

Control said earlier that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had not been out to witness the intimidation that was going on at the factories at Welshpool. I had a very close association with one worker who suffered considerable intimidation. Might I say he knew considerable fear and some degree of—

Sir David Brand: Victimisation.

Mr. THOMPSON:—victimisation, thank you. This man was not a member of the union on strike and he was pursuing his legal right to work. He was approached after work one afternoon by a group of people and was told he had to resign from his employment and leave the place. In fear for his safety he said, in fact, that he would resign from his employment. On thinking it over his thoughts were, "I have a legal right to work and I shall continue to work."

He returned to work next day and worked for a couple of days. The people again approached him and followed him home on a couple of occasions. On another occasion, in true Al Capone style, they drove a car in front of his and forced him off the road. He was dragged out of the car but stood up to them. Fortunately for him some passers by came along and the people who were intimidating him soon departed.

A friend of mine came to hear of this and asked me to have a word with him as the man lived in my electorate. I did this and I found that he was scared stiff. This fear was not solely for his own self, because the people who intimidated him told him they were going to take action against his two small children. One afternoon he came to the point where he regularly met his children and he could not find them. However, a car containing four people who had been picketing the factories at Welshpool was there. He looked for his children for a considerable time and could not find them. When he eventually did, with the aid of a certain bank manager, he found them cowering at the back of a row of shops. They were too scared to come out for fear of what would happen.

Mr. Court: It is a good thing for the Minister for Prices Control to hear this.

Mr. THOMPSON: I suggest that this is not the sort of thing the trade union movement should do. I believe there is intimidation to people who want to pursue their legal right to work. This is to be deplored in our society today. Might I add that the man concerned has been an energetic supporter of the Labor Party for probably all of his life. He does not see much difference between the trade union movement and the Labor Party. I can assure members he has probably voted Labor for the last time in his life.

Mr. Davies: A delightful story.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Court	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Ruchman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Williams
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Nalder	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Noes—22

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brady	Mr. May
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Graham	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Hartrey	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Reid	Mr. Jones
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Burke
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Bickerton

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Toms): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

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

House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 4th August, 1971

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

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. RAILWAYS Increased Fares

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

Would the Minister explain to the House just how some of the public became so confused and inconvenienced as a result of statements apparently emanating from the Railway Department concerning recent increases in railway fares, and will he also advise whether the misunderstandings on increased rail fares have been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of those persons concerned?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

It was intended to issue tickets at the old fare up to closing time on Saturday, 31st July, but the staff were unable to cope.

The situation has now been rectified by Press and radio announcements to the effect that people who applied for tickets on Saturday, 31st July, and were not attended to will be issued tickets at the old fare and appropriate refunds will be made where applicable.

These arrangements will apply up to 4.30 p.m. Friday, 6th August.

2. RAILWAYS

Freight Concessions for Wool

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON, to the Minister for Transport:

With reference to the announcement by the Hon. Premier in *The West Australian* on Tuesday, the 3rd August, 1971, regarding the reduction in rail freight charges for the cartage of wool to Albany from towns south of Narrogin, and to further increase the intake of wool to Albany, thus strengthening the stability of the port as a wool selling centre, and retaining the confidence of the Scan Austral shipping group—would the Government be prepared to extend the concession to embrace the next two wool selling seasons and enable the producers to arrange their annual budgets in a more satisfactory manner?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

Consideration to extension of the concession will be given, having due regard to the effect of the concession which has just been granted.

3. POTATO INDUSTRY COUNCIL

Function and Personnel

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

In regard to the Potato Industry Council—

- (a) when was this body established;
- (b) what is its function;
- (c) what is the composition of the personnel; and
- (d) on what dates has it met formally?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) The first meeting of the Potato Industry Council was held on the 1st February, 1968.
- (b) To consider matters of broad interest to the Potato Growing Industry, to maintain liaison between sections of the Industry and to recommend appropriate actions by bodies represented on the Council.

- (c) Two representatives each from the Potato Growers' Association of W.A., the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board and the Department of Agriculture of Western Australia, under the chairmanship of an officer of the Department of Agriculture.

- (d) 6 meetings.—

1st February, 1968.
5th November, 1968.
24th April, 1969.
31st October, 1969.
2nd October, 1970.
19th March, 1971.

4. POLICE

Motor Vehicle Steering Locks

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Minister for Police:

As the Minister is reported in the Press as having a proposal in mind to compel motorists to equip their vehicles with steering locks, has the proposal been discussed by the Government in Cabinet?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

On 26th May, 1971, I circularised Cabinet Ministers re unlawful use of motor vehicles by juveniles and suggested the following means for minimising the high rate of this unlawful use.

"Legislation to be introduced compelling owners of all motor vehicles to have a steering locking device fitted to such vehicles irrespective of their age."

The proposal has not yet been discussed by Cabinet.

5. LAND ACQUISITION

Garden Island Causeway

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is the State Government responsible for the acquisition of properties and the construction of roadways to service the causeway between Point Peron and Garden Island?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) how many properties have so far been acquired;
 - (b) what has been the cost of acquisitions to date;
 - (c) are any more properties to be acquired in the future for this work;
 - (d) if so, what is the anticipated cost of such acquisitions;
 - (e) will any of these moneys be recouped from the Federal Government;

- (f) has any agreement been entered into to provide roadways, etc., by this Government or by the previous Government; and
- (g) if so, on what date?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

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

6.

TOURISM

Cossack

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

With reference to my question on Thursday, the 29th July, 1971, relating to tourist development at Cossack—

- (a) If \$18,334 was spent on repairing and restoring the Courthouse and cemetery for the purpose of tourist development, why is the Courthouse packed with explosives and displays "PRIVATE PROPERTY—KEEP OUT" signs on the walls;
- (b) how long have the explosives been there, and when will they be removed; and
- (c) will the caretaker unlock the doors, replace the handles on the water taps, and be in attendance on Sundays between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m.?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) There are no explosives in the Courthouse or "PRIVATE PROPERTY—KEEP OUT" signs displayed.
- (b) Answered by (a)—
I believe that explosives are stored in the Customs House which is under private lease to Messrs. Hancock and Wright.
- (c) The caretaker is resident within forty yards of the Courthouse and he or his wife are available to enable entry to the Courthouse or use of drinking facilities on request.

7. *This question was postponed.*

8.

EDUCATION

Port Hedland Hostel

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

When will the secondary school hostel at Port Hedland be completed and staffed?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

The contract date for the completion of the hostel is 24th December, 1971 and staffing should be finalised by the opening of the 1972 school year.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Leader of the Opposition), leave of absence for 12 consecutive sittings of the House granted to The Hon. Clive Griffiths (South-East Metropolitan) on the ground of private business overseas.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 3rd August, on the following motion by The Hon. L. D. Elliott:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.41 p.m.]: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply I would, firstly, like to thank members for their support and their congratulatory remarks on my re-election as Chairman of Committees of this House.

In my contribution to this debate I would like to commence by supporting the remarks made by Mr. White last evening relating to some of the recommendations which he has put forward dealing with traffic and the road toll. He did put forward the suggestion of arranging for a programme of education to be shown on television and for the use of radio scatters to make people aware of what they should do when they are driving, and of the dangers attached to driving at speed and without care.

It is surprising to note that the National Safety Council which receives about \$40,000 a year from the Government devotes some of this money to the publication and circulation of bulletins now and again; but these are distributed to some of the people of the State only. I realise that we as members of Parliament each receive a copy. I do not think these bulletins have a great deal of effect on people like members of Parliament, who are mostly staid in their habits and who take into consideration what should be done when they are driving cars.

The young people are the ones we should be concerned about, but the bulletins issued by the National Safety Council would not fall into their hands. Consequently, they have no idea of what that council has in mind. For those reasons I support the suggestion that has been put forward by Mr. White.

I would now like to refer to a traffic control system that has been adopted by one of the radio stations. This is a programme which is sponsored by a private company. I believe the radio station uses two cars for the purpose of road patrols at peak hours of traffic. I am sure we have all heard the announcements made by these patrols over the air. They advise motorists where traffic congestion occurs in the metropolitan area, where accidents have taken place, where traffic is held up, and which spots are dangerous. They do a magnificent job in giving this advice to motorists.

I heard one of the men on patrol getting upset by the fact that towards dusk, and on evenings when there was rain and visibility was not good, some motorists would not switch on their car lights. How many times have we seen motorists driving after sunset, without any sign of a light on their vehicles; yet along the same road, in front or behind that motorist, 10 or 20 vehicles have their lights on. This motorist, who is the odd one out, who has not switched on his lights, does not seem to realise that his failure to do so might cause other cars to run into him. I do not think the police apprehend many of the drivers who break the traffic regulations by failing to switch on their lights after sunset.

Another hazard of driving at night is caused by the vehicle with only one headlight burning. On occasions when travelling only a short distance I have passed five or six vehicles with only one headlight on. Despite the excellent job the police are doing they cannot catch up with all these offenders. At times I have seen a motorcar travelling on the road with one headlight on and a patrol officer on a motor cycle going the other way, but the officer did not take any notice of this breach.

That is the type of breach about which something should be done. I believe that by continuous short attacks on the driving public, by the use of scatters on the radio, by the showing of educational programmes on television, and with more patrol cars like the ones I have referred to a great deal would be achieved in assisting to reduce the traffic toll.

In the debate on the Supply Bill I referred to speeding and to carelessness in driving. To a great degree I attribute carelessness to "rubber neck" driving. This is the type of driver who instead of paying attention to the traffic ahead, looks at this or that side of the road, or at this or that object.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Looking at the mini skirts!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mini skirts or anything that is moving. He is the rubber neck type of driver, and he is the one who should be apprehended and

prosecuted. In my view it is a very serious offence for a motorist to drive along and not pay attention to the traffic. A motorist should not twist his head from one side to the other, or allow his attention to be distracted by a dog running along the side of the road. These are some of the hazards that are created on the roads.

I now comment on a situation where a traffic hazard exists; it is at a spot not far from that mentioned by Mr. White last evening. This is at the railway crossing at the intersection of James Street and Meadow Street in Guildford. Most of us are aware that is the intersection where boom gates have been installed and where bells ring when a train approaches the intersection. I took this matter up with the previous Minister for Police who was good enough to refer it to the Main Roads Department. Similarly, I have taken this matter up with the present Minister for Police (Mr. Dolan), who also was good enough to refer it to the Main Roads Department. On each occasion I got the same reply from the Minister for Police. It was that the Main Roads Department had looked into the matter and did not consider this to be a hazard.

To my knowledge no serious accident has occurred at this intersection, but I am sure before very long one will occur. This spot does not lie within my province, but I contend that where any hazard like this exists it is the business of members of Parliament to draw attention to it, in order to have the position rectified. Furthermore, many of my constituents use this crossing when they travel into and out of Perth. The people who travel over this intersection run the risk of being struck by trains.

If a motorist is travelling to Perth, southwards along Meadow Street and over the railway crossing, he has a line of cars in front of him as he proceeds along Meadow Street. He then has to turn right into James Street. Some of the traffic coming along James Street turns left into Meadow Street but the other traffic proceeds straight along James Street.

With the give-way-to-the-right rule being in force, the driver proceeding along Meadow Street across the railway crossing has to stop to enable the traffic going eastwards along James Street to proceed. There is room for about four vehicles only on the stretch of road between James Street and the railway line. The attention of the driver is centred on the cars in front, and he often finds there is also a car alongside him. He cannot see the cars going eastwards along James Street because of the cars which are turning left over the crossing.

With all this going on, very often the result is that a motorist is stranded at the railway crossing waiting for the east-bound traffic along James Street to proceed. I myself have been stranded, as has the former Minister for Police, at this very spot.

The Hon. F. R. White: Have you seen a boom gate resting on a vehicle at that crossing?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, but I believe such an incident has occurred. It is a very difficult situation. As a matter of fact, one morning I happened to hear a complaint on the radio from the driver of a slow learners' vehicle. He had been caught on the railway crossing several times. Just imagine what would happen if he were caught on the railway line and a train came along. He would have no hope of getting the children out of the bus.

The Main Roads Department has the audacity to say there is no traffic hazard at the crossing. However, there is a simple solution to the traffic hazard. A "Give Way" sign is located on Meadow Street where there is very little traffic proceeding northwards. The north bound traffic is only a fraction of the traffic which uses the intersection. A "Give Way" sign on the median strip in James Street would prevent traffic from proceeding eastwards and would solve the problem. However, the Main Roads Department is not prepared to take that action, and it is high time that something was done to see that the hazard in question is eliminated.

Another crossing further along the road, past the Guildford Grammar School, is also dangerous, but in this case one can see the traffic coming from the opposite side of the railway line. There is room for four vehicles, and the drivers of vehicles using the crossing have a clear view eastwards along Great Eastern Highway. However, the other crossing to which I have referred gives a driver no chance of seeing whether vehicles are proceeding along James Street, because that traffic is hidden from view by the vehicles which are lined up in the street.

I ask the Minister if he will again take this matter to the Main Roads Department to try to impress on the department the necessity to take some action before a number of people meet their doom.

There is another matter to which I would like to refer. A few days ago I asked a question regarding the number of vagrancy charges laid by the police against people with no visible means of support. I was surprised to hear from the Minister that no separate record was kept of such charges. I would have thought that some record would be kept of the various charges in the police courts, but apparently there is none.

I asked the question because I think it is a matter which exercises the minds of quite a number of people. When we look around our community we see a number of young people, in particular, who apparently do not have anything to do. We see them in the mall in Hay Street and in all sorts of other places around the

city. Either they have no occupation or they are shift workers. However, it does seem to me that there are quite a number who have motorcars, and I wonder where they get the money to support themselves and run their motorcars if they do not have jobs. I think most of us can assess whether a person has an occupation, or whether he is doing nothing.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Some of those people might have a couple of degrees.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Possibly, some of those young people are living on their parents and are not prepared to work. Perhaps the money provided by the parents is enough for some of them to be able to run motorcars. However, those who do not receive any money from an occupation, or from their parents, have only one other source: robbery.

A terrific number of robberies have occurred in this State and in the Eastern States in latter years. I asked the question in an attempt to find out how many people are picked up for having no visible means of support. I think such an inquiry is worth while when one sees so many people around who apparently have nothing to do. I know that some years ago, if a person—such as Percy Buttons—was seen in the streets he was usually picked up and charged with having no visible means of support; and I realise that some young people can look scrappy without there being any question as to whether they have any visible means of support.

From my reading of the newspapers I seldom see a person charged with having no visible means of support. There is an occasional charge. I think that this is a matter which should be examined by the police or the C.I.B., to see whether the people to whom I have referred are committing the robberies. The circumstances do not apply only to Perth; they apply in all cities in Australia.

I would now like to refer to the Governor's Speech, wherein it was stated that the Government proposed to establish a statutory lamb marketing authority. This proposal was, of course, under way before the elections. The Farmers' Union of Western Australia put a proposal to the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr. (Nalder) towards the middle of last year. The original proposal was examined by the Minister and his departmental officers, and referred back to the Farmer's Union, because the Minister and his officers felt that a number of aspects of the proposal would not work.

After some further study by the Farmers' Union, and discussions with the officers of the Department of Agriculture, a plan was submitted which was acceptable to the Minister and the department. As I have said, the plans had reached that stage before the election, and they were referred

to the Crown Law Department so that legislation could be drawn up to bring the scheme into operation. I mention these facts because while Mr. Abbey was speaking last week he implied that nothing very much had been done in this respect while Mr. Nalder was the Minister for Agriculture. However, that is not so.

Mr. Abbey also referred to a meat marketing authority, and to the abattoirs. As far as the meat marketing authority is concerned, Mr. Abbey probably did not know that such a proposal was not placed before Mr. Nalder. That proposal was presented to the Government some seven weeks ago. Apparently it is thought that Mr. Nalder, in the circumstances, should have introduced a system of meat marketing.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: The honourable member is referring to mutton marketing?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, mutton and beef. It is thought by some people that the Minister should have introduced a scheme to cover mutton and beef. However, the policy of our party and I believe, of all parties is that the industry concerned should have the say as to whether or not it requires a meat marketing authority. Again this is not a matter which can be treated very lightly because a plan has to be evolved. Meat marketing authorities do exist in several other States of Australia and I understand they are not entirely satisfactory.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Has the honourable member read the Towns and Austen report?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have read part of it.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is a very good report to study.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I will comment on that report in a moment; just now I am discussing the meat marketing authority. As I said, the authorities operating in the Eastern States are not very satisfactory. I want to see some stabilised form of marketing for lamb, beef, and mutton. We all want that in the interests of the producers and the State itself because the present situation is very bad, as we all know. However, there is more involved in this than just a scheme for meat marketing.

Mr. Heitman referred to the Towns and Austen report. I will deal with that. This is the matter for which Mr. Abbey said the previous Minister for Agriculture was somewhat to be blamed because he did not accept all the recommendations in the report. We will consider what happened after the Towns and Austen report was given to the Government.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Nothing.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Something did happen. Consideration was given to this report, particularly in relation to abattoirs. Mr. Nalder took this matter up with

Cabinet. Cabinet agreed to spend \$2,500,000 on upgrading the Midland and Robb Jetty abattoirs rather than spend, at that time, some \$7,000,000 on a new abattoir which would have taken a long time to build and would not have been ready for this killing season.

Mr. Abbey mentioned that \$7,000,000 was to be spent on upgrading those abattoirs. The amount was not \$7,000,000. I understand the figure decided on by Cabinet was \$2,500,000, which has now risen to about \$3,500,000. I have not got the exact figures but I understand that to be so.

It is absolutely wrong to say that Mr. Nalder did nothing about the Towns and Austen report. He did not take up the matter of meat marketing which was recommended in the report for the simple reason that he left it to the industry organisations to come forward with a decision and a plan. The plan was finally evolved and presented to the Government only seven weeks ago.

As members know, these plans cannot be evolved in a very short time. The lamb marketing plan took a considerable time. To evolve a plan for mutton and beef marketing will also take a considerable time. Had the Government decided to build a new abattoir a very poor situation would have existed as regards killing space at Midland this year. We are not in a good situation now but I believe the reason for that is rather obvious.

The eastern and north-eastern parts of the wheatbelt of this State have had a very dry season, which in certain areas has been worse than in the drought year. Perhaps some people do not realise how serious the situation has been in that part of the country.

I know of one man at Meckering who in recent weeks, has been shearing sheep and transporting them to Bremner Bay in order to keep them going, because there is no feed at Meckering. In the same area I have a brother who is a very good farmer and keeps a good supply of fodder for his stock. This year he will have to resort to taking some of his overquota wheat from the bin, buying it back at 14c a bushel, in order to keep his fat lambs going.

For these reasons greater numbers of stock are going to Midland at this time of the year; because people cannot hold them. Normally the glut season is about September; this year it is earlier because of the factors I have mentioned. I believe the additions and improvements to the abattoirs will be completed in about September, in time for the normal glut season.

Therefore, to say nothing has been done and the Towns and Austen report has not been acted upon is extremely misleading.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Do not forget that the Pastoralists and Graziers Association was opposed to the idea.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know that the association used the word "opposed" in relation to the marketing scheme. Its members were advised not to vote for it, but the association did not come out and say it opposed the lamb marketing scheme. I can assure this House that Mr. Nalder and my party were very strongly in favour of it. We discussed it at party meetings and unanimously agreed that once the plan was finally decided upon and completed to the satisfaction of the Minister and departmental officers, we would go ahead with it, and Mr. Nalder went so far as to take the matter to the Crown Law Department to have legislation drawn up.

I think I have covered the points I wanted to make in regard to meat marketing in this State. I now want to refer to another matter.

We have heard and seen in the papers many complaints about the raising of doctors' fees. We have also heard many complaints about the increase in the salaries of members of Parliament and various other increases.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Proposed increases.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Perhaps I have missed it but I do not recollect having seen anything in the Press in regard to the charges by dentists.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There was something in the Press about 10 days ago.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I must have missed that. I would have been pleased to see it. In my estimation, doctors' fees are pennies to pounds as regards charges.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Cents to dollars today.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Cents to dollars. I think the charge for a visit to a doctor has been increased from \$2.80 to \$3.50. The other day I was told of the experience of a young woman who has a young family, including a child in the first year of high school who required dental treatment. She made an appointment and took the child to the dentist. The dentist examined the child's mouth and said, "That is \$10 for the examination." Ten dollars for examining a child's mouth!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How old is the child?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: About 13 years old. The estimate given for doing the work required on the child's teeth was \$360! The woman was told by the dentist that when she brought the child for the first visit she would have to bring along \$130 of that sum.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you check this figure?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The only check I had was what this lady told me. Knowing the type of person she is, I would take her word for it. She is a fine type

of young lady. I suppose her husband's earnings from his job would be in the vicinity of \$70 or \$80 a week at the most. I have no reason to disbelieve this lady because she is a very good type of person who would not have stated these figures unless they were factual.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have the impression that you are condemning a group of people on hearsay evidence.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To some degree I am, but let me follow this up. Several years ago I had occasion to ask whether any charges were laid down by the Dental Board in this State. I rang the secretary of the board and found that no scale of charges had been laid down; dentists were able to charge the amount they thought fit. Yet the Australian Medical Association has laid down a scale of charges for doctors. I cannot understand why one profession in the sphere of health should adopt a scale of charges while another does not.

Many years ago the cost of having a tooth pulled was 2s. 6d. The charge has gradually risen and I do not think it would cost less than a couple of dollars to have a tooth drawn today. That is a large increase. The charges made for some types of dental work are absolutely astounding. I know it is not the nicest type of work and that dentists have to contend with all sorts of things and incur some expense, but they do not have to contend with any more than doctors do in respect of the treatment of patients.

From my own knowledge I would say that a reasonably serious operation, such as for gallstones, including hospital charges, would cost infinitely less than having a set of dentures made. Yet a doctor, in performing an operation and attending the patient afterwards, would spend as much, if not more time than a dentist would spend in fitting a set of dentures.

This is a matter to which members might give some thought. I do not think we, as members of Parliament, can do anything about it under our legislation, but some inquiry should be made into dental charges in order to find out whether they are extortionate. If the charges are fair, that is good enough. From what I have seen, experienced, and heard about dental charges, Ned Kelly was a gentleman. I conclude on that note and support the motion.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.11 p.m.]: Mr. President, in addressing myself to this motion the first matter I wish to refer to is a question I asked a few days ago in regard to the reservation of timber rights to the Crown. A part of my question reads as follows:—

- (1) Has the Government given any consideration to the matter of immediate abolition of timber

rights to the Crown on freehold and conditional purchase land, thus allowing the timber to become the sole property of the landholder?

I received the following answer:—

Reservation to the Crown of marketable timber existing on Crown land is provided in the Regulations to the Land Act, and is designed to enable the earlier release for selection of land that would otherwise be withheld from selection until the marketable timber had been removed.

It is obvious to me that whoever prepared the answer did not understand the question, which had no reference whatever to the release of Crown lands. The question referred to land that had already been alienated, either under a conditional purchase lease or as freehold land. There is quite a difference. It is to this matter of the reservation of timber rights to the Crown on conditional purchase leases and freehold land that I wish to address myself.

The history of this matter goes back quite a long time. I believe the intention was to preserve timber. Over the years the scheme has utterly failed to achieve the object for which it was designed.

If there is one direction in which our Forests Department is lacking more than in any other, it is in the matter of public relations with other holders of land. For a considerable time there has been a great deal of bitterness between the Forests Department and other land users in the forest areas of our State, and I would say the greatest single cause of this bitterness has been the reservation of timber rights to the Crown.

A moment ago I said I believed this action had been taken in an endeavour to preserve timber. This goes back to the early days of this century, when a considerable quantity of timber was being destroyed by means of ringbarking and so on.

It was partly because of the concern expressed that the Forests Department was set up as we know it today. Prior to 1918 it operated as a section of the Lands Department; it was not a separate department. The Forests Act of 1919, actually established the Forests Department as a separate department.

I was very interested when I read some of the debates which took place in 1918, before the introduction of the legislation to which I have referred. In the Address-in-Reply debate during the year 1918 the then member for Northam, Mr. James Mitchell—Sir James Mitchell as he later became—put forward an idea that land should be opened up for soldier settlement south of Manjimup, on the cessation of hostilities in the 1914-18 war.

The debate to which I refer took place some time in September, 1918, a couple of months before the armistice was signed bringing the 1914-18 war to a close.

Some people took a great deal of exception to this idea on the ground that it would destroy a lot of timber. My own father who was a member of the Legislative Assembly at the time was one of the people who took exception to the idea and, in order to give the House some of the background I would like to quote part of that debate which appeared on page 154 of the *Parliamentary Debates* of 1918. It reads as follows:—

I am sure the member for Northam would not wish to sacrifice 100 loads of karri per acre, to see it wasted, ruthlessly destroyed, in order to put men on that land. There is in that district mixed timber country and open red gum country which can be and will be used.

A little later in that same session the Forests Act was introduced and, as I have said, certain provisions of that Act were incorporated with the idea of preserving our timber. I regret, however, that those sections of the Act have never operated to this day, even though they still exist.

As a result of what happened after the debates to which I have referred, and following the introduction of the Forests Act in 1919 we find that over the next six years—which were the early years of the group settlement scheme—hundreds of thousands of loads of timber were destroyed down south. A great deal of it can be seen standing dead today south of Manjimup. This was done to put men on the farms in that area.

If my memory serves me right—and it does go back that far—there was a public outcry at the destruction of this timber as a result of which in about 1926 or 1927—I am not sure of the year—timber rights were first reserved to the Crown. All royalties from timber on any land alienated after that date were reserved to the Crown.

In my humble opinion this did not do what it set out to do, because there was no control of the timber itself and there never has been. An owner of land could ringbark the trees on his land; he could bulldoze them in later years when bulldozers were introduced; or he could blow them down with gelignite. He could destroy whatever timber he wanted to destroy.

Had the timber rights not been reserved to the Crown the men in question would have had a good look at the position—at least this would have been done in many cases. I will, however, expand on this later on. This principle of timber rights did not exist only for a few years, it continued for a great number of years.

One could be excused for thinking that there was a great deal of timber on those blocks, but I would like to quote some of

the replies given to me in 1958 by the late Mr. Strickland when answering some of my remarks on the Address-in-Reply debate.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member please quote the page number for *Hansard*.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I propose to do so, Mr. President, but I would first like to give some of the background. In reply to some of my remarks Mr. Strickland referred to blocks which had been purchased for the planting of pines in the Nannup area. To give some indication of the figures he quoted concerning the timber stands in this country I will refer to the Parliamentary Debates of 1958 where at page 530 Mr. Strickland was giving the price paid for some of the blocks and the value recovered in timber from those blocks.

I take it that in these cases the timber was reserved to the Crown and the owners—unlike most owners—had not cleared their country but had sold it back to the Forests Department for pine plantations.

Among the examples of the purchase price paid and the value of timber on some of these blocks, Mr. Strickland said that the value of the timber far exceeded the purchase price, and that some of these figures were as follows:—

Purchase price.	Value of timber recovered.
£582	£2,300
£3,000	£11,760
£162	£3,692
£352	£9,000

That will give members some indication of the value of the timber which was destroyed on the blocks that were cleared.

These were obviously blocks which had been alienated and on which no work had been done. The people concerned were glad to sell them back to the Crown. As I have said, this will give members some idea of the type of destruction that took place. It would have been far better had the provisions of the Forests Act, 1919, been brought into operation instead of reserving the timber rights to the Crown.

It is obvious that somebody had an idea as to what was likely to happen, because a provision was inserted in the Forests Act which, as far as I am aware, has never been brought into operation. I venture to say, not 1 per cent. of the landholders in the timber areas of the State would know that this provision exists. Had it been brought into operation it would have preserved hundreds of thousands of loads of timber which, when all is said and done, is a national asset. The few dollars which the Treasury receives from timber royalties on timber reserved to the Crown is a mere bagatelle when compared with the national

asset and the value of the timber which was destroyed. Section 73 (2) of the Forests Act states—

The planting of trees, approved by the Conservator, on not less than five acres of any land acquired under the conditional purchase provisions of the Land Act, 1898, shall be deemed an improvement within the meaning of that Act . . .

The next part of the subsection is the important part. It reads—

. . . and the conservation and improvement, to the satisfaction of the Conservator, of indigenous timber already growing on any portion of land acquired under the conditional purchase provisions of the Land Act, 1898, may, with the approval of the Minister for Lands, be deemed an improvement within the meaning of that Act.

The timber to which I have referred would not have been destroyed had this provision in the Forests Act been used instead of people being allowed to acquire the land and ringbark the trees on that land. They were allowed to get rid of the timber in any way they could and they did so to enable them to claim the clearing they had done as an improvement in connection with their conditional purchase leases.

I am convinced that this could have been avoided, partly because many of the people who owned their own timber rights prior to the land being taken up in 1926—or whatever date it was—were in the same position in which I had been.

My father owned the land, which I am about to mention, before I did, and now one of my sons owns this land. This was good jarrah country. About 40 years ago I partly cleared the land to which I have referred and left some jarrah standing on it. It looked to me to be good jarrah. Prior to this two or three harvests of timber had been taken from this land and there have been a further couple of harvests taken since that time.

When I say I cleared the land in question I do not mean it was developed in a haphazard sort of fashion. It was developed to the point of being able to carry six sheep to the acre. So members will appreciate that it was highly developed grazing land. In spite of this, earlier this year another cut of timber was taken off that same land. The result of that cut of timber was \$5 to the acre—that is in timber—and that after it was cleared and pastured for 40 years. It can still run six sheep to the acre.

I am not the only one who has done this sort of thing; it has been done by others who owned their own timber. I cannot help but stress the fact that had the provision of the Forests Act to which I have referred been used over the last 50 years, hundreds of thousands of loads of timber would have been saved, because the men

concerned would have had an incentive to preserve that timber, particularly if they were able to get the benefit of it and claim it as an improvement for the purposes of freeholding their land.

I again repeat that I do not think 1 per cent of the landholders today know that the provision I have mentioned exists in the Forests Act.

I would now like to quote one other case which gives the reverse side of the picture. I have already said that in many cases timber is destroyed because there is nothing to prevent it from being destroyed, apart from which the clearing that is done can be claimed as an improvement in connection with the freeholding of the land.

The example I am about to cite is not an isolated one; because this sort of thing has happened on many occasions in recent years. This particular case is one which occurred in the Margaret River area. It came to my notice while I was examining the workings of the dairy farm improvement scheme in its early days.

I visited the property of the man in question who is a good and well known farmer in the Margaret River area. He was doing certain clearing in connection with the dairy farm improvement scheme. When I visited his property the bulldozing had been done and the timber had been pushed into windrows. He had, however, left some very good jarrah to one side, because he was a conscientious sort of fellow. He said he did not own the timber. Incidentally this happened before any royalty was paid on such timber. Later a small royalty was paid. That, however, is beside the point.

As I have said the man in question had left the good jarrah aside. He complained to me, however, and said that he had informed the Forests Department that it was there. He was anxious to get in touch with a spot mill near his property so that the timber could be removed. He was told, however, that the spot mill could not touch the timber in that area because it stood in the concession of the Adelaide Timber Company.

The farmer then approached the Adelaide Timber Company saying that he understood the timber stood in its concession area and as nobody else could touch it would the company remove it. The reply he received was that the company was not operating in that area and that it would not pay the company to send its trucks or its men to pick up the timber in question.

So the man returned once again to the district forestry officer and said, "They do not want it. What about letting another fellow have it?" And the officer replied, "No, I cannot allow that, because it is

within the area belonging to the Adelaide Timber Coy." So the farmer simply pushed it into the windrows and burnt it. Here we have a sort of a half attempt made to control the sale of timber, but there is no control whatsoever over its destruction. I contend that this has done a great deal to destroy timber rather than to preserve it as was intended.

So I urge the Government to have a close look at the problem, because I believe it is still not too late to take steps to solve it. I think that in some cases the waiving of this reservation of the timber to the Crown so that the timber belongs to the landowner can still be applied so that the timber, which is a national asset, can be preserved. Those comments, of course, relate to hardwood timbers.

The other evening when Mr. Ferry was speaking he mentioned that we have been having some difficulty in negotiating agreements for the sale of hardwood chips to the Japanese. There are more reasons than one for this. One is that, in my opinion, the Commonwealth Government should not interfere in the State's business and fix the price. I know nothing of the technical reason, but I understand from Japanese interests that they would prefer to buy Tasmanian or Victorian wood chips that are priced \$2 higher than they would pay for Western Australian wood chips. For some technical reason the wood chips from those two States have a greater value. That is one of the reasons we are having difficulty in negotiating an agreement with the Japanese. Of course, it is a fact that the Japanese can go to many parts of the world today and obtain hardwood chips. As Mr. Ferry mentioned the same cannot be said in regard to softwood chips. One can still sell them like hot cakes provided we had them for sale. However, we do not have them for sale at this stage because we do not have sufficient softwood timber available.

I think we have been dragging our feet for many years in regard to the planting of softwood timber. This State, in particular, has relied entirely on the State Forests Department to engage in softwood timber planting. No incentive whatsoever has been given to private enterprise in this State to plant softwoods. In fact, at this point I would like to quote figures relating to the proposed plantings of softwoods in the future by our Forests Department. These figures refer to the Government purchase of land by the Forests Department for the planting of pines. Members know that there has been a great deal of controversy over this. The figures are as follows:—

Government Purchase of Forestry Land. 16,000 acres of *pinus radiata* land was purchased by the Government in the years 1953-65, and a planting programme of 2,000 acres per annum maintained during the 1950's.

This programme was financed largely from Loan Funds at the rate of approximately \$200,000 per annum.

That is what has been done to provide for our future needs. It is just chicken feed, and meagre chicken feed at that! Continuing—

By 1965 the planting programme had increased to approximately 3,000 acres per annum and the area of plantations in the State was 19,000 acres of *pinus radiata* and 26,000 acres of *pinus pinaster*.

That is tremendous! Continuing—

The Softwood Forestry Agreement Act of 1967 provided funds to double this and the programme is now 6,000 acres per annum, with a proposed increase to 8,000 acres in the next two years.

Here I would like to say that I have considerable doubts as to whether this will be done in view of the financial position in which the Commonwealth and the States now find themselves. Because of that I do not think we will see any increased funds coming forward for softwood plantings. In fact, there is more likely to be a decrease in the funds that are made available. I continue to quote—

The current target is 240,000 acres by the end of the century at least 80,000 acres of which should be *pinus radiata*.

That is the target set by our State Forests Department. I repeat that I have thought, until now, that this target would be reached so that our future requirements would be met. However, I now do not think the target will be reached and I am of the opinion that we are not doing anything to encourage private foresters to engage in softwood planting. In fact, until recently this was frowned upon by the Forests Department, but now there is a change in the attitude held by some of its officers, thank goodness. However, it is a change of thinking that has not come soon enough, because we are losing ground all the time with no chance whatsoever of catching up.

Further, many private investors are greatly interested in the planting of softwood timbers. When I was in London last year one large private organisation, the British Economic Forestry Group, showed considerable interest in extending its activities to Australia for the purpose of planting pines. That company has since become actively engaged in Australia, but unfortunately, not in Western Australia. It went to New South Wales and I think it will eventually extend its operations to Victoria. The reason for its interest in planting pines in those two States is probably because of its getting more encouragement to go there. We certainly did not give it any encouragement, and it is

high time we woke up to what we are missing not only in regard to overseas capital but also local capital because we are not giving private planters in this State any encouragement.

Every country in the world that is able to make an assessment of its future needs of forest products has come up with the same answer: there will be a dearth of timber by the turn of the century, and all countries that have made assessments are trying to do something to prevent it. At the moment the Commonwealth is faced with a bill for the importation of timber products amounting to some \$210,000,000 annually. Some people merely say, "Oh well, why should we bother about planting timber when we can import it?" However, in a few years' time, with the evidence that we have from other countries about the prospect of there being a dearth of timber by the turn of the century, from where will we import it? That could well be the principal question in this country by the turn of the century. It will not be a question of what it will cost us to import timber, but from where we will be able to import it; because it appears that other countries, as I have said, are expecting to be extremely short of timber themselves.

To illustrate, in my opinion, how small our thinking is in Western Australia in regard to pine plantings, I would point out that we are a State with only some 5,000,000 acres of forest and yet we are prepared to battle along at this slow rate of progress and do nothing to encourage plantings, and this despite the fact that in the United States of America there are 498,000,000 acres of commercial forests. However, in 1950, the United States passed what is known as the Co-operative Forest Management Act, its purpose being to assist the States to undertake programmes of planting timber and to engage in other forestry work to assist in ensuring an adequate supply of timber in the future for the needs of industry.

Various means of assistance are provided by the United States Government. In referring to the 498,000,000 acres of commercial forests in that country, one has to multiply that by five to obtain the figure which represents the area of forest country in South America. We have only 5,000,000 acres of such country. At the moment we have about 60,000 acres of pines, and yet it is estimated that we need approximately 250,000 acres by the end of this century. Japan has 60,000,000 acres of forest, but I will return to Japan later.

In an endeavour to demonstrate what I think might be the situation in this State in regard to the importation of timber by the end of the century, let me refer to New Zealand, which has slightly in excess of 1,000,000 acres of exotic forest. Of our total imports of timber products, 20 per cent. comes from New Zealand. That

represents one-fifth of our importations, but at the moment we absorb 80 per cent. of New Zealand's timber exports. This is an indication of what I think will happen, and I would point out that most other people who have studied this question visualise that they can see this happening in 30 years' time.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: When you speak of assistance for the planting of timber, you mean assistance to convert agricultural land to forest?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Not necessarily, but I will deal with that matter later. I will keep the honourable member here a while yet and he will get the answer to the point he has raised in due course. Therefore, in my opinion, the target of 250,000 acres of pine plantings by the end of the century is completely unrealistic and the outlook on this question was the same in 1918.

Again I will return to the events of that year with a view to quoting what the Attorney-General and the Minister for Forests had to say on the introduction of a Bill which was to become the 1919 Forests Act, the Statute under which we still operate. In the course of his speech, which was recorded in the 1918 *Parliamentary Debates* at page 353, Mr. R. T. Robinson had this to say—

Whilst the improvement of our great indigenous forests of hardwoods will form the main work of the Forestry Department for all time, we must not shirk the duty we owe of replacing our enormous softwood importations by timbers locally grown.

This was in 1918. Continuing to quote—

A fourth principle should, therefore, be added to the three I have already laid down as the foundation of our forest policy, and this fourth principle may be set out thus—the formation annually of a sufficient area of pine plantations to supply the softwood needs of the State.

Before the war we imported annually from America and northern Europe no less than £144,000 worth of softwood, all of which might be produced here. Taking into account the growth of our population, it is estimated that an area of one square mile of country should be planted with pines every year. Here again, the importance of continuity of policy is well shown. Once the pine planting scheme is initiated, it must continue until the timber on the first square mile planted has reached a marketable size. It is clear that, if the continuity is broken, if for one year we fail to put in our square mile of pine, then, when the time comes to reap the crop, there will be a blank in the corresponding year at the end of the rotation, and the many local industries dependent on the timber

from the plantations will find themselves without work for that year, or else be compelled to have recourse again to American softwood.

That is what was visualised as being necessary in 1918. Had that plan been carried out we would have had now, I suppose, 35,000 acres of pines. I venture to say that that forecast of future needs was just as far out then as our present one is these days. That is what was thought would be required; that is, 640 acres a year. We are presently planting 6,000 acres and that amount will certainly not be enough.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I cannot help but think you are following in your father's footsteps.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: He may not be disappointed in that!

In order to drive this point home I will quote another section from the same *Hansard* of 1918, which contains some very interesting debates; and if anyone wants to know anything about the Forests Acts of this State I would recommend that he read those debates, because they contain very good reading. The members spoke at some length, with some speeches in another place lasting for three hours. They might have had big ideas—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: And mouths, too!

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: —and they certainly lacked nothing in words. On page 458 of the 1918 *Hansard*, the then member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlin) said—

But let me point out that during the year 1912 five million pounds worth of timber was imported into the Commonwealth, and the amount paid to shipowners for carrying that timber was £665,000. From 1909 to 1912 the imports of timber increased by 70 per cent. That appears to me to be a damning indictment against the patriotism of our own people.

In those days the value of the timber imported was \$10,000,000; today the value is \$210,000,000, and we are still really not making an attempt to do anything about it. We never will while we depend entirely on Government money. Governments do not have the sort of money required to be able to anywhere near catch up with the softwood situation.

I want to refer to some of the systems used in other countries in an endeavour to encourage the planting of pines by private investment. I want to indicate why we should be doing so much more about the situation because it is easier and cheaper for us in Western Australia than it is in almost any other part of the world.

Many countries tried a loan scheme, but nearly all those which did so have now abandoned the scheme, because it failed. The two countries of which I will speak are the United Kingdom and New Zealand,

which countries both started these loans to private enterprise for the purpose of establishing forests. After a few years they gave it away because they found this was not the answer. They now have a system of straight-out grants and the grants are by no means chicken feed.

Just as an instance I will quote from a little publication sent to me by the British Forestry Commission. I will not read it all, but when dealing with the dedication scheme—it is called this because in order to obtain a grant a person must dedicate his land as forest land for all time—the publication states—

This scheme, which was launched in 1947 and has already been adopted by over 3,250 estates—

That is, private estates. To continue—

—involving over 960,000 acres of woodland, provides the most comprehensive form of assistance. Briefly, the owner enters into a Covenant or Agreement with the Forestry Commission, under which he undertakes to manage his woodlands for the main purpose of timber production in accordance with an agreed Plan of Operations, and to ensure skilled supervision. In return he receives, under the Basis II provisions which have been most generally adopted, the following financial grants:

- (1) A planting Grant, currently £23 3s. 6d. per acre, for every acre satisfactorily planted. . .

An annual management grant is also made available. This amount varies according to the size of the estate, but it commences at 21s. 3d. an acre for the first 100 acres, then it is 14s. 3d. for the second 100 acres, and 8s. 9d. for the remainder. Those amounts are fairly substantial and are what the United Kingdom makes available. New Zealand operates under a similar sort of system; that is, a grants system.

Other schemes are also in force and some of them are referred to by Dr. M. R. Jacobs, Director-General of the Forestry and Timber Bureau, Department of National Development. He refers to several schemes such as the one in Sweden under which a grant is made of 50 per cent. of the cost of clearing land, and in some cases it is as high as 75 per cent. Norway provides something similar, as does France. The Government in that country pays 50 per cent. of the total cost of forest establishment.

This is what other countries are providing in an endeavour to encourage private forest establishment. I maintain that we could encourage and obtain forest development by private enterprise without the provision of any such monetary grants. That might sound peculiar to some people, but I have made the statement for various reasons. One of these is the fast-growing

rate in Australia. The growing rate for pine is two and a half times greater in Australia than it is in Britain, Scandinavia, or any of the cold countries; and I will come back to that point later, because it has a great deal more bearing than many people realise.

Another reason is the close proximity of our forest areas to the road, rail, and port facilities; and the third reason is the ease in establishing these plantations in our terrain in comparison with the situation in most of the other softwood-growing countries where the terrain is very mountainous and the access roads must be constructed over many mountain streams, and so on.

One of the most important advantages we have is that we can plant very easily with the use of machinery. Our forest areas are to be found virtually on one big plain because we do not really have such a thing as a mountain. We use machinery to plant pines at a rate per day which would take an army of men to accomplish in the mountainous areas where most of the pines are planted and grown overseas.

This is the sort of advantage we possess, but we are not making use of it. Another important factor—and I will come back to this again later—is the political stability of this country. This is very important.

Returning for a moment to the fast growing rate, an interesting situation arises, and it is the basic reason loan schemes failed and the reason straight-out grants have been adopted instead. I am referring to the compounding of costs over a long period of time. This is a field in which we have a tremendous advantage over slower pine-growing countries. I do not intend to quote the whole of this information, but only that portion which is relevant. This is again from *The Australian Timber Journal*, and the article is by Dr. Jacobs to whom I have already referred. He says—

The amount of interest accumulated depends on the length of time over which it must be compounded and the rate charged. The way it works can be gauged from Table I, which shows the way a charge of one unit increases with different rates of interest over different periods of time.

This is the field in which we really have an advantage. Dr. Jacobs has compiled a table indicating the rates of interest from 2 per cent. to 7 per cent. while the periods range from five to 80 years. For the purpose of this exercise I will quote the interest rate of 5 per cent. a unit and I will use the dollar in my demonstration.

At the rate of 5 per cent. compounded over the years, in five years the dollar has become \$1.30; in 10 years it has become \$1.60; in 20 years, \$2.70; and in 30 years it has become \$4.30. In Western Australia a start is made on cutting after 15 years and most of it would be cut out by the time 25 years had elapsed.

In Britain if the rate is only double, a very different situation occurs. In 40 years the dollar becomes \$7. In 60 years, which is double the time in Western Australia, the dollar becomes \$17.70. The growing rate in Western Australia is two and a half or three times faster than it is in Britain and so the number of years involved over there could be something like 80 years and the figure then would be \$49.60.

This is why we have a tremendous advantage with our fast-growing period and this is mainly why the loan systems have failed. Because of this advantage we have I believe we could encourage investment. In fact, I am certain, having spoken to people from overseas, that we could encourage private enterprise here without recourse to grants which we cannot afford.

Another aspect comes into this. In my opinion, it is the reason we are not advancing half as fast as we should with our planting. In the Nannup area, pine forest timber is dying from water stress because the trees are too thick and have not been thinned as they should be. Natural selection is considered cheaper than paying to thin the trees when there is no market for the product. This might sound crazy when I have said there is a shortage of timber. It is a fact that we do not have sufficient to supply any sort of a market, because there must be continuity of supply which we do not have at this stage. We will need to have much bigger plantations if we are to achieve anything like this aim.

Another ill effect from the lack of thinning and from allowing the trees to die from water stress is that the remaining vegetation is affected. There is not the growth there should be on the trees that live. It is not good silviculture to allow this, but under our present set-up there is not much choice.

To return to the subject of Japan. I have already said there are 60,000,000 acres of forest in that country. Nevertheless, Japan is desperate for land anywhere in the world on which to plant softwoods. It has recently acquired 1,000,000 acres in Brazil for this purpose. An organisation exists in Japan which is known as the Japan Overseas Afforestation Association. It is an association of forest interests, co-operatives, and companies which investigate the possibilities of land overseas for planting purposes. The Japanese Government provides 50 per cent. of the finance for this organisation.

Sitting suspended from 6.02 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Mr. President, prior to the tea suspension I had just reached Brazil. I think I had made the point that Japanese interests, through the work of the Japan Overseas Afforestation Association had acquired an area of 1,000,000 acres in Brazil for softwood plantations. I am also told—and I have no reason to believe this is not true—that they are fairly concerned about

things there; firstly, because of the instability in the political situation in Brazil, upon which I do not need to enlarge. I think everybody knows how politically unstable things can be in that country.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They have a few nuts there.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I have said that we are a stable country—perhaps not quite as stable since the last election as we were before, but still stable enough.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I think you must have been more unstable before the election.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It will improve as time goes on.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Of course, they cannot grow our fast-growing trees—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you talking about Brazil now or the present Government?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I understand the Japanese propose to grow a form of Carribean pine, and they were also rather concerned as to whether these can be successfully grown in Brazil. I think there is quite a bit of doubt about the whole project.

Another thing the Japanese are concerned with is the fact that Brazil is five times as far from Japan as is Western Australia; so transport in this context is a very big consideration.

I know the Japanese people are very interested indeed in acquiring land—in Western Australia in particular, but also in Australia generally other than in Queensland. For some reason they have investigated Queensland and they feel it not suitable for their needs. But Western Australia is eminently suitable for the reasons I detailed earlier; which include the cost of growing pines here.

I believe this matter should be examined very carefully by the Forests Department. There has been talk of making land available for planting which is at present held by that department. I think Japanese companies would also be interested in purchasing land if they could not get it any other way. But this would necessitate their pouring a lot of capital into the purchase of land, capital which could be better spent in planting pine—I mean planting it, not getting land to plant it as the department is doing at the present time. I think this should be carefully examined.

Some of the officers in the Forests Department are changing their attitude but unfortunately the general attitude is that we have not got any land available for this purpose. The officers are not sure whether this land or that land will grow radiata pine. I am quite convinced there are large areas which carry a poor type of indigenous

timber. This timber could be removed and the land made available to Japanese or other interests wishing to grow pine.

I should make it clear that the Japanese want to grow pine for export purposes, and I think a deal could be negotiated with the Japanese on the same basis that many of these plantation ideas are put into operation these days. The department would make the land available to the growers, who do not pay a cash rental for it. This goes right back to what I tried to explain in the compounding of the costs. What is done is that the department makes the land available and then the royalties are taken when the timber is harvested. In our case I think it would probably be advantageous to take it out in timber; a proportion of the harvest becomes the property of the State for the use of the land.

Of course, this would involve people putting capital in at risk because in some of the areas it may be doubtful to what extent they could grow good pine. Therefore, if any area is a partial failure, the planters would pay less for the use of the land. The system would be self-adjusting in this way, and this is how it works in a number of cases. I think we should look very carefully at propositions such as this.

There is a large area of land north of the road between Augusta and Nannup which I am quite convinced would carry radiata pine.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What does it carry now?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: There are other areas between Busselton and Nannup where the jarrah is becoming diseased. In another decade there will not be any jarrah in those areas, it will all be dead. This is very serious, and I think the obvious thing to do is cut the jarrah out and make the land available for planting pine. The disease would not affect the pine as it does the eucalypts.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: This is what they are doing now.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: They are only doing it in very small areas. It will not have any impact in the form of a quick build-up.

I repeat what I have said: our assessment of a quarter of a million acres at the turn of the century will not be sufficient. I think this will be the same as everything else—what is sufficient today will not be anywhere sufficient in 30 years' time. I think this is what will happen. At the present rate of planting by the Government it will take us 30 years to get that quantity. By the turn of the century at our rate of planting we will have 240,000 acres if we are lucky and maintain the present rate of planting, which I doubt very much.

We must look to private capital; very large sums of private capital. I am informed, and again I have no reason to doubt

the information, that one Japanese company alone would be prepared to come and plant here, if the land were available, at the rate of 6,000 acres a year; which is the rate at which we are planting at the moment for a period of 15 years.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What about New Zealand?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: New Zealand is more interested in attracting capital rather than putting money into Australia for forest growing.

I think this should be looked at very carefully while we have Japanese, British, and other people who are interested in coming here with a view to planting.

The reaction one gets from the department is, "We want this land for ourselves. We will want this in the future." If one looks at what they mean by the future, one will find it will be 40 years before they think about planting it.

The idea of the Japanese companies is the same as a lot of other interests—they want the wood mainly for pulp. They would harvest their pines at the age of about 15 years. The pines would be planted close together and harvested with a mechanical harvester like an oat crop at the age of between 15 to 18 years. Even if the trees were grown to full maturity, which is about 30 years for radiata pine, the Japanese could come in here, plant the crop, harvest it and be gone before we could get around to planting it at our present rate. The department's attitude just does not make sense to me.

I think we should look very closely at trying to attract capital. As I said previously, we can attract investment here without resorting to monetary grants. I think we can do it without that because of the advantages we have. The major aim should be to attract the investment of private capital by creating a sympathetic environment of co-operation and trust. I mentioned earlier the lack of this atmosphere between private landholders and the department at the moment.

This could be done comparatively cheaply by providing services which the investors need but cannot readily provide for themselves; services such as income tax benefits, technical advice, and laboratory services, which are important. We have the means to do this, and this should be a part of any contract investors would have with the department. Private enterprise should have the approval of the department in planting stock so that only the best stock is planted; because this is just as important in growing a pine tree as it is in breeding a racehorse. The stock has to be good if we are to be successful.

We must give credit to our State Forests Department. It has put a great deal of work into selecting good stock. It has spent years sending men overseas

to select the best so we can grow our pines from the best. I think they can give valuable advice to investors coming to this State.

Another thing which should be looked at—and this is not going to cost the Government anything in the way of cash—is the matter of probate. Probate is a serious bar to the planting of forests and the harvesting of them for one reason only. A person who plants pines must have a good deal of capital and usually he would be about 35 to 40 years at least before he plants the trees. The trees do not reach maturity for 30 years, so it is unlikely he will see his harvest; he will be dead. Under our present provisions, when he dies the timber would probably be harvested prematurely to pay the probate. This has been experienced in other countries, and in the United Kingdom they have created legislation to avoid this very thing. In the United Kingdom—and I think this should be looked at here—when a death occurs the value of the plantation is assessed at the date of the death of the owner and probate is assessed on that value, but that does not become payable until the timber is sold, either by felling at maturity or the sale of the plantation. In other words, it is deferred payment.

If there is a second death, the first assessment is scrubbed altogether, it becomes redundant. The estate is valued again at the time of the second death, and again the assessment of probate is made on that value, and again payment is deferred until the timber is harvested. This policy continues through any number of deaths, so that a system of deferred payment and updating of values is constantly in operation.

I think that system should be looked at very carefully because I believe it is sound; it gets away from the main problem of immature timber being felled to pay probate.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What would happen if a fire went through the area and burnt the tract?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Insurance cover is available for forests at quite reasonable rates. It is available from private companies, but I do not know whether it is available through the Government. However, I think the honourable member will find that insurance is available at reasonable rates.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Insurance is part of the capital structure.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, that is so. Therefore, I think consideration should be given to making available areas of land for timber planting. I feel also that the probate question should be seriously considered. Perhaps some alterations could be made in the matter of income tax because this also has been a bit of a stumbling block, although it is not

all that serious at the moment and the people I have spoken to in regard to investing in this State do not regard it as seriously as the matter of probate.

Under our present taxing laws a person can grow a forest in 30 years and he becomes liable for income tax in the year in which he harvests it. This type of timber growing is treated as a crop and not as indigenous timber. As members will know, if a person sells indigenous timber on his property by the load he must pay income tax. If he sells the cutting right to a milling company, that does not mean he sells the timber by the load; he simply sells the right to cut the timber for whatever period may be agreed upon and in that case he does not pay income tax.

However, that does not apply in the case of man-made forests; they are treated as a crop. I think this problem should be investigated. If the State Government and the Forests Department take some of my suggestions seriously, perhaps they will be prepared to take up this matter with the Commonwealth.

As another suggestion, I think perhaps the best way to start off this business is for the Forests Department to establish a better understanding between itself and private landholders or private investors who are willing to invest in forestry. In this respect we should do what has been done in so many other countries; that is, establish an advisory board. This is not an original idea on my part, it is something that is done in other countries.

I would suggest that an advisory board be set up to advise the Government from time to time, to liaise between the private grower and the Forests Department—at the moment there is no liaison—and to co-ordinate points of view. If this were done I think it would be the start of the breakdown of hostilities which exist at the moment. I suggest that the advisory board could be established along these lines, although it need not necessarily be exactly as I suggest: There could be appointed one representative from the Treasury, a representative of the Forests Department, a representative from the Country Shire Councils' Association, a representative of what I would call wood lot farmers, a representative of Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants, and two representatives from private forestry interests.

I suggest a representative from the Country Shire Councils' Association because shire councils are concerned in the matter of private forestry inasmuch as private plantations are ratable. This does not apply to Government plantations; they are not ratable. I feel there should be a representative of private wood lot farmers—they are farmers who plant some of their own land—because much interest is being shown in this now and I think with encouragement more farmers will

plant. I do not think the wood lot farmers will have much effect on the overall forestry position, but I think they should be encouraged and relations between the Forests Department and farmers would be improved if more farmers were interested in forestry.

I suggest the two representatives from private interests should come from the larger interests for the reason that there might be a tendency for those representatives to slant things in the interests of whatever company or co-operative that happens to employ them. By having two representatives I think we could keep the game clean, if I might use that expression.

As I have said, there is nothing new or original about this idea. Similar organisations are in operation in other countries. In the United Kingdom the Home Grown Timber Advisory Committee of Great Britain has been established. The committee consists of an independent chairman, a representative of the Timber Growers Organisation of England and Wales, a representative of the Scottish Woodland Owners Association, a representative of the Home Timber Merchants' Association of Scotland, a representative of the Timber Trades Federation, a representative of the Timber Research and Development Association, and two representatives of small wood lot owners.

Members will notice that no Government or Forestry Commission representatives are included in the advisory committee of that country. That is the stage to which Great Britain has advanced in encouraging private forestry, and they work together very closely and very harmoniously. That was not always the case; at one time they were almost in the position in which we find ourselves now, but they have managed to get over it.

The Home Grown Timber Advisory Committee is recognised as being competent to advise on all aspects of forestry in Great Britain. Normally, its advice is tendered to the Forestry Commission, but it is authorised to tender advice direct to Ministers whenever the committee so desires, so that it has direct access to forestry Ministers. Meetings are held quarterly and Forestry Commission people attend the meetings to tender advice if required and to hear things at first hand rather than wait for the minutes to be issued.

A similar situation exists in Finland, where there is a body known as the General Forestry Associations of Finland. In Sweden there is the National Federation of Swedish Forest Owners Associations. Similar bodies also exist in the United States and in Norway. So this is quite a common practice and I understand the organisations work very well and have developed understanding between government and private interests.

I think I mentioned earlier that there are some 480,000,000-odd acres of forests in the United States, but only 27 per cent. of that area is publicly owned. The rest is private forest, which illustrates that private forests play an important part in that country. In Britain the area of private forest is expected to overtake the area of Government forest. I suggest it is only by the use of such methods that we will achieve what I feel is the necessary result in Western Australia. This State just has not the funds to be able to do it alone. I suggest the first thing to do is to change some of the thinking within the department, and that must be done by the Government.

In fact, many people seem to think that the money being made available to the States under the Softwood Forestry Agreement—and this is a point I have not made previously, but I think it is important because it refers back to the point I made in regard to the compounding of costs—is merely a grant; but that is not so. I think the States are going to be hanged by the neck, as usual, by the Commonwealth in this regard because the funds made available under that agreement are actually loans made over a period of 35 years. No interest or repayments are applied for the first 10 years, but after that interest is payable at the rate of five per cent.—I think it is—and the repayments begin. This brings me back to the objection I have in regard to what the department is doing at the moment; that is, it is using that money, plus loan funds, and a large amount of the reforestation fund for the purchase of land for pine planting.

At the moment we have in hand sufficient land to plant and I suggest it would take at least seven years to plant that land. The money we are borrowing and which we will have to commence repaying at the end of 10 years, together with interest and sinking fund, is not being spent on planting the land. Instead it is being spent on buying land; and we are not building up an asset to offset our repayments. To my mind that is very poor business practice. It seems to me that if we borrow money on which we have to pay interest after the expiration of 10 years, we should as quickly as possible establish the asset for which we borrowed the money. I feel this matter is most important and should be considered carefully.

Mr. President, I wish to apologise to you and members for taking up rather a lot of your time. There are a great many more things with which I would like to deal, but I think I have taken up sufficient time on this occasion and I suppose there will be other occasions. For the moment I will leave it at that. I do hope the Government will look into at least some of the suggestions I have put forward, because I feel they are of importance to the future of the

timber industry in this State. I feel they will help save the State from spending, on timber imports, not only the \$10,000,000 which was spent in 1912 or the \$210,000,000 which is being spent today, but also the expenditure of goodness knows what amount by the turn of the century.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [7.57 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion. Whilst I am on my feet I would like to take this opportunity to present my hardy annual to the House. Mr. Ron Thompson mentioned that if one talks about something long enough it eventually comes to pass. I only hope that I do not have to talk about this matter for as long as he did before it comes to pass. However, if it takes that long all I can say is, "Lord help those in Carnarvon."

My hardy annual—and this is now the fourth year I have presented it—concerns the Gascoyne River and the effect of the river on the town of Carnarvon. Each year I rise to my feet to bring to the notice of the Government the position which exists in Carnarvon and how vitally necessary it is to have an augmented and stable supply of water. Part of the Premier's policy speech in regard to water supplies states—

Labor Governments in Western Australia have by far the best record in the provision of water, and we shall carry on the tradition by according this work a high priority.

However, I refer members to *The West Australian* of the 2nd June, 1971, where in the "News Of The North" section the heading "The Ord and Gascoyne" appears. The article states—

In this issue of News Of The North and in the next three issues the Premier, Mr Tonkin, provides the answers to a number of questions about the North.

One of the questions was as follows:—

Q: What priority will you give to damming the Gascoyne River to allow expansion of Carnarvon's irrigation potential?

The answer was—

The question of priorities has not arisen, because so far there is no proven scheme for impounding water. Investigations show that a major dam is not feasible for a number of technical reasons, including the intermittent flow of the river.

That is the very reason why we want the dam—because of the intermittent flow. If the river flowed every year we would not need the dam. Sometimes I wonder why I continue to stand up here and talk about the Gascoyne River.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: I suppose you stand up, because the President will not allow you to sit down and talk.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I suppose that is a good enough reason. I want to get the message across. The answer goes on to point out that the work has been concentrated on a small dam at Rocky Pool, and field investigations are proceeding steadily. That is the understatement of the century. Work has stood still in the 12 years that the investigations have been going on. I marvel that the investigations can take such a long time.

When there was a desire to construct an atomic bomb during the last World War it did not take very long for one to be produced; but when it is a matter of providing something for a peaceful purpose—something which is essential to an area in the north of the State, which has supported itself over the years with very little, if any, assistance at all—it has taken 12 years of investigations, and we are no closer to a solution to the problem of retaining some of the water which flows out to the sea every year the river flows. This river has flowed every year since 1960, but how great a quantity of water flowed out to sea I cannot hazard a guess.

If one saw the water of the Gascoyne River from bank to bank when it flowed one might get some appreciation of the quantity of water that flowed out to sea. When one looks at the ocean and sees the discolouration of the water at the mouth of the river caused by the silt from the river entering into the sea, one is able to get an appreciation of the quantity that goes out. Yet, after all this time we do not seem to be any closer to a solution. I must go back a little, and deal with the Gascoyne River and the areas which are open to irrigation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What is the answer to solving the problem?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: We might be able to have a decision made. When the areas were opened up for irrigation, because it was thought at the time to have sufficient water to enable the land to be cultivated, it was necessary to allocate a fairly large section of the river to each settler, so that he could draw sufficient water in order to make a living. In those days the properties were mainly family units, and it was considered that a fairly large section of the river had to be allocated to each settler to enable the property to be worked as an economic unit. In those days if the river did not flow things got pretty grim.

Then came the time when market gardeners from the south of this State established themselves at Carnarvon, and as a result winter crops were grown. These were shown to be very lucrative. Subsequently the properties were subdivided. In the original allocation of water rights no provision was made to ensure that when the land was subdivided the water supply would also be subdivided. Instead, the blocks were cut up but the section of the

river allocated to each was insufficient. So more people were establishing units, but there was not any additional water.

In the 1950s a clay barrier was built across the river. The Government Geologist of the time addressed a meeting of the growers and explained that this river system was not peculiar to the area, and advised that an effective method of storing the water would be by building a series of clay barriers at intervals, so that the water could be stored and drawn on when required.

In the 1950s the Government of the day constructed one clay barrier, probably as an experiment. It was against the recommendations of the Government Geologist to construct a single barrier. What he recommended to a meeting was that one barrier would be useless, and what was required was a series of clay banks.

During the 1950s we experienced a series of bad seasons; there were floods, and a couple of cyclones. At the end of the 1950s we experienced a particularly long dry period when there was a small flow of the river. The water got down to the other side of the bridge, nine miles from the sea, and trickled along. Finally in the 1958-59 summer the river ceased to flow at all. It was in 1960 that we experienced a flow of some major proportions. I do not know whether the change of Government brought that flow, but there was a change of Government and it was held that this change brought about the flow.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You have had a flow of the river ever since.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: We have had a flow of the river ever since. We asked whether the Government would do something to retain some of the water which was flowing into the sea. The Government agreed but only if it took control of the existing water supply, otherwise it would be like a dog chasing its tail. After a lot of discussion and several meetings it was agreed that control would be passed over to the Government, on the understanding that action would be taken to resolve the water position and that the supply would be augmented so that there would be sufficient water in times of drought. Everyone thought that was a very good idea.

Twelve years have now elapsed, and the water from the river is still subject to being rationed. It has not been necessary to apply rationing, because the river has flowed each year. However, we are no closer to getting a stable or an augmented supply. The matter is still under investigation, as it has been for the last 12 years.

An adequate supply of water is important to the economic operation of the properties, and it would be a disaster if the river did not flow, in view of the increased population which has settled in the area. The agricultural units which have been established on the banks of the river make this

ten square miles of land the richest in the Commonwealth—probably in the world—because the productive capacity of the land is almost unbelievable.

With the establishment of industry in the area it is absolutely vital that we have a stable water supply. The town has built up to one of some proportions. It used to be the biggest town north of Geraldton, but since the development further north it has been superseded in size. However, it is still a town of some consequence.

I have got to the stage of mentioning that the matter was still under investigation. We do not know how it is progressing. The Deputy President of the Carnarvon Shire, Mr. Tuckey, is reported in *The West Australian* of the 12th May, 1971, under the heading of "Tuckey asks for study of dam blast," as having taken the following action:—

The deputy-president of Carnarvon Shire, Mr. C. W. Tuckey, has asked the Minister for Community Welfare, Mr. W. F. Willesee, to study proposals for using a nuclear blast to dam the Gascoyne.

Mr. Tuckey first suggested the idea after reading a paper by T. D. J. Leech.

Mr. Leech was formerly engineer in charge of the scientific services division of the Snowy Mountains Authority.

In his paper he advocated diffusion blasting as a cheap, efficient means of creating deep water storage dams under conditions similar to the Gascoyne.

When mention is made of the use of atomic energy hands are raised in horror. No doubt, when that is mentioned people think of the times when Hiroshima and Nagasaki were destroyed by atomic bombs. Since that time the world has gone a long way in the peaceful use of atomic energy, which is a process developed from the atomic bombs used in the last World War. The use of atomic energy has been applied in medicine and industry.

When a proposal is made to apply the use of atomic energy in the construction of a dam or for blasting we seem to run into trouble. Such a method was mentioned in the development of a couple of projects, but in view of the row that resulted everybody concerned seemed to wash their hands of the proposal and nothing further was done about it. In the area with which I am concerned the use of atomic energy for the construction of a dam is worth investigating, and the Government should gather some information on this matter.

After 12 years of investigation we are told that the spot in the Kennedy Range selected for the construction of a dam was not feasible. I do not know the present indications in respect of a dam in

the Rocky Pool area, but I suppose someone has some ideas. I think we ought to have a look at the use of atomic energy for the establishment of a dam in the Carnarvon area.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Would you not have some evaporation problems?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: A deeper hole can be made by using atomic energy, and a greater quantity of water retained. I do not know the pros and cons of the questions, but I think it is worthy of study. An attempt should be made to do this instead of having the matter shelved and having everyone throwing his hands up in horror when an atomic blast is proposed.

None of the experts agree on the method of construction. The place I have mentioned is ideal for carrying out a trial run in the use of atomic energy. I would point out that at Monte Bello Island an atomic blast was set off many years ago, but since that time we have gone a long way.

I understand that on projects where diffusion blasting has been used people were able to enter the area after a couple of days in perfect safety. Therefore the use of atomic energy in the construction of a dam in the Carnarvon area might not sound to be an impractical idea. We should take a good look at this matter and obtain some information. We should listen to the views of people who have been working on similar projects. I refer especially to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its Ploughshare project.

I hope that before I have to get on my feet again to speak to the Address-in-Reply, at the next session of Parliament, I will receive some better news than that which I received tonight. During the post-war years we have spent millions of dollars on overseas foreign aid. From what I hear that money did not do much good in some places. Yet, when we require money for an investigation we find that the lid on the Treasury chest is pretty tight. I think we should prise it open a little. I hope that in the near future a solution will be found to the problem regarding the Gascoyne River and the water situation at Carnarvon.

There is another matter in the same area which concerns me, and my colleague, Mr. Dellar, has already mentioned it. Of course, I refer to the town of Exmouth. A sum of approximately \$13,000,000 is to be spent on the R.A.A.F. base at Learmonth and the town is growing. However, the section of road between the two ribbons of bitumen is in very poor condition. Only last week it was again closed because of a shower of rain. I would have thought there would be a programme whereby a certain amount of money could be allocated each year to seal that section of road. I remember when I attended the opening of

the Eyre Highway at Eucla the then Premier said a sum of money was put aside each year so that the highway could be built. Suddenly, one day it was found the highway had been completed to the South Australian border.

The same programme should apply to the Exmouth road. If we wait until there is enough spare money, we will wait for ever. I have never heard of any Government having any spare money. There has to be a programme so that each year a section of the road will be completed; not a willy-nilly programme of doing some work when funds become available.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I think there was a programme, but nobody stuck to it.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: It is about time somebody did stick to a programme; it is time we had a bit of organisation somewhere so that there is an allocation made for the completion of the road. A lot depends on the road itself. Supplies which go to Exmouth have to go by road or by air. The cost of goods taken to Exmouth by air is exorbitant. Anybody who has had anything to do with air freighting of perishable foods will know such goods are very dear.

I hope that by the next time I get to my feet to speak on the Address-in-Reply we will have a programme for the Exmouth road so that we will know when it is to be completed. I hope it is tomorrow.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I thought the honourable member might have been hoping otherwise.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I will now again refer to the pastoral industry in the Lower North Province. I have mentioned this matter many times and I again point out the difficult situation the industry faces at the present time. Mr. Dellar mentioned that he had received a telegram from Leonora, and I also received a similar telegram. On the 27th July, I asked the Leader of the House the following question:—

In view of the serious financial situation in the drought-stricken pastoral areas of Lower North Province, will the Government supply assistance until Federal finance becomes available?

The reply I received was as follows:—

No official advice has been received from the Commonwealth that assistance will be made available to the wool industry, nor of the precise nature of any planned assistance.

Financing of a pastoral business is basically a responsibility of the pastoralist and his financiers. It is their joint responsibility to provide funds until the impact of any Commonwealth assistance can be assessed. The possibility of emergency State assistance is however being examined for special cases where, due to unusual

circumstances carry on finance is not now available but the pastoralist with Commonwealth assistance seems to have prospects of continuing in the industry.

Well, that is a ray of hope. I am concerned at the time it takes for the wheels of the machinery to grind around. I marvel that the wheels can turn so slowly. While those wheels are grinding so slowly, people are suffering and they do not know what they are to do. I hope the wheels will turn a little faster and that assistance will be provided where it is needed.

We have received some rain in the north, but not sufficient to break the drought. Any rain is good rain, particularly in the areas which concern me.

I hope that the recommendations of the mining inquiry committee include a provision for compensation to be paid to pastoralists whose properties have been virtually ruined by the activities of the prospecting companies and the mining companies.

It seems that pastoralists have been placed in the situation whereby they are having the last ounce wrung from them. It has been told to me that one pastoralist was in a position to sell his wool, but because his wool clip was under lien, he was obliged to dispose of it through a particular firm. The loss to him from disposing of the wool through that firm was \$15,000. By any calculation that is a fair amount of money and it could mean the difference between a pastoralist continuing and going to the wall. There seems to be something wrong with a system where this can happen. I understand the pastoralist wanted to pay the amount of the lien, but that was not allowed. His wool had to be disposed of through a particular firm and the result was that \$15,000 went down the drain. When a system such as that prevails in the industry, it is not conducive to successful farming, particularly in these difficult times.

Getting away from the pastoral industry, and onto the mining industry, some very exciting developments have taken place in the Lower North Province. One company concerned in the excitement was on everyone's lips last year, and I refer to Poseidon. A picture appeared in *The West Australian* of Wednesday, the 28th July, 1971, showing the Premier, Mr. Graham and Mr. May signing an agreement which will mean the commencement of operations at the Poseidon mine.

It does seem rather tragic that we are to have two towns in the area. The mining company will establish a new town within a stone's throw of Laverton. It seems to me there could have been some agreement whereby the facilities which exist at Laverton could have been used by the company, instead of having two towns within a stone's throw of each other. Of course,

when I say "a stone's throw" that means anything from 20 miles to 30 miles in that area.

Coupled with the Poseidon agreement is the fact that we are to upgrade the existing railway from Kalgoorlie to Malcolm. This shows a lack of foresight. We are to upgrade the present line when it has already been proved very forcibly to us how this State has been disadvantaged in the past because we disagreed with the other States and built a 3 ft. 6 in. railway throughout our State.

Poseidon is only one mining company taking part in the very exciting development. A few miles further north, in the vicinity of Agnew, there exists some substantial deposits. Poseidon is the beginning of an extensive area in which there will be some very imposing developments.

It seems to me to be a very short-sighted policy to upgrade the present railway line. That line was nearly closed a few years ago because it was falling to pieces. We will rue the day we decided to upgrade the line. In the not-too-distant future we will find the line will not be able to carry the freight available to it and then a standard gauge line will have to be constructed at a much higher cost.

Another hardy annual of mine is the 26th parallel, as it relates to taxation allowances, and to Government thinking. I have been told that the Government does not consider the 26th parallel as a yardstick, but I am sure it does. Just recently contractors were allowed to cart goods from north of the 26th parallel, so the Government does use the 26th parallel as a yardstick.

I think it is time we forgot about the 26th parallel because it has lost its usefulness. As is known, the 26th parallel is an imaginary line drawn across the Commonwealth. It starts just below Yaringa station in the Carnarvon area, crosses near Wiluna, and goes right through to the eastern seaboard. For taxation purposes one is in Zone A above the 26th parallel, and in Zone B below the 26th parallel. The difference means a substantial reduction. However, one must spend 183 days—or 184 days in a leap year—north of the 26th parallel in any one tax year to be able to benefit from the taxation reduction. Those people whose work year goes from the 1st January to the 31st December, are caught in a vicious circle and cannot qualify. The argument used, of course, is that it is an inducement to attract people to the area. The 26th parallel is not there just so that some people have the misfortune to work in a certain area.

So, I think the 26th parallel is not in the best interests of this State. As I have pointed out previously, Carnegie station is just north of the line but the adjoining station of Windidda is just south of the line.

It is simply beyond me how a line could separate these two places, one being in Zone A and the other being in Zone B. They are about 40 miles apart and situated east of Wiluna on the edge of the desert.

Eucla is 450 miles from Norseman and far from any habitation on the South Australian side, but because it is south of the 26th parallel the people who live in that area are not entitled to any of the allowances that are made available in the north. To me, it is perfectly ridiculous. I am not saying that people north of the 26th parallel should be deprived of the allowances but I think a realistic view should be taken of the distance people live from facilities.

I also wish to mention the radio and Press publicity given to the threat of a flood heading for Carnarvon. Never in my life have I heard such a shemuzzle as that caused when the Press and radio took up the story. I cannot find out where the information came from. The rain fell in two areas, on two different river systems in two isolated places. The shemuzzle that occurred was so fantastic that even people who had been there for years were beginning to believe it and to doubt whether they know where it rained in those areas.

My next door neighbour came to me and asked, "Aren't you moving out?" I said, "Whatever for?" She said, "Haven't you heard the radio?" I said, "I don't care what's on the radio." She said, "A flood is coming." I said, "Fiddlesticks!" People were ringing relatives up from Sydney and asking, "What are you doing up at Carnarvon? What can we do to help you?" They said they had heard the news on TV in Sydney and thought they must be in danger.

The river must have lasted fully a day at its peak of nine feet when it finally got down to the bridge.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It was nine feet two days ago.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: That is right. In 1965, I think, in one area on the Gascoyne River 12 to 14 inches of rain fell. At that time the river reached 18 feet at the bridge and it took nearly a fortnight to get down to the sea. How anyone could concoct panic like that is beyond me. I think there should be some means whereby people can obtain authoritative information about these things. The citizens of the town should not be subjected to this barrage of publicity about what is going to happen to them.

The Hon. J. L. Hunt: Time and time again the same thing happens in regard to weather.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: It is absolutely ridiculous. Although one has lived there for years, one begins to think there must be something in it when it is pounded into one so much by the radio and newspapers. Reporters were sent to Carnarvon

to see this water, and when they arrived they could not believe there was no water in the river. One man who was working in the river bed was asked, "Aren't you getting out of the river!" He said, "Whatever for?" The reporter said, "Because of the water that is coming down. Don't you know about it?" The man said, "No, I don't know about it." The reporter said, "That amazes me." It amazed me, too. It amazed everyone. In the general flap, I think the people from one caravan park moved up to O.T.C., but the next minute they had to move back again because nothing happened.

On the subject of publicity, Mr. MacKinnon mentioned some photographs of forests. On one occasion when we had floods in Carnarvon, a picture appeared in various papers showing a man in water right up to his neck. It is rather deep water if it is up to one's neck when one is standing in it, but when one is lying down in it with one's head sticking up out of the water it is not very deep at all. That is how the photograph was taken. It did not show the man standing up in the water; it showed his head poking up out of the water, so that it looked as if he were standing up, and that is the impression people got. They were saying, "My God, look what is happening up at Carnarvon!"

On another occasion a photographer came along and said, "We are doing a publicity stunt in the district. We want to see the plantations." At the time we had some good mandarins in Carnarvon. The photographer said, "That is just the thing." However, he wanted a picture which showed the size of the mandarins, and he looked around and saw a little girl. One man said he wanted to get his son into the picture but the photographer said, "No, we want someone who is small so that it will show up well." He posed the little girl holding the mandarins next to her head, and he said, "There is nothing faked about this—it is just a straightout picture." The way the picture was taken, the mandarins looked enormous. This is the sort of thing that happens when such pictures are taken. One cannot believe one's eyes; one must be very careful.

In this House last year many letters from the State School Teachers' Union were read. Dr. Hislop, for one, had a great bundle of them and read out quite a few letters on one occasion. I wish to read part of a letter that was addressed to me. It concerns a meeting that was held in the Perth Town Hall on the 22nd June. The part of the letter which I will read should cause us some concern. It says—

This meeting was arranged jointly by the W.A. Teachers' Union and the W.A. Federation of Parents and Citizens. Among the people who spoke was the State Treasurer, Mr. T. D. Evans, M.L.A.

Mr. T. D. Evans said that as a result of the Australian Education Council's survey of the needs of education for the period 1970-75 it would be necessary to increase the Western Australian allocation of funds for education from revenue sources to an estimated \$505 million in the next five years. He went on to say this would be more than double the present allocation and he stated that the prospects of achieving this target were minimal. He also stated that the deficit for the year 1970-71 would be at least \$6 million and that the outlook for 1971-72 was equally grim. In conclusion Mr. Evans said it would be hard to achieve the previous steady upward trend in education expenditure in the near future.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Mr. Garland spoke before him and he made a condition in the sob story he quoted to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I am quoting a letter from the State School Teachers' Union. This letter says nothing about Mr. Garland, so I cannot quote Mr. Garland. The honourable member will appreciate that.

I hope I have got the message home to this Government that, with the situation that exists in the town of Carnarvon, something must be done about the river.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I hope you have more success with this Government than you had with the previous Government.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: The Leader of the House might remember the time when he was up there. Very little has happened since he has been a member of the House, and he has been here for some time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The ball is at the Minister's feet.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I hope this augurs well for the future and that we will have an increased river flow. In the past, we have only been able to get it to flow for nine months of the year. If the present Government can make the river flow for 12 months of the year I will keep it in office for a long time; otherwise, out it goes.

I thank members of the House for listening to me and I support the motion.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [8.43 p.m.]: I think my speech will be something of an anti-climax after the speech we have just heard. After listening to that speech I am seriously contemplating moving to Carnarvon. Nothing like that ever happens in our neck of the woods and it must be very entertaining to live up there.

I would like to join in congratulating all the new members who have been elected to the House, the old members who have been re-elected, and the Government. May the Government remain in office for as long as the electors are willing to keep it there.

If I remember rightly, on this occasion last year I said I was sure the problems of the rural people would soon be over. I made mention of the rural committees of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, and the Country Party. All those parties had policies as regards farmers but I am sorry to say that during the last 12 months the situation has not improved. Despite all the rural policies the plight of the farmers is, perhaps, much worse than it was at this time last year.

We have heard a great deal about rehabilitation. Personally, I am convinced that the only way to rehabilitate farmers at the present time is to do something about wool. The Federal Government apparently has something in mind for us in the Budget. I hope the amount to be allocated is sufficient and that it will achieve all that is necessary.

I am concerned about all this talk of subsidies for farmers, and so on. I think this is very wrong. In today's paper there is a headline reading, "\$571,000 aid for 303 farmers."

This is all very true. The small print in the body of the article, however, states that this amount must be repaid out of the first crop. The rank and file of the public would never read those last few lines.

To make my point further I would indicate that while Mr. Withers was being interviewed on television the other night the gentleman who was with him kept asking, "What about the millions the farmers are getting?"

We should consider what the farmers will get as cost compensation not as subsidy. Many of the costs the farmers have incurred which have placed them in the position in which they find themselves today have been incurred for the benefit of the rest of the community. That is why I feel we should not talk about subsidies; we should call this cost compensation.

There may be some farmers in the newer areas who are leaving their properties but in the main this is not the case at all. It is certainly not the case with the well established farmers. For example in the three Great Southern towns I do not know of one farmer who has gone off his property or who is likely to go off his farm. I admit there are many who would sell their farms if they were able to get the right price for them.

It is the people in the towns who are really being affected. For example there are 60 empty houses in the town of Wagin

—60 houses from which the State Electricity Commission has removed the meters. Some of these could, of course, be business houses. While the impact of this economic depression is very severe on the farmer it is a great deal worse on the people living in the country towns.

I think it is more a lack of confidence which is proving the greatest source of worry to the country people; it is this which makes them have doubts about their future. The situation is certainly very serious, and I am quite convinced that the best way to rehabilitate the farmers and the country towns is to rehabilitate the wool industry. Quite a number of speakers have dealt very ably with the plight in which the farmers find themselves in respect to sheep sales. For example Mr. Abbey stressed the problems associated with the Midland Junction Abattoir.

I consider it is a tragedy that Midland has become the clearing house for the surplus sheep of the State, instead of establishing itself as the meat market. Midland is the only place to which the people can send their sheep, and thousands of sheep not suitable for the trade are sent to the Midland sale yards. At this point I would say that it is possible to obtain a good price for the right type of sheep for export purposes. Buyers are visiting farms to purchase some of them. Sufficient of these are not being sent to the Midland sale yards. Anyone who has the right type of sheep will find a good market for them. The sheep that are being sent to the Midland sale yards are wrecking the market.

As members know there was a nine week strike in the middle of the glut period last year which meant that many thousands of old sheep were retained on the farms—these sheep should never have been kept on the farms. There is a sequence of a certain number of sheep available each year. The same number of old sheep crop up each year, and when there is an accumulation of old sheep over a period of two years the position becomes serious. To make matters worse, the drought had a most devastating impact on the whole position.

It is possible that the farmers are themselves a little to blame. Most of them have been forced by the economic problems associated with the times to carry more and more stock in the false belief that this is the way they can build up their income. This has worked to some extent but in the process many of these farmers have forgotten about animal husbandry and, as a result, a terrific number of wethers which would have been good enough for export to Singapore are not at the moment big enough to be exported. For export purposes one must have an animal of a decent size.

A few years ago this presented no problem at all, but today a large percentage of the sheep are rejected on account of their size. I think, perhaps, that farmers should prefer to keep one sheep and cut 12 pounds of wool rather than to keep two sheep and cut 6 pounds of wool. The cost to shear a sheep is 24c for the shearer alone without other charges. Let us hope that the proposal which will be contained in the Commonwealth budget will make things easier for all concerned.

I now wish to touch on the question of wool freights to Albany. An article in the paper states that the Government has agreed to a 50 per cent. reduction in the rail freight on wool carted to Albany from towns south of Narrogin. This is a very interesting and a very good suggestion.

I cannot, however, go along with the Government's attitude as expressed in this article which says that the Government has not approved the plan prepared by the Director-General of Transport (Mr. Knox) which would have allowed farmers in some areas to cart their wool to Albany by road. The article states—

Mr. Tonkin said that this would have brought increased freight charges on other commodities.

I cannot see that at all. I hope the reduction of 50 per cent. in rail freights will not be balanced out by increasing the freights on other commodities.

There appear to be two aims evident. One, of course, is to get a sufficient number of bales of wool into Albany. This is very important and could possibly be achieved because, at the moment, no wool is coming from Narrogin and very little from Wagin—certainly none that would go to Albany. Under the conditions mentioned in the paper I think there is a possibility of getting a considerable amount of wool from Wagin.

The Hon. J. Dolan: We hope so.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The previous transport plan envisaged a ten mile corridor and the farmers in that corridor were not very happy. They will be much happier under the new set up. I do feel, however, that this will prove to be a tragedy for the woolgrowers in the rest of the State. I will be very interested to see the result of the answer given by the Minister to a question asked by Mr. Logan today.

The article refers to areas from Narrogin south. How does this apply to Wickepin and areas east of Narrogin? Will the wool from those areas be eligible under this scheme; or will it have to go the other way?

The Hon. J. Dolan: I think it is an imaginary line drawn east and west. I think this is the case, but I cannot be definite about it.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: This would be quite a substantial help. It will help the areas from Narrogin to Albany. It is possible that some of the people from Pingelly will cart their wool by road to Narrogin and put it on the train to Albany.

I would now like to refer to the question of daylight saving. This is a pretty hot potato. At a Rotary meeting on Monday night I informed those present that they need not worry on this score. This was at a time when the news was being read. I said that Mr. Stubbs was waiting for replies to some of his letters. Members can appreciate my surprise when I got home and my wife gave me the news that daylight saving was to commence from October.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Government received letters against it but decided to go on with it.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: When the news got out all the letters started coming in. I think the rank and file is against it, but I will say that I ran into a couple of bank managers who supported the move. This is very much like the matter of traffic control, which I intend to mention later. We do not hear of the benefits that might accrue, or of how the lives will be saved by a change; all that we hear is that it will maintain the present standard difference of two hours between Western Australia and the Eastern States. We are not told what other benefits might accrue.

Many problems will arise, one of which of course will be that the working man will have so much longer to spend at the pub before going home. This will, of course, assist the publican.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: The average working man has only so much to spend and, having spent it, he goes home.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The trouble is that he will now spend Mum's share as well before he goes home.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I know that in support of the proposal the people in the cool drink trade said that this would boost trade for them. I think we have enough daylight in this State, particularly in the summer months. When we wake early in the morning it is daylight and there appears to me to be quite sufficient daylight for our purposes. Yet we find the Government now wants to have daylight saving. I do not know how much daylight saving we need in the summer months.

There are probably financial angles associated with the question of daylight saving, but I do appreciate the difficulties which will confront housewives and others who will be affected by it. I daresay, however, that we will have further opportunity to say more about this in the House later.

From the Governor's speech I see we will also have an opportunity to discuss many other matters, so I do not propose

to weary the House much longer. I would, however, like to point out that in the *Collie Mail* I notice that several farmers are finding their land pegged as a result of a sudden rush for coalmining leases. There seems to be a general lack of confidence throughout these areas at the moment. In recent times Collie has had something of a boost. The char industry has got off the ground and the prospect for coal seems a little better than it has been. The same paper states that new industries are rushing to peg coal leases and yet we find that lack of confidence.

I appreciate the fact that the Government is pledged to assist decentralisation and I wish it every success in its endeavours to do so. I do, however, also appreciate the difficulties associated with decentralisation in our country towns. This is a very difficult problem indeed.

I appreciate the assistance the Government has given to the industry and this particular town in an endeavour to maintain it. It has held its own and is improving its position a little. I repeat, the decentralisation of industry in country towns is a very serious problem at the moment.

I daresay we will have many opportunities to discuss traffic control during this session. I am sure the Minister for Police will agree that the country traffic inspectors are performing an efficient job. The main emphasis must be laid on the saving of lives in regard to any move that is made. I am as concerned about this problem as anyone else and if I could see one glimmer of hope that the takeover of traffic by the police will save lives I would support the proposal wholeheartedly, but unfortunately, to date, we have had nothing put before us to indicate that this hope will be realised. I will welcome any indication in this direction, because it would considerably allay the fears that are rising in country towns at present over the increase in the road toll which has reached serious proportions.

I agree with the move that safety belts should be made compulsory. Nevertheless, I have been told by one gentleman who has just returned from a visit to the United States of America that wearing of seatbelts in that country is not stressed.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Surely we do not have to take all our ideas from America.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: That is quite correct, and by the same token we do not have to adopt all the ideas that are put forward by any of the Eastern States. The gentleman to whom I have referred has returned from a tour of the U.S.A. and he said that seat belts in the States have fallen from favour despite the fact that they were all the go at one time.

I am more concerned about the report that appeared, I think, in Saturday's paper on the fitting of locks to the steering of all vehicles. I consider this will

present a serious problem, especially when such locks have to be fitted to the steering of old vehicles. Could the Minister give us some indication of the cost of fitting such a steering lock? I quote as an example old farm utilities which have to be licensed but which are rarely driven into the town.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Continuous investigations are being made.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The statement which appeared in the Press made it quite clear that such locks would be fitted to all vehicles. This, of course, brings me back to the remark made by Mr. Berry on publicity. I consider that many remarks made are over-publicised in the Press and we do not gain the correct impression from them. I believe that in several instances the newspapers are rendering a great disservice to the community. Mr. Berry quoted an example a while ago in regard to a statement made about Carnarvon.

I would also point out that I have a daughter in Rabaul, New Guinea. At the height of the riots in that town we were very concerned, because my daughter was living in an area which was right in the thick of the scene of the riots. However, she sent us a wire which we received on the same night we were watching reports of the riots on the TV news. From her telegram we realised that Press and TV reports on the riots had been over-exaggerated. Therefore, in my opinion, such publicity does a lot of harm in the community.

I believe greater control should be exercised over the release of reports on such matters. I do not think I have missed anything I wanted to say during this debate, and with those few remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply which was so ably moved by Miss Lyla Elliott.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police).

House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 4th August, 1971

LIQUOR

Sale of Low Alcohol Beverages: Petition

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition for presentation to the House from the Women's Christian Temperance Union of W.A., and it reads—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly

of the Parliament of Western Australia.

We the undersigned petitioners express our concern that beverages of low alcohol content are being put on sale in stores and milk bars in W.A.

Makers of beverages containing Alcohol are pressing hard to win new markets. They are exploiting a law which permits beverages with less than 2% alcohol content to be sold in milk bars and stores. The legal limit is used to its furthest point because Shandy drinks contains 1.99% alcohol.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your House will take this petition into consideration and take whatever action is needed to restrict the sale of the said beverages as to licensed premises.

I have placed my name on the top of the petition which contains nine signatures and I have certified that it is in accordance with the Standing Orders. I ask that the petition be tabled.

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

QUESTIONS (47) : ON NOTICE

1. BUILDING BLOCKS

Guilderton

Mr. HARMAN, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) When was the last sale of lots at Guilderton?
- (2) How many lots were—
 - (a) offered;
 - (b) sold?
- (3) What prices were obtained—
 - (a) maximum;
 - (b) minimum;
 - (c) average?

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

- (1) 24th February, 1968.
- (2) (a) 50.
- (b) 45.
- (3) (a) \$2,350.
- (b) \$800.
- (c) \$1,151.

2. WATER SUPPLIES

Thompson's Brook Dam

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When will construction commence on the Thompson's Brook damsite near Donnybrook?
- (2) If no date is known, what priority does this work command?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) A proposal to construct a dam in the Thompson Brook area was one of eight projects