

The matter mentioned by the member for Kalamunda is causing concern. I can assure him I have had as much if not more practical experience than he has in connection with constructing buildings in places where the rocky subsoil necessitates blasting, not only for foundations but also for plumbing, sewerage, and drainage work. For quite some time it has been difficult to get shotfirers. The question here is whether from a practical point of view we should lower the standard set down in the regulations in order to get more people and therefore play with safety, or whether we should maintain the safety level and thereby perhaps have fewer people available to do this work.

Departmental officers do not consider it is their job to recruit people, as suggested by the honourable member. One must agree with them. They live by the rules in the book. However, if in my capacity I can do anything through technical education or other means to spread the word that it might be worth while to acquire a license in order to take up this occupation, I shall do so.

Again I thank members for their contributions to the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 6.11 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 10th September, 1974

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

SHIPPING

Payment to Unions

The Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Has the Minister read the article in *The West Australian* of Wednesday, the 4th September, 1974, headed "\$35 600 paid to appease union", in which it is alleged that this sum was extorted from the Australian Newsprint Mills in Tasmania by the Seamen's Union?
- (2) Has the Minister read the article in *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 5th September, 1974, in which the secretary of the Fre-

mantle branch of the Maritime Workers' Union, Mr C. Wells, is quoted as saying "that there was not one shipping agent who had not paid unions to allow ships to move"?

- (3) Will the Government consider instituting an inquiry in order to uncover—
 - (a) the extent to which extortion of this type is practised by unions within Western Australia;
 - (b) the extent to which moneys gained by such extortion have been used by the Australian Labor Party in State and Federal elections as claimed in the above article by Mr E. V. Elliott, the federal secretary of the Seamen's Union?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government has set up a Royal Commission to inquire into this matter it is assumed that the Western Australian practices will be covered by the Commission. If we find that the Commission's terms of reference are not adequate to deal with the position in Western Australia the State Government will give consideration to conducting its own inquiry into the matters covered by the Hon. Member's question.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.36 p.m.]: I believe that the issue of daylight saving is a social rather than a political one. In other sessions over the last three years or so we have heard many arguments for and against daylight saving. We often hear arguments about whether it is better to do something in daylight or in darkness.

I recall that quite a few years ago I was frequently obliged to indulge in aerial gymnastics in order to preserve my state of good health in those hostile days. It was my experience that the hours of darkness had a good deal of advantage over the hours of daylight.

There were a number of reasons that darkness had such an advantage over daylight, and one of these was that when flying in conditions of darkness, there

were many things I did not see, and that sometimes helped a great deal. On the other hand, those things I did see frightened the daylight out of me. So it is no wonder, I suppose, that I have a "thing" about daylight saving.

I will come to the more serious aspects of daylight saving in a moment, and I will make a suggestion which I hope will be of benefit to the whole community. However, still in a lighter vein I would like to refer to a particular aspect of flying. Navigation, whether by night or day, is always a matter of great concern. This was so during daylight hours or double summer daylight hours—the system that applied in Britain during the war years. I venture to add that my prowess as a navigator would have been very much inferior to that of my friend and colleague, Mr Withers. When I come to think of it, I only had two methods of navigation; both fairly simple. The first was by guess, and the other was by "crikey". If my guess was correct, I had little to worry about. However, if my guess was incorrect, then by "crikey", I was in trouble. I am sure Mr Withers would use far more sophisticated methods because I understand he was a professional navigator.

Mr Withers supports daylight saving, and I can well understand this because he represents the northern part of the State including the Kimberley area. Many of us agree with the theory that this area of the State should be on permanent central standard time because it is so close to the Northern Territory-South Australian border. It is reasonable that the people in this area should have some time advantage.

In my case, as I represent the south-west corner of the State—an area so different geographically from the Kimberley—I believe that daylight saving is not in the best interests of the majority of the people whom I represent. However, judging by the progress of this legislation, it seems that the whole of Western Australia will be experimenting with daylight saving during the coming summer months. The intention is that we will have a referendum soon after our return to normal western standard time. It will be very interesting. My guess—and this is purely a guess, like my navigation very frequently used to be—is that having experienced daylight saving in this very hot State, with its peculiar summer weather pattern, the people will vote against daylight saving. It is only a guess; we will not really know until the numbers go up.

I should like to remind members that in 1971, when the first Daylight Saving Bill was introduced in this House, it was my opinion—I believe subsequent events have shown my contention to be reasonable—that it would be best to have a trial period in reverse. I suggested that Western Australia should remain on Western Standard time throughout the year while the Eastern

States experimented and played around with daylight saving hours. In my view, the experiment was a thorough success. Very few people in the community and very few business concerns in Western Australia were inconvenienced to any great degree. Certainly, there were some inconveniences, but the degree of inconvenience was insignificant when related to the entire community. I believe we have had our experiment. However, judging by the mood of the House, it seems that this Bill will be passed and a referendum will follow.

This brings me to the thought that all our citizens could well take stock of the situation, particularly in regard to productivity, whether we work by daylight saving hours or whether we remain on Western Standard time. One of the greatest things to affect this nation, particularly Western Australia, in these troublesome economic times, is the matter of productivity; namely, more goods being produced and more services provided. I believe these two factors are the main ingredients in the current inflationary dilemma in which we find ourselves. As we are now likely to have daylight saving in this State over the next summer, it seems apparent to me that some attempt should be made to take advantage of the situation with a view to creating a greater output in terms of hours worked, greater productivity, and better services to the community.

I should like to quote to the House figures compiled by the International Labour Office relating to the average weekly hours worked in different countries of the world. They relate to the period June-July, 1972, and are based on a standard working week, excluding overtime, and subtracting the maximum permissible annual public holidays and annual leave. As I peruse these figures, I find that the average hours worked per week in France are 40 hours; in Italy, they work a 39-hour week; in the Netherlands, a 39-hour week is worked; in the United Kingdom, they work 37 hours; in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a 37-hour week is worked; Canada works a 37-hour week; Sweden has a 36-hour week; and, in Australia, we work an average of 36 hours a week. When one makes due allowance for long service leave, the average working week for the average Australian worker comes down to 35½ hours.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I should like to put a calculator on those figures. Workers receive three months' long service leave after working 16 years and 8 months. Does Mr Ferry claim that this would reduce the average working week by half an hour a week? The member's figures are well out.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Some workers receive long service leave after eight years' service.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I believe all members would do well to examine this subject in depth. I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for his comment and remind him that the source from which I quoted was the International Labour Office. I suppose that these figures would be approximate and that fractions would be involved, but I am not going to quibble about a fraction of a per cent. The principle to which I am alluding is the important issue here.

This Bill is not really designed to save daylight; it is designed to provide more opportunity for leisure time. Here in Australia it seems that with a 36-hour average working week—35½ hours after deducting long service leave—the community enjoys a great deal of leisure time in the normal course of events.

Dare I suggest that all employees and management forego this one hour of daylight saving and work an extra hour a day? That would mean an additional five hours a week worked by each employee and those involved in management. If I did not dare to suggest that, perhaps I reasonably could suggest that all people worked an extra 30 minutes a day during the period of daylight saving in Western Australia, bearing in mind that daylight saving will operate for only four months.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The figures you quoted relating to long service leave would reduce the working week by 10 minutes a week over eight years' service.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Leader of the Opposition will be able to get a job with the National Cash Register Company if he keeps this up; he will be indispensable to them. If people worked an extra 30 minutes each day, an additional 2½ hours a week would be worked during the daylight saving months. In this way, they would get the best of both worlds. They would receive an additional 2½ hours' leisure time a week and would increase productivity. So, I put this forward as a reasonable proposition; I do not see why it cannot succeed. It is a matter of goodwill by all people at all levels. It is an individual decision and I believe it is full of merit because we hear so frequently today the comment that things are costing too much and that inflation is running riot. Perhaps these things are true. The remedy appears to be in the keeping of the people; we need to give more of ourselves, particularly in the way of production and in the provision of more services to the community.

Let us remember that during the period in which daylight saving will operate, many people will take their annual leave and that it will be school holiday time for a good deal of that four-month period. So, comparatively few people would be inconvenienced by working an additional 2½

hours a week. I believe it is up to us as Australians to consider this proposal. After all, what is 30 minutes a day?

Many firms and individuals today work what commonly is referred to as staggered working hours. Of course, staggered working hours can be interpreted in many ways. In the opinion of my mythical friend, Sozzle Sydney, staggered hours are those hours spent making one's way home after leaving licensed premises at closing time. However, I do not think that interpretation is the correct one. But I do believe we can have staggered working hours in association with daylight saving in Western Australia. This is not a frivolous suggestion; I believe it could catch on. For example, the little New South Wales community of Batemans Bay is setting the pattern by working a little longer and, in fact, the prices in that little community are being reduced. I for one believe that Western Australia should support this proposition; I should like to think that the community at large would seriously consider this sidelight to the daylight saving proposition.

It seems to me that, undoubtedly, we will have daylight saving in the summer months ahead, although I believe that it will not be in the best interests of the people of this State. If we are to have daylight saving, let us try to be more productive with our time, rather than have so much leisure time on our hands. I look forward to the referendum in due time, because my guess is that the people, having experienced daylight saving, will vote against it.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) (4.50 p.m.): The progress of the Bill has proved to be of interest; and the second reading debate confirms that view. The changing views of the Government members remind me very much of the words of a popular song entitled, "Let's twist again like we did last summer".

The change of view has not escaped the notice of the public, because in this morning's *The West Australian* appears a letter to the editor which makes reference to the fact that certain Cabinet Ministers had voted against the Bill; and the person concerned expressed some surprise on how the Bill managed to find its way into Parliament. Those views are similar to comments I have made; and they are not new. I was surprised at the way in which two Ministers voted, in view of the comments they had made on previous occasions when similar legislation was before the House.

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member referring to Ministers in this house?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, to Ministers in this House. I would like to refer to some remarks which they made on a previous occasion when similar legislation was before us. I refer to the comments made by Mr MacKinnon which are

recorded at page 6122 of the 1973 *Hansard*. He was then speaking in reference to an amendment moved by the then Leader of the Opposition. He is recorded as having said—

We are now faced with a different situation because of the proposal put forward by Mr Arthur Griffith. I would not have favoured the proposal put forward by the Government but that put forward by Mr. Arthur Griffith is one which, in all fairness, and in all justice, will be hard to discard. In all the circumstances, it seems to me to be a reasonable proposition that we should try it and then vote upon it.

Further on in his contribution to the debate in 1973 he said—

I can see the justice in the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and I will not vote against them.

We have been told that the Bill now before us follows precisely the lines suggested by the then Opposition in 1973; and Mr Clive Griffiths gave his support to the second reading of the Bill before us for that reason. However, when the vote on the second reading was taken we found that Mr MacKinnon did not appear to share the same view.

We are all aware that the present Minister for Justice enthusiastically opposed the reasonable proposals which were put forward in 1971. In 1973 when a similar Bill was before this House he is recorded at page 6419 of the 1973 *Hansard* as having said—

I support the view of the Leader of the Opposition. Because this is an election tactic, and because it is intended to cloud the issue for the purpose of an election, I oppose it on those grounds. I also oppose it because it is not for a trial period first. I am prepared to change my vote in relation to daylight saving in order that it be given a trial followed by a referendum. That is a change of attitude on my part and if the Chief Secretary is counting heads that should be of some value to him.

Apparently what he said was not of much value when the Bill came before us on the present occasion.

I shall not delay the progress of the third reading. I thought it was as well for me to make known the views which some Government members held on previous occasions when similar legislation was before us.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.56 p.m.]: I can see some virtue in reading *Hansard*, and I must take up the practice some day! It seems to me that people who have insufficient wit to make speeches of their own are able to make what passes as a fair and reasonable

speech by reading out-of-date opinions and concepts which might have had validity on a previous occasion; but I should point out that they need not necessarily have validity on a subsequent occasion.

I make no pretence of the fact that from time to time I do change my mind; and I repeat that if I can see even a glimmer of sense in reading *Hansard* for that purpose I might follow the practice which, currently, I regard as a waste of time.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—18	
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. D. K. Dans
	(Teller)
Noes—8	
Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. A. Lewis
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. V. J. Ferry
	(Teller)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE PRESIDENT: The third reading of this Bill requires the concurrence of an absolute majority of the Legislative Council.

Question put.

THE PRESIDENT: I have counted the House and there being an absolute majority present, with no dissentient voice, I declare the motion carried with the concurrence of an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.02 p.m.]: I thank the Minister for Justice for giving me an opportunity, at this stage, to comment further on the Bill. As members are aware I did propose some amendments during the Committee stage, but they were rejected. The situation now

is that if the Bill is read a third time the Town Planning and Development Act will provide for the appointment of an additional member on the board, and the additional member shall be selected by the Minister from a panel of three names submitted by the Local Government Association of Western Australia. The Minister agreed to the adjournment of the third reading debate last week, and that has given me an opportunity to examine the situation further.

With due deference to Mr MacKinnon, and his comments with regard to reading from *Hansard*, I intend to refer to a debate which appears at page 1268 of the 1959 *Hansard*. At that time the Legislative Council was dealing with the Art Gallery Bill and a similar debate ensued as to whether or not a certain organisation should have the right to nominate a representative to be appointed to the Art Gallery Board. I think that you, Mr President, objected to the move on that occasion and commented along the same lines as Mr Cloughton and I have spoken in relation to this measure. You thought, on that occasion, that the field would be thrown open for many other organisations to make similar representations to the Minister. If one organisation has the right to submit a panel of three names to the Minister, why should not some other organisation have a similar right?

I believe this legislation was drawn up in haste, whether because of the inexperience of the Minister concerned, or his eagerness to abide by the request of the Local Government Association, I do not know. However, the situation is that if the Bill is read a third time the Local Government Association of Western Australia will have the right to nominate a panel of three names from which the Minister shall select one member to be appointed to the Town Planning Board.

If we examine other situations appertaining in Western Australia we find that the position with regard to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is set out in paragraph (d), subsection (4) of section 7 of the Act and states that the members shall be—

- (d) four members each representing one of the groups of local authorities in The Schedule to this Act, who shall be a mayor, councillor or member as the case may be of one of the the local authorities set out in the group which he represents.

That is the provision with regard to four of the members, and the local authorities included in the schedule are divided into various groups, and each group has a right to nominate a person to be appointed to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. Section 8 reads—

8. (1) Each of the four members referred to in paragraph (d) of subsection (4) of section seven of this

Act shall be appointed by the Governor from a panel of the names of three persons nominated by the appropriate District Planning Committee constituted under the provisions of section twenty-three of this Act.

Those are the local authorities mentioned in the schedule. Subsection (2) of section 8, reads—

(2) The Minister shall by notice in writing invite each of the District Planning Committees to furnish the Governor within a time stipulated in the notice, being not less than twenty-one days from the giving of the notice, with a panel of the names of three persons nominated by the Committee for appointment and willing to accept office as member representing the group of local authorities from which the District Planning Committee is formed.

The position is that the Minister advises the organisation that it has 21 days during which to provide a panel of three names for nomination. I would like members to note that point. Subsection (3) goes on—

(3) Where a District Planning Committee fails to so furnish the panel of names within the stipulated time as provided in subsection (2) of this section, the Governor shall appoint such person, having the necessary qualifications, as he thinks fit to represent the group from which a panel of names has not been received.

If a district planning committee fails to notify the Minister of its selection of persons it wants considered for appointment, within the period of 21 days, the Minister, through the Governor, then has the right to appoint a person whom he considers fit.

Similar provisions are included in an Act which was passed only last year, and I refer to the Tourist Advisory Council set up under the provisions of the Tourist Act. The terms for the appointment of members to the Tourist Advisory Council are set out in section 5 of the Act, and subsection (3) reads—

(3) Prior to the first occasions on which an appointment is to be made to an office of member, under subsection (2) of this section, other than the appointment referred to in paragraph (e), and on each occasion thereafter when such an office becomes vacant, the Minister shall, in writing, request the body of whom the office of member is representative to submit to him, in writing, a panel containing the names of not fewer than three persons willing to act as members of the Council.

Subsection (4) reads—

(4) Where a body has been requested, pursuant to subsection (3) of this section, to submit a panel of

not fewer than three names to the Minister, the Minister—

- (a) shall, if such a panel is submitted to him within twenty-one days of the body receiving the request, nominate one of the persons whose names appear on the panel for appointment to the office of member to be representative of the body; and
- (b) may, if default is made within that time in submitting such a panel to him, nominate for appointment to the office of member to be the representative of the body, such person as he thinks fit.

Those are two instances which exist in current legislation. I might add that although the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act was passed in 1959—15 years ago—and times have changed, only last year this Chamber adopted a similar provision for the appointment of the Tourist Advisory Council.

The point I am making is that the Town Planning and Development Act will make no such provision. It will simply indicate that the Local Government Association shall submit a panel of three names, and from those three names the Minister shall select the person he considers fit for appointment. The point is that no safeguard is provided for the occasion when the Local Government Association—and I am not saying that this would occur—does not, in fact, nominate a person to be appointed to the Town Planning Board. The Bill does not contain a provision for the Minister to make alternative arrangements for the appointment of an additional member to the board. That being the case, we defeat the whole purpose of the exercise. One purpose was to ensure that a quorum was readily available.

I believe this is a worthy criticism of the Bill and I would ask the Minister to refer my comments to the Minister for Local Government. I understand there is not much likelihood of a recommitment of the Bill to consider further my previous amendments. However, I believe that further examination should be made of the Bill, with a view to providing an added safeguard along the lines I have outlined.

The Hon. N. McNeill: If I obtain the views of the Minister in relation to this point, at least the member will be satisfied, initially?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: There would not be much point in passing the Bill without including the safeguards. I believe the Bill should go back to the Minister and if the Minister is prepared to include the provisions I have mentioned the Bill could be recommitted.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I will refer it to the Minister.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Minister has assured me he will take my comments back to the Minister for Local Government. However, at this stage I would not agree to the third reading, and I ask the Minister to defer it so that he can consult the Minister for Local Government and ascertain his views on my suggestion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. W. R. Withers.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [5.13 p.m.]: I rise at this stage to briefly set out my thoughts in respect of this legislation. I am far from happy with the proposed increases, as I have, indeed, stated on previous occasions when registration fees have been increased.

I am particularly concerned because of the present position regarding incomes in the farming areas, but I will be more expressive of the burden which will be placed on the community as a whole. I do not think anybody could possibly justify an increase of 65 per cent as being correct and proper. It would be most difficult to persuade anyone to be in full agreement with the present policy.

I have been surprised to hear some of the remarks from members in this Chamber. A short time ago the Minister for Education said that he was not an avid reader of *Hansard*, and neither am I. Nevertheless, one is surprised at some of the comments one reads, and we have to be factual. I intend to quote from page 1226 of the current *Hansard* where the Hon. V. J. Ferry said—

However it must be acknowledged that this is the first increase in vehicle license fees in nine years because it was in 1965 that these fees were last increased and, bearing in mind the present galloping rate of inflation, an increase of 65 per cent becomes rather insignificant when making comparisons.

In drawing a comparison with galloping inflation it is necessary for one to look at the farmer's case again. If it is our incomes in the country which are involved in galloping inflation, then I want to know exactly where the horse is galloping to. I would like to know whether galloping inflation was responsible for the price of wool being 255c a kilo last year and 110c a kilo this year; whether it is responsible for cattle being worth \$160 a head last year and only \$80 or \$90 a head this year for the equivalent animal; I would like to know whether such inflation is responsible for the farmers getting \$22 a sheep last year while only getting \$4 or \$5 per sheep

this year and, also, whether it is responsible for lambs being priced at \$19 a head last year and only \$9 or \$10 this year.

If this is the type of galloping inflation about which the honourable member speaks then I am afraid I do not understand the terms he used in respect of the income of some of us who have to stand these blistering increases to our license fees.

I daresay if I approved of this principle in general the people in another place from whence I came will probably say, "He has certainly changed his mind completely"; that is if I approved of it in principle without saying exactly why this measure must come into being.

I think I have looked into every angle possible to try to amend this Bill in order to help and meet the requirements of the people I represent. I have looked at the possibility of a change being made to the RAC system of licensing which is power weight times the weight factor; I wondered whether we would gain very much by reversing this and having a look at the old system to see what we might lose in the long term—appreciating, of course, that we are trying to attract \$8 million to the coffers of the State by the introduction of this measure. I have considered this to see whether the people I represent would be justified in expecting such a measure to be completely applied over all at this late stage.

I have also considered the aspect of the average increase of 65 per cent. I have, of course, heard of a man drowning in a stream with an average depth of 2 feet; it could be 2 feet deep one end and 10 feet the other. This average increase of 65 per cent will constitute a pretty big impact on the users of high-powered vehicles particularly as it relates to farm and station owners. The trucks in use generally must be high powered to operate over the roads we have at the moment; they must also be high powered to pull the loads required of them. However, I felt such an exercise would not do any good, because we find immediately that the owners of smaller vehicles—those owned by people who we might say are on a wage—would suffer so that others might gain.

To me this seemed to have some consequence in the argument that it could not be done; and not only that but perhaps it might be necessary to have a higher increase in one aspect to attract this 65 per cent.

Accordingly I considered the possibility of amending the schedule to lift the recording fee from \$4 to \$6 to see whether the Government should be giving more money back to the local authorities, and thereby decreasing the amount of borrowing that the councils are having to do within their own right.

Having considered this further I found another anomaly. It is, of course, necessary to look at this matter in all its aspects. By the introduction of such measures it will mean that a large number of workers would have to pay their license fees every six months, where possibly they previously were able to pay the fee every 12 months. Accordingly the shire council or licensing authority will not in fact, be getting one \$4 per vehicle as the recording fee. There will be the distinct possibility of farmers—and I know many who will do this—licensing their trucks once every six months instead of once each year. So the shire council will be getting \$4. The allowance in fact will be considerably greater for the period of 12 months than it would initially seem to be.

I hold the view that the system of \$4 for the first 1 000 vehicles and \$3 for the second 1 000 vehicles has been with us far too long, particularly in these days of true wage escalation as a result of which shires and others have been pretty hard put to justify the \$4 and \$3 fee. When the fee was lifted to \$4 all over it was considered to be very good; but even then I did wonder about the amount. I have heard several shire representatives say that \$4 a year is too little; that the figure should be \$6 or \$8. Other figures were also snatched out of the air.

Having considered this aspect I find for the reasons I have stated that I cannot honestly go ahead with the amendment I had drawn up to investigate this particular angle.

I am quite in accord with the increases in the fees for drivers' licenses. I am in accord with the three-year period for which these licenses will be issued. But when one considers the 65 per cent rise one finds the Government is endeavouring to raise \$8 million to continue—not to increase—the payments the shires have been receiving in the past.

We are told, in fact, that 82 per cent of this \$8 million will be going to the country shire councils. So if one votes against the 65 per cent increase I wonder who one will be knocking. I wonder whether in fact one would be knocking the shire councils whom one represents, which, in a number of cases, have had to increase their rating by 30 to 40 per cent over and above the increase of last year. When all is said and done if the primary object of this exercise is that the money will be going back completely to the shires—and 82 per cent to the country areas—then I suppose to endeavour to reduce it in this House, or bring in some other argument by which a reduction might be sought would not be helping the cause which constitutes a great problem at the present time. I hope what I have just said is correct; I hope nobody will

prove me wrong in my expectation that in a short period of time this money will go to the shires.

Quite frankly the shires are very short of money. I know of one shire clerk who has refused to take his justifiable salary increase because he feels his shire is going down the hill. This may sound strange, but it is true. I know of another shire which has fired its foreman because it was not able to pay the wage to which he was entitled. These facts are all in writing if any member wishes to see them.

This is the type of chaos that is being experienced by the councils at the present moment; and for me to suggest now that the fees are far too high; for me to endeavour to oppose them or reduce them, would mean I would be kicking in the teeth the people of my own community; the workers in my district, and this quite apart from affecting the roads which supply our farms. This is what I would be doing if I said to the shires, "You did not get your money so you had better increase your rates, not by 30 per cent but by the equivalent necessary to make up the amount which was not granted by the registration of vehicles."

As I have said before I hope this 82 per cent does in fact go back to the country areas which are suffering at the present time.

I know that we in this Chamber have a very unsympathetic audience when we talk about the country people suffering. If members read my previous speeches and note what I have said by interjection they will find that I am speaking the truth; that there is a lack of sympathy.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It does not come from all of us.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No, and this reminds me that perhaps I should emulate a politician who many years ago entered a certain room where there were a number of members of Parliament gathered and said to them, "You all drive me up the wall; except you, and you, and you."

I am not saying this at all; but there is a great deal of criticism of what can and cannot be done in country areas. Frankly we have just about come to the end of our tether. We have experienced increases in freight, increases in water charges, and electricity charges, and we are now having inflicted on us the fee increases proposed in this Bill. Our incomes are getting less and I wonder whether we are expected to stand by and take this sort of treatment time and time again in the interest of keeping things going on an even keel—at least this is what we are told.

I could, of course, refer to the old argument that is being used—and it is an old argument—that it is necessary for us to make these increases because of the

decrease in the amount of finance we are receiving from Canberra. But this does not lessen the importance of the problem or the seriousness of the position in which we seem to be getting.

There is only one course open to me, so reluctantly I must go along with the measure. I am being quite genuine when I say I want to have a very close look at this aspect to see exactly how the shires will be financed from increases such as these. No doubt everything will be all right, but I want to make sure that what we vote for here, and what is passed, does in fact go back to those who deserve the finance; that it does in fact go back to the country shire councils and that it is in fact put into road works for which we are currently screaming in the agricultural areas particularly in view of the heavy losses we sustained last winter. I say this because there is a great deal tied up in opposing a measure such as this.

One must consider the aid roads legislation that was recently passed through the Federal House of Representatives and which was amended in the Senate and returned and as a result of which certain conditions had to be complied with—such as the buying of graders, spending money on roads, on rural roads, all of which has to be referred back to Canberra in the future.

The entire ramification of this aspect is building up into an almost impossible burden so far as the agricultural community is concerned. I know of one farmer who has a large farm—he has three trucks, three utilities and one car. As I have said it is a large farm and his license fee will rise from \$529 to \$900.

I give another example of a smaller farmer who has a truck, a car, and a utility. One could not operate a farm with fewer vehicles than that. He must be able to drive into town, to run around his paddocks, and to cart his produce to market. His license fees will rise from \$120 to \$212. Another farmer has a truck, a car, and two utilities. His two sons are working with him, and this is why he has two utilities. There is nothing wrong with that, because these days every son has a utility or a car. His license fees will increase from \$177 to \$341; and his is a family farm.

This sort of increase horrifies me, because it is a real slug for these farmers. Then again, I am stymied, because I cannot honestly say I should vote against this Bill and throw away all the advantages which it is supposed to provide to shire councils to enable them to keep their workers employed, and to continue with the upgrading of their roads without further increasing rates, which are already at a high figure.

So I declare myself reluctantly in support of the Bill, despite visits I have made to the Parliamentary Draftsman over the

last two days. I wish to proceed with only one of my amendments in the Committee stage; and that is to clause 6, which amends section 11 of the principal Act. I find there is an anomaly which apparently has been in the principal Act for a good number of years. I am surprised, Mr President, that it escaped even your able attention when you were the Leader of the House and, subsequently, the Leader of the Opposition.

I notice section 11 states that, "A local authority shall issue a license for a tractor other than a prime mover . . . on payment of \$4 fee per annum." The legal opinion obtained when we were investigating the ramifications of introducing possible amendments to this Act was that this provision could be said to apply to "a tractor", meaning "one tractor"; and farmers traditionally have licensed all their tractors for the fee of \$4.

I have been cautioned to have a look at this provision because it could mean that if an accident occurred—whether it be in your area, Mr President, or in any other area where there is a multiplicity of tractors licensed under this provision—it could be said that "a tractor" refers only to one tractor owned by the farmer concerned, and not to each tractor he owns, as has been implied and as has been understood by the local authorities throughout the agricultural areas and, I understand, the near-agricultural areas.

In those areas not one farmer licenses one of his tractors as "a tractor" for the fee of \$4 and then pays \$60 or \$70 for his second tractor. That is just not on. I know the intention of the Act was that "a tractor" meant "one or more tractors".

When we reach clause 6 in the Committee stage I intend to move an amendment which I have discussed with the Minister in charge of the Bill and with the Leader of the Opposition, both of whom obviously understand my point. So far they have raised no objections to my suggestion.

I close my contribution by apologising to the House for speaking in the fashion I have; however, I am far from happy with the Bill as it stands before us. I daresay it will be the forerunner of other hardships. Somehow or other all of us, whether we be State or Federal members, must keep our feet on the ground and consider not only the people who can jack up their wages to combat the high rate of inflation, but also the people who are the backbone of the country and who must pay for this sort of thing. I will most reluctantly support the second reading of the measure.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [5.36 p.m.]: I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Ferry, and Mr Gayfer for their contributions to the debate on this Bill. To the

extent that its provisions will affect so many vehicle owners, the legislation is important and I agree with some of the expressions used in regard to the proposed increases. However, I feel this is one of those things which cannot be avoided.

During my introductory speech two aspects concerning the Bill were raised by way of interjection: one by the Leader of the Opposition, who inquired in respect of the recasting of license fees as to whether allowances were being made for utilities and vans used for private purposes; and the other by Mr Heitman, who sought clarification of whether the recording fee is to be a separate fee over and above the actual vehicle license fee.

In reply to Mr Thompson, utilities and vans are treated as light commercial vehicles, there being relatively few used absolutely and exclusively for private purposes. When the Bill was explained to members I pointed out that the annual mileage travelled by light commercial vehicles, utilities, vans, and light trucks is approximately 20 to 25 per cent higher than that for motorcars. Consequently, a fee of \$1 per power-weight unit is proposed for these vehicles, which is approximately 20 per cent higher than the rate for a car.

I am advised that very few of these vehicles are used wholly for private purposes. I understand Victoria has two separate fees for utilities and motorcars, and that a statutory declaration is required to obtain the lower fee for the light commercial vehicles being used exclusively for private purposes. This system has not operated in Western Australia to date, and the Bill contains no similar provision. In fact, when the schedules to the Act were drawn up no provision was made for separate license fees for light commercial vehicles used for private purposes, similar to the provision for motorcars. It is rather noticeable that the Leader of the Opposition did not amend the Act when he was the Minister for Police and Traffic; but now he suggests, "Do not do as I do; do as I say."

The Hon. R. Thompson: I was the Minister only for a dogwatch; and we were not increasing fees by 65 per cent.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Leader of the Opposition would have had the opportunity to bring up the matter in his party room.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We did not amend the Traffic Act.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: However, I do not intend to argue on this. I merely say that it appears to be a case of "Do not do as I did; do as I say."

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Make the comment and duck out.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Leader of the Opposition also compared concessions for pensioners in South Australia

with those in Western Australia. He stated that pensioners in South Australia receive a 50 per cent concession for vehicle license fees. This is not so. The concession in that State is only 15 per cent, and not 50 per cent.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I told you where I got my information from.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That is so; apparently the honourable member was misinformed about this. This does happen; sometimes the wrong information is conveyed to one. I do not blame the Leader of the Opposition for quoting the figure in error.

In Western Australia physically handicapped pensioners are exempted from motor vehicle license fees. This is a much greater concession than that given in South Australia.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They are not exempted.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Physically handicapped pensioners are exempted under the principal Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, they are not.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: If the Leader of the Opposition cares to look at the principal Act he will find this is so. I think from memory they are exempted, under section 11 of the Act, from the payment of vehicle license fees.

Victoria and New South Wales do not give any vehicle license concessions to pensioners, unless they are totally physically handicapped. That is along the lines of what is done in Western Australia. South Australia provides a concession of \$1 for pensioners' drivers' license fees, compared with the Western Australian concession of \$2 for pensioners. The net driver's license fee of \$3 which will be paid by pensioners in South Australia is the same as that which will be paid by pensioners in Western Australia.

So the fact that there is a disparity of \$1 in one case and \$2 in the other case does not lighten the burden of pensioners in respect of drivers' license fees. Generally speaking, the concessions given at present to pensioners in Western Australia are more generous than those in most other States. As stated in the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Transport, the Government has appointed a committee to investigate the whole question of concessions to pensioners.

The Leader of the Opposition also made comparisons with the vehicle license fees in the other States when criticising the proposed fee increases in Western Australia. However, it is important to note that most of the other States will be forced shortly to increase vehicle license fees in order to meet Commonwealth

matching requirements and to fund balanced road programmes. Increases of about 60 per cent have been mentioned for Victoria and New South Wales, and this would place their fees above the fees proposed for Western Australia.

In comparing the proposed South Australian vehicle license fee increase of about 25 per cent with the proposed increase in this State, it must be remembered that the South Australian fees have been well above the Western Australian fees for many years. The fees in this State have not been increased since December, 1965; and all the other States have increased their fees since that date.

The proposed increases in fees, averaging 65 per cent, in Western Australia are urgently required to maintain the State's road construction programme and to sustain employment of road workers throughout the State, including local authority road workers.

The Leader of the Opposition also referred to what was said in regard to inflation by the Premier in his policy speech. He accused the Government of intending to use the revenue raised from this source—that is from increased license fees—to finance extravagant policy promises. I would refer the Leader of the Opposition to section 14 of the principal Act, which indicates just what chance the Government has of using this money to finance election promises; or any extravagant promises to which the honourable member has referred.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I told you in reply to your interjection that I knew of this provision and that the money must be paid into the main roads fund. Don't twist my words.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not twisting them; I am merely stating what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I wrote down his words at the time. He said that it was the intention of the Government to use the money raised to carry out extravagant policy promises. I think if the Leader of the Opposition checks his speech in *Hansard* he will find that is what he said.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Of course; but you are increasing taxes and charges in every avenue available in order to finance the extravagant policies you propounded before the last election.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I think the Leader of the Opposition has a very extravagant imagination indeed.

The Hon. R. Thompson: When you said you were going to put things right, did you mean that increasing fees by 65 per cent would put things right?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I did not say it would; but let us see who is putting things right. What is the Federal Government doing? What are the unions doing? They are forcing prices higher

and higher. The trade unions of this country should have the sense not to keep pressing for increased wages, because there will be no end to it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Your GGL said he would put things right.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about the parliamentarians?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is all rot to speak about the parliamentarians. The increase in their salaries is only a drop in the ocean. Did the honourable member refuse his increase? Of course he did not. In replying to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition about the use of this money, I only wish we did have more money for this purpose. If we could obtain more money from the Commonwealth Government we would be much happier.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If you continue to twist the words of people you are going to be a very bad Minister.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not twisting any words. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition read his own speech, and I will leave the matter at that for the moment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There is no need to spell out to me what the Act contains.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Leader of the Opposition has a poor memory. In referring to the matter of pensioners' concessions, the Leader of the Opposition said that there are concessions which pensioners so rightly deserve.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Of course they do.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I wonder what he meant by that statement, because he did not qualify it. He just said, "that they so rightly deserve". In this life a person deserves what he earns and I will attempt to show where a pensioner rightly deserves the granting of any concession. Concessions are granted to pensioners who are in adverse financial circumstances. However, I do not think we can go to the length of saying that concessions should be granted in regard to the payment of motor vehicle registrations if a pensioner can afford to own his own motorcar and run it on today's very high running costs. I cannot see that such a pensioner would rightly deserve a concession in those circumstances.

At the moment the Government is in the process of setting up a committee to consider the granting of concessions to pensioners.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We are asking that you grant concessions to pensioners in regard to a driver's license.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: We grant them concessions on drivers' licenses now. This applies to all pensioners. Many pen-

sioners, of course, do not own a motorcar, but they do drive a vehicle that is owned by, say, their sons or their daughters.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That concession does not apply to all pensioners, either.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: All aged pensioners.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, it does not.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I did not say it applies to all pensioners.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You did.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I will not argue with the Leader of the Opposition. I know what I said, and I know what I did not say. I cannot agree with the broad statement that pensioners should get the concessions they so rightly deserve.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I will remind the Minister in Committee in regard to what I said about pensioners being granted concessions they so rightly deserve.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Very well. The honourable Mr Gayfer referred to the impact of these increases on the farmer. I admit that this Bill will represent a severe impact on the farmer in view of the cost factors and the returns factors at present. We all know, as Mr Gayfer has said, that there has been a downturn in the price of wool, cattle, and sheep, but the farmer still has to bear many of the ever-increasing costs. In addition he is faced with the discontinuance of the superphosphate bounty.

Naturally my sympathies go out to the farmers in the same way as sympathy has been indicated by Mr Gayfer and other representatives of the country people. In viewing the circumstances in which farmers are placed at the moment, the Government has to consider all these factors, including how local authorities would manage if we did not increase license fees to assist them to maintain the roads in this State and to keep in employment those people who work on road maintenance.

The Hon. R. Thompson: According to the article in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* the Country Shire Councils' Association does not think it will get any money.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I fail to see how it will not receive money because the revenue goes into the main roads trust account and it will then be apportioned out in CAR grants. That system has been followed for some years now in regard to road funds made available to local authorities.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I do not think the Country Shire Councils' Association thinks that.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are going to pass on the benefits to the local shires, are you?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Only in accordance with the system that has been followed in the past between the CAR and the local authorities. The honourable member knows that this system has been in operation for some time.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I was only asking; you have satisfied me for the moment.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr Gayfer also referred to the \$4 recording fee and he suggested that he thought the fee should be \$6. That would be a sound suggestion in one way, but he did not point out what would happen if this were done. An anomalous position would be created. For example, one shire could be licensing 15 000 vehicles and, at \$4 for each vehicle that would represent a return of \$60 000. On this amount the shire would make quite a good profit. On the other hand, another shire could be licensing only 120 vehicles which would mean that it would not make a great deal of profit. If we increase the fee to \$6 the shire with the fewer number of vehicles to register would probably earn enough to cover expenses, but the shire that was registering 15 000 vehicles would make an even bigger profit and, on that basis, it would be able to employ a number of clerks to carry out the licensing work and still make a huge profit. That is not the intention of the amendment contained in this measure. The intention is to try to lower the costs involved in the recording of license fees.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I hope you are going to tell us about the committee the Government set up a couple of months ago.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Which committee?

The Hon. R. Thompson: To inquire into the reduction of license fees charged to pensioners.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No committee was set up to look into the reduction of license fees to pensioners. I think I said earlier in my speech tonight that a committee will be set up to look into all concessions that may be granted to pensioners. The committee will make inquiries as to what the position is in the other States; what concessions are granted to pensioners in those States, and what concessions we can afford to grant to pensioners in Western Australia. The committee will be inquiring into many aspects apart from the granting of concessions in the payment of license fees.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What progress has the committee made? Has it been formed yet?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The committee is in the process of being formed. We are awaiting the return of people who are outside the State at present so that we may obtain their consent to serve on this committee.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Two months to set up a committee!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Leader of the Opposition is so clever that he can set up committees in no time, but when the State Government sets up something it is really worth while.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Stamp Act Amendment Bill.

2. Explosives and Dangerous Goods Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), read a first time.

TEACHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.56 p.m.]: My party has no objection to the proposals contained in this Bill. The measure seeks to make three amendments to the principal Act which was introduced by a previous Labor Government to establish the Teacher Education Council. The first provision in the Bill seeks to amend section 10 of the Act which, in its present form, excludes the President of the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia (Incorporated) as a candidate to be a representative on the council.

The second amendment seeks to repeal and re-enact section 55 of the Act. This provision relates to the associations of academic and salaried staff, and of students. The wording of the principal Act has excluded salaried staff of colleges to be free to organise and communicate with the council, but the relevant amendment will clarify that omission.

The third amendment seeks to amend section 72 of the principal Act which permits the colleges to invest their surplus funds. There is nothing of great moment in any of these amendments; they are not matters of great public import. They represent minor alterations to the Act to tidy up matters which possibly were overlooked at the time the original legislation was drafted. However, shortly after the original Act was proclaimed, it was noticed that the President of the State School Teachers' Union was unable to be appointed as a member of the council. Nevertheless, it was deemed wise at that time to defer any amendments to the Act because of the numerous pieces of legislation that were on the notice paper and the pressure of other business before the previous Parliament.

It is interesting to note that Mr Bennett, the current President of the State School Teachers' Union, is the existing union representative and of course if the Act is not amended he will be unable to continue in that role. So, in all, it is desirable that these amendments should be accepted.

There is only one other comment I would make on the Bill for consideration by the Minister who, I think, has the Bill in front of him. If I mention it now the Minister will have an opportunity to examine it to see whether what I say is relevant. Clause 6 seeks to add certain words after the word "otherwise" being the last word in section 72 of the Act. At the moment there is a full stop after the word "otherwise" in the Act and the normal procedure is for that word to be deleted with the full stop and then for the amendment to include the word again, with a comma in order to enable the proposed words to be added. It is merely a minor drafting point and is not very serious.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think that would come into the category of those items the President would allow the Clerk to alter.

The PRESIDENT: In any case it would be dealt with at the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, but I thought I would mention it now.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you very much.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: A similar amendment is made in the Art Gallery Bill, but in that case the word involved is deleted and then included in the amendment with the altered punctuation. That is the normal procedure.

With those comments I simply add that it is pretty small-time legislation. It contains nothing to indicate that this Government is extremely progressive or is one to which we can look for great things. We are now well into the session, but we are still discussing machinery Bills. We have been told nothing to indicate that the present Government—

The PRESIDENT: We are dealing with Order of the Day No. 5.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —has anything of importance to introduce to Parliament.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [6.02 p.m.]: Before Mr Claughton spoils his sensible address by the silly nonsense at the tail end, I had made up my mind to thank him for his contribution, and I feel I should still do so. I also wish to thank him for drawing attention to the drafting of the amendment to section 72.

We will discuss this in Committee when I will bring it to the attention of the Clerk.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.04 to 7.30 p.m.

Clause 6: Section 72 amended—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am sure the Clerks can take care of the matter raised by Mr Claughton regarding the word "otherwise", but your instruction would be needed, Mr Deputy Chairman.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): I assure the Minister and Mr Claughton that the Clerks can attend to the matter.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The normal procedure is followed in the next Bill to be dealt with, where the final word of the paragraph is deleted and included in the paragraph to be substituted, with the changed punctuation. I am quite happy to go along with the Minister if we have the assurance from the Clerks that it is quite in order for them to adjust the matter themselves.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): I am assured that is in order.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [7.35 p.m.]: On the surface of it, this Bill deals with quite a simple matter, and my party has no objection to the changes proposed, which permit the Art Gallery to borrow money and invest funds it will not be using in the short term. However, important considerations arise from this process.

In the Act as it stands, the Art Gallery has power to invest its surplus funds. The power is contained in section 22 of the Act. However, it is required to pay its funds into an account at the Treasury, and any temporary surpluses may be invested as directed by the Treasurer, the interest accruing from those investments to be paid into the Art Gallery fund.

The change proposed is that the Art Gallery may borrow and invest funds without reference to the Treasury; so it is quite a significant change in its way. Two questions arise. First of all, if the gallery is to borrow funds, what limits are to be imposed on the borrowing and what security will it offer in support of its borrowings? One assumes the Government would be the final guarantor for the Art Gallery's borrowings, but this would bring it into the area of Loan Council considerations. I believe semi-Government and statutory bodies have a limitation of \$400 000 on their borrowings.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is right.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We can therefore assume that is the limit of the borrowing capacity of the Art Gallery. But when it comes to Loan Council deliberations, how will that body receive the information that a further group has acquired these borrowing powers which are more or less outside the control of the Government itself and which in fact increase the total borrowing capacity of semi-Government and statutory bodies in Western Australia in comparison with those in the other States? I believe a marked imbalance already exists between such groups in this State and in, say, New South Wales which, as far as population goes, is much larger than Western Australia; and that State may feel disadvantaged.

Will this be like the last straw on the camel's back, and will a halt be called to what is going on so that the question of the borrowing capacity of these types of institutions in this State can be investigated? This is a serious situation which is not to be passed over lightly. When it is brought under the microscope, we might find ourselves in the same position as we are in with road funds, where the other States will say, "Your State has an advantage we do not enjoy and it is time something was done about it to balance the amounts available."

I pose that question to the House. I am not saying we should not agree to the Bill but that members must bear in mind the situation that will be created when the Bill is passed.

If the Government intends that the Treasury will not be the borrower as a last resort for the security of loans which may be raised by the Art Gallery, then what security will the Art Gallery offer to the people from whom it borrows money? Will it offer as security the art treasures which we have accumulated over a period of time? If we envisage a situation where finance becomes tight for the Art Gallery, where it has committed itself for purchases or capital works which it cannot finance from its own funds, and the Government cannot back it up, will we perhaps lose some of these possessions which belong to the people? It might sound far-fetched

but we could arrive at that situation if there is a suggestion from the Loan Council that the Government is not to support the Art Gallery borrowings.

Clause 2 of the Bill provides that the Art Gallery shall have borrowing powers in its own right, and clause 3 contains the provision that surplus funds or those which are not being used at any time may be invested in the areas which are lawfully available to people who are handling trust funds. The difference between subsection (4) of section 22 of the Act and the proposed subsection (5) of that section is that in the proposed subsection there is no reference to the Treasury regarding the investment of these moneys. One assumes the people appointed to the Art Gallery trust are responsible people who will not take any risks. Obviously, the investments allowed to trust funds are what are commonly called gilt-edged investments.

We support what is proposed but we have these reservations about the consequential effects of what seems to be relatively simple legislation.

I am not sure what the Government's intention is, but the Minister should make quite clear the views of the Government in relation to this matter. How does it view the effect of this provision on the Loan Council? Is it, in fact, an attempt to bypass the allocations placed on Governments by that council? Is it seeking some other means of finance not presently available to it? If that is so, the legislation is not insignificant at all—it is quite a serious departure from the current practice. In this case Parliament should be aware of what the Government has in mind.

I do not intend to speak at great length on this measure. During the debate on the previous Bill I could have dealt at length with the subject of education generally; and on this measure I could dwell at length on the subject of the Art Gallery.

Precisely how will this borrowed money be spent? We are informed that it will be used to acquire annexes to display the Art Gallery stock. That is a very commendable desire; for too long the art treasures of the State have had to be stored away and have not been available for public viewing. Members who attend functions at the Art Gallery are frequently told that the storage facilities are not adequate and that the paintings are subject to damage and deterioration in the present facilities.

If the legislation sets out to achieve facilities to enable the paintings to be viewed by a much wider public, it will be of great benefit to the State. However, I would like to correct the view that art material displayed, for instance, at Esperance, would be available to a wider public than the same material displayed at Perth. This would not be so because of

the small population in that part of the State. These art treasures would be no more available to the people at Wyndham than if they were displayed at Kalgoorlie or Tuckanarra—another place in the news.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Thank you for the reference.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perth is a centre to which people from all over the State repair, and so art works displayed here will be available to a wider public than those displayed in any other place in the State. However, if we could institute a system whereby exhibits are mounted and circulated throughout a number of areas of the State, obviously they would be available to many people who perhaps would not normally come to Perth to see them. Such a suggestion has a great deal of value.

Of course, suggestions of this kind do not resolve the current problems of the Art Gallery and the need for a new display centre in Perth. I would like to think that the Government will press on with the development of the area known as the Cultural Centre. With those words I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Cultural Affairs) [7.50 p.m.]: I thank Mr Claughton for his comments. Of course, the ultimate authority for borrowing is the Treasury because it has to fund the loan. There is no doubt about it; in this particular case the Treasury will do just that. I suppose anyone's capacity to borrow is limited by his capacity to fund the amounts that he borrows. From my own personal experience, this has always been a very salutary limitation. I have no doubt that it has application to many other institutions, including those of Government.

It has become also a perfectly normal function for various groups to have the right to borrow up to the statutory limit of \$400 000 a year. This provision has been applied by successive Governments to a variety of autonomous groups and semi-Governmental institutions, such as the local authorities, the Country High School Hostels Authority, just to name two types of institutions. For obvious reasons it was decided to extend this provision to the Art Gallery at the present time.

The Art Gallery is severely limited in its capacity to store its art treasures. Approximately \$3.5 million or \$4 million of taxpayers' property is kept in conditions far short of the optimum, and also only a very small proportion of our art treasures can be shown to the public. It is desirable that display and general storage facilities should be greatly improved.

Currently the Art Gallery is refused the right to display certain international and interstate exhibitions because of the lack of air-conditioned display space. This is a great pity because the people of Western Australia have as much right to see these treasures as does anyone else. The idea is that if we can raise \$400 000 a year, with some assistance from other funds, maybe we can make a start with some display space for the Art Gallery. It is as simple as that. I know very well that I am not telling the Opposition any secrets because shortly before the election the Minister whose place I took was investigating alternative sites to secure space for the Art Gallery. Of course, I do not know whether he had taken anyone else into his confidence, but I do know he was looking for space.

Our Government has pursued the same quest, but perhaps in a slightly more effective way in ensuring that the Art Gallery has the necessary borrowing capacity to make a start if the opportunity presents itself. Investigations have proceeded to find some way in which material available in Western Australia presently, and any which become available from time to time, can be displayed more adequately.

Turning now to the other part of the Bill; it provides for ordinary trust investments when money is raised, or when any money is given, bequeathed, or secured in any way by the Art Gallery. The Bill provides that the money can be invested at a reasonable interest. These days people in my age group would be more inclined to say, "Invested at an unreasonable interest!" However, if the Art Gallery invests the money at the going rate of interest, it may make a profit. That is the simple explanation of the measure, and I thought it would be understood by members opposite who were in Government themselves not so very long ago and attempted to deal with this matter. It seems to me to be a good idea. I am delighted from what Mr Claughton has said that the proposal contained in the measure will meet with his whole-hearted accord. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Cultural Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I rise to bring to the notice of the Minister the fact that on page 8 of the principal Act the last two lines are transposed. I thought this could be corrected when the Act is reprinted.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): To save time, I think the honourable member should know that matters such as this are adjusted by the printer when an Act is amended.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It does demonstrate the care and attention of Mr Cloughton's research.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Very thorough!

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 5 amended—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I cannot say I am satisfied with the reply given by the Minister in relation to my query on this clause. He indicated that funds could be borrowed for the construction of a new art gallery. However, there was no indication of this in his second reading speech. He said—

At the present time the board and the Government are considering the establishment of annexes to the gallery in order that a greater number of exhibitions may be made available to the public throughout the State.

This seems to indicate proposed additions to the existing buildings or to other places acquired around the city or in other centres to increase the display space. It does not seem to indicate that the Government intends to start on the construction of a new art gallery—which is the strong desire of all the people closely associated with our Art Gallery. Nor does it answer my objection in relation to the Loan Council. Up to this point we have been able to follow the principle that statutory bodies have the power to borrow up to the sum of \$400 000, but at some point the Loan Council will call a halt. Will we find that this legislation is the last straw on the camel's back?

I would not want to be responsible for holding up the Art Gallery in its desire to improve exhibition facilities. However, I have pointed out some of the consequences of the legislation, and I feel we should think about it more seriously, particularly if the measure provides only for additions to existing buildings or the acquisition of places around the city or in other centres for art works to be displayed. From the speech notes, quite obviously it is not going to produce the new building that those vitally concerned with the Art Gallery most strongly desire. I can only suggest that if that is all it amounts to, I must oppose the measure, just to register my protest. This is not a very imaginative point of view and simply adds to the general feeling one gets about this Government that it is not doing very much at all; it is just sitting and doing nothing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is quite obvious that if there is a limited amount of money to be borrowed, something must go by the board. There has never been any argument that Government or semi-Gov-

ernment bodies should not be given this sort of power. So far as imagination is concerned, we have had three years of absolute ineptitude in this field. Nothing has been done, but the moment something is done we are criticised, whether we are building an annexe or commencing construction on the Art Gallery. At least something is being done which would come as a happy surprise for anyone who has any association with art. It is quite possible, of course, to fund this loan money and to make a start, whether it is in the form of an annexe on a separate site or the commencement of the Art Gallery proper. At least there will be some 20 000 to 30 000 square feet of space in which art can be exhibited instead of being stored away in dungeons where it has been left deteriorating for the last three years, while Mr Cloughton has had something to do with it.

This measure is quite clear. What does it matter if a few words are out of place? The fact remains that there are all sorts of self-governing things, when we get down to considering governmental borrowing. Successive Governments have given different instrumentalities the power to borrow money up to a statutory limit of \$400 000. If this is to be the straw that breaks the camel's back, I suppose Mr Crean or Mr Whitlam will tell us. The Prime Minister seems to be telling us all sorts of other things which are pushing us all to the edge of despair in relation to the direction the country is taking, so I suppose no doubt he will give us with some relish another thunderbolt if he feels that the Western Australian Art Gallery will be the straw that will break the back of the Australian economy and will inform us that we cannot borrow the \$400 000. This is an incredible proposition. Such borrowings certainly would not be going on year after year; it would be a once or twice operation.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: There is no guarantee of that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: But you said this would give them an annual borrowing power.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course it would. If it wants to go on, the Treasury must fund it. However, the possibilities of its going on are remote in the extreme. Mr Dellar who has been a member of a local authority would know that a local authority does not take up its full borrowing powers every year.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I did not say it did.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: But Mr Dellar is trying to intimate that this sort of thing happens automatically when he knows that it does not.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: But you said it would be a once or twice operation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: People reading *Hansard* will say, "Mr S. J. Dellar, a shire clerk, knows what he is talking about."

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I am not a shire clerk.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The member was once a shire clerk.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He is busily studying the Local Government Act at the moment, in case he might have to become one again.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I notice that you took my advice and renewed your electrical contractor's license.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: People might get the idea that Mr Dellar knows all about it and that every local authority rushes in and borrows to its statutory limit every year when of course they do not. I do not know why we are all getting steamed up about a perfectly simple sort of Bill.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is rather sad in a way to see the Minister seize on some side issue to attempt to escape criticism.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who raised the side issue?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: He has what appears to be a complete lack of knowledge about what is contained in this Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would need all of five minutes to find out about it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have been trying to find out, Mr MacKinnon, but it has not been explained to me as yet. What is this money to be spent on? Where is it to be spent?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In Perth.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: What are the plans of the Art Gallery? Is this money to be used on, say, renovations to the CIB building?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is not. Well, just where is it to be spent? Will it be spent on an addition to the existing building?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If it is not a secret, why not let us know?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have told you. It could be spent on an annexe or on part of the new building. How much more do you want?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is quite obvious there is no clear plan behind this proposition. All we are told is that it will be spent on an annexe. However, nobody knows where it is going to be spent.

I am rather shocked at the lack of information supporting this Bill. The Minister blames Mr Crean, of course, for any rejection of loan applications but Mr Crean is only one member of the Loan Council. The other States when comparing their loan allocations with those available to Western Australia are the ones which start objecting. However, there is nothing that we on this side can do to change this Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Well, sit down and shut up!

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Why should he?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is not talking any sense.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister tells me to sit down and shut up so that he can escape criticism. That is quite obvious from the Points of Order that are raised every time his Government is being criticised. But in this case, I believe my criticism is justified.

We do not have the information relating to where this money will be spent, except in a very vague sort of way. We do not know what its effect is likely to be on the function of the Loan Council as a whole.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Does not the Act spell out what is permitted and what is not permitted?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Tozer's very question confirms what I have been saying.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is the only thing you have ever confirmed in your life.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: He confirms that the information has not been given to us.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: But we have the parent Act.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have all the members of the Art Gallery administration.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This Bill contains amendments to the parent Act. I do not criticise Mr Tozer for his question, because it takes a little time to gain experience here.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We have noticed that. You have too much time and you have never gained any experience.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order! I remind members that even in Committee remarks should be addressed to the Chair. These interjections will cease.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Perhaps I should—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Say something sensible.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —conclude by saying that the amendments will allow the Art Gallery to raise borrowings without reference to the Treasury and to invest surplus funds without reference to

the Treasury. It does not say anything about how the funds will be spent or what the effect of this extra loan-raising capacity will have on Loan Council deliberations. That is the beginning and the end of it, as far as the legislation is concerned.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Very simply, there is a board which handles its own affairs, and all we are going to do is to allow the board to raise money. Whether it will spend that money on an annexe or on a new establishment will depend on the board. Quite simply, that is that.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

SALE OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to regulate the advertising and the promotion of schemes for the sale of undivided shares in land. There are a number of ways in which a person can acquire an interest in real estate and the sale of undivided shares has been common practice for many years. An undivided share in land may be described as an interest which a person may have in a parcel of land in common with other persons, but which does not confer on him the exclusive ownership of any particular part of the parcel of land. The purchaser of such an undivided share may receive what has become known as a "purple title", as evidence of ownership of his undivided share.

There are schemes, based on this practice, in which the purchaser is given the right of exclusive use or occupation of a specified building or part of a building—for example, a town house, home unit or office. There are others where a specific commercial enterprise or development is intended to be carried on by or on behalf of the co-owners—for example, the purchase or development of an income-earning property, such as a block of flats for letting. Many of these schemes are already controlled in some respects by the provisions of division 5 of part IV of the Companies Act 1961-1973.

Briefly, the object of this division of the Companies Act is to regulate the raising of funds from the public in relation to certain schemes which fall within the definition of interests under that division. A promoter of a scheme involving such interests is obliged by the division first to

have a trust deed approved, and then to register a prospectus-like statement which will inform the investor of the nature of the interest offered and the rights and liabilities attaching to a participant in the scheme. The promoter is prohibited from advertising any such interest or seeking subscriptions for such an interest except by disseminating the prospectus itself or by publishing information merely drawing attention to the prospectus.

The division then proceeds to provide that only a public company may offer such an interest to the public. That company is termed the management company and is in turn obliged to enter into the trust deed I have already mentioned, under which a trustee approved by the Minister is appointed to safeguard the interests of the participants in the scheme. The deed must contain certain covenants by the management company and trustee intended to further protect the rights of the participants.

However, some schemes relating to the sale of undivided shares in land do not involve any precise or specific commercial enterprise or development. Many of such schemes relate to the sale of undivided shares in broad acres or rural land, and in some cases the sales take place outside the State or even outside Australia.

Numerous inquiries and complaints have been received from individuals about the sale of undivided shares in land. These inquiries and complaints have originated locally, from interstate, from New Guinea, and from the United States and Japan. In almost all cases in which it has been possible to interview the complainant, it has been evident that he expected to get a specific building lot, because of the misleading nature of the advertising material or because of verbal statements made to him by salesmen at the time of the transaction.

Local authorities also have complained, and that is not surprising when one considers the difficulties facing a local authority attempting to recover rates, or to enforce fire-break requirements, or to deal with owners when resuming portions of land for road purposes in any instance where the ownership of a particular block of land is held by some 200 or more persons, perhaps spread throughout Australia and even overseas, each of whom must be dealt with.

There are alarming accounts of the practices and techniques used by the sellers to market the land. Press statements warning the local public to exercise extreme caution in such land dealings have been issued by Town Planning Ministers and Commissioners in the past.

Two main areas of concern are the advertising and invitations associated with this type of scheme and the difficulties arising from an excessive number of co-owners.

The matter was referred to the Law Reform Commission for consideration and recommendations on legislation to control or prevent such activities.

The Bill now before the House would implement the recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission as varied to take into account recent amendments to division 5 of part IV of the Companies Act. With certain exceptions, the Bill prohibits the public offering or soliciting of offers of undivided shares in land.

I will deal with each of these exceptions in more detail but the main exception with which I wish to deal at this stage is in relation to a scheme which complies with the existing provisions of division 5 of part IV of the Companies Act.

It is envisaged that if a scheme relating to the sale of undivided shares in land complies with that division of the Companies Act, a purchaser or intended purchaser would be adequately protected in relation to the two main areas of concern which I have already mentioned; namely, the advertising and invitations associated with this type of scheme and the difficulties arising from an excessive number of co-owners. In relation to a scheme complying with that division of the Companies Act, under section 81 only a public company or its duly authorised agent may issue or offer an interest in such a scheme to the public.

A statement which is deemed to be a prospectus and which must comply with all requirements relating to prospectuses must be approved by the registrar and issued before any offer can be made to the public. Under section 42 of the Companies Act, such a statement cannot be approved by the registrar if it contains any misleading material, and under section 40 advertisements calling attention to any offer of an interest in such a scheme to the public are prohibited if they do anything more than merely draw attention to the prospectus-type statement which the promoter is required to issue.

Provision is made for a trust deed, which must be approved by the registrar, and unless there is an approved deed it is unlawful to issue or offer any interest in such a scheme to the public. The deed must appoint a trustee company approved by the Minister to represent the holders of such interests. In order to obtain approval, a deed must contain certain provisions specified in the Companies Act and regulations, and generally speaking those covenants are aimed at the supervision of the management company and the protection of holders of interests. Because this division of the Companies Act requires the assets of the scheme to be vested in the trustee, it overcomes many of the problems arising from an excessive number of co-owners.

I now propose to refer more specifically to some of the more important provisions contained in the Bill. Provisions are included with the intention of ensuring that new provisions dealing with the sale of undivided shares in land will not be avoided by devices such as resorting to options, resorting to trusts where the legal interest but not the beneficial interest is transferred out of the promoter's hands, and resorting to means other than public newspapers for soliciting offers from sections of the public by circulars or door-to-door canvassing.

An endeavour is made to prevent evasion of the provisions through the use of dummies or other associates of the promoter; although it appears to be most complex, it is not novel and similar provisions are to be found in the Companies Act dealing with takeovers and the disclosure of substantial shareholdings; and a further provision establishes that a person alone or together with associates who has sold more than three undivided shares in land in the past 12 months is to be regarded as being in the business of selling undivided shares in land, except where the transaction involved a common purchaser.

The crux of this Bill is provided in clause 5 wherein there is prohibition, except in certain circumstances, of the public offering or soliciting of offers of undivided shares of land.

The exceptions are important and it is appropriate that I make particular reference to them. The first, which I have already discussed, is where the scheme is already regulated under division 5 of part IV of the Companies Act.

The second relates to public offers of the sale of purple titles with which there is a collateral right to occupy a specified building or part of a building. This in fact used to be, before the advent of strata titles, the common form of transaction for the sale of home units, but is also used in some factory transactions where the factory is physically subdivisible and each purchaser acquires an exclusive right to use a portion of the factory premises.

A third exception will permit, for example, a private individual—as distinct from a professional promoter—who has bought, say, three undivided shares in one of the previous beach estate schemes, to advertise publicly one or two of them for sale. It will also permit a person with an undivided shareholding in a farm, block of flats, etc., to advertise publicly that part of his interest is for sale where he wants to realise on part of his shareholding. If he wants to liquidate the whole of his interest he can advertise it publicly as being for sale without committing an offence, because the Bill specifically creates a defence in those circumstances.

A fourth exception recognises that when the new provisions come into operation there may be partly-sold schemes in existence which might founder absolutely, both for the promoter and existing investors, unless the balance of the land can be sold off. This exception only applies where the Minister has granted an exemption for which specific provision is made. It is proposed to extend the date shown in the printed Bill to the 10th day of September, 1974. I make that reference to clause 6 of the Bill, the date being the date on which the Bill was publicly announced.

I have mentioned earlier a provision which would have the effect of permitting anybody to advertise publicly his total interest in any land if he is intending to dispose of it to a single purchaser. The subsection will, however, not afford a defence if, having so offered his interest in the land, the vendor proceeds to split his interest on sale to more than one purchaser.

The power of the Minister to grant exemptions is worthy of further mention and it is intended to permit an exemption in respect of schemes commenced before, but not completed at the time of, the coming into operation of the new provisions. The criteria under which the Minister may grant exemptions are reasonably similar to those already contained in the present provisions of the Sale of Land Act.

A further new provision gives added protection to the purchaser of an undivided share in response to an advertisement, which has infringed the key provision of the Bill.

In conclusion, it is important to note that the Bill is not directed at restricting or regulating sales or the selling of undivided shares in land. The Bill seeks only to prohibit the public advertising or offering for sale of such undivided shares, and even then, only prohibits the public advertising or offering by persons who are carrying on the business of promoting the sales of undivided shares in land, or who have in fact sold at least three such undivided shares in land in the previous 12 months.

I believe the Bill represents a very significant advance in the regulation of promotional schemes of a very questionable nature which have been a cause for concern to the public, local authorities, and successive Governments over a lengthy period.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 17th September, on motion by the Hon. S. J. Dellar.

House adjourned at 8.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 10th September, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (39): ON NOTICE

1. KULIN HIGH SCHOOL

Reticulation Scheme

Mr P. V. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of the proposed reticulation scheme to service the Kulin District High School?
- (2) Is it proposed to incorporate the old Kulin town dam and a concrete holding tank within the scheme?
- (3) Is it proposed to have the scheme operative before the 1975-76 summer period?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) A scheme to reticulate a full oval area was estimated in April 1973 to cost \$20 000.
An alternative proposal to reticulate about one-third of the required area at an estimated cost of \$7 000 is not recommended.
- (2) The old town dam is proposed as a source of water supply. Other storage details have not been finalised.
- (3) It is not possible at present to make a firm decision with regard to fund expenditure for 1975-76.

2. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Office: Busselton

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Does the Government intend to establish an office for the State Housing Commission in Busselton?
- (2) If so, what functions of the Commission will be carried out by the Busselton office?
- (3) Has suitable accommodation been secured and when is it expected to be operational?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Collection of rentals and associated office duties.
Calculation and processing of rental rebates.
Recovery action on overdue accounts.
Receipt of applications.
Inspections.