary security for property or any other risk has been stamped for duty, it is intended that the collateral shall be stamped. This will overcome the effect of a decision in the United Kingdom which has been applied in this State to the disadvantage of the Taxation Department.

Furthermore, when no primary security is discharged the collateral shall bear the duty which would have been paid had the primary security been discharged. Here can be seen a method of evading the duty—not to discharge the primary security but to discharge the collateral. The Bill is intended to ensure that if that practice is adopted the collateral being discharged shall be liable to duty.

Mr. Court: I do not think that is our real quarrel. The question of pulling a smart trick by discharging the collateral in order to avoid duty is not the serious matter about which we are concerned. It is not the big issue I was trying to state with persons A, B, and C.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I will come to that. What I have just explained is intended to overcome the flow-on from the United Kingdom decision, and its purpose is to protect future revenue.

No reference was made to the provision in the Bill for the exemption of charitable organisations, so I assume that provision is accepted and supported by the Opposition.

Reference has been made to the provision in the Bill enabling the imposition of stamp duty to be effected on insurances taken out outside the State. I am pleased to note that no exception has been taken to the provision. This is a case in which it appeared that duty could be avoided. Under this Bill, if agreed to, that will no longer be possible and insurances effected outside this State in regard to risks within the State—this does not apply, of course, to insurances effected outside the State in regard to risks outside the State—will be liable to duty. Whether or not an insurance is taken out within the State or outside the State, it will still be liable to duty if the risk is within the State.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spent a little time on differentiating between property risk policies and liability policies. I am assured that it was originally intended that this be done, and that it is not breaking new ground at all. It is merely giving effect to what it was believed had been already properly attended to.

Another provision provides for alternative methods of stamping insurance policies. I think it is desirable that there should be some flexibility in connection with cases

in which it is not possible accurately to determine the amount of premium which is being paid, and so a calculation is to be made. I am pleased to know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition accepts that the assessment based upon a method of calculation is a reasonable one so far as he can see. I think it is.

Mr. Lewis: Is it based on a lesser payment by the banks, or is it calculated to the same amount as before?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: No, it is calculated to bring in, as far as can be judged, the correct amount of duty. Surely the member for Moore would know that Commissioners of Taxation, if they err, err on the side of the Treasury. I am not saying they do err, but should they err I think we can take it for granted that they err on the right side so far as the Treasury is concerned—at least I hope they do!

Mr. Lewis: Is this one of the occasions when they have erred in regard to that policy?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am not admitting at all that there is any error. I think the method to be adopted in the absence of precise data is as reasonable as one can think up in the circumstances.

Mr. Court: There is the safeguard that if you argue that you are being taxed too much all you have to do is produce the insurance details.

Mr. Lewis: I notice that the banks agree to the proposal, which makes me suspicious.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is right. It has been discussed with the banks. We are reasonable; we did not impose this upon them without getting their point of view.

Mr. Court: There is a well-known song to cover that remark.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If I have overlooked any points I am sure they will emerge in the Committee stage, and I will be very pleased to do what I can to provide further elucidation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 87A added—

Mr. COURT: I would like to make a suggestion to the Treasurer in respect of this clause, because if what he said is in fact what his Treasury officers mean, we are not at variance at all as his interpretation of what I was trying to get across is exactly my own understanding. However, I have a suspicion from reading the notes, and in view of the fact that

we are trying to avoid the flow-on of the English case, that the Commissioner of Taxation has other views. In view of the complexity of this drafting, and the fact that the Treasurer's speech indicates that the Commissioner of Taxation, on behalf of the Treasury, is trying to avoid this flow-on, I would suggest we are talking at cross-purposes.

I suggest that the Treasurer either discuss the matter with the commissioner, or authorise some of us to express our point of view to the commissioner and ask him to explain to us why he believes the Bill is satisfactory in its present form. I suggest we should clarify this matter whilst we are in the Committee stage, or at least before the third reading. I like to see taxing measures leave this Chamber in the form in which we desire them to be, and to give the other place minimum cause for making amendments.

Based on my study of the Treasurer's speech, and the insistence of the commissioner that it is his desire to avoid the flow-on of the English case, I would submit that the commissioner does not wish to accept the principle that if a person has paid full tax on a primary security he pays only a collateral rate of tax on the mortgage where the mortgage is taken by the original vendor. In other words, the commissioner is trying to place these transactions in exactly the same position as would apply if the mortgage was held on money supplied by a third party at arm's length.

In his comments the Treasurer agreed with my desire in the matter; namely, that if the primary security has been taxed as a primary security, then there is scope for collateral security and for the taxing of the collateral security as collateral. Yet the speech notes and the emphasis on the desire to avoid the flow-on of the British case lead me to believe that the draftsman attempted to plug the hole. Possibly an argument may be advanced that the hole should be plugged, but I do not think so. However, we should be certain of this before the Bill leaves the Chamber.

I am prompted to suggest that the drafting be reviewed because I referred the Bill to two prominent lawyers who do nothing but conveyancing. I referred it to each unbeknown to the other. They both gave completely opposite opinions; and they are people of competence who work in this field.

Therefore, I suggest it might be desirable to hold the Bill at this stage in order that we may receive the benefit of advice either through the Treasurer or, if he prefers it, from the commissioner.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I regret that I overlooked mentioning in my reply to the second reading debate that it was my intention to speak to the draftsman about the points raised by the Deputy Leader

of the Opposition. I say now that I will do so. However, I do not think we should delay the Bill.

Firstly, I see little difficulty because I think the two assertions I made are set out clearly in paragraphs (a) and (b) of proposed new section 87A. I said that the provision in paragraph (a) is that in cases where no primary security has been stamped, the collateral will be stamped. I refer members to paragraph (a) of the proposed new section, which seems to be perfectly clear; it states that if the primary security has not been charged with duty, then the collateral shall be. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said he referred this to two lawyers and received different opinions.

Mr. Court: You have to take paragraph (b) in conjunction with paragraph (a) and the second schedule.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is nothing new to receive different opinions from different lawyers. How would they make their money if there were no differences of opinion! I refer now to paragraph (b). I stated before that this paragraph proposes that where no primary security is discharged, then the collateral shall bear the duty which would have been paid on the discharge of the primary security, had it been discharged. I refer members to the wording of the paragraph. I think it is perfectly clear.

Mr. Court: We could all say that from just reading the words, but when you read the parent Act and the schedule you will find that you can have two approaches. It is quite obvious that the commissioner—who, presumably, advised you on these matters—has a different view from that which you and I hold in regard to what this means. That is why I ask that this should be cleared up while the Bill is in this Chamber.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think so, because the view I have been expressing to the Committee is the view expressed to me by the Commissioner of Taxation, and it is the conclusion to which I come after reading paragraphs (a) and (b) of proposed new section 87A. However, in order to clear the matter I undertake to discuss this with the draftsman tomorrow and to raise it at the third reading stage.

Mr. Court: And with the commissioner too. I think his views are different from ours.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Very well.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 92A amended—

Mr. COURT: I am sorry that the notes as presented to the Treasurer and as presented to this Parliament included reference to the fact that no new ground was being broken, because I am quite emphatic

that it is. Even when the Treasurer was introducing the Bill I was heard to interject on this basis, and having studied the provision further I am more than ever convinced that I was right. I now return to my earlier point. We are not making a great issue about this legislation and we have given our support towards trying to achieve the original objective, but it does not matter what the commissioner says to the Treasurer—and I have great respect for the commissioner as a man of great integrity, of tremendous industry, and earnestness—the fact is that when the legislation was introduced to the Chamber in 1968 some definite statements were made by the then Premier and Treasurer, and it is necessary that we look at them in spite of the fact that the present Treasurer says that we should not place too much reliance on what we read in *Hansard*. After going into a great deal of detail about motor vehicle agreements involving stamp duty, the then Premier and Treasurer was reported on page 1876 of the 1968-69 *Parliamentary Debates* as saying—

With the increase in number of Eastern States and overseas companies carrying on business in Western Australia, insurance cover on assets—I emphasise the words “insurance cover on assets.” Continuing—

—in this State is being arranged under policies of insurance that are issued and retained outside the State. There are cases where stamp duty is not being paid on these policies or renewals.

Legal opinion has been obtained and we are advised that until these policies or renewals come into this State there could be no obligation to pay Stamp Duty.

In order to overcome this situation and remove any doubt as to the liability to pay duty on insurance policies covering assets in this State,—

I emphasise again the words, “covering assets in this State.” Continuing—

—it is proposed to add two new sections on insurance policies to the Act.

The Treasurer then went on to explain that one of those sections provides for persons in Western Australia who insure Western Australian property outside this State to submit a return to the commissioner.

If members look up the 1968 Bill which became an Act they will see two new sections—sections 92A and 92B—that cover this and which I believe cater adequately for property. The point I am making is that there was no suggestion in the introductory speech nor in the Bill that the legislation was referring to anything but property, so it is no good anyone from the Crown Law Department, or from any other

section of the Government, saying that we are not breaking new ground. They found that items such as insurance against loss of profits and that type of insurance are not covered. That is fair enough. I am not one to let persons off scot free because they write policies in Canberra or some other place.

Let us say here that we are trying to introduce a new principle that was not envisaged in the 1968 legislation. The whole emphasis in the introductory notes and in the 1968 Bill is on property. That is the only reference. One could only assume at the time, because of the speech and because of the words in the Bill, that the legislation intended to cover policies dealing with property. If an omission has been made and the officers want the legislation to go further, all that is needed is for us to be told that this is new ground being broken and all the argument would cease; because I do not think there would be any member in this Chamber who would want to see an evasion of stamp duty because someone was smart enough to insure something in this State and have the document in another State.

To the best of my knowledge, and from what the Treasurer has said, sections 92A and 92B have not been challenged in respect of assets and property in this State. If it would hold water in respect of the risks involved in those sections it would hold water in respect of the many other risks that are covered, such as loss of profit and things right outside the normal risk. These include loss of profit protection, workers' compensation cover, public risk cover, and the like. None of those are in dispute, but I want it to be clearly understood that there is a new principle involved, and while the Treasurer is talking to the commissioner on this matter I would like him to get some information which he can convey to us on the third reading of the Bill in order to clear up this point.

I can visualise that this will be challenged in another place and we will just trigger off an unnecessary argument. If we want these things—and we accept them in respect of assets and property—I for one would not object to the extension of another taxing field provided I know what is being done.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I cannot understand why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is making so much of this point. I am not admitting that this intends to break new ground, but let us assume, for the sake of argument, that it does. The new ground would be to extend the insurance to risks on things which some people might not regard as being property. If a person dies and the argument is put forward that certain things which are regarded as real estate are really not property, the argument will not get very far. Those putting forward the argument will

find they will have to pay probate duty on what the commissioner considers is property, even though it is something which is not tangible property in the sense of real estate.

Mr. Court: But this is not stamp duty on assets; this is stamp duty on an insurance premium.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This is stamp duty on risk; that is what this is.

Mr. Court: It is stamp duty on the insurance premium.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and the insurance is insuring a risk; that is the point about this. It is insuring not property as such, because it is property, but it is insuring against the risk of loss which would result from the destruction of the thing being insured.

Mr. Hartrey: That is right.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The purpose of this provision is to ensure that the insurances that are taken out, whether they be on what is generally regarded as property, like real estate and insurances which are taken out on other risk, usually bear stamp duty and one shall not be free of duty whilst the other has to bear stamp duty.

Let us accept, for the sake of argument, that this does break new ground to the extent that it will now make liable for duty insurance on some risk which previously did not carry duty. Would the Opposition object to that?

Mr. Court: I made our position clear. We want this to be set in its proper compartment, because you said it does not break new ground, and it does.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is the only point that is worrying the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—the statement that it does not break new ground. He is satisfied with the duty being imposed, but he is worried about the fact that this imposition of duty may not be what was originally intended. It is, in fact, extending taxation.

Mr. Court: That is right.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I put this to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: Supposing it does, does the Opposition oppose this extension of taxation, which appears to me to be an equalisation of what ought to be done? Why should a person who has insured a property known as such be liable for duty on the insurance policy, and a person who is insuring a risk of another kind, but which is worth 10 times as much so far as the insurance is concerned, be exempt from paying any duty? Where will be the common sense in that?

Mr. Court: We have dealt with that. We are asking you to declare that you are introducing a new principle; that you are extending the taxing machine.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I said I would refer this to the Commissioner of Taxation and the Parliamentary Draftsman and put it straight to them. I will say, "The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says you are breaking new ground, and you have told me you are not."

Mr. Court: That is fair enough.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What will I ask? Will I ask: Did you tell me the truth or did you not?

Mr. Hutchinson: That is right. It is quite serious.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I have undertaken to find out what is the true position, but after I have found out I want to know this: If it transpires that, to some extent, it does break new ground, does that mean the Opposition will oppose it?

Mr. Gayfer: It is a taxing measure, but you, in fact, are saying you are not breaking new ground.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is splitting straws. I appreciate the desire of the Opposition to be so meticulous and I will help it in this objective but not to the extent of holding up the Bill now on such a small matter. I will certainly refer this to the Commissioner of Taxation and the Parliamentary Draftsman and I will give the answer when I am dealing with this matter on the third reading.

Mr. COURT: This matter is not as easy as the Treasurer would make out. I have been in this place long enough to see him in Opposition and in Government and I know he can stand here by the hour and by the day repeating a statement and very often I have felt like "turning off the machine."

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is only a tribute to my stamina.

Mr. COURT: I have heard the Premier say, "I am saying that we cannot accept the assurances of the people on the other side of the Chamber. They are not worth anything." If we care to read the words he was so emphatic about, after I made my interjection and gave him a chance to break it down a little, we will find that the Treasurer said, "I emphasise this: The Bill definitely does not break any new ground." Later on, being thoroughly disordered, I interjected to ask—

Do you mean it does not impose additional tax but it does in fact break new ground in the approach to the problem?

The Treasurer replied by saying—

It does not break new ground at all. If those notes go up to another place and are seen by some of the members who understand this type of legislation they will create an argument over something which is not really necessary.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: They will do that whether the notes go up there or not.

Mr. COURT: They will do it more effectively if the Treasurer sends up something that is not accurately written. This is not as simple as it sounds, because we are introducing an extension of the taxing machine. I have said to the Treasurer—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Will you make it clear what you want me to do?

Mr. COURT: Wait a minute!

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Why wait a minute? Tell me now!

Mr. COURT: I happen to be speaking and after the performance of our Speaker today I would think that the Treasurer would be highly orderly, because he would not want to be using some of the words he has said about me in the past.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You know that is not justified.

Mr. COURT: After today we will have to use language which will mean that this place will probably lose a lot of personality and colour, but that is another issue. I said to the Premier earlier that we are not opposing the fact that he might want to attract the duty on this business that comes from other States where people are avoiding the payment of stamp duty in contradistinction to those who are here. I have made that clear. All I want the Treasurer to tell us when we reach the third reading stage is whether, in fact, this breaks new ground by extending the taxing machine. I believe it does.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th April.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [9.01 p.m.]: This is a relatively simple and straightforward Bill the purpose of which is, as the Minister outlined when introducing it, to enable the Acclimatisation Committee which controls and manages the zoo to operate more effectively.

The Bill does three things. Firstly, it renames the Acclimatisation Committee zoological gardens board. It also appoints the board a body corporate with perpetual succession and with a common seal. It will have power to sue and be sued. Finally, the Bill confers on the board necessary wider powers, similar to those at present contained in the Parks and Reserves Act of 1895.

As it is a relatively simple and straightforward Bill and is in no way contentious, the Opposition supports it. However, before I resume my seat I would like to express my appreciation of the way the zoo

is controlled and managed. As the member for the area involved, I have not, in all the years I have represented South Perth, received a complaint of any kind in respect of the zoo, although it is feasible to expect that a complaint of some kind would be made. This speaks volumes for the management.

The zoo gives a tremendous amount of pleasure to thousands of people annually and in the last few years the attendance of juveniles and adults has increased by 58 per cent., which is a very creditable performance and indicates how popular the zoo has become. Quite apart from the pleasure the zoo gives, it has also an educational value and at the moment is serving a further role in our State in that it is propagating various types of rare species. As the Minister pointed out, the short necked tortoise is an example.

In the circumstances I would like to express appreciation of the way the zoo is being conducted and I trust the Government will continue to go out of its way to make as much money as possible available to the new zoological gardens board. I support the Bill.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Lands) [9.05 p.m.]: I thank the member for South Perth for supporting the Bill and I appreciate his remarks in regard to the management of the zoo. One of its most outstanding features is the recent introduction of walk-through aviaries and animal cages. The water bird collection and the water bird cages and lakes are now approaching world standards and this is a direct reflection upon the administration and, in particular, the director of the zoo who himself is an authority, particularly in this regard.

The member for South Perth rightly pointed out that the passing of this Bill will make the administration of the board much more effective and I therefore commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th April.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [9.09 p.m.]: Before I express my amazement concerning this legislation, I appeal to the Premier to withdraw this Bill and Nos. 14 and 15 on the notice paper and establish a committee of all parties involved in an effort to reach reasonable agreement on the best

way to deal with the problem. I say this in all sincerity because I believe that is the only way to tackle the matter.

Obviously the introductory notes on these Bills were prepared way back in August or September, or even earlier last year, and have not been looked at since; because when introducing the Local Government Act Amendment Bill the Minister said that the Government would assist in 1971-72 those local authorities which agreed with the proposal. All fruit-fly baiting schemes have been concluded and none is in operation at the moment.

If the Government wants those involved to assist it to carry out a legislative programme, surely it must first discuss the programme with them and get them on-side. Yet, the Minister has admitted that not one local authority in Western Australia is prepared to back his proposal. Nevertheless, he is appealing to local authorities to assist him to get it off the ground—a proposal he considers better than the previous one.

I do not know what the member for Maylands thinks of the legislation, but when I reached the office on the morning following the introduction of this legislation I received a telegram from his local authority requesting me to oppose the legislation. I do not know whether the member for Maylands received a similar telegram. I do not know of one local authority in Western Australia which is prepared to support this legislation.

Therefore, before I go any further, I appeal to the Premier and to the Minister to withdraw the legislation and hold a conference in order to devise a better scheme than the one already in existence. It is obvious that some improvement is necessary although I hasten to say that a certain amount of success has been achieved. We have no right to force legislation of this nature onto anyone, let alone a highly-regarded and responsible section of the community; and all the local authorities are against it.

I would like the Premier at least to postpone this legislation to allow all local authorities to discuss the matter. I am sure all members believe this problem must be attacked on a united front and therefore the Government, the local authorities, and the present fruit-fly baiting people should get together.

Undoubtedly some of the schemes have been successful. The one at Applecross is a case in point. I have spoken to the Town Clerk of the Melville City Council and he could write a book in support of the committee operating in the Applecross-Mt. Pleasant-Brentwood area.

The experience gained in the past is to be ignored. Because no compulsion is involved in the scheme, all of the 130-odd local authorities will not be interested and will not do anything about the matter.

We will be further behind than we were when the problem was on our plates long before most members came into this Parliament. As I say, I have a great deal of evidence. I have received letters from local authorities on this matter. I wrote to the City of Perth and received a reply. I wrote to the City of Stirling and received a reply. I also wrote to the City of Fremantle and received a reply. Every one of those local authorities is opposed to the present situation.

Mr. H. D. Evans: With whom should the administration of a community scheme work?

Mr. NALDER: If the Minister were on-side with local authorities I would support it wholeheartedly, but this legislation has been brought down when not one local authority is in agreement.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There are four alternatives. Which do you propose?

Mr. NALDER: Why does not the Minister discuss it with local authorities? He has not seen local authorities up to date but has merely written letters saying what the Government would do. Every authority is opposed to it. Surely under those circumstances we should not proceed with the legislation. I appeal to the Premier to postpone it and to call together all the people concerned to discuss the matter. If we go on with this legislation I consider we will be in a far worse position than we have ever been with regard to the scourge of fruit fly.

Mr. Harman: Why did the local authorities say they were opposed to it?

Mr. NALDER: First of all I will read the telegram from the Bassendean Shire Council which says—

Council opposes amending legislation to transfer fruit fly control to local government.

The telegram is dated Wednesday, the 12th April, and I received it at 10.50 last Wednesday morning after the legislation had been introduced on the previous evening.

Mr. Bertram: They do not give any grounds.

Mr. NALDER: I have, as I have said, a great deal of evidence. This letter will prove it. If the honourable member wishes me to read the correspondence I will do so. The first is a letter addressed to myself from the Local Government Association of Western Australia dated the 12th April, 1972. It reads, in part—

Referring to our telephone conversation, I advise that on the 20th of October last I wrote on behalf of this Association to the Hon. Minister for Agriculture as follows—

The Association considers that the eradication of control of fruit fly, and meeting the cost thereof, is a matter which should be undertaken by the State itself, and

the local authorities should not be called upon to undertake this responsibility.

I wrote further on the 23rd February last as follows—

On the 20th October last, I wrote to you advising that the Association considered that Fruit Fly Control was a matter for the State, and not for the local authorities.

At its meeting on the 18th instant, the Association again discussed this matter, and directed me to write to you, and

- (a) advise that the Association is resolute in opposing the transfer of control of fruit fly from the Department of Agriculture to the local authorities,
- (b) ask whether you propose introducing legislation in the coming Parliamentary session which will make local authorities responsible for fruit fly control,
- (c) request that you reconsider the proposal, with a view to retaining the responsibility as one for the Department of Agriculture.

On behalf of the Country Shire Councils' Association I wrote to the Minister on the 15th of December last as follows—

Your letter of the 1st October last was placed before the Executive of this Association at its quarterly meeting on the 6th instant, when it was resolved that the responsibility for the control of fruit fly should lie with the Department of Agriculture, and not with Local Authorities.

Any new legislation, therefore, should be designed to give the Department adequate powers of control, and should not impose any responsibility upon Councils.

It was not my wish initially to read out this correspondence. I consider I have a great deal of evidence and I think I have given an indication of this from the correspondence coupled with the fact that I have a letter from the Perth City Council.

Mr. Jamieson: Did any of them say why? You quoted what they said but they did not say why.

Mr. NALDER: I do not know what the Minister said in his letters. He must have written stating what he intended to do.

Mr. Jamieson: They did not say why.

Mr. NALDER: These were written because those authorities had received letters from the Minister outlining the reasons.

Mr. Jamieson: I suppose it would be the same with the control of house flies.

Mr. Hutchinson: They believe the responsibility rests with the department.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The responsibility of implementing the Plant Diseases Act remains with the department.

Mr. Hutchinson: But you will be getting someone else to do the work.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The administration is so expensive and time-consuming to officers who should be engaged in control and research. Officers are being tied up with detailed administration in a manner which is expensive and time-consuming.

Mr. Hutchinson: You want to load it off onto local government.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Local authorities are better equipped because they have the facilities.

Mr. NALDER: I would have thought the Minister would go out of his way to get local authorities onside. If necessary, conference after conference should have been held to allay any fears they have in connection with problems which could arise in consequence of this.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There is no compulsion on them.

Mr. NALDER: That is why I am so concerned.

Mr. H. D. Evans: If it is their wish they will get every assistance.

Mr. NALDER: There is no compulsion and no encouragement either.

Mr. H. D. Evans: There is encouragement.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister is asking local authorities to take over, to impose rates—and to accept the full responsibility for doing so—but local authorities will not be held responsible if the scheme does not succeed. The Minister is virtually saying, "Do what you like; do it how you like; we do not care what you do. You can please yourselves whether you impose a general rate upon all ratepayers in connection with fruit fly."

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Are they likely to do that?

Mr. NALDER: The Minister is saying that if they do not succeed it does not matter.

Mr. H. D. Evans: They will have the scope to decide their own way. They can rate or put on a charge.

Mr. NALDER: As I have said, the Minister should have gone out of his way to get local authorities onside. He should have held discussions and said that the Government would do all in its power to help because it wants this proposal to

succeed, and that it will introduce legislation accordingly. There was nothing like this.

The local authorities are absolutely opposed to it. For this reason I again appeal to the Premier and the Minister to postpone the legislation and give everybody an opportunity to try to work out a scheme which will be acceptable to the majority. I make this request in all sincerity in the belief that this is the best way to go about it. To pass this legislation in its present form would be one of the worst actions taken by this Parliament. It would undo all that has been done in Western Australia to control fruit fly.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you consider the present situation is satisfactory?

Mr. NALDER: Right at the beginning I said that I do not believe the present situation is satisfactory.

Mr. Jamieson: You have changed your tune in a couple of years. You should read from *Hansard* what you have said on this.

Mr. NALDER: I was endeavouring to do something and I did it. There are 50 schemes operating in Western Australia.

Mr. Jamieson: It is one hell of a mess.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister for Works has nothing to be proud about.

Mr. Jamieson: Let us hear about me. We will see how good you are.

Mr. NALDER: In all sincerity I ask the Premier to do this.

Mr. Jamieson: Let us hear those accusations about me.

Mr. NALDER: I will oppose the present legislation.

Mr. Jamieson: You know nothing. Tell us something.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister for Works opens his mouth and anything comes out.

Mr. Jamieson: Tell us something.

Mr. NALDER: I have never heard the like.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [9.24 p.m.]: The Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill, the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, and the Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act Repeal Bill, all of which are complementary to each other, have an admirable objective which is, one supposes, to eradicate fruit fly. I believe that whilst the objective is admirable the means are completely empty. Certainly to place these measures on the Statute book will not do anything towards eradicating fruit fly. I find myself very closely in agreement with the Leader of the Country Party in this regard. How can the system succeed in the terms outlined in this legislation?

We have already learnt from the Leader of the Country Party that the Local Government Association is opposed to it. Part

of a letter from the Local Government Association was read in this Chamber, and it indicated that the association did not support the legislation and did not want a transfer of control from the department to local authorities.

This Bill merely allows local authorities to come into a fruit-fly baiting scheme if they so desire. I think the Minister will agree that is so. Indeed, by interjection a short while ago he said that very thing. He said there was no compulsion on local authorities to enter this scheme. For that reason, it fails.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you think there should be compulsion?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: No. I am just coming to that point. Neither I nor the Local Government Association would support a compulsory scheme if the voluntary aspect were eliminated. The proper depositary for all the control and management is fairly and squarely with the Department of Agriculture. This is what the Local Government Association believes and this is what we all believe.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Wait a minute. This is not on.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It is naive in the extreme of the Minister and the Government to propose legislation for the voluntary control of fruit fly. This is a matter which must be tackled *in toto*.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is the situation now?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: A campaign must be waged and won as the Argentine ant war was won.

Mr. Jamieson: How many times did I use those phrases when the previous Minister was here?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The interjection of the Minister for Works does not make sense. I say again that the scheme covered by these three Bills is doomed to failure. They are pusillanimous pieces of legislation.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What would your proposal cost?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I do not know what it would cost. The Minister for Agriculture has already said it would be a rather expensive job. If a campaign were mounted, I suppose a charge would have to be levied upon the people in whose backyards the fruit trees and the vehicles carrying fruit fly are to be found. But let there be a campaign. Do not have a pusillanimous faint-hearted piece of legislation; it does not make sense. The objective of the Minister for Agriculture—the eradication of fruit fly—is admirable, but this legislation will not achieve it.

Something along the lines suggested by the Leader of the Country Party, with the formation of a committee working, in the initial stages, in close co-operation with local authorities, might bring some

success in its train, in the same way as the Argentine ant campaign was very successful; but that campaign was waged, conducted, and managed by the Department of Agriculture with the assistance and co-operation of local authorities in minimal ways.

Mr. Harman: Is that what you are suggesting for fruit fly?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: A campaign against fruit fly.

Mr. Harman: Run in the same way as the Argentine ant campaign was run?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It would not be conducted in the same way. They are different pests. The Minister should get together with his department, enlist the co-operation of local authorities, and work out a campaign. It is naive of the Minister to put forward the proposals contained in this legislation. It does not do him any justice, and I am rather surprised that he of all the Ministers on the front bench, should have introduced such a feeble piece of legislation.

Mr. Jamieson: Damned with faint praise.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister must be aware that there are tremendous weaknesses inherent in this Bill. I appreciate that he tried to avoid compulsion and did not want to force local authorities to do this.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But you want to force the department.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is so. I want to put the prime responsibility on the department and on the Government.

Mr. H. D. Evans: They are synonymous. What cost would be involved, and what would be the attitude and the degree of co-operation if there were a Government-controlled set-up in a community facility?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister must work that out before he conducts the campaign. Wars are not won easily, and this one will not be won easily; but this Bill does not do anything. It will not get the Minister anywhere, and he knows it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You are wrong. It will supplant a scheme that is disliked.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I am completely right, and I think the Minister for Works knows I am completely right.

Mr. Jamieson: No, he does not at all.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Am I to understand that the Minister for Works—who was very interested in this matter and spoke about it on a number of occasions when he was in Opposition—believes success will attend this legislation, if it is carried? I want to know.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, I think it will, because certain sections of local authority administration go along with this. Local

authorities deal with the problem of house flies; they go into gardens to find out where they are coming from. The proposed scheme is similar to what they already do.

The SPEAKER: The member for Cottesloe.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I am surprised that the Minister for Works spoke in those terms. He has lost the spirit he had when he was in Opposition.

Mr. Jamieson: I would still like a compulsory scheme but I do not think we would get away with it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister has lost much of his practical common sense in regard to coping with problems. I am really surprised that he feels that way. Therefore, I am surprised at two Ministers. In any event, I stick to my point of view that this proposal is no way to win a campaign against fruit fly.

An overall campaign, waged with the co-operation of local authorities and the community, is necessary for success. I agree there must be co-operation from the community, but it cannot be obtained under such a scheme as that outlined in this Bill. We therefore oppose the legislation.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [9.33 p.m.]: I wholeheartedly support the request of the Leader of the Country Party to the Premier to take these Bills out of circulation for the time being in order that we may have a look at them. I think everyone agrees that the challenge of the fruit fly must be met, and it is no good playing around with it.

I am not opposed to many of the principles contained in this Bill because I believe there should be local control of fruit fly. State-wide control could lead to difficulties. I cite, by way of example, the voluntary schemes that have been initiated. Anyone who knows anything about those schemes will admit that they do present difficulties but they have been successful. Perhaps the Minister for Works, who does not know anything about them, will not admit it.

Mr. Jamieson: Tell us what I do not know about them.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I spoke about this matter only a week or two ago, and it seems I must repeat some of the things I said. These voluntary schemes have been so successful that places where fruit fly was rampant now have no sign of fruit fly.

Mr. Jamieson: We have had a scheme in our area and the fruit still falls off the trees.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If that is so there is something wrong with the administration of the scheme.

Mr. Jamieson: This is the very point.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is not the fault of the scheme, it is the fault of the persons administering the scheme.

Mr. Jamieson: You do not have elected representatives administering the scheme.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If the job is done properly there is no difficulty which cannot be overcome. It does not cost more. In fact, in many cases it costs less than if the individuals bought the bait themselves, and this would not take account of the work the individuals would still have to do. The scheme is carried out from house to house and very considerable economies are effected throughout the community. I believe that the scheme could be administered by the local authority.

The purpose of this Bill is to transfer the administration of the scheme to local authorities, but the local authorities do not want it. I do not know whether this is because they do not fully understand it. However, we should find out their reasons. It is certainly time to hold a conference with these people or their representatives. We may find a way to modify the scheme to ensure its success. It has to succeed and we must see it succeed. It will not succeed if the Minister continues with his present idea of forcing the control of the scheme upon local government against its opposition. What is the use of that?

The Minister said, by way of interjection, that there are four alternatives. However, he did not get a chance to tell us what the alternatives were. If there are four alternatives, the conference should discuss them and endeavour to reach agreement with the Minister. The matter is too serious to be glossed over.

As the legislation stands we will probably oppose it. We do not want to oppose it—we want a scheme which will work. I appeal to the Premier to put these Bills to one side until we have had time to study them. We may be able to make everyone happy and still achieve the eradication of fruit fly, which is the main objective. We can do this if we settle down to it. If the Minister for Agriculture gets rid of his dogmatic attitude—and he is perhaps influenced by the Ministers next to him—and gets down to the problems which have been raised, he could formulate a policy in conjunction with the local authorities. In this way a satisfactory conclusion can be reached.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [9.38 p.m.]: I wish to add a few words to this debate. It seems incredible that this legislation is being pressured upon us and upon local government. If one looks at the facts, there is nothing to sustain the argument that the legislation should proceed.

The original fruit-fly baiting scheme was introduced in the areas I am pleased to represent, and it was most efficient. The local authorities do not wish to take on—

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you consider the local schemes were all efficient? I do not think you know much about this.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think I know more about the local schemes than the Minister does. He would not carry on like this if he knew more about it.

The people in the area I represent have shown that the scheme will work with a little help from the Minister's department. For instance, this year the grant from the department was reduced from \$3,000 to \$2,000. After begging for extra help, another \$1,000 was added. Now the Minister wishes to push the scheme onto local authorities which are not equipped to handle the responsibility. We have growers and other people who are prepared to carry this responsibility.

As others have said, this legislation needs more thought and due regard for the different interests. My own view is that the responsibility for fruit-fly baiting lies with the Department of Agriculture. The control of codling moth and the Argentine ant was not transferred to someone else. On this occasion the department is simply passing the buck.

Mr. H. D. Evans: At this moment who is responsible for fruit fly?

Mr. RUSHTON: At the present time?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Yes.

Mr. RUSHTON: In my area it is the local committee.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is the responsibility of the individual under the terms of the present legislation.

Mr. RUSHTON: And it must always remain partially the responsibility of the individual.

The committee in my electorate works in close liaison with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Court: It must always be a corporate responsibility.

Mr. RUSHTON: Of course that is so. The Government should study a local scheme which is working at least 80 per cent. effectively. The proposal put up by the Government does not have much chance of being efficient at all.

Mr. Jamieson: Tell me, who gets the odium from the schemes if they do not work properly?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister does not like any odium at all. Does the Minister wish to pass the buck to the local authorities whom he attacks from time to time?

Mr. Jamieson: Just a minute! It is the local authority members who get the odium when the scheme goes wrong.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why should this happen?

Mr. Jamieson: This is what has happened, and this is the problem.

Mr. RUSHTON: At this time the Government should adjourn the debate on the legislation and study the scheme working in the south-suburban district. This scheme covers two shires, the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott and the Shire of Gosnells. A study should be made of the workings and costings of the scheme, and an estimate made of the shire's involvement if it had to run the scheme.

Mr. Jamieson: Will you speak to some of the fruit growers as well and ask them what it costs to try to keep their orchards free?

Mr. RUSHTON: Let us look at this: The Government wishes to transfer the cost of the scheme to the ratepayers. Does the Government expect that all the ratepayers should bear the cost?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, this is what happened with Argentine ants.

Mr. RUSHTON: There is some fruit fly in the Armadale-Kelmscott district, and the ratepayers would not accept this proposal.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You should look at the legislation before you say this.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government is proposing to offer the shire 50c for every ratable property.

Mr. Court: For one year.

Mr. RUSHTON: And at the present time the local baiting scheme is under threat of losing its grant in a short time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The administrative costs are less this way. Any scheme must be financed and if the avenues for raising funds are effective, administration costs are much lower.

Mr. RUSHTON: Is this under the local authorities?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Yes.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister should study this again.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You should do some more reading.

Mr. RUSHTON: What would be the position if the local authority was engaged in this operation for seven months of the year? A special staff would be necessary and then what would happen in the other five months?

Mr. H. D. Evans: How do you think the committee got on? It had to send out notices and make up assessments. It needed a general supervisory staff.

Mr. RUSHTON: Does the Minister know the breakdown of costs in the south-suburban scheme?

Mr. H. D. Evans: This is all right if a scheme operates well.

Mr. RUSHTON: The estimate is that the scheme will cost three times as much if it is administered by the local authority.

Mr. Nalder: Every bit of it.

Mr. RUSHTON: This will mean an escalation in the rates of every property owner in the district.

Mr. Jamieson: What would be the excess costs?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister only needs to study the costs of the committee. The person who supervises the present scheme is paid \$2,500 for his supervision, plus other items. The scheme just cannot be operated for less by the local authority. I could make a list of all the expenses, and it would include such items as running tractors.

From my understanding, there are something like 9,000 assessments in this shire. This would attract something in the order of \$4,500 as a subsidy. At present the Government makes a grant of \$3,000—and it has to be squeezed for every dollar, by the way. It would be preferable to encourage the local people by being a little more open-handed with finance.

As other speakers have said, this legislation should be held over in order that it may be reconsidered and recast. I refer to Argentine ant control. I think the Minister for Works said by way of interjection that the shires should have run that scheme.

Mr. Jamieson: The shires weighed in very heavily for it.

Mr. RUSHTON: But they did not run it.

Mr. Jamieson: If the shires weighed in as heavily for this as they did for the control of Argentine ants we would have no trouble.

Mr. RUSHTON: It would appear that this measure has been inspired by the Minister for Works. For years he has had a thing about this and obviously he has inspired Cabinet to do something.

Mr. Jamieson: I am afraid my inspirations in Cabinet are not that good.

Mr. RUSHTON: The measure appears to be attacking local government.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, that is an unfair remark. It has no basis at all, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think it is time this Government had a little more consideration for the part played by local government in our community.

Mr. Jamieson: It is an unfair remark. You have made it again. You have no justification for it, and you know it.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is strange that the Minister is so volatile in his objections to a few remarks which apparently touch him deeply.

Mr. Jamieson: You go out and sound out the local authority in my area and see what my standing is.

Mr. RUSHTON: I could have quite a lot to say on that.

Mr. Jamieson: And you will find you are quite haywire.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I have spoken to many competent fruit growers in my area, and I have spoken to local authorities; and they all object to this measure. I understand the Local Government Association has objected to it. The fruit growers in my area object to the legislation because they say it is inefficient and there is nothing attractive in it. One could speak at great length on this and bring out all the cost factors which clearly show that the Government is doing something without having regard for all the aspects which should be considered. I oppose the Bill.

MR. REID (Blackwood) [9.47 p.m.]: I would like to add my brief comments to those of previous speakers. The member for Dale mentioned that the fruit growers in his area are opposed to this measure. I think great concern is felt by all fruit growers throughout the State at the spread of this cursed pest. The Fruit Growers' Association has for many years been striving to institute a general programme for the eradication of fruit fly in Western Australia. Those of us who have studied the problem acknowledge the magnitude of such a move, and no-one will decry it. The eradication of fruit fly is indeed possible. All things are possible, although some are more costly than others.

Whilst I am speaking of costs I would mention it is interesting to observe that over \$100,000 a year is being spent on the provision of fruit-fly inspectors. That is a tremendous amount, and it is a recurring cost. We are spending that amount without any thought of, or taking any steps towards, the eventual eradication of fruit fly. The Fruit Growers' Association has for many years stressed the need for steps to be taken towards a general eradication programme.

I think one point needs emphasis; that is, the spread of this menace into commercial orchard areas. Under the present scheme backyard orchards are registered, and the registration fees return an income of some \$16,000 to \$17,000 a year. This scheme is to be discontinued because the cost of collecting the registration fees exceeds the income. Nevertheless, if we repeal that provision and people are not required to register their orchards, how are we to know where the fruit trees are, and how could we deal with an outbreak of fruit fly? We are actually encouraging the planting of more trees, which bring with them a higher incidence of fruit fly.

When one considers the argument put forward that the control of fruit fly should be a local authority responsibility, one wonders whether the Bush Fires Board or the Agriculture Protection Board should not also be included under the Local Government Act. If it is fair for one, it is fair for all.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You will admit that this is a totally different circumstance.

Mr. REID: Nevertheless, it is a threat. Fruit fly is a pest which can threaten the viability of commercial fruit-growing operations, in exactly the same way as wild dogs can threaten other primary industries.

Mr. Nalder: If we had no trouble with fruit fly we could be exporting apples to Japan right now.

Mr. REID: The Leader of the Country Party has raised a valid point, and one which I intended to raise; that is, the possible shipment of our export apple crop to Japan. As the Minister well knows, apart from fruit fly there is another limitation on our fruit trade with Japan; namely, the codling moth. But then we have no codling moth in Western Australia; we have only the Mediterranean fruit fly. If we can prove to the Japanese that we have no codling moth—and we know that we have not because we have a fairly good inspection system and a quarantine check on the Western Australian border—I think we would be halfway towards convincing the Japanese to deal with our commodities. If we could prove that we are taking realistic steps to eradicate, or keep under control, our fruit fly, then perhaps we would be still closer to our goal of fruit trade with the Japanese.

The Department of Agriculture has undertaken a most active programme in an effort to obtain a 100 per cent. kill of fruit fly in its various stages.

I have added my comments to this debate because I believe there is every reason to suggest the measure will not prove to be very effective. Obviously schemes will have to be conducted in country areas along similar lines to those in the city area. I accept that perhaps anomalies have occurred in the old fruit-fly control scheme, but I have no faith in the proposed scheme.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [9.53 p.m.]: I listened with considerable interest to the speakers opposite, and I must say I appreciate their points of view. However, they made light of, and did not perceive very fully, some of the more important aspects of the measure. Let us consider the operation of the existing schemes. The number in existence is 55, of which 45 operated this year, three schemes failed to commence

in 1971-72, and one terminated during the course of the season. The system is rather cumbersome and it is something of a hazard to operate at long range.

Firstly, referendums are required. Generally these are conducted at the instigation of the local authorities concerned. At the request of the local authority a survey is conducted by the Department of Agriculture, and the actual poll is carried out by the Electoral Office. Even this does not give a very clear picture of the requirements of a district. Indeed, in some cases only a minimal number of commercial growers vote; sometimes only about 20 per cent. of those eligible actually cast a vote. So the establishment of a scheme is almost as cumbersome as its operation.

A great number of difficulties and complaints were encountered not only this year, but also in previous years. One of the most difficult problems to overcome is that of staffing, especially in regard to supervisory staff as this problem is always very disconcerting when trying to administer local schemes. Some operate most effectively, but there is a direct correlation between the quality of the supervisory staff and the efficiency of the scheme. Also, the cost involved is considerable. We have only to analyse the cost of collecting the fees and sending out follow-up notices, because this requires additional postage and additional clerical costs. This is the administration which each scheme has to set up itself. Here again I cannot follow the suggestion made by the member for Dale that the present overall scheme is more economical. Admittedly he is associated with a particularly good scheme, but on looking at the whole of the State in balance, consideration has to be given to the overall operation. At the moment the eradication of fruit fly is regarded as not being technically possible, but its incidence can be reduced. One of the most difficult factors to overcome is the range of hosts that the fruit fly can use. Such hosts embrace roses, lilli pilli, and at Carnarvon even vegetables have been cited as being the hosts of fruit fly.

Therefore, if a total eradication programme was ever to be countenanced it would need to include all gardens, and provision is made in this Bill whereby a local governing authority can bait every garden in its area if it so desires. Where a local shire has an established staff, particularly in its office, this must, necessarily, bring about a reduction in the cost of operation. The basic supervisory staff already exists. The shire has several methods alternative to raising finance by means of a levy. It can make a charge, or make a rating. The rating does not necessarily have to be imposed on the whole of an area governed by the shire. It can apply to a certain section of the local government area. Such provisions are within the compass of this legislation.

Any control method that may be introduced must have a community component. If a community does not participate in an eradication scheme it may as well be abandoned right from the start. This is the reason that the involvement of a local government authority is probably the best type of community involvement we can possibly obtain.

Mr. Nalder: How do you expect to get local authorities to support it?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Some local authorities, no doubt, would support such a scheme at the request of the community. It is a community requirement and the desire is there. Encouragement will be given to this. As the situation stands now we have valuable officers who normally should be engaged on research work being caught up in a considerable amount of routine office work.

Mr. Nalder: Do you know how many hours your departmental officers spent in the Melville Shire area?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I cannot quote specifically the number of hours that were spent in that area by them.

Mr. Nalder: Your departmental officers spent 11 hours in the Melville Shire. They were quite satisfied with the Applecross baiting scheme.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That is confirmation that we had one scheme which operated successfully. The suggestion by the member for Cottesloe that the Government should be totally involved should be rejected out of hand. For the Government to take over the total fruit-fly baiting scheme the cost would amount to \$1,250,000 or more.

Mr. Hutchinson: Who is to bear the cost now?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: At the present moment it is borne by the owners of the fruit trees who pay the registration fee and it is also covered by a Government subsidy.

Mr. Hutchinson: Charges could still be made.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It would be preferable to administer the scheme through a local government community instead of trying to involve the department.

Mr. O'Connor: It will increase efficiency for sure.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: If we introduce Government control?

Mr. O'Connor: No.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The total cost to the State would be something in excess of \$1,250,000. The next point is that we would finish up with the Department of Agriculture inspection staff being regarded in the same light as a police force, or worse. It would not engender co-operation of communities. Instead, the people of the community would be alienated, and without

the community interest and concern, it would be impossible to get the scheme into operation.

Mr. O'Connor: Virtually, you are buck passing.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is not a case of buck passing.

Mr. O'Connor: That is what you are doing.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The responsibility of the Government will in no way be diminished. In fact, it will be increased by the use of other methods.

Mr. Hutchinson: Just words!

Mr. H. D. EVANS: This has already been demonstrated. Will the member for Cottesloe indicate what additional steps have been taken in regard to fruit-fly baiting methods this year? Considerable efforts have been made in advancing fruit-fly research and this, in itself, has involved considerable cost. Also, to tie up valuable officers of the Department of Agriculture in unnecessary administrative work is not desirable. Therefore, to expect fruit-fly control, as we know it now, to operate under a Government administration is not satisfactory.

One of the other alternatives to which we can point is that the individual will accept full responsibility, and he is being held responsible for the prophylactic measures that are required. The householder will be responsible for the spraying of the tree, fallen fruit, and other precautions to ensure that full control is achieved.

Mr. O'Connor: I think you are just working your way out of your responsibility.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is the individual's own responsibility if he grows a tree or keeps an Alsatian dog, or any other animal for that matter. The fundamental responsibility is his, and if he does not fulfil his responsibility in eradicating fruit fly he is open to prosecution under the legislation. The community schemes are set up at the request of communities to assist with control methods. This is where the schemes virtually emanate from. Community participation in any scheme under the administrative control of local government is the one that is most desirable. The present scheme is unacceptable because of the shortcomings that have been displayed.

Mr. Hutchinson: It is virtually the same. The poll applied previously.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: But a voluntary set-up can in no way compare with the professional approach and the back-up facilities that a local authority has.

Mr. Hutchinson: Under the poll system it only functioned in one or two places. Under the voluntary system it hardly functioned anywhere. What local authorities will take this on?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That is the point. The community has access to the local authority representatives. If a community scheme is desired surely the quicker avenue of implementation is through the local authority. Under the legislation a local authority will be obliged to take the responsibility initially if in its opinion—and surely a local authority is better equipped to assess the opinion of the community it represents—it is unable to divest its responsibility for administering the scheme.

Mr. Nalder: You are going to force this issue through the House?

Mr. Bickerton: You taught us how to do that when you were on this side.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The legislation I have introduced has resulted from months of research and consideration by the appropriate department and the Government.

Mr. Nalder: Why don't you bring your notes up to date?

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

Ayes—19

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamleson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. May
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman
Mr. Hartrey	

(Teller)

Noes—19

Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Reid
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Thompson
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. Williams
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Nalder	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Brady	Sir David Brand
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. McIver	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Graham	Dr. Dadour
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Blaikie
Mr. A. R. Tonkin	Mr. Rushton

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal I give my vote to the Ayes.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

Mr. NALDER: I made an appeal to the Premier in the second reading debate, but he remained silent and it seems that his silence indicated his support of the Bill. I again make the appeal to him.

Everything that the Minister for Agriculture said in his reply to the second reading debate already exists. The local committee exists, and all the operations are undertaken by it. Under that scheme there is no centralisation of administration. The charges and the assessments are made by the local committee.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I was referring to the initiating and the setting up of a scheme.

Mr. NALDER: All that is in operation now. Everything that the Minister has pointed out is already put into operation by the local committees, and the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture assist the local committees and give advice, when required.

Most of the local authorities are represented on the local committee, so they know what is going on. Under the Bill it is proposed to take the responsibility away from the local committees, and to introduce a set-up that will cost the ratepayers—and this has been confirmed by the Town Clerk of the City of Melville—from 100 to 500 per cent. more than it costs the ratepayers at the present time.

I would ask the Minister to agree to progress being reported in order that a full investigation may be made, instead of trying to bulldoze the measure through when he does not have the support of the people upon whom he wishes to foist the responsibility.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Harman.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 19th April, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

1. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Funds: Delay in Allocation

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) If it is not possible to give monthly break-ups of the number of successful applicants receiving payments under the Rural Reconstruction Act, what information is available to members and to the Federal Government on when the 103 settlements were completed?

- (2) When did the Minister appreciate the difficulties involved in the type of securities required for the majority of loans, and the scarcity of specialist security staff?
- (3) When he was appreciative of the difficulties, what warning did he give successful applicants that there would be long delays?
- (4) What provision is made to tide these successful applicants over the period before their funds become available?
- (5) What does the Minister intend to do in the future for those waiting for loan payments, particularly those who are unable to put in this year's crops through lack of funds?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Monthly break-up is available as to amount. It is—
1971—November—\$40,000.
December—\$73,000.
1972—January—\$168,464.
February—\$816,493.
March—\$1,419,695.
- (2) As individual cases arose involving applications based upon incomplete Estates, land not in the names of the applicants, or subject to caveats protecting the interests of third parties, or involving ownership by minors. These problems are continuous.
- (3) Individuals were informed in the course of correspondence aimed at clearing the obstructions to registration of security.
- (4) No direct provision is possible under the Act, but many applicants are able to arrange temporary accommodation from their banks on the evidence of a Reconstruction approval.
- (5) Accelerate completion of loans. After this month the only ones seriously delayed will be those with defective security—which is the responsibility of the applicant.

2.

EDUCATION

Teachers' Housing

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Teachers' Union submitted to the Government their housing requirements as outlined on page 4 of the *Daily News* of Monday, the 10th April, 1972?
- (2) If so, what increase of rents has the Union stated they are prepared to pay for the upgrading in the different categories suggested?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

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